

The Book of Jubilees Among the Apocalypses

Todd Russell Hanneken

Publication Date

30-06-2008

License

This work is made available under a All Rights Reserved license and should only be used in accordance with that license.

Citation for this work (American Psychological Association 7th edition)

Hanneken, T. R. (2008). *The Book of Jubilees Among the Apocalypses* (Version 1). University of Notre Dame. <https://doi.org/10.7274/z890rr19n0d>

This work was downloaded from CurateND, the University of Notre Dame's institutional repository.

For more information about this work, to report or an issue, or to preserve and share your original work, please contact the CurateND team for assistance at curate@nd.edu.

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES AMONG THE APOCALYPSES

VOLUME I

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate School
of the University of Notre Dame
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Todd Russell Hanneken

James C. VanderKam, Director

Graduate Program in Theology

Notre Dame, Indiana

June 2008

© Copyright by
Todd Russell Hanneken
2008
All rights reserved

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES AMONG THE APOCALYPSES

Abstract

by

Todd Russell Hanneken

The Book of Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” to express a worldview that differs significantly from the cluster of ideas typically expressed by contemporary apocalypses. Jubilees has often been viewed as a borderline or ambiguous case among apocalypses. When viewed with the proper distinctions and definitions, Jubilees is indeed atypical but not ambiguous. Jubilees does use the genre “apocalypse,” but uses it ironically. Typically, the revelatory framework of apocalypses authorizes new esoteric wisdom. Transcendence on the spatial axis typically emphasizes the influence of cosmic powers and limits human agency. Transcendence on the temporal axis typically conveys a view of history in exponential decline culminating in “final woes” and a future restoration. Although the apocalypses express great variety in worldview, they form a cluster of compatible views around these issues inherent in the use of the genre. The genre creates a reader expectation that the typical worldview will be conveyed. Jubilees, however, uses the genre to address the definitive issues of the apocalyptic worldview, and consistently presents views radically different from the typical cluster of views. Thus, the revelation in Jubilees is a re-revelation of the single eternal revelation already familiar

Todd Russell Hanneken

and accessible to all of Israel. Humans are primarily responsible for sin, suffering, and the eschatological turning point. The eschatological turning point is natural, gradual, and most importantly, realized. The inversion of reader expectations can be called irony on purely literary grounds. The intent of the author is more speculative, but the quantity and quality of the subversions of the apocalyptic worldview by means of the literary genre suggest deliberate use of irony.

CONTENTS

Volume I

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1. Uses of genre in Jubilees	4
1.2. The apocalyptic worldview defined.....	8
1.3. Reader expectation and irony	13
1.4. Previous scholarship on Jubilees among the apocalypses	16
1.4.1. The reified view of “apocalyptic” and the expectation of “ <i>Gattung</i> ”	17
1.4.2. Theories of social continuity	19
1.4.3. Emphasis on issues other than worldview (the figure of Enoch and calendar)	24
Chapter 2: The History of Scholarship on the Genre of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature ...	30
2.1. The relationship between morphological, conceptual, and sociological features	35
2.1.1. The early form-content distinctions and the reification of apocalyptic.....	36
2.1.2. Gunkel’s concept of <i>Gattung</i> and the concept of genre promoted in the 1970s	45
2.1.3. Paul Hanson’s separation of literary genre and worldview	57
2.1.4. The apocalyptic worldview of which eschatology is one part	64
2.1.5. The radical divorce	71
2.1.6. The case for some relationship	76
2.2. The possibility of defining the genre “apocalypse” morphologically	78
2.2.1. The earlier alternatives	79
2.2.2. The purpose of a definition.....	84
2.2.3. The <i>Semeia</i> 14 definition.....	86
2.2.4. Resistance and clarifications	89
2.2.4.1. The supposed exclusivity between definition and description.....	90
2.2.4.2. The desire to say more	91
2.2.4.3. The desire to say less.....	95
2.2.4.4. The resistance to artificial boundaries.....	102
2.2.4.5. The push for a diachronic definition	103
2.2.5. The function amendment	104
2.2.6. Prototype theory	107

Chapter 3: The Text of the Book of Jubilees	111
3.1. The reliability of the texts available	112
3.2. Coherence of composition	121
3.2.1. Four general comments on theories of multiplicity of authorship	122
3.2.2. Some specific arguments	126
3.2.3. Segal's theory of the redaction of Jubilees	134
3.3. The Book of Jubilees was composed in the second century BCE, probably shortly after 159 BCE.....	141
3.3.1. The oldest manuscript and texts which presume Jubilees	146
3.3.2. Texts which Jubilees assumes	154
3.3.3. Historical circumstances and events reflected in the concerns, images and language of Jubilees	157
3.3.4. Wars.....	164
3.3.5. Possible and probable historical allusions in Jubilees 23	166
Chapter 4: The View of Revelation	182
4.1. The use and view of received authority	183
4.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses	188
4.1.1.1. The use of Enochic traditions	188
4.1.1.2. The use of non-Enochic Jewish traditions.....	191
4.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses	195
4.1.2.1. The use of Danielic traditions	196
4.1.2.2. The use of non-Danielic Jewish traditions	202
4.1.3. Jubilees	208
4.1.3.1. The heavenly tablets.....	212
4.1.3.2. Departures from Genesis and Exodus	218
Psalm 90 in Jubilees 23	219
Third Isaiah in Jubilees 23	222
The covenant curses in Jubilees 23	227
4.2. The dependence of revelation on wisdom	232
4.2.1. The Enochic apocalypses	237
4.2.2. The Danielic apocalypses	240
4.2.3. Jubilees	245
4.2.3.1. Revelation without the elitism of wisdom.....	246
4.2.3.2. Revelation made unambiguous and accessible	252

Volume II

Chapter 5: The Spatial Axis.....	261
5.1. Angels and demons.....	264
5.1.1. Before the flood: the origin of evil	265
5.1.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses	265
5.1.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses.....	268
5.1.1.3. Jubilees	269
5.1.2. After the flood: the persistence of demons	272

5.1.2.1. The early apocalypses	273
5.1.2.2. Jubilees	274
5.1.3. Angelic mediation	277
5.1.3.1. Evidence outside the apocalypses	277
5.1.3.2. The early apocalypses	281
5.1.3.3. Jubilees	283
5.1.4. The leader of evil.....	285
5.1.4.1. Terms, names and titles	286
5.1.4.2. Satan in non-apocalypse received scriptures.....	291
5.1.4.3. The early apocalypses	293
5.1.4.4. Mastema in Jubilees	294
5.1.5. Angels and demons in the eschatological crisis and restoration	301
5.1.5.1. The early apocalypses	302
5.1.5.2. Jubilees	304
Jubilees 23.....	305
The rest of the book	307
5.2. Humans	310
5.2.1. Groups	310
5.2.1.1. Third Isaiah	312
5.2.1.2. The Enochic apocalypses	313
5.2.1.3. The Danielic apocalypses.....	318
5.2.1.4. Jubilees	320
5.2.2. Violence.....	329
5.2.2.1. Third Isaiah	332
5.2.2.2. The Enochic apocalypses	332
5.2.2.3. The Danielic apocalypses.....	334
5.2.2.4. Jubilees	338
Chapter 6: The Temporal Axis	347
6.1. The decline of history	349
6.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses	349
6.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel	353
6.1.3. Jubilees	355
6.2. The final woes.....	357
6.2.1. The Enochic apocalypses	359
6.2.2. The Danielic apocalypses	366
6.2.3. Jubilees	367
6.2.3.1. The “final woes” are just chastisement from God as prescribed by the covenant.	369
6.2.3.2. The “final woes” have already been fulfilled.....	371
6.2.3.3. The white children.....	379
6.3. The judgment.....	385
6.3.1. The Enochic apocalypses	386
6.3.2. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel	388
6.3.3. Jubilees	391
6.3.3.1. Jubilees 23	392

6.3.3.2. The rest of Jubilees	395
Judgment in Jubilees 5	396
The role of Enoch in judgment.....	397
The judgment of individual nations	400
6.4. The restoration.....	405
6.4.1. Third Isaiah.....	406
6.4.2. The Enochic apocalypses	408
6.4.3. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel	412
6.4.4. Jubilees	413
6.4.4.1. The restoration in Jubilees 23 is gradual and has already begun.	414
6.4.4.2. The restoration in Jubilees as a whole restores and fulfills the original plan of creation.	417
Revelation	418
The people of Israel.....	420
The land of Israel	426
The sanctuary	429
The calendar	430
6.4.4.3. The periods of history in Jubilees	433
6.5. Conclusion to the chapter on the temporal axis.....	434
6.6. Appendices: Background issues and difficult readings related to the temporal axis	436
6.6.1. The problem of the correlation between longevity and righteousness	436
6.6.2. Who were the descendents of Lot and Caphtor in the second century BCE?	439
6.6.3. Jubilees 32 promises conquest in the land of Israel, not a global empire.....	442
6.6.4. The sanctification of the land	447
6.6.5. Jubilees 1:26-29 identifies the indwelling of the sanctuary in the restoration with the indwelling of the sanctuary of Aaron.....	449
6.6.6. The fiftieth year in Leviticus 25 and Jubilees 50	456
Chapter 7: Review of Ironic Use of the Genre “Apocalypse” in Jubilees	460
7.1. Jubilees 1, the framework	462
7.2. Jubilees 2, creation.....	468
7.3. Jubilees 3-6, evil, injustice, and the lack thereof	469
7.4. Jubilees 10, the other nations.....	473
7.5. Jubilees 15, heavenly outsourcing	476
7.6. Jubilees 16-22, miscellanea	478
7.7. Jubilees 21, Enoch + Noah = Leviticus	480
7.8. Jubilees 23	482
7.9. Jubilees 24-46, more miscellanea	498
7.10. Jubilees 30-32, six reasons to love Levites.....	499
7.11. Jubilees 39-43, “Do you not know that a man takes pleasure in his cup, as I do in this cup?” (the Joseph cycle)	505
7.12. Jubilees 47-50, revealing the past.....	507

Conclusion	510
Bibliography	515
Index of Modern Authors.....	534

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Book of Jubilees is one of the longest, oldest, and most unified Jewish compositions from antiquity. Judging by the number of identifiable copies, it was among the most authoritative writings at Qumran. Composed in Hebrew, the work is known to have been translated into Greek, Latin, Ethiopic, and possibly Syriac, and gained canonical status in the Ethiopian Church. Nevertheless, Jubilees was largely forgotten in the Jewish and Christian traditions, except for occasional echoes. As the study of Judaism and Christianity looks beyond the constraints of canon, Jubilees offers a special insight into Jewish thought in the middle of the second century before our era. Even with recent increased attention, Jubilees can still be called understudied, if only because of its great potential to cast light on so many fields of inquiry. In the past, Jubilees has been particularly appreciated, but not exhausted, for insights into biblical interpretation and Qumran origins. The literary genre of Jubilees has been studied principally in relation to “rewritten scripture” or “rewritten bible,” although it is widely recognized that Jubilees also warrants comparison with the apocalypses. Jubilees has been viewed as a hazy case among the apocalypses, and lack of precision in calling Jubilees somewhat or partially apocalyptic has contributed to misuse or misrepresentation of the work in a number of studies.

The present study seeks to bring clarity to the relationship between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses by applying rigorous definitions, distinguishing the literary genre “apocalypse” from the apocalyptic worldview, and deferring speculation about social location and function. On the level of literary genre, Jubilees does use the genre “apocalypse.” On the level of worldview, Jubilees differs substantially from the typical apocalypses on the issues raised inherently by the literary genre. Thus, Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” to express a worldview that is not apocalyptic, and indeed anti-apocalyptic.

This observation has significant implications. It is one thing for the worldview that is typical of the apocalypses to be expressed without the literary genre (Paul and the sectarian literature from Qumran being the most discussed examples), but another to use the genre without the worldview. The use of genre has meaning independent of what is said by means of the genre. The most basic literary function of a genre is to create reader expectations. When a reader or audience reads or hears the definitive features of apocalypses, a reader expects certain typical ideas to be expressed. Discord results when the expected ideas conflict with the ideas actually expressed. On a purely literary level, apart from questions of authorial intent and social function, this discord between expected and actual meaning can be described as irony. The question of *why* a second century BCE author would do such a thing is inherently more speculative and outside the scope of the evidence and argumentation of this dissertation, although a few considerations will be presented in the final chapter.

The principle of “reader expectations” helps to explain why Jubilees has often been lumped together with the Enochic apocalypses in modern scholarship. Modern readers form expectations that can be so strong that differences are not seen at all, or seen

only in small slices. Unlike the ancient readers, modern readers are often impaired by expectations based on anachronistic classifications. Jubilees is like 1 Enoch in that it is canonical in the Ethiopic church, but excluded from all other canons. Jubilees is more or less pseudepigraphic. Jubilees expands positively the figure of Enoch. Jubilees is well represented at Qumran, where Enochic literature was preserved and literature with an apocalyptic worldview was produced. However, none of these are good reasons to conclude that Jubilees conveys an apocalyptic worldview. The categories of canon and “false ascription” do not belong to a historical-critical investigation of Jubilees in its original context. Regardless of later developments and various hypotheses, there is insufficient evidence that the figure of Enoch defined a fundamental rift in Judaism in the 150s BCE. The fact that Jubilees was influential at Qumran, even right along side compositions that convey an apocalyptic worldview, does not resolve the question of the worldview of Jubilees. The sectarians used Deuteronomy far more than they used the Enochic apocalypses, and one could hardly argue that there are no differences in worldview between Deuteronomy and the Enochic apocalypses. The sectarians represented at Qumran did not maintain orthodoxy in their own writings, and they certainly did not maintain a strict standard for ideas that could be found in their collections. These misleading associations often operate below consciousness. It is not the case that such false expectations have corrupted a thorough study. The problem is that there has never been a thorough study of the use of the literary genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees, distinct from the worldview and apart from speculation about social location. This study aims to fill a lacuna and correct a wide body of casual generalizations and unexamined assumptions about Jubilees.

The introduction will proceed in four stages. First, the uses of genre in Jubilees will be addressed, with particular attention to the lack of contradiction in saying that Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” and also uses (or is an example of) “rewritten scripture.” Second, the apocalyptic worldview will be defined in relationship to, but distinguishable from, literary genre. Third, we will clarify what is meant by reader expectation and literary irony, and how they can be separated from more speculative questions of authorial intent and social location. The introduction will conclude with a survey of previous scholarship on the place of Jubilees among the apocalypses.

1.1. Uses of genre in Jubilees

Chapter 2 will explore at length the history of scholarship distinguishing between literary genre and worldview, defining the genre “apocalypse,” and understanding the purpose and limits of a morphological definition of a literary genre. By way of introduction, a few basic points should be laid out.

First, I find it helpful to ask, not whether a work or passage *is* an apocalypse, but whether it *uses* the genre “apocalypse.”¹ This helps to avoid the impression that by

¹ The “classical” or “Aristotelian” concept of genre taxonomy was binary and exclusive. A work was either in or out of a category, like a container, and could only be a member of one category. No internal structure distinguished members within the category. Today it is recognized that there are many levels at which generic relationships can exist, and different ways a work can *use* a genre in the broader sense. John Frow, *Genre*, ed. John Drakakis, The New Critical Idiom (London; New York: Routledge, 2006), 53-55. Michael Sinding, “After Definitions: Genre, Categories, and Cognitive Science,” *Genre* 35 (2002): 181, 185. Carol A. Newsom, “Spying out the Land: A Report from Genology,” in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Ronald L. Troxel, Kelvin G. Friebel, and Dennis Robert Magary (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 445. Similarly, Jacques Derrida prefers to say a work “participates” in a genre. Jacques Derrida, “The Law of Genre,” in *Modern Genre Theory*, ed. David Duff, Longman Critical Readers (Harlow, England; New York: Longman, 2000; reprint, originally published in *Glyph* 7 (1980), 202-213. Translated by Avital Ronell.), 224, 230.

identifying use of genre, scholars have established something conclusive and exclusive about the essence of a work. In the case of “apocalypse,” I do think that the genre is more than just a construct for the convenience of modern scholars; it was a tool used by ancient authors to construct literature so as to convey meaning (it does not matter how much they were aware of it, or whether they labeled and systematized the rules in a handbook). Answering whether Jubilees is an apocalypse is not an end in itself, but the first step to asking further questions, starting with *how* Jubilees uses the genre.

Second, a work can use more than one genre. This study focuses on the use of the genre “apocalypse,” but does not deny that Jubilees also is an example of—or uses the genre of—“rewritten scripture.” At the level of worldview there is a certain tension in the implications of framing rewritten scripture as an apocalypse. This tension will be discussed in Chapter 4, but it does not negate the principle of compatibility of multiple genres at the literary level. I am not claiming that Jubilees uses no other literary tools, or has no other concerns than rejecting the apocalyptic worldview. Based only on “volume” within the work, one might say that Jubilees uses “rewritten scripture” more than “apocalypse.” It seems that recent scholarship has paid more attention to Jubilees as “rewritten scripture,” but I do think that use of the genre “apocalypse” has been underestimated, particularly for the special significance in framing the work. For example, Michael Segal’s recent monograph devotes a section to the literary genre of

Chapter 2 will discuss the case for distinguishing literary morphology and worldview, which will allow us to describe the ways Jubilees is and is not a typical apocalypse. Prototype theory is one way of saying some apocalypses are more typical than others (see below, Section 2.2.6). Indeed, Jubilees is not a prototypical apocalypse in that it mixes literary genres and is not typical at the level of worldview. A clear definition of the literary morphology does not deny other levels at which a work can be typical or atypical. Jubilees is *among* the apocalypses. It *uses* the literary morphology of the genre, but to say Jubilees *is* an apocalypse may obscure the differences at other levels included in the broader concerns of genre theory.

Jubilees, but makes no mention of “apocalypse.” This leaves nothing to say of the beginning, middle, and end of the work except that they are “formally anomalous.”² If only by virtue of location, and not total volume, the genre used in the literary framework bears a special (certainly not exclusive) significance for understanding the work.

I would say further that the genre “apocalypse” pervades the Book of Jubilees, well beyond chapters 1, 23 and 50. Every time we read, “Now you Moses write down...,” every time first person forms are used for angels, and every time the heavenly tablets are mentioned, we are reminded of the revelatory framework. Within this framework, the discussions of the agency of angels and demons, the agency and classification of humanity, the times and places of judgment and restoration, and the broader scope of history, all constitute use of the genre. It certainly would have been easier to write a study of one or two chapters, but the fact of the matter is that Jubilees pushes the “apocalypse” buttons throughout the book.

Along similar lines, the discord which I am describing is not the result of apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic sources redacted together. Rather, it is precisely when using the genre “apocalypse” that Jubilees inverts the worldview typically implied by the genre. Jubilees 23 was originally responsible for the observation developed here, and does provide a special concentration of interesting examples. However, at the end of research I believe that the same case could be made had the chapter been lost. Chapter 3 will consider further the coherence of the work.

² “Units 1, 4, and 7 [chapters 1, 23, and 50] are formally anomalous: both regarding their location and their content; they are not direct rewritings of the pentateuchal stories, but rather serve as a literary framework, both surrounding and within the rewritten stories.” Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*, JSJSup 117 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 3-5.

Chapters 4-6 will consider the worldview typically implied in the three parts of the morphological definition of the literary genre apocalypse: the view of revelation, the spatial axis, and the temporal axis.³ In each case it is fairly clear that Jubilees uses the literary genre. To summarize, the revelation mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient appears in chapters 1, 50, and every time the reader is reminded that an angel of the presence is dictating the heavenly tablets to Moses. The transcendent spatial reality concerning a supernatural world appears most clearly and frequently when the agency of good and bad angels and demons is discussed. Along similar lines, the explanation of suffering, the classification of groups of humanity, the comments on the cosmic efficacy of violence, and the spatial boundaries of places of judgment and restoration, all constitute ways in which Jubilees uses the definitive features of the apocalypses on the spatial axis. Jubilees 23 is special in that it concentrates unmistakable use of transcendence on the temporal axis, particularly in explaining events current to the “actual” audience within a survey of the meaning of history. Temporal transcendence can be found elsewhere in the forms and issues of a structured view of history, a new creation, and day(s) of judgment for individuals and nations. It is true that Jubilees spreads out the use of the genre among other literary devices and concerns; consequently, one would not want to say Jubilees “is” an apocalypse, if that were to mean that all of Jubilees can be explained as an apocalypse and nothing else can be said of literary genre in Jubilees. Still, Jubilees uses the literary genre “apocalypse” more than some works that are easily considered apocalypses.

³ John J. Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” *Semeia* 14 (1979): 9. In the present work, page 86.

The difficulty is not in identifying use of the genre, but in distinguishing literary genre from worldview. The history of scholarship on this issue will be considered in Chapter 2. By way of a general introduction, the simplest rule of thumb is to separate the issues raised from what is said about the issues. An issue can be raised simply by use of language such as “heavenly tablets,” “demons,” “day of judgment,” or “new creation.” In each of these cases, there is no doubt that Jubilees uses the literary forms and literary contents necessary both to raise these issues and to trigger certain reader expectations as to what will be said about them.

After identifying the presence of an issue, the key is to ask two further questions: What do apocalypses typically say about the issue, and does Jubilees agree? Thus, one finds that heavenly tablets typically reveal otherwise unknowable esoteric mysteries, but not in Jubilees. Apocalypses typically use angels and demons to explain suffering in general and the present suffering in particular—not so in Jubilees. The day of judgment is typically deferred and cosmos-wide, but in Jubilees every individual and nation is judged justly in its own time. Each of these differences operates at the more abstract level of worldview. Thus we come to defining the apocalyptic worldview in relationship to the literary genre.

1.2. The apocalyptic worldview defined

The apocalyptic worldview is the worldview typically conveyed by the literary genre “apocalypse.” Four elaborations are necessary: first to justify the dependent definition, second to qualify the appropriateness of chronological specification, third to

qualify the worldview as a pattern, not a systematic orthodoxy, and finally to describe the typical worldview.

Dependent definitions for distinct terms are appropriate for different, but closely related, layers of abstraction. Chapter 2 will consider the history of scholarship that called for treating the worldview and literary forms as necessarily co-incident, completely unrelated, or in a typical relationship. For example, it makes sense to define “apocalypse” in such a way that does not depend on a definition of “prophecy,” partly because of the difficulty of defining “prophecy.” The literary genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview occur together often enough that the worldview can be understood in terms of the genre. There are two basic cases for maintaining a distinction. First, the worldview sometimes appears without the genre (especially Paul and sectarian literature found at Qumran). By defining the worldview as distinct from but dependent on the genre, we can speak clearly both of what is typical and what is variant. Second, in order to account for the possibility of irony, it is necessary to define the genre without recourse to the worldview, and to qualify the relationship between the worldview and the genre as typical but capable of variation.⁴ There is another reason not to define the apocalyptic worldview first and then define the genre dependently. Literary genre operates at a lower, or more robust, layer of abstraction, and thus can be defined and measured more objectively.

⁴ Independent definitions run the risk of failing to mesh where appropriate, and too many definitions can lead to semantic confusion. Thus Collins warns, “To speak of apocalypses that are not apocalyptic can only compound the semantic confusion.” Collins was referring to the problem when “Apocalyptic” is reified independent of texts, such that “Apocalyptic” cannot be substantiated from apocalypses, or certain apocalypses cannot be called “Apocalyptic.” This point is valid and is not intended to exclude the possibility of irony. In Jubilees there is a relationship between the literary genre and the typical worldview, only it is an inverse relationship. John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 13.

It is possible to define the literary genre in such a way that spans significant time and space. The definition of the genre defines the scope within which diachronic developments take place. It is sometimes necessary to qualify statements about the literary genre according to more specific sub-sets, such as “the historical apocalypses,” “the Enochic apocalypses,” the “early apocalypses,” etc. In the case of the worldview, there is an additional need to qualify the sub-class. For the present study, the important qualifier of the worldview is “at the time of Jubilees,” which includes works written at that time and older works as they were read at that time. As different as the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses may be, it is striking that Jubilees diverges from them fundamentally, at the level at which they overlap.

Along similar lines, it is important to be clear that “the apocalyptic worldview” is not a single, coherent, systematic set of theological principles. If one speaks generally enough it may be possible to say something minimal about the worldview of every apocalypse. Even then it would be a pattern, not a continuously transmitted orthodoxy. We can be more specific by applying the qualifier “at the time of Jubilees,” and further still by addressing the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses separately, and then the individual texts within these corpora. On all but the most qualified statements, if one wishes to speak of “*the* apocalyptic worldview,” it is necessary to understand the worldview as a cluster of compatible perspectives. The cluster must be broad enough to include all the apocalypses (or the appropriately qualified sub-set), but should still be distinctive of the apocalypses. In practice, this is easier than it sounds. For all the variations among the apocalypses, at a certain basic layer of worldview there is a remarkable degree of compatibility. There is a certain overlap in most or all Jewish religious texts from a particular time period, but the apocalypses at the time of Jubilees

form a distinctive cluster of compatible perspectives. Jubilees consistently and conspicuously falls outside the cluster.

It is not a coincidence that there is a relatively high degree of compatibility in worldview among texts at the time of Jubilees that use the genre “apocalypse.” The use of a genre conveys meaning, and certain literary forms and contents lend themselves to the expression of certain views. For example, the revelatory framework of cosmic knowledge through an angelic intermediary to an exemplary human lends itself to presenting information that could not be learned or authorized by more mundane means, such as observation and reason. Attention to agents and places on the spatial axis—besides humans and God—lends itself to arguing that these other agents have a significant impact on the situation of humans in their relationship to God. Transcendence on the temporal axis lends itself to the view that the present situation is a time unlike other naturally-known times. As described by Collins,

The essential ingredients of this worldview were a reliance on supernatural revelation, over and above received tradition and human reasoning; a sense that human affairs are determined to a great degree by supernatural agents; and the belief that human life is subject to judgment, culminating in reward or punishment after death.⁵

⁵ John J. Collins, “From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism Volume 1, the Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Continuum, 1998), 157 (cf. 147). Collins elsewhere offered an alternative formulation, “The essential elements of this worldview are a lively belief in the role of the supernatural forces in shaping human behavior and an equally lively belief in the certainty of a final definitive judgment that will not only set matters right on earth (if the earth is thought to endure) but also provide everlasting reward or punishment for individual behavior.” John J. Collins, “The Legacy of Apocalypticism,” in *Encounters with Biblical Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005), 161-162. Collins has elsewhere emphasized the perception that something is fundamentally wrong with the world, and that the world is mysterious such that a supernatural source is needed. John J. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility,” in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, ed. L. G. Perdue (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1993; reprint, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997), 171. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 8.

Chapters 4-6 will consider the primary sources in detail to illustrate clearly what can be said of the worldview of particular apocalypses, the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses generally, and more generally still the apocalypses at the time of Jubilees. Empirical observation of the apocalypses confirms a basic outline of worldview that one might expect to be implicit in the genre.⁶ The immediate implications of the literary genre are the best start, but do not necessarily exhaust the distinctive features that can be found at the level of worldview. Section 2.1.4 below will discuss the importance of not letting any one aspect exclude all others as a single definitive feature of the apocalyptic worldview.⁷

The remarkable observation is not that the apocalypses form a compatibility in worldview around these issues. The remarkable observation is that Jubilees subverts the genre, using it to say something other than what it most naturally lends itself to saying.⁸ The relationship between the literary genre and the worldview is typically close enough that the genre creates a predictable reader expectation, the inversion of which can be described as irony.

⁶ Stemming from the same point, the categories used for chapters 4-6 are not arbitrary or self-serving. The views of revelation, the spatial axis, and the temporal axis are the natural categories of worldview typically implied by the literary genre “apocalypse.”

⁷ Other “key” features of the worldview have been proposed and debated. Some would emphasize or de-emphasize eschatology, the “parentage” of the apocalypses in prophecy or wisdom, dualism, a particular mode of revelation, temple cosmology, or none of the above.

⁸ To foreshadow briefly the development of these points in chapters 4-6: Jubilees frames as an apocalypse revelation that is already familiar and publicly accessible to all of Israel. Jubilees maintains that covenantal fidelity grants Israel immunity from demons and capricious angels, who only exist to lead other nations away from Israel’s exclusive relationship with God, and to punish those of Israel who align themselves with the nations. Jubilees explains the “recent” cycle of sin-punishment-repentance-(incipient) restoration in terms of the “Deuteronomic” cycle of history. There is nothing about the present moment that is fundamentally different or fixed outside of human choice. Further, the “eschatological” restoration is the fulfillment, not reformation, of Jewish tradition.

1.3. Reader expectation and irony

All literature uses some degree of genre that creates some degree of reader expectation. In the case of apocalypses in the 150s BCE, reader expectations form in both of two ways. First, and more theoretically, the above described principle of meaning implicit in the manner of communication (illocution) generates a basic level of reader expectation. Genres do not come from nowhere, but, even if a reader had no experience with the literary forms, the reader would assume that a matter is raised because it is deemed relevant. Fortunately, we can add a second and more robust standard for asserting and studying the basis of reader expectations. We have a good variety of apocalypses that existed around the time of Jubilees, and we have good reason to believe that others existed but were not fully preserved. We need not assume that any one apocalypse defined for the audience the genre and worldview, but we can safely assume that readers had knowledge of the literary genre and typical worldview, based on direct or indirect familiarity with any number of apocalypses. Expectation based on such prior knowledge is triggered by the use of the literary genre.

Reader expectation is not a conscious process. One might think of Pavlov's dog, who was conditioned to salivate in expectation of food at the sound of a bell. A better analogy would be a dog that salivates at the sound of dog food being poured into its bowl. One who hears or reads certain generic triggers immediately expects certain ideas to be expressed. If the reader pays attention to what is said, the conscious recognition of the ideas conveyed can either agree or disagree with expectations. In most cases there is basic agreement and the process goes unnoticed. A small disagreement can be incorporated into the treasury of experience, but a significant disagreement creates

discord. Without exploring further the ways the discord can be resolved, we can identify the discord between what a reader expects to be communicated and what is actually communicated in literary terms as irony.⁹

Unfortunately, the term “irony” is often used without precision. It is important to distinguish irony from sarcasm, satire, and parody. Literary irony can be understood independent of the intent of the author. The evidence and argumentation of the present work concern literary genre and worldview, not the social context that would be necessary to reconstruct the intent of the author. Further study of social setting and function may follow from observations of worldview, but is not prerequisite. This is especially true given our lack of direct knowledge of the social setting of Jubilees, and our only speculative knowledge of the social categories operative at the time.

The final chapter will consider some broad parameters within which the intent of the author should likely be understood. It is significant that the author of Jubilees articulates a worldview by use of contrast, but that alone does not tell us the intent of the author. Expressing one’s own distinctive worldview is not necessarily a matter of polemic. Although it is reasonable to surmise that the use of irony was intentional, we should not imagine that the composition of the Book of Jubilees was primarily motivated by antagonism toward the apocalyptic worldview. If the intent was to reconcile a discord by demonstrating compatibility, then the pattern might be described as harmonization. However, the quantity and quality of subversions of the apocalyptic worldview, and the

⁹ There are, of course, variations. If the reader expects the different worldview then the use of the genre creates a discord that is resolved with the recognition of irony. If the reader expects ironic use of genre then the resolution comes as the otherwise discordant elements are presented. In any case, literary irony is present. The personal psychology and social setting of the reader are here deferred.

relatively superficial nature of the use of the genre, make it unlikely that harmonization would have been successful.

It is difficult to be more precise, however, in characterizing the subversion. Ridicule, humor, and parody are difficult to define, classify and establish on the basis of the evidence available. Satire can take different forms, depending on the harshness with which the target is contrasted with a normative position.¹⁰ One approach to understanding the intent of the use of irony would be to look for social divisions that correspond to the division in worldview. Evidence does suggest that Jews were willing to kill each other over issues along the lines of Hellenistic assimilation, but it is far less clear that the disagreements in worldview considered here had significant social implications. For example, we know there were differences of opinion on whether the sovereignty of God over Israel is mediated by an angelic prince. We do not know whether the disagreement was the stuff of friendly discussion, group formation, or a symbolic token inseparable from the roots of violence.

There are elaborate theories about social and intellectual movements in Judaism at the time of Jubilees (particularly in terms of Qumran origins). The present literary study of Jubilees will not prove or disprove any such theory. It does, however, call for greater care in hypothesizing intellectual or social history on the basis of literary features. The study of social setting and function is not prerequisite to the study of genre and

¹⁰ The traditional classification of satire follows the models of Horace and Juvenal. Horatian satire is not harsh, and could be found humorous even by the “target” of satire. The target can be oneself or one’s friends, and the critical edge is softened by friendly humor. Juvenalian satire attacks a target so bitterly that the target would certainly not be amused. Humor is at the expense of the target, and a clear “us vs. them” divide exists between the satirist and the target.

worldview, but the present study may contribute to further study of theories of religio-social phenomena at the time of Jubilees.

1.4. Previous scholarship on Jubilees among the apocalypses

Three features distinguish the present approach from previous scholarship on Jubilees among the apocalypses. This study will (A) distinguish the genre “apocalypse” from the apocalyptic worldview, (B) defer social reconstruction and the relationship between instances of apocalypticism, and (C) systematically address the issues essential to the apocalyptic worldview. These three points provide the structure for the following. One often encounters slices of insight into one way or another that Jubilees is atypical. Many similarities and differences have been noted that do not pertain to the apocalyptic worldview. For example, the figure of Enoch and a certain calendar are not definitive of or coterminous with the apocalyptic worldview. I should emphasize that by discussing the position of Jubilees on the issues that define the apocalyptic worldview, I am not speaking exhaustively of the worldview of Jubilees. There are other issues.

Rather than cataloging the untenable statements made about Jubilees, the following will examine three structural problems that have prevented previous studies from identifying the ironic use of the genre “apocalypse.” A limited number of illustrative examples will be given. An effort will be made to include insights that point in the direction of the present study, even if they appear as footnotes in studies that push in very different directions. Many excellent studies have considered other aspects of Jubilees without advancing or contradicting the present observation. The least tenable

statements—those which assume Jubilees shares the ideas of ancient apocalypses—tend to appear in broad surveys.

1.4.1. The reified view of “apocalyptic” and the expectation of “*Gattung*”

Chapter 2 surveys the history of the scholarship in which “Apocalyptic” is reified as a single coherent entity and approached as a *Gattung*, with an assertion of inseparability of literary forms, ideas, and setting in life. Before the 1970s, it would not have been possible even to ask if Jubilees uses the literary genre apocalypse to express an anti-apocalyptic worldview. Without observing a larger pattern, scholars did notice some significant ways in which Jubilees is atypical. For example, Russell often treated Jubilees as a sequel to the Book of the Watchers, expounding further the same thoughts. Yet, when tabulating the “new eschatology” of apocalyptic, he did observe an exception to the rule that transformation is not evolutionary but cataclysmic,

An exception to this is the Book of Jubilees, whose author apparently believes that the messianic age has already set in. Its growth would be gradual; men would grow in spiritual stature and nature would become gradually transformed.¹¹

This is a big exception for a footnote, and a couple more footnotes would be appropriate on the same page for other ways in which Jubilees is exceptional. Still, this is a good example of one way in which the worldview of Jubilees is not like other apocalypses. The reification of “apocalyptic” into a single “method and message” prevented a systematic

¹¹ D. S. Russell, *The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 BC-AD 100*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), 269 n. 4.

explanation of the similarities and differences, but did not prevent individual insights into ways that Jubilees is atypical.

In some ways Christopher Rowland's work can be thought of as a reaction against—or at least an approach alternative to—the quest for precise distinctions and definitions pursued by Koch, Hanson, Stone, Collins, and so forth. Rowland approaches “apocalyptic” primarily as a religious perspective, and emphasizes diversity and flexibility over any definitive features. Even from this very different approach, a tension of form and contents in Jubilees is recognized, although Jubilees is ultimately subsumed into the “apocalyptic spirit.”¹²

Armin Lange is an exception to the general trend of emphasizing the similarities. He observes that Jubilees differs from “*Apokalyptik*” in the treatment of allegorical dreams. This important point will be taken up in the present work in Chapter 4. It is difficult to compare conclusions, however, since Lange approaches *Apokalyptik* as a movement (*Bewegung*), without thoroughly differentiating genre, worldview and religious-social phenomenon, “Eine Klassifikation des Jubiläenbuches als apokalyptische Schrift ist vor diesem Hintergrund abzulehnen.”¹³ The point is certainly valid with respect to worldview, but does not negate the use of the literary genre in Jubilees, nor does it adequately establish that the apocalyptic movement existed or could only tolerate one idea about allegorical dreams.

¹² Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 51-52.

¹³ “A classification of Jubilees as an apocalyptic writing is to be rejected on this basis.” Armin Lange, “Divinatorische Träume und Apokalyptik im Jubiläenbuch,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange (Tubingen: Mohr, 1997), 35.

Much like the problem when “apocalyptic” is treated as a coherent entity, Jubilees is easily misunderstood when individual ideas or motifs are treated as monolithic linear developments. An example that will come up in Chapter 5 of this work is the idea of “Satan.” It is often assumed that a single basic idea of “Satan” developed steadily and was referenced in many texts, each of which articulated only part of the motif. In this way, ideas of “Satan” thought to be contemporary with Jubilees are projected onto Jubilees, well beyond what is actually said of Mastema. Although Mastema warrants comparison with certain ideas about Satan, over-hasty identification has caused scholars to miss substantial differences (see further, Chapter 5).¹⁴

1.4.2. Theories of social continuity

The question of whether the figure of Enoch defined a competing form of Judaism appears in the next sub-section. In the case of the pietists (*hasidim*) and groups assumed in the sectarian literature at Qumran, we can at least be confident that the designations had social significance in antiquity. The problems are in situating the author of Jubilees in relationship to these groups, and what that might tell us about the worldview of Jubilees.

When I say we lack specific knowledge of the religio-social setting of Jubilees, I do not mean we do not know whether the author was for or against Jason and Antiochus Epiphanes. I mean that such general knowledge does not tell us the worldview of

¹⁴ A partial exception appears in Neil Forsyth, *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987), 183. “But the author’s theology, though definitely apocalyptic, is dominated by the supremacy of the Law, and this leads him to adapt the rebellion myth in certain crucial respects.”

Jubilees, since very different worldviews could have been held by those who opposed Jason and Antiochus. It is easy to forget how little direct evidence we have for the pietists. It may be likely that the author of Jubilees could have been considered a pietist, if the classification refers generally to those who opposed with religious zeal the reforms of Jason and Antiochus. If we say that the pietists were not only *sometimes* but *necessarily* militants who were willing to fight on the sabbath (1 Macc 2:41-42), then we already have a contradiction, or at least a development. Jubilees prohibits fighting on the sabbath (Jubilees 50:12), and arguably condemns militancy in general (see Chapter 5). If the author of Jubilees is to be counted among the pietists, then the classification must be so broad as to include a number of different ideas. If the authors of the Danielic apocalypses could also be described as pietists in a broad religio-social sense, then the classification would have included adherents to very different worldviews. We should not imagine that we have said something meaningful about the literature or the ideas expressed in Jubilees by saying that the author might be classified as a pietist. Surely we would like to know more about Jewish thought in antiquity than whether someone was in favor of or opposed to the reforms of Jason and Antiochus.

In the case of the Damascus Document and the broader question of Qumran origins we have a different set of problems. On one hand, the influence of Jubilees at Qumran is evident in the Damascus Document and the number of copies of Jubilees found at Qumran—not to mention pseudo-Jubilees documents and countless other parallels that can be explained as influence. On the other hand, the relationship is in one direction. The author of Jubilees exercised no long-term control over who could read the work. It seems safe to say the author of Jubilees would not have looked favorably on the separation of a group from the rest of Israel and the temple in Jerusalem (see Chapter 5).

A group can develop legal and interpretive changes over time (which may explain some non-parallels), but groups can also overlap or converge without sharing a continuous line of development. The issues that defined Jewish groups at the time of Jubilees may not have been the issues that defined groups later. The influence of Jubilees at Qumran is certainly worthy of study, as are their similarities and differences more broadly. Even if one accepts the possibility of direct social continuity between the author of Jubilees and the group described in the Damascus Document, the later developments of this group do not tell us about the literature and worldview of Jubilees at the time of composition.¹⁵

Also, it is worth being careful about identifying Qumran and “apocalyptic.” The sectarian writings do not use the genre. They were influenced by some apocalypses, but also by many non-apocalypses. The religio-social phenomenon “apocalypticism” seems to apply to the groups they describe, and some of the compositions reflect an apocalyptic worldview. However, religio-social phenomena can occur independently as a result of similar circumstances without direct causal continuity. It is not possible to make assertions about a single continuous apocalyptic movement based on bits of evidence from the Book of the Watchers through Qumran (or later).

Michel Testuz gives an early example of a study that finds too much similarity between Jubilees and the Damascus Document, other sectarian literature, and the later descriptions of the Essenes.¹⁶ One problem is the extent to which expectations from other

¹⁵ Segal, following Kister, comments on the probability that Jubilees was produced in the same stream of Judaism as the Qumran sect, after the formation of the Essene sect or stream. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 322. The term “stream” is appropriately vague, and fits the fact that the influence was in one direction. It is more difficult to establish that Jubilees comes after the rift. Jubilees is aware of a divide in Judaism in chapter 23, but does not approve of it. That divide is not necessarily the same as the one that distinguished the Essenes. Even if Jubilees takes positions that later became distinctive of the Essenes, it does not follow that Jubilees’ self-conception was sectarian in any way. See further Section 5.2.1.4 below.

¹⁶ Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Genève: E. Droz, 1960), 179-195.

texts are extrapolated into Jubilees. For example, a single phrase (“elect of Israel”) becomes the basis for calling Jubilees the beginning of a separatist movement, contrary to the rest of the book. It seems Testuz reads Jubilees with the expectation that it would be like certain apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and sectarian documents. Another problem is that the parallels are not critically explained. There are indeed parallels between Jubilees and the sectarian documents, but continuous development of a single movement is only one explanation. Nevertheless, Testuz does note important differences in worldview that will be developed further below. For example, Testuz begins the chapter on eschatology with a warning, “Ensuite, les idées de notre auteur sur ce point sont assez différentes de l’enseignement des autres apocryphes ou pseudépigraphes, et il faut se garder d’introduire ici des notions empruntées ailleurs.”¹⁷ Arguably, Testuz heeds this caution better in that chapter than in others, but a pattern of differences is not explored.

A later example of a study that overlooks differences in worldview in order to fit a hypothesis of sociological continuity is the work of Friedemann Schubert.¹⁸ Schubert makes some key insights and had access to the distinctions and definitions worked out in the 1970s. Ultimately, however, speculation on the continuity of a movement pushes aside study of discontinuity in worldview. Schubert accepts the *Semeia* 14 definition and embraces temporarily Stegemann’s case for basing the discussion on works that use the literary genre (not the sectarian writings from Qumran).¹⁹ Thus, he rightly concludes that

¹⁷ Ibid., 165.

¹⁸ Friedemann Schubert, *Tradition und Erneuerung: Studien zum Jubiläenbuch und seinem Trägerkreis*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe III, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 771 (Frankfurt am Main; New York: Lang, 1998). Based on a 1996 dissertation at the University of Leipzig.

¹⁹ Ibid., 75, 80.

Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse,” particularly in the framework (*Rahmen*).²⁰ Schubert also observes at least one difference from the level of worldview—that rewritten scripture is not the typical *Stoffe* of apocalypses.²¹ This observation is an exception noted in a march to fit Jubilees in a comprehensive social theory of second temple Judaism. Drawing heavily from Hengel, Schubert places the Jubilees group in a continuous line of development that includes the circles that produced the Enochic apocalypses and the Qumran sectarians.²²

In fairness to Schubert, his stated goal was to investigate the circles that produced and transmitted Jubilees,²³ and he may indeed have found the most plausible of the comprehensive theories available. Even if the continuity at the religio-social level is legitimate, it plows over discontinuities and diversity of thought along the way. If the author of Jubilees fits on a line of social continuity which connects the authors of the early Enochic apocalypses and Qumran origins, it must at least be admitted that this line arches over significant intellectual diversity. (There remains the problem that alleged

²⁰ Ibid., 72.

²¹ Ibid., 263. “Einerseits war dieser apokalyptische Grundzug des Jub festzustellen, andererseits zeigte sich aber, daß insbesondere das weitgehende Fehlen genuin apokalyptischer Stoffe und stattdessen die Wiedergabe des biblischen Erzählfadens gegen eine eindeutige Zuordnung des Jub zu apokalyptischen Schriften stand.” My translation, “On the one hand, this apocalyptic essential feature of Jubilees was determined, on the other hand it was shown that in particular the significant absence of genuine apocalyptic materials, and in their place the retelling of the biblical narrative, stood against a clear allocation of Jubilees to apocalyptic writings.”

²² Ibid. “Aufgrund dieses Denkens, daß das Jub in seiner Konzeption mit anderen apokalyptischen Entwürfen verbindet, ist es m.E. berechtigt, das Jub als Apokalypse und seinen Trägerkreis als apokalyptisch geprägt—und zwar insbesondere durch die Henochtradition—zu bezeichnen.” My translation, “On the basis of this reckoning, that Jubilees connects with other apocalyptic sketches in its conceptual design, it is justified (in my opinion) to designate Jubilees as an apocalypse and its tradition circles apocalyptic-shaped, particularly through the Enoch tradition.” See pages 78-80 for Schubert’s adoption of Hengel’s model of development from the early apocalypses to Qumran.

²³ Ibid., 12.

intellectual continuity was the main basis for the hypothesis in the first place.) Schubert rightly observed that Jubilees does not have the *Stoffe* of the apocalypses in that one does not expect to find rewritten scripture in the framework of an apocalypse, but this is only a fraction of the differences in worldview. The present study intends to focus on the question of the worldview of Jubilees in relationship to other apocalypses. Since the literature is our main source of evidence, this sort of study should be considered logically prior to social theories. The conclusions of the present work will not rule out a broad evolutionary model of social continuity, but such a model, if it still seems probable, will be colored with significant “sibling” rivalry.

1.4.3. Emphasis on issues other than worldview (the figure of Enoch and calendar)

There are two important issues in Jubilees that are sometimes given absolute status as determinative of the worldview of Jubilees. Jubilees develops the figure of Enoch and advocates a 364-day year. However, neither of these issues defines the apocalyptic worldview or the literary genre “apocalypse.”

Mention of the figure of Enoch—beyond what is said in Genesis—may create a literary association with the Enochic apocalypses, but this association is not an automatic, uncritical endorsement of every idea associated with Enoch. As elsewhere, we need to ask separately what is said about or by means of the shared literary features. The figure of Enoch is one of the features that hold together the early Enochic apocalypses, but the

figure was not limited to a single group, worldview, or genre.²⁴ Enoch later became a divisive figure in some circles, such that the figure could only be embraced or rejected, depending on social location and worldview far beyond the interpretation of Genesis 5:24.²⁵ For the time of Jubilees, three assumptions should be avoided. It should not be assumed that the figure of Enoch constituted an issue on which an author had to take sides. It should not be assumed that Jubilees was embracing a worldview by including the figure of Enoch in an expansion of Genesis. It should not be assumed that Jubilees was embracing a worldview (or a canon) by including some writings and traditions attributed to Enoch among the received writings and traditions of Israel.

It might be acceptable to use the adjective “Enochic” in connection with Jubilees if it meant only “making mention of the figure of Enoch,” “addressing issues sometimes associated with Enoch,” or even, “making some use of traditions associated with Enoch.” However, classification of Jubilees within Enochic Judaism implies assumptions about religio-social origins and worldview that are not consistent with the findings of the present work. Within this trend there are different perspectives and emphases as to the extent to which a single coherent worldview applies to all things “Enochic.” Gabriele Boccaccini finds the social and intellectual pre-history of Jubilees in Enochic Judaism,

²⁴ Sirach and Genesis are examples of texts that share the figure of Enoch, but not much of the genre, worldview or movement. The Danielic apocalypses are examples of texts that share the genre “apocalypse,” and much of the worldview, but not the figure of Enoch.

²⁵ The reticence toward Enoch is supported by Targum Onkelos on Genesis 5:24 (God killed him), and according to Ginzberg is true of Tannaitic and most Amoraic Rabbinic literature, although Himmelfarb calls for moderation. Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-1928), 5.163. Louis Ginzberg, “Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings,” *JBL* 41, no. 1-2 (1922): 115-136. Martha Himmelfarb, “A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature,” *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 13, no. 1 (1978): 259-269.

but counts Jubilees itself as a major development, particularly in subsuming the figure and revelation of Moses.²⁶ James Scott places Jubilees within the Enochic apocalyptic tradition and treats the Apocalypse of Weeks as presumed in Jubilees, but again some room for variation is permitted.²⁷ Helge Kvanvig emphasizes the centrality of Enoch in Jubilees, and situates Jubilees in a pattern far broader than the contemporary apocalypses.²⁸ Some broad patterns may be more helpful than others; the essential qualification is the possibility of heterodoxy in worldview even where other continuities exist. Jubilees is not pro-Enochic or anti-Enochic, but its worldview does differ from the worldview typically conveyed by the Enochic (and Danielic) apocalypses.

The second issue that encourages over-hasty assessment of the worldview of Jubilees is the issue of calendar. Judaism at the time of Jubilees cannot be neatly divided into two parties, two worldviews, two calendars. This is not the place to outline all the complexities of calendars in second century BCE Judaism; suffice it to say that sources could agree on a 364-day year and still disagree on calendrical details and emphases.²⁹

²⁶ Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 87-89. In a more recent work Boccaccini further emphasizes the extent to which Jubilees is a new movement. Gabriele Boccaccini, "From a Movement of Dissent to a Distinct Form of Judaism: The Heavenly Tablets in Jubilees as the Foundation of a Competing Halakha," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

²⁷ "The Jubilean stream of Enochic apocalyptic tradition seems to have very different ideas about how history is constructed and where to put the focus." James M. Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 91 (Boston: Brill, 2005), 132. The different idea here is whether the mid-point of history is the building or destruction of the first temple.

²⁸ Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988). Helge S. Kvanvig, "Jubilees—Between Enoch and Moses: A Narrative Reading," *JSJ* 35, no. 3 (2004): 243-261.

²⁹ The Astronomical Book and Jubilees both use a 364-day year, but they address different issues, and disagree on the substantial issue of whether lunar observations have any legitimacy. The author of

All the more so, sources could agree on a 364-day year and still disagree on significant matters of worldview.³⁰ Calendar helps with the classification of Jubilees in ancient Jewish thought and movements, but does not resolve the worldview conveyed by the genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees. A certain view of history is part of the apocalyptic worldview—a certain calendar is not.

Friedemann Schubert uses the correlation between the calendars of Jubilees and the Astronomical Book to situate Jubilees in the Enochic tradition.³¹ As discussed above, this is less of a problem in Schubert’s pursuit of the long-term social patterns that explain the background of Jubilees. However, this approach tends to ignore the subtleties of worldview, and contributes to the misconception that the social-circles described correspond to a strict and coherent ideology. The findings of the present work will help to disconfirm the assumption that alleged chronological similarities between Jubilees and the Apocalypse of Weeks point to a shared theology and unarticulated elaborate system

Jubilees is concerned to interpret Leviticus 25 in terms of the Exodus and return to the Land, and insists that a lunar calendar not be used for dating festivals. Still, Jubilees should not be counted as obsessed with all matters chronological. Besides the things that are not mentioned at all (days of the week, *mishmarot*), Jubilees 5:27 and references to the middle of the third month as the fifteenth (14:10; 15:1; 16:11, 12, 13) may point to lack of concern for clarity and consistency on the counting of the four intercalary days. Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of *Jubilees*,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming. For more ambitious theories that bring out problems and variations in the 364-day year calendars, see Leora Ravid, “The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar - A Reexamination,” *DSD* 10, no. 3 (2003): 371-394. Gabriele Boccaccini, “The Solar Calendars of Daniel and Enoch,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John J. Collins, Peter W. Flint, and Cameron VanEpps, VT Sup 83 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2001), 311-328.

³⁰ There may be some connection between the condemnation in Daniel of Antiochus Epiphanes seeking to “change the times” (Daniel 7:25), and Jubilees warning of calendrical errors that will make a holy day profane and vice versa (Jubilees 6:37), but how much does this tell us about worldview? We should not ignore the ways in which Jubilees and Daniel are compatible, nor should we think that agreement on opposition to the festival calendar of Jason and Antiochus is bound with agreement on other matters.

³¹ Schubert, *Tradition und Erneuerung*, 54-69.

of chronology. Fortunately, recent works are pointing to the diversity in details and concerns among texts that fit generally with the 364-day year.³² An enriched understanding of the diversity of chronological thought will complement the present investigation into the diversity of thought on issues pertaining to the genre “apocalypse.”

Twentieth century scholarship brought great progress in the study of ancient texts as literature, but the above three impediments to understanding the worldview and use of the genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees developed at the same time. In a sense, a more tenable position can be found in the first modern work on Jubilees, by August Dillmann.

Sowohl um dieser seiner form willen, als auch weil das buch an meheren stellen hinweisungen auf die fernere, sogar messianische Zukunft enthält, kann es allerdings mit den zahlreichen apokalyptischen erzeugnissen der letzten Jahrhunderte vor und der ersten nach Christus zusammengestellt werden, und erklärt sich auch daraus der zweite name des buches... ἡ τοῦ Μωυσέως ἀποκάλυψις. Auf der anderen seite aber ist es doch durch seinen inhalt und seine ganze art von den büchern, die wir jetzt Apokalypsen nennen, so verschieden, dass wir ihm jenen titel nicht wohl beilegen können...³³

As we shall see, the contrast between form and contents lacks the precision of the contrast between literary genre and worldview, and the terminology is better tied to literary genre than conceptual contents. Nevertheless, this brief summary of the ways in

³² Especially, Ben-Dov, “Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of *Jubilees*,” forthcoming. See also, note 29 above.

³³ August Dillmann, “Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis,” *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft* 2-3 (1850-1851): 74. Cited in Lange, “Divinatorische Träume,” 25. My translation, “Both on account of its own form, and also in as much as the book in several places refers to the distant, even messianic, future, it can indeed be placed with the numerous apocalyptic witnesses of the last centuries before and the first after Christ; and the second name of the book, the Apocalypse of Moses, is clarified through this. On the other hand, however, it is, by its contents and the whole nature, so different from the books which we now call apocalypses that we can probably not give it that title.”

which Jubilees is typical and atypical among the apocalypses is virtually unsurpassed until now. By applying a rigorous set of distinctions it is possible to offer a clear and precise description of the literary relationship between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses. We now turn to the history of scholarship on the genre of Jewish apocalyptic literature. We will pay particular attention to the development of the distinctions and definitions that make it possible to clarify the levels at which Jubilees is and is not like contemporary apocalypses. Jubilees clearly does use the literary genre “apocalypse,” but clearly does not convey the typical worldview.

CHAPTER 2

THE HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON THE GENRE OF JEWISH APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

The Greek word ἀποκάλυψις, “uncovering,” comes into English by way of the Apocalypse of John. The word “apocalyptic” is often used in English in a vague sense of, “similar to the Apocalypse of John.” Modern scholarship on Jewish apocalyptic literature largely developed from the perspective of formal and conceptual similarities with this particular text.¹ The focus on the Apocalypse of John is not due solely to its inclusion in the Western Christian canons. It is the earliest clear use of ἀποκάλυψις as a technical term for a type of literature, whether by the original author or shortly thereafter.²

¹ James Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 58 (1975): 15. Paul D. Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism,” in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*, ed. Keith R. Crim (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 27, 29. Ironically, even the Apocalypse of John has not been immune to the question of whether it is “really” apocalyptic. Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 15 n. 2. Sacchi does not doubt the genre “apocalypse” or apocalyptic themes in the Apocalypse of John, but does exclude it from the apocalyptic tradition. Gabriele Boccaccini, “Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Contribution of Italian Scholarship,” in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies Since the Uppsala Colloquium*, ed. John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth, JSPSup 9 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 38.

² See Smith and especially Adler for discussion of the Christian use of the technical term. It is not problematic that the early Christian usage was broader than all but the broadest modern usage, nor that we find no pre-Christian attempt to name the genre. Morton Smith, “On the History of Ἀποκαλυπτοῦ and Ἀποκάλυψις,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 9-20. William Adler, “Introduction,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, ed. James C. VanderKam and William Adler (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 8-9.

“Apocalypse” is the most ancient term for the literary genre used by the Apocalypse of John and a good number of earlier and contemporary texts. Indeed, the opening of the Apocalypse of John introduces the basic issues that have concerned modern scholarship on the genre. In three verses one finds the basic framework of a revelation from God, through an angel, to a human scribe. The spatial axis is suggested by the journey of the angel, and the temporal axis by the nearness of the “appointed time.” More complicated issues, such as the function, social location, and esoteric readership and audience could be debated from these verses. The Apocalypse of John introduces but does not resolve these issues. Modern scholarship on the genre “apocalypse” attempts to define and describe what is typical of all the apocalypses in order to understand how the genre is used in any one apocalypse.

Two basic issues from the history of scholarship are essential for this dissertation. First, the literary genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview are distinct but related in that the apocalyptic worldview can be defined as the worldview typically conveyed by the apocalypses, and therefore suggested by the use of the genre. Second, the definition of the genre “apocalypse” in *Semeia* 14 accurately reflects a type of writing used by ancient authors. On both of these points there is a basis of solid agreement and a degree of continuing debate.

On the first point, scholars agree on the distinction but not always on the relationship between the genre and the worldview. For a long time, and for different reasons, scholars held the literary genre “apocalypse”, the apocalyptic worldview, and the socio-religious phenomenon of apocalypticism to be fundamentally co-incident. From this view, it would be impossible even to ask if Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” but does not convey the apocalyptic worldview. At the other extreme, if one holds the genre

and the worldview to be not only distinct but essentially unrelated then there would be no significance if Jubilees uses the genre but does not express the worldview. Thus, one might think that a non-apocalyptic apocalypse is no more surprising than an apocalyptic non-apocalypse (such as much of Paul and the War Scroll).

I claim that the use of the genre creates a reader expectation of the worldview, and an ironic discord when the reader expectation is inverted. It makes sense to define the apocalyptic worldview as the worldview *typically* conveyed by the apocalypses (even when found in works that do not use the genre). To omit the word “typically,” however, would amount to a denial of the possibility of irony in ancient literature. To a degree, the apocalyptic worldview must be conceived as a “big tent” in order to account for the breadth of ideas conveyed by the genre (especially diachronically). For that reason, I speak of the apocalyptic worldview as a cluster of compatible ideas. It remains for the rest of this dissertation to establish that Jubilees does, in fact, express ideas so much at odds with that cluster of ideas that no tent of the apocalyptic worldview could be so big without becoming the megaplex of common Judaism. It is essential for this chapter to establish a definition of the genre “apocalypse” that accounts both for the typical case (the genre expresses the worldview) and the possibility of irony (the genre creates an expectation of a worldview that is inverted).

On the second point, scholars agree that there is no better definition of the genre “apocalypse”, but still show hesitation on whether it should be viewed as a tool constructed by modern scholars, or as a tool used by ancient authors to convey meaning. It is true that no technical term existed for the genre at the time of Jubilees, but the

validity of the concept of genre does not depend on the naming thereof.³ Even the question of whether the ancient author was conscious of the use of genre does not concern us here. Nor is it a problem if Jubilees uses more than one genre.⁴ All theories of genre build on the fundamental insight that the composition of texts involves use of borrowed elements to convey meaning. Although one theory of genre or another might fail to explain the composition of texts in the second century BCE, the basic concept of genre cannot be dismissed as an anachronistic construct. Thus the question becomes whether the *Semeia* 14 definition is a good definition, such that it articulates patterns that already exist in the ancient texts. Although the history of scholarship has produced some helpful qualifications and caveats, this chapter seeks to show that the *Semeia* 14 definition is not only unsurpassed as a scholarly tool, but accurately defines a genre used by ancient authors. The literary definition of the genre does not tell us everything we would like to know about the intent of the author and the composition of the text, but the definition does allow us to make soundly one basic conclusion: Jubilees meets all the criteria of the definition of the genre “apocalypse,” therefore the book uses the genre.

The modern study of the relationship between genre and worldview in Jewish apocalyptic literature climaxed in the 1970s. A number of texts in the 1960s reflect increasing study, but generally raised more problems than solutions. Before 1960 apocalyptic literature was left vaguely defined according to lists of characteristics of a

³ Klaus Koch made this point with an analogy from grammar. The validity of the category “piel” is not dependent on the naming of the concept. Klaus Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method*, trans. S. M. Cupitt (New York,: Scribner, 1969), 12.

⁴ Scholars have long recognized cases of mixed genres, but I prefer to avoid any implication of exclusivity in genre. For that reason, I speak of works or passages making use of the genre “apocalypse,” rather than simply being apocalypses.

few “exemplary” apocalypses. A number of other issues came from around the 1960s, and influenced the quest for distinctions and definitions primarily by illustrating how inconsistently the terms had been used. In the following we will address the major issues thematically—chronological surveys exist elsewhere.⁵ First we will consider the three-fold distinction, the factors that delayed and resisted it, its extreme application, and the case for a moderate relationship between the distinct elements. Then we will consider the possibility of defining the literary genre “apocalypse” morphologically, taking *Semeia* 14 as the center.

⁵ Schmidt deals exhaustively with modern scholarship up to 1947 with attention to form-content distinctions. Johann Michael Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1969). Koch provides an excellent, however polemical, review of the maelstrom of conflicting interests from systematic theology, historical Jesus scholarship, and Old Testament scholarship. Koch’s work itself soon became a milestone in the history of scholarship. Klaus Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik. Eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1970). English translation, Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Naperville: Allenson, 1972). Unfortunately, neither Schmidt nor Koch discusses the modern Jewish scholarship on the subject. It would fit well with Koch’s points to note that Ginzberg and Buber shared the negative assessment of apocalyptic, and as much as Christians tried to dismiss apocalyptic as a Jewish corruption of Early Christianity, contemporary Jewish scholars equally dismissed Apocalyptic as a foreign, marginal, sectarian apostasy from normative Judaism. Ginzberg, “Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings,” 115-136. Martin Buber, *Kampf um Israel: Reden und Schriften (1921-1932)* (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1933), 61-63. Barr gives an extended review of Koch with additional emphasis on English-language scholarship. Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 9-35. Hanson’s review reflects his interest in sociological study. Paul D. Hanson, “Prolegomena to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic,” in *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, ed. Werner E. Lemke, Patrick D. Miller, and Frank Moore Cross (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 389-413. Sturm organizes his history of scholarship into studies primarily as a literary genre and primarily as a theological concept (his sympathies toward the latter). Richard E. Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’: A Problem in Biblical Criticism,” in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards, JSNTSup 24 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 17-48. Collins focuses on scholarship in a narrow, but important, range from 1979-1989. John J. Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies Since the Uppsala Colloquium*, ed. John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth, JSPSup 9 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 11-32. Recently Lorenzo DiTommaso produced a lengthy review of scholarship since Collins’ previously mentioned 1991 article. DiTommaso refers extensively to older works in filling out the issues. Lorenzo DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I),” *Currents in Biblical Research* 5, no. 2 (2007): 235-286. Lorenzo DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part II),” *Currents in Biblical Research* 5, no. 3 (2007): 367-432.

2.1. The relationship between morphological, conceptual, and sociological features

The distinction between the formal features of the genre “apocalypse” and the worldview typically conveyed thereby is foundational to this study. One frequently finds some distinction made between form and content, if only as a way of organizing a chapter that presumes their unity. Several earlier studies anticipate the foundation of the distinction, but Paul Hanson was the most influential in proposing not only that the genre “apocalypse,” apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism could be distinguished, but that they did not always overlap and could be studied separately. Previously, two major factors had inhibited the possibility of even asking the question if the genre “apocalypse” was used ironically to express an inversion of the apocalyptic worldview. First, from the beginning of modern study of the subject, “apocalyptic” was reified into a single coherent entity with the various manifestations showing different sides of the same literary, conceptual, and psycho-social monolith. Second, Hermann Gunkel promoted a way of studying *Gattung* that demanded the simultaneous study of elements from various levels of abstraction. This influenced an approach to “apocalyptic” as a *Gattung* that constitutes a single and distinctive combination of literary form, thought, and *Sitz im Leben*. New evidence (particularly the Scrolls) and new scholarship (Klaus Koch discusses developments in systematic theology and historical Jesus research as well as Old Testament scholarship) built on the weak foundation of a reified notion of “apocalyptic.” The resulting terminological chaos and logical desperation (described by Koch as *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*) in the 1960s prompted some extreme reactions in the 1970s, calling for a complete divorce of formal and conceptual elements. As understandable as this

reaction may have been under the circumstances, a moderate relationship can be maintained.

2.1.1. The early form-content distinctions and the reification of apocalyptic

We should address from the outset the need to qualify any distinction between form and content. In *Semeia* 14, John Collins distinguishes form and content within the morphology of the literary genre. Specifically, the form is the narrative framework, and the content of the narrative framework is transcendence on the spatial and temporal axes. In a broader sense, the contrast between literary genre and worldview could be considered a contrast between form and content. One might think of form and content not as an absolute division, but as a spectrum from the most explicit and concrete elements to the most abstract and speculative. Thus, while spatial and temporal transcendence is more abstract than the narrative framework, it can be measured in explicit features of the texts, such as heavenly tablets, angelic liturgies, and judgment scenes. Theoretically one could contrast any two points along the spectrum as form and content. It will aid clarity, however, to limit the use of the terms to the narrower sense of form and content as components of literary genre. Most importantly, the contents of the literary genre should not be confused with the contents of the worldview.⁶

⁶ Fletcher-Louis accuses the *Semeia* 14 of failing to stratify form and content. The criticism loses strength if we think of form and content as a continuum or a distinction that can be made on various levels. *Semeia* 14 does include the content of the revelation at the level of literary morphology, but not the theological or worldview contents. Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "Jewish Apocalypticism," in *The Handbook of the Study of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and T. Holmén (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

From the beginning of modern study on the subject, *Apokalyptik* was reified as a coherent entity. Although various distinctions between form and content were made in the course of organizing presentations, they were viewed as two sides of the same coin without seriously considering a complex relationship.⁷ Strong generalizations were made based on a limited number of sources. Although one might expect to find a trend toward more qualified assertions or more thorough noting of exceptions as new texts became available, the monolithic view of “apocalyptic” survived through the 1960s partly by privileging some texts over others as “exemplary cases.”⁸ As James Barr points out, many statements about “apocalyptic” were based on theological or philosophical constructs that could not be verified or falsified based on any ancient apocalypse, let alone a survey of all of them.⁹

Needless to say, Friedrich Lücke’s pioneering work in 1832 did not take into account all the evidence now available.¹⁰ With the Apocalypse of John in the foreground, “apocalyptic” essentially became the background of everything literary and theological that the Apocalypse of John shares with other texts.¹¹ While a number of features may be

⁷ Schmidt is particularly attentive to the distinction between form and content in nineteenth century scholarship. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*.

⁸ See page 80 below for attempts to define the genre by exemplary cases.

⁹ Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 30-31.

¹⁰ Friedrich Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesamte apokalyptische Litteratur*, Kommentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes (Bonn: Bey Eduard Weber, 1832). Friedrich Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes: oder, Allgemeine Untersuchungen über die apokalyptische Litteratur überhaupt und die Apokalypse des Johannes insbesondere*, 2. verm. und verb. Aufl. ed., Kommentar über die Schriften des Evang. Johannes (Bonn: Weber, 1852). See Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*.

¹¹ Richard Sturm organizes his history of scholarship into scholarship on apocalyptic as a literary genre and as a theological concept. He puts Lücke in a class by himself, noting that Lücke intends to do both (though fundamentally a more literary approach). It might be better stated that Lücke made no such distinction. Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 19.

“generic” (in the sense of typical or borrowed) in the Apocalypse of John, if one wishes to say what is true for *all* the apocalypses, one can in fact say rather little. The problem developed as scholars made the otherwise laudable move of studying the apocalypses in their own right, yet made even more specific and bold claims about “apocalyptic” as the historical bridge between Old Testament prophecy and Christianity. Sturm says of Adolf Hilgenfeld,¹² “He thus wants to consider ‘Jewish apocalyptic’ as an historical entity in and of itself, including canonical and non-canonical works, both to be valued equally.”¹³ The assumption of the existence of such a coherent historical entity pervades the history of scholarship through the 1960s. While Lücke’s title spoke of “apokalyptische Litteratur,” Hilgenfeld’s title makes clear his presumption of single coherent historical entity, “Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung.” Although the use of “apocalyptic” as a substantive is grammatically acceptable and potentially usable on a very abstract level for that which relates to the apocalypses in some way, the substantive became a symbol of the reification of a coherent historical entity.¹⁴

Johann Michael Schmidt’s survey of scholarship on Jewish apocalyptic makes a point of noting various form-content distinctions.¹⁵ He considers Johann Gottfried Herder

¹² Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Christenthums. Nebst einem Anhang über das gnostische System des Basilides* (Jena: Mauke, 1857; reprint, Amsterdam: Rodopi 1966).

¹³ Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 20.

¹⁴ For example, Adela Yarbro Collins criticizes Rowland’s, *The Open Heaven* for using the substantive, “It is hard to understand how, after the helpful work in this regard of P. Hanson and M. Stone, any specialist on this subject can still use the adjective ‘apocalyptic’ as a noun.” Adela Yarbro Collins, “Review of *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* by Christopher Rowland,” *JBL* 103 (1984): 465.

¹⁵ He sees the *Gattung*-historical approach as a wheel that was re-invented in the history of scholarship. This kind of redundancy demands the book-length history of scholarship he provides. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 306-307.

(1744-1803) the forerunner of the study of the forms of the apocalypses, although not at all in the same way as what was carried out in the 1970s, after Schmidt's survey was written.¹⁶ One finds in the two editions of Emil Schürer's master work an early struggle with the problems that led to the distinction between the genre "apocalypse" and the apocalyptic worldview.¹⁷ While the 1874 version devoted a section to *Apokalyptik*, the 1886 version split the material into two sections. One deals with the conceptual aspects under the heading "die messianische Hoffnung," the other with the literary aspects under the heading, "prophetischen Pseudepigraphen."¹⁸ Schmidt credits Schürer as the first to reserve the term "apocalyptic" for a literary form, separate from theological dogma.¹⁹ Unfortunately, neither the terminological nor the conceptual distinction between literary form and worldview took hold.

Another important distinction can be found, though not thoroughly developed, in H. H. Rowley's lectures given in 1942 and first published in 1944 as *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*.²⁰ First, he distinguishes apocalyptic literature from apocalyptic eschatology, which is the subset of eschatology that is typically found in apocalypses. More

¹⁶ "Form und Inhalt werden geschieden, um mit der Form nicht auch den Inhalt dieses ntl. Buchs an das Judentum zu verlieren. Was aber sind die Kriterien für diese Scheidung? Herder selbst bahnte trotz einiger mißverständener Äußerungen der Ansicht den Weg, daß in der Ap. Johs. eine allgemeine christliche Wahrheit in ein zeitbedingtes Gewand gehüllt worden sei." Ibid., 92.

¹⁷ Emil Schürer, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1874). Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 2. Neubearb. Aufl. des Lehrbuchs der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte ed. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886).

¹⁸ Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 174. Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 37. Barr, "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study," 15 n. 1. Sturm, "Defining the Word 'Apocalyptic'," 20-21.

¹⁹ "Schürer den Begriff 'apokalyptisch' seit der 2. Aufl. seines gen. Werks für die Bezeichnung allein der literarischen Form jener Inhalte reserviert." Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 174.

²⁰ H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*, New and revised 3rd ed. (Greenwood, NC: Attic Press, 1980).

importantly, he notes, “the ideas of apocalyptic eschatology may be found in works that could not be described as apocalypses.”²¹ He seems further to suggest that the description of apocalyptic eschatology should be based only on apocalyptic literature, and extended to other genres only to the extent to which they reflect influence from the ideas found in the apocalypses.²² Again, however, the proposal did not take hold, and not until Klaus Koch, followed particularly by John Collins, will one find a thorough attempt at precise terminology that grounds assertions about apocalyptic theology in the texts which use the literary genre.

Following a number of significant developments such as the publication of the first Dead Sea Scrolls,²³ and developments in systematic theology and historical Jesus research,²⁴ increased attention was paid in the 1960s to the study of apocalyptic literature and theology. Two works from this decade by Philipp Vielhauer and D. S. Russell stand out for a number of important distinctions and insights, and yet were crippled by a flawed view of “apocalyptic” as a coherent entity.²⁵ Both distinguish literary and conceptual characteristics at some level, at least as a means of organizing the discussion, but essentially treat them as two aspects of the same whole.

²¹ Ibid., 51.

²² “[The Pauline writings] have no place in a study of apocalyptic literature, though they have a place in the study of the influence of apocalyptic literature on the current of the Church’s thought.” Ibid. Sturm, who favors thinking of “apocalyptic” as a theological concept in the study of Pauline writings, discusses Rowley. Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 22.

²³ One major problem posed by the sectarian documents in particular is taken up below under “Paul Hanson’s separation...” (page 57).

²⁴ See especially, Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*.

²⁵ Philipp Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” in *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 581-607. Russell, *Method & Message*.

Vielhauer distinguishes the literary character, the world of ideas, and the origins of “apocalyptic” as separate sections, but still holds a reified concept of “apocalyptic” as a single coherent entity, and overestimates the degree to which a single essential literary character, set of ideas, and social origin can account for all the apocalypses. We shall return to the assertion of the inter-connectedness of literary, conceptual, and social elements in the following section on Hermann Gunkel’s theory of *Gattung*. Vielhauer distinguishes, but does not separate the genre and the worldview,

By means of the word “Apocalyptic” we designate first of all the literary genre of the Apocalypses, i.e. revelatory writings which disclose the secrets of the beyond and especially of the end time, and then secondly, the realm of ideas from which this literature originates.²⁶

By the words “first” and “secondly” Vielhauer does *not* indicate importance or logical priority.²⁷ Rather he tends to reconstruct a monolithic world of ideas of which we only get occasional hints in the preserved texts. For example, Vielhauer begins the section “The Doctrine of Two Ages,” by saying, “The essential feature of Apocalyptic is its dualism.”²⁸ He admits that the so-called “doctrine” is not explicitly stated before 4 Ezra, but the problem is not so much whether variations on dualism are an important characteristic of the apocalyptic worldview, but whether “apocalyptic” is an entity that can be defined by doctrines and essential ideological features with only secondary recourse to preserved texts. Like Russell, Vielhauer tends to follow an assertion of what

²⁶ Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” 582.

²⁷ Similarly, the acknowledgment of a distinction between literary type and theological province by Cullmann should not be mistaken for a methodological hierarchy. Oscar Cullmann, *Heil als Geschichte: heilsgeschichtliche Existenz im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1965). Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History*, 1st American ed. (New York,: Harper & Row, 1967).

²⁸ Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” 588.

“the apocalypticist” thought with a single reference to 4 Ezra.²⁹ The possibility that post-second temple apocalypses vary considerably from earlier apocalypses is not adequately considered. In fairness to Vielhauer, he does include “lack of uniformity” in the details as a major characteristic of the apocalyptic worldview, although only after making some bold claims about the “basic character of Jewish apocalyptic.”³⁰ Here he says, “the world of ideas of Apocalyptic is uniform only in its basic structure, but lacks that uniformity and harmony in its expressions.” This important qualification notwithstanding, he finds too much uniformity and ascribes too little significance to the variety of expression.³¹

D. S. Russell also deserves credit for making some important observations and distinctions. The reified concept of apocalyptic literature and thought discussed with respect to Vielhauer applies similarly to Russell. Russell underestimates chronological variation and overestimates the extent to which a single phenomenon stands behind the various manifestations of apocalyptic. For example, Russell presumes a coherent angelic sin myth with Jubilees just filling in some gaps that went without saying in the Book of the Watchers.³² As we shall see, the significant degree of variation should prohibit such an assumption. Since much of the confusion climaxing in the 1960s was of a terminological nature, we should also point out that Russell does not propose a rigorous definition *per se*. (We shall consider below the attempts to “define” the apocalypses with

²⁹ For example, in explaining why the “apocalypticists” used elements such as pseudepigraphy and future-form history Vielhauer presumes that a basic motivation and thought can be ascribed to every apocalyptic writer. *Ibid.*, 586.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 594.

³¹ For further discussion of Vielhauer’s reified concept of apocalyptic, see Adler, “Introduction,” 2-7.

³² Russell, *Method & Message*, 250.

lists of descriptive characteristics.) Thus, to take another example from our topic of interest, Russell states, “Jubilees is not, strictly speaking, an apocalyptic book,” but he does not speak strictly of what makes a work an apocalypse or an apocalyptic book.³³ Since Jubilees uses “apocalypse” among other genres, but does not share the apocalyptic worldview, the reified view of “apocalyptic” was incapable of describing Jubilees precisely. Simply put, Russell’s title reveals the basic limitation of the work, “The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic.” Although some distinction is drawn between method (roughly, literary devices) and message (roughly, theological concepts), “apocalyptic” is still a singular noun for a reified entity that has a singular method and message.

Following the terminological inconsistency and the conceptual confusion climaxing in the 1960s, Klaus Koch facilitated the division of intellectual history into decades by publishing his tide-turning polemic, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*, in 1970,³⁴ as did all those who completed or published their work in 1979.³⁵ Koch does not so much propose a more systematic program, but attempts to stir controversy and “expose the present state of affairs as untenable and to provoke its amendment, even if it is by way of contradiction.”³⁶ Koch succeeded in influencing subsequent scholars not just because of his critique within the disciplines of Old Testament scholarship (broadly defined beyond

³³ Ibid., 54.

³⁴ Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*.

³⁵ Especially the SBL Genres Project in *Semeia* 14 (1975-1978, published in 1979), Jean Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalypique: son emploi à Qumrân,” *RdQ* 10, no. 1 (1979): 3-33. (published 1979 with a post-script on *Semeia* 14), the Uppsala conference (August 1979, published 1983), and Rowland’s *The Open Heaven* (completed January 1979, published 1982).

³⁶ Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 12.

the canon), historical Jesus scholarship, and systematic theology, but by illustrating the fundamental disconnect between them. Koch called for consistent terminology and a more rigorous foundation for theology in the historical-critical study of texts. As we shall see, his own proposal toward a definition resembles the previous attempts to define with lists of optional characteristics, even if he does go further than Vielhauer with the distinction between literary and conceptual features. Perhaps most significantly for our study, Koch proposed that a rigorous consideration must begin with a typology of a set of texts defined by formal criteria (although the formal criterion of composition in Hebrew or Aramaic turned out not to be helpful). Only on the basis of a defined set of texts could the common characteristics properly be called “apocalyptic.”

Was an diesen Schriften apokalyptisch ist, läßt sich nur erheben, wenn gemeinsame Gattungsmerkmale aufzuweisen sind. Wenn es überhaupt gelingen soll, einen verbindlichen Begriff von Apokalyptik in Zukunft zugewinnen, ist die form-, literatur- und sprachgeschichtliche Ausgangsposition nach Lage der Dinge die einzig mögliche.³⁷

Koch’s proposal of grounding assertions about the *Gattung* characteristics of “apocalyptic” in a typology of a formally defined set of texts is of crucial significance for the history of scholarship, but is most potent in combination with Hanson’s loosening of the association of literary forms, conceptual features, and sociological background. In effect, this is a challenge to the very notion of *Gattung* as developed by Hermann Gunkel and an assertion that the apocalypses could be defined as a literary genre without reference to the worldview they convey or the *Sitz im Leben* from which they arise.

³⁷ Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*, 20. Translated by Kohl, “We can only ascertain what is apocalyptic about these writings if characteristics common to the type can be demonstrated. If we are to succeed at all in the future in arriving at a binding definition of apocalyptic, a starting point in form criticism and literary and linguistic history is, in the nature of things, the only one possible.” Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 23.

Before continuing on with the contributions of Hanson, Stone, Barr, and Collins in the 1970s, we should look more closely at the theory of *Gattung* from which they diverge. The reification of “apocalyptic,” more often assumed than argued,³⁸ hindered the development of the distinctions that make it possible to ask how the genre is used in the Book of Jubilees. No less significant, however, was the active assertion that literature should be studied as an indivisible compound of formal, conceptual and social attributes. It is important to review the proper application of Gunkel’s method and the critiques that led to theories of genre better suited to complex literary compositions such as Jubilees.

2.1.2. Gunkel’s concept of *Gattung* and the concept of genre promoted in the 1970s

Hermann Gunkel’s influence on the historical critical study of ancient texts is far-reaching,³⁹ but in this section we are concerned with his understanding of *Gattung*, and how it differs from the concept of literary genre used in *Semeia* 14 and in this study. First, we will attempt to clarify the terminology of the German terms *Gattungsgeschichte* and *Formgeschichte*, and similarly *Gattungen* and *Formen*. Then we will consider Gunkel’s assertion of the inseparable unity of the small form, the conceptual content, and the *Sitz im Leben* in the study of a *Gattung*. We should also note Gunkel’s emphasis on

³⁸ Schmithals argued what many had assumed, that “apocalyptic is a relatively closed, cohesive, and independent religious phenomenon.” Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement, Introduction & Interpretation*, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), 30. He explicitly focuses on “the unitary character of apocalyptic piety” while disregarding the possibility of development or local forms (page 212), and rejects the logic of starting with the historical texts and building the theological concept thereon (page 188).

³⁹ Hanson and Collins emphasize his contribution to the multivalent understanding of myth and the use of antecedent myth. Hanson, “Prolegomena to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic,” 393-396. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2nd Edition)*, 16ff. See further Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 195-204.

the diachronic study of *Gattungen*, and the possibility of sequential study in the larger project of *Literaturgeschichte*. Rather than attempting a thorough critique of the benefits and difficulties of Gunkel's method, we will focus on three features of Gunkel's concept of *Gattung* that complicate its applicability to apocalypses. Finally, we will consider some critiques of form-criticism that effectively describe a concept of literary genre very different from Gunkel's concept of *Gattung*.

Unfortunately, no consistent distinction is maintained between *Gattungsgeschichte* and *Formgeschichte*. *Gattungen* and *Formen* are sometimes interchanged, or *Formen* are treated as a subset of *Gattungen*, along with elements of conceptual contents and *Sitz im Leben*. In his earlier works Gunkel used the term *Gattungsforschung*. Dibelius introduced the term *Formgeschichte* in 1919 for essentially the same method.⁴⁰ *Formgeschichte* became the dominant term for the method developed largely by Gunkel,⁴¹ despite Gunkel's own reservations.⁴² "Form criticism" became the typical way of referring to Gunkel's method in English, and does not imply a rejection of Gunkel's emphasis on historical development (*Geschichte*). Koch writes, "So nützlich die

⁴⁰ Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 3. The original German edition should also be consulted, particularly for technical terminology that does not easily translate. The book was written and translated as an introduction for students, and hence takes liberties such as deleting or replacing references to untranslated German works. Klaus Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1964).

⁴¹ Koch also notes Gressmann's contributions, and Gunkel's often noted dependence on his predecessors decades earlier. Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 14. Schmidt finds predecessors of the *Gattung*-historical approach in the 18th century in Herder and Eichorn. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 173, 307.

⁴² Buss explains Gunkel's reservations about the term, since it can connote concrete phenomena or holistic structures. Gunkel viewed the external linguistic forms as components of a *Gattung*, but accepted the term in the holistic, organic sense. Martin J. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, JSOTSup 274 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 248. See also, Erhard Blum, "Formgeschichte—A Misleading Category? Some Critical Remarks," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Marvin A. Sweeney (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 33.

Unterscheidung von Formeln und Gattungen ist, so sinnlos ist andererseits das Nebeneinander von ‘Formen und Gattungen.’”⁴³ In a more moderate vein, Koch quotes Dupont on the French equivalents,

Il n’y a pas de distinction adéquate entre ‘forme’ et ‘genre littéraire.’ La seule différence est qu’une ‘forme’ désigne un moyen d’expression concret, une formule plus ou moins fixée par l’usage, tandis qu’un genre littéraire se caractérise par un certain nombre de ces moyens d’expression.⁴⁴

This relationship of *forme* as a component of *genre littéraire* is often found in German also, as Koch suggests, “Die bloße ‘Formensprache’ allein macht noch keine Gattung. Es gehört dazu immer ein gemeinsamer ‘Schatz von Gedanken und Stimmungen.’”⁴⁵ Thus, whether the term *Form* is used as a synonym for *Gattung*, or as an element of *Gattung* along with contents and social function, we come to the most significant claim of Gunkel for this study, the inseparability of the study of the three elements of *Gattung*.

Although there is some variety in how the elements are described by Gunkel and his followers, and some variety in how strongly the inseparability is stated, it is usually stated strongly enough that micro-forms, conceptual contents, and social function must be

⁴³ Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? First Edition*, 6 n. 5. Translated by Cupitt, “Though the difference between formulas and types is an important one, it is useless to try to differentiate between ‘type’ (*Gattung*) and ‘form’ (*Form*).” Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 5 n. 5. Hartman also notes the tendency to use *Form* and *Gattung* interchangeably. Lars Hartman, “Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 330.

⁴⁴ Dupont *Les Béatitudes* 1954 p. 20f, in Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? First Edition*, 6 n. 5. Translated by Cupitt, “There is no adequate distinction between ‘form’ and ‘literary type.’ The only difference is that form designates a means of concrete expression, a formula of style that is more or less fixed through usage, whereas a type is characterized by a certain number of these means of expression.”

⁴⁵ Ibid., 5. Translated by Cupitt, “The mere type of language used is insufficient to constitute a literary type. Besides there must be a common ‘fund of thoughts and feelings.’”

studied inseparably together.⁴⁶ As we shall see, the issue for us is not whether each should be studied, but whether it is possible or necessary to understand one first, and then the others in light of the first. Gunkel describes the three elements of *Gattung* in a letter to Adolf Jülicher in 1925, “‘Gattungen’ stelle ich fest a) nach dem gemeinsamen Schatz von Gedanken u[nd] Stimmungen, b) nach dem gleich Sitz im Leben, c) nach gleichbleibenden Ausdrucksformen.”⁴⁷ Gunkel states the requirement of considering the three elements together in 1924, “Nur, wo wir alle drei Merkmale zusammen gewahren, wo wir also feststellen können, daß bestimmte Gedanken in bestimmter Form bei bestimmter Gelegenheit ausgesprochen werden, haben wir das Recht, von einer Gattung zu reden.”⁴⁸ One should also note the resemblance of these coincident elements to Hanson’s distinct categories of genre (*Formen*), eschatology / worldview (*Gedanken*), and the religio-social phenomenon (*Sitz im Leben*).⁴⁹ Gunkel went beyond asserting that the three basic elements should all be considered, to asserting that they could only be

⁴⁶ According to Buss, Gunkel systematized the three-part understanding of *Gattung* beginning in 1921, while writings in 1906 and 1917 point in that direction. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 247. Buss calls the three-part view of *Gattung*, “Gunkel’s most important contribution.” Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 259.

⁴⁷ Hans Rollmann, “Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels an Adolf Jülicher zur religionsgeschichtlichen und formgeschichtlichen Methode,” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 78, no. 3 (1981): 284. Translated by Hayes 1980 *An Introduction to Old Testament Study*, pp. 127-128, “Genres I establish a) according to the common store of thoughts and moods, b) according to the similar Sitz im Leben, c) according to the constant forms of expression.”

⁴⁸ Hermann Gunkel, “Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie. Ein Vortrag,” *ZAW* 42 (1924): 183. “Only where we encounter all three characteristics together, where we can ascertain thus, that certain thoughts were spoken in a certain form on a certain occasion, have we the right to speak of a *Gattung*.”

⁴⁹ Koch notes that, “der Begriff Stimmung bedeutet in den ersten Jahrzehnten unseres Jahrhunderts meist ‘Stimmung der Situation’ und weniger einen psychologischen Zustand im engeren Sinn.” Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? First Edition*, 37 n. 18. Cupitt translates, “the word ‘mood’ (*Stimmung*) was usually used in the first decades of this century to mean only the ‘mood of the situation’, rather than a psychological condition in the narrow sense.” For more on Gunkel’s notion of *Sitz im Leben*, see Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 234-238.

considered together, “zu gleicher Zeit.”⁵⁰ Gunkel himself did not elaborate on the *Gattung* of the apocalypses in particular,⁵¹ but his influence can clearly be seen in those who insist that the apocalypses cannot be conceived or defined apart from their *Sitz im Leben*.

Before proceeding with some of the problems of applying Gunkel’s concept of *Gattung* to the apocalypses, we should point out some further influential aspects of Gunkel’s program. First, Gunkel emphasized the diachronic study of *Gattungen*. That much is certainly proper, particularly in as much as *Sitze im Leben* change. As we shall discuss below (p. 103), however, Gunkel’s insight does not exclude the possibility of defining explicit literary types (genre in the sense used in *Semeia* 14) on a phenomenological basis. The need for diachronic study of *Gattungen* leads us to another point from Gunkel’s program. Although he emphasized the inseparability of the elements of *Gattungen*, he did recognize the need for some separation and sequence in the broader study of literature. As Koch phrases it, “Jeder Exegt muß deshalb, sobald er die Gattung seines Textes festgestellt hat, auch nach der Gattungsgeschichte fragen.”⁵² Diachronic

⁵⁰ Gunkel 1925, quoted in Rollmann, “Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels an Adolf Jülicher zur religionsgeschichtlichen und formgeschichtlichen Methode,” 284 n. 16. Koch commented, “Der Brückenschlag von der Gattungsbeobachtung zum Sitz im Leben war ein genialer Einfall Gunkels.” Klaus Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese*, 2., durchgängig überarb. Aufl. ed. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1967), 47. Translated by Cupitt, “It was Gunkel who had the genius to perceive that one cannot usefully study a particular literary type without at the same time taking account of its proper setting in life.” Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 37. See also Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 248-249.

⁵¹ Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 218, 220. Gunkel comments on a history of religions methodology for interpreting the Apocalypse of John in *Schöpfung und Chaos*, but not *Gattungsgeschichte* in particular. Hermann Gunkel and Heinrich Zimmern, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895), 207-208.

⁵² Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Second Edition*, 25. Cupitt translates, “Thus, as soon as the literary type of the text has been established, the exegete must turn to the history of the literary type.” Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 20.

study is necessary as following from, not preliminary to, identification of types. Further, as inclusive as Gunkel's concept of *Gattung* may be, his total desiderata for the study of literature is appropriately longer. "Solche Untersuchung der Gattungen aber wird erst dann Literaturgeschichte, wenn man versucht, die Geschichte zu erkennen, welche die Gattungen erlebt haben."⁵³ The distinction between literary history and the study of *Gattungen* can be understood as the distinction between everything we would eventually like to know about literature, and the minimal requirements for the first step of identification.

We should consider three factors that complicate the application of Gunkel's concept of *Gattung* to the apocalypses: the smaller size of unit conceived by Gunkel, his focus on the oral stage, and direct relationship between form and *Sitz im Leben*. We will also consider Koch's helpful distinction between *Rahmengattung* and *Gliedgattungen*. Then, in the critiques of Knierim and Doty we will find not so much a refutation of Gunkel in his own terms, but clear evidence that Gunkel's *Gattung* and Doty's "genre" (including also *Semeia* 14 and this study) are very different concepts. "Apocalypse" can be understood as a genre or perhaps a *Rahmengattung*, but not a *Gattung*.

First, Gunkel developed his notion of *Gattung* in reference to smaller units, such as the Decalogue and the Beatitudes, with the presumption that they could be understood in a setting independent of the literary context in which they are now embedded.⁵⁴

⁵³ Hermann Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 33. Reprint of *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 27 1906, columns 1787-1800, 1861-1866. Translated in, Hermann Gunkel, "Problems of Hebrew Literary History," in *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*, ed. Alexander Kennedy Dallas (New York: Macmillan, 1928), 61. "This study of the literary types, however, will only merit the name of Literary History when it attempts to get at the history through which these types have passed."

⁵⁴ See especially Blum, "Forgeschichte—A Misleading Category?," 36-38.

Gunkel was of course aware of the significance of the redaction process and how settings change with time and editing. His primary interest, however, lay in the original setting that caused a specific discrete unit to be used. To refer to the differences in scope, Koch distinguished between *Rahmengattung* and *Gliedgattung*. Gunkel's focus on the original, smaller unit of the *Gattung* corresponds more with the *Gliedgattung* than the *Rahmengattung*. According to Koch,

Das Problem von Glied- und Rahmengattung ist in der formgeschichtlichen Arbeit bisher vernachlässigt worden. Gunkel hat es nur bei den kultischen Liturgien und bei den Sagenkränzen gesehen und behandelt. In beiden Fällen gab er die Entstehung einer umfassenderen Gattung für einen zeitlich sehr späten Vorgang aus.⁵⁵

Dibelius states the limitation succinctly,

Die Formgeschichte hat es bekanntlich nicht mit den abgeschlossenen literarischen Werken zu tun, sondern mit den kleinen Einheiten, die in mündlicher oder schriftlicher Ueberlieferung weitergegeben werden, deren Kenntnis wir aber freilich aus Büchern schöpfen, in die sie Aufnahme gefunden haben.⁵⁶

As we shall see, the intimate relationship of form and social setting breaks down in larger works of "literary" rather than oral composition. The distinctive formal elements of the apocalypses are to be found in the narrative framework.

⁵⁵ Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Second Edition*, 31. Translated by Cupitt, "The problem presented by component and complex literary types has been neglected hitherto in form-critical work. Gunkel dealt with it only in connection with cultic liturgies and collections of sagas. In both cases he asserted that the development of more complex types was a very late occurrence." Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 24.

⁵⁶ Martin Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte der Evangelien," *Theologische Rundschau* N. F. 1 (1929): 187. Quoted by Koch and translated by Cupitt, "It is a recognized fact that form criticism is not concerned with complete works of literature as such but with small units which are handed down orally or in writing, though of course we derive our knowledge of these from the books into which they have been absorbed." Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 25.

Similarly, in pushing backwards toward the original setting of smaller and older units, Gunkel was on solid ground in conceiving of the *Sitz im Leben* as some variation of oral composition and transmission. According to Koch, quoting Gunkel,

Gunkel wollte freilich vom Sitz im Leben nur bei mündlichen Gattungen reden. Er meinte, daß die Gattungen diesen Mutterboden “in entwickelterer Zeit, als die Schrift zur Herrschaft über das geistige Leben emporstieg ... zu Gunsten des geschriebenen Buches mehr oder weniger aufgegeben haben.”⁵⁷

Genre, for the present study, is found in the narrative framework of written works.⁵⁸ A study of the smaller oral units behind the apocalypses as we have them would certainly be valid, but none of those smaller oral units could be appropriately called apocalypses in anything like the sense we use. The problems of applying Gunkel’s notion of *Gattung* to the apocalypses do not undermine his original project. Gunkel himself did not develop specific claims about *Apokalyptik* as a *Gattung*. We should, however, take these problems into account when we encounter other scholars whose treatment of apocalypses and “apocalyptic” is dependent on Gunkel’s program.

⁵⁷ Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? First Edition*, 31 n. 2. Gunkel, “Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie. Ein Vortrag,” 183. Translated by Cupitt, “Gunkel wanted to speak of settings in life only in connection with *oral* literary types. It was his opinion that literary types to some extent lost their link with their parent soil, for as ‘in the course of time they developed and writing won a dominating position in intellectual life, they gave up their original setting in life in favour of that of the written book.’” See also Buss’ discussion of Gunkel’s contrast between the purity of oral forms and the deviations and mixtures introduced by writers aiming for clever effects. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 236. Consistent with his times, Gunkel attached a value judgment to pure/oral over mixed/written. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 254.

⁵⁸ William G. Doty, “The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis,” in *The Society of Biblical Literature, One Hundred Eighth Annual Meeting Book of Seminar Papers*, ed. Lane C. McGaughey (Los Angeles: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 424. Rolf Knierim, “Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered,” *Interpretation* 27, no. 4 (1973): 444. Eibert Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic*, Oudtestamentische studiën 35 (New York: Brill, 1996), 4.

Finally, along the same lines, Gunkel's understanding of the close relationship between *Sitz im Leben* and smaller oral forms does not translate easily to a *Sitz im Leben* of a larger literary apocalypse as a whole. Alt elaborates that Gunkel's method,

beruht auf der Einsicht, daß in jeder einzelnen Literaturgattung... bestimmte Inhalte mit bestimmten Ausdrucksformen fest verbunden und daß diese charakteristischen Verbindungen nicht etwa erst von Schriftstellern nachträglich und willkürlich den Stoffen aufgeprägt sind, sondern von jeher, also auch schon in der Frühzeit volksmäßiger mündlicher Gestaltung und Überlieferung vor aller Literatur, wesentlich zusammengehörten, da sie den besonderen, regelmäßig wiederkehrenden Ereignissen und Bedürfnissen des Lebens entsprachen, aus denen die Gattungen je für sich erwuchsen.⁵⁹

The question for us is not whether the relationship between *Sitze im Leben* and *Formen* works for smaller oral units in the Tetrateuch, but whether the same logic should lead to the conclusion that the apocalypses all arise from a certain *Sitz im Leben*. As Knierim points out, the precise *Sitz im Leben* of a literary, as opposed to oral, genre is simply the situation of the writing.⁶⁰ The claim of organic unity between the *Sitz im Leben* and the manner of expression becomes vastly more complicated when one turns to the apocalypses, a point not lost even on those who seek such a dimension to a definition of the genre.⁶¹ For any one apocalypse the scholar must usually wander from the explicit features into hypothetical reconstruction to argue for a particular *Sitz im Leben*. To claim

⁵⁹ Albrecht Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3 vols. (München: Beck, 1959), 1.284f. Quoted and translated in Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 27., "...rests on the assumption that each individual literary type... has a particular content and particular forms of expression, and that these two are closely connected. This is not the result of any arbitrary linking up on the part of the writers, but the two were linked right from the start. That is to say that even in primitive times material was shaped and handed down orally by the people generally, so that these forms correspond with the regularly recurring events and needs of a particular way of life, out of which the literary types arose naturally."

⁶⁰ Knierim, "Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered," 444.

⁶¹ David E. Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," *Semeia* 36 (1986): 80.

that any one *Sitz im Leben* produced *all* the apocalypses, and in that sense is generic, would strain credulity and mangle the concrete sense of *Sitz im Leben* used by Gunkel. When we turn to Jubilees, even the distinction between *Rahmengattung* and *Gliedgattung* is not adequate since a work in general, and Jubilees in particular, need not make use of only one *Rahmengattung*. Even if one accepts the correspondence of a *Gliedgattung* to a particular *Sitz im Leben*, a larger literary work not only has multiple *Gliedgattungen*, but can make use of multiple *Rahmengattungen*. It is consequently impossible to speak of the *Sitz im Leben* of a work like Jubilees in the generative sense used by Gunkel.

When Koch speaks of a *Rahmengattung* we already find a significant change from Gunkel's concept of *Gattung*.⁶² As we move on to consider the critiques of Knierim and Doty, we should think of "genre" in a new sense, rather than a translation and revision of *Gattung*. Doty and Knierim both speak of genre in general, not in specific connection to the apocalypses. As we shall see, apocalypses can be defined as a literary genre in this sense. Collins cites Doty in *Semeia* 14, and Sanders also perceives the radical difference between *Gattung* and genre in the sense of Doty, Collins and so forth.⁶³ Knierim and Doty both develop a larger sense of genre as that which is "typical" or borrowed in a work as a whole. The typical elements in the larger sense can occur at any level of abstraction. Knierim starts generally with the observation that, "men express themselves through language by availing themselves of the typical patterns of expression

⁶² Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Second Edition*, 31. Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 24-25.

⁶³ Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," 2. E. P. Sanders, "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 453.

conventional in their societies.”⁶⁴ These typical patterns can, but need not be structure, setting, content, function, etc., “The components which comprise a text’s typicality are not always unified in the same way.”⁶⁵ Knierim expands the sense of what *can* be typical, but limits the requirement of what *must* be typical; in particular, he harshly critiques Gunkel’s requirement of a *Sitz im Leben*. Knierim contrasts Gunkel’s sociological concept of a genre with his own linguistic concept.⁶⁶ Similarly, Doty calls for more possibilities of what may (or may not) be typical, “Generic definitions ought not be restricted to any one particular feature (such as form, content, etc.), but they ought to be widely enough constructed to allow one to conceive of a genre as a congeries of (a limited number of) factors.”⁶⁷ More factors can be typical, but genre cannot be identified with any one factor, especially not social setting.

Both Knierim and Doty maintain a distinction between form and genre. The latter might include forms and various other elements. They refuse to conflate the two or reduce genre to formal morphology. Doty says clearly, “‘Forms’ are constituent elements of genres, and can be identified by *scientific* criteria. Generally, forms are smaller elements than genres, and it will often be possible to chart forms typical of certain genres.”⁶⁸ The term “scientific” points to a major shift from an idealized holistic understanding of explicit features along with reconstructed and hypothesized features, to

⁶⁴ Knierim, “Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered,” 449.

⁶⁵ Ibid.: 458.

⁶⁶ Ibid.: 442.

⁶⁷ Doty, “The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis,” 439-440.

⁶⁸ Emphasis added. Ibid., 439.

a practical sequential approach to the study of genre. Again, genres cannot be reduced to forms, but,

Generic *definitions* should focus upon the formal, structural composition of the literary works rather than upon thematology. It may be necessary to keep characteristic motifs in view, but identifications of subject matter are of dubious value, since related subjects may be expressed in several genres.⁶⁹

Doty does not divorce the explicit formal features of a genre from the hypothesized thematic elements, but he does prioritize the formal elements for the purposes of definition. A definition does not describe a complete understanding of everything “typical” in a genre, it merely expresses as objectively as possible the foundation for subsequent study. There is a difference, but not an exclusive dichotomy, between definition and description. In the following pages it will be important to recognize that the *Semeia* 14 definition does not claim to describe all that is typical in apocalypses. Genre theory since 1979 will have much to add to the understanding of genre, but will not fundamentally challenge the preliminary task of identifying and defining the genre morphologically. The relationship between definition and description is not “definition or description,” but “definition then description.”⁷⁰

From this section it should be clear that two very different approaches to the study of literary types are found in Gunkel’s concept of *Gattung* and the understanding of literary genre articulated by Knierim and Doty, and followed by *Semeia* 14. Unfortunately, these two archetypes do not exhaust the number of conceptions that have

⁶⁹ Emphasis added. Ibid.

⁷⁰ See below, Section 2.2.4.1, page 90.

been pursued in scholarship, nor is the distinction between *Gattung* and genre universally observed. As we move from the history of scholarship on concepts of “genre” to the study of the genre “apocalypse” in particular, it will often be necessary to discern the conception underlying scholarly claims. We shall soon turn to the possibility of defining the genre morphologically. First, however, we will take up the question of the relationship between elements that had previously been understood as necessarily coincident: the literary genre “apocalypse,” the apocalyptic worldview, and the socio-religious phenomenon of apocalypticism. Our main interest lies between the first two, genre and worldview. On one hand, it is indeed essential to maintain the possibility of separating these distinct elements, for they are not *always* co-incident. On the other hand, we can make the case for some relationship between them. The apocalypse literary genre is not devoid of meaning; rather, it causes the audience to anticipate the apocalyptic worldview.

2.1.3. Paul Hanson’s separation of literary genre and worldview

We already mentioned the rediscovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a major contribution to the increased interest in Jewish apocalyptic literature, and the need to re-evaluate some terminology and presumptions. We should now say more in particular about the problem posed by the sectarian documents from Qumran for the reified concept of “apocalyptic.” Previously, a number of generalizations about “apocalyptic” had been based on minor coincidences between a small number of “exemplary cases.” More data naturally contradicted weak and simple theories. Specifically, the sectarian documents challenged the view of “apocalyptic” as a single entity with its own way of thinking and

mode of expression. With retrospect, we can explain the evidence by saying that the sectarians held a basic worldview very similar to the one typically conveyed by apocalypses, but did not use the genre “apocalypse” to express their worldview. That statement was very difficult in the making, as it requires a separation between literary genre and worldview. As Stegemann said, depending on whether one defines “apocalyptic” as using a literary genre or conveying a worldview, the sectarian documents are either wholly or not at all apocalyptic.⁷¹

The Scrolls demanded a distinction to describe the situation when the literary genre and the worldview do not coincide, but much remained to be said about the relationship between the now distinguishable elements. At one extreme, several scholars called for a complete divorce between the two concepts. At the other extreme, some proposed preserving a vague or essentialist notion of what an apocalypse *par excellence* is. Individual texts could be described as more or less apocalypse-like on a number of spectra corresponding to multiple levels of abstraction. We shall consider the merits of these proposals, but ultimately conclude with Collins that the literary genre should be distinguished and defined without reference to the worldview, but that the genre does typically convey a worldview which can be found in other literary genres.

⁷¹ Hartmut Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 496. Philonenko calls Qumran apocalyptic based on its apocalyptic thought, while Carmignac and Stegemann, based on the literary genre, severely limit the extent to which the term applies to Qumran. Marc Philonenko, “L’apocalyphtique qoumrânienne,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 211-218. Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyphtique,” 3-33. Jean Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyphtique dans l’Ancien Testament,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 163-170.

Although we found traces of distinctions in previous scholarship, Paul Hanson was the most influential in thoroughly proposing that the literary genre, worldview (which he identified with eschatology), and social setting of the apocalypses should be studied separately, and that distinct terminology should be used in each case. In a number of ways Hanson left the completion of the job to others, but the significance of his contributions is unmistakable. In particular, we should note that Hanson was interested in the sociological study of religion and proposed his distinction in the interest of disentangling literary details from the features of ideology, social origins and function.⁷² In a sense, this chapter is interested in the same disentanglement so that the explicit literary features can be studied without speculative sociological reconstructions. While this work may not resemble *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*⁷³ on most levels, both share a common foundation.

The seeds of Hanson's distinction can be found in his 1971 article, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment."⁷⁴ Although he still uses "apocalyptic" as a noun, he adds in a footnote that it would be better to speak of "apocalyptic eschatology."⁷⁵ More importantly, he critiques the approach to apocalyptic as a *Gattung* (as we discussed above), he proposes a precise and explicit definition, and he critiques the attempts to define "apocalyptic" with long lists of characteristics of

⁷² "The book of Revelation will help to clarify the latter [apocalypticism], not by analysis of literary genre, but by a study of its position in the history of the socioreligious phenomenon of apocalyptic movements." Hanson, "Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism," 29.

⁷³ Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

⁷⁴ Paul D. Hanson, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment," *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971): 31-58.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*: 35 n. 35.

which no apocalypse has all (as we will discuss below).⁷⁶ His definition in this work is based on a proposed sociological situation, with no real reference to literary mode.⁷⁷ His main interest here is to set up an “essential” contrast between prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology. The separation of the terms apocalypse, apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism was yet to come.

In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Hanson distinguishes and defines separately the genre “apocalypse,” apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism.⁷⁸ Hanson defines “apocalypse” as “a literary genre which is one of the favored media used by apocalyptic writers to communicate their messages.”⁷⁹ He elaborates only a little, starting with the typical features of the first work designated an apocalypse, the Apocalypse of John.⁸⁰ He defines “apocalyptic eschatology” as “a religious perspective, a way of viewing divine plans in relation to mundane realities.” The following sub-section will address the importance of not identifying the apocalyptic worldview with

⁷⁶ Ibid.: 33-35.

⁷⁷ “Apocalyptic [footnote: more accurately, one should perhaps use the term ‘apocalyptic eschatology’ ...] we define as the disclosure (usually esoteric in nature) to the elect of the prophetic vision of Yahweh’s sovereignty (including his future dealings with his people, the inner secrets of the cosmos, etc.) which vision the visionaries have ceased to translate into the terms of plain history, real politics and human instrumentality because of a pessimistic view of reality growing out of the bleak post-Exilic conditions in which the visionary group found itself, conditions seemingly unsuitable to them as a context for the envisioned restoration of Yahweh’s people.” Ibid.: 35.

⁷⁸ Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism,” 27-34.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 29.

⁸⁰ In advance of our discussion below as to whether function belongs to literary genre or social setting, we should mention that, on the one hand, Hanson includes “setting and function” as a subsection of “the apocalypse genre in the book of Revelation” along with “structure and typical features.” On the other hand, when he expands to “other apocalypses” he notes that the genre can have multiple functions. We should also mention that he only notes explicit textual features under the setting and function of the Apocalypse of John. It would seem that Hanson considers setting and function to be part of any one text’s literary genre, but since it is variable it cannot constitute a part of the definition.

eschatology or any other single issue, but this adjustment in terminology is incidental to Hanson's basic point. It is not a creed or a constitution but "a perspective which individuals and groups can embrace in varying degrees at different times."⁸¹ Hanson contrasts apocalyptic eschatology with prophetic eschatology largely on the basis of the agency of human persons. Finally, Hanson defines "apocalypticism" as "the symbolic universe in which an apocalyptic movement codifies its identity and interpretation of reality."⁸² He emphasizes that apocalypticism is a phenomenon, not a tradition. In antiquity there were many independently occurring apocalyptic movements. "The symbolic universe of an individual apocalyptic movement is not handed down to it ready-made by an authoritative antecedent tradition."⁸³ Consequently, "it is not possible to give one formal cognitive definition of apocalypticism."⁸⁴

Hanson left to others much of the work of explicating the relationship between the three elements.⁸⁵ Relative to his predecessors, he emphasizes the separation, but he does hold them to be interrelated. "While apocalypticism cannot be identified with the perspective of apocalyptic eschatology, a relationship does exist: apocalypticism is latent

⁸¹ Hanson, "Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism," 29.

⁸² Ibid., 30.

⁸³ Ibid., 29.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 30.

⁸⁵ Most recently, Paolo Sacchi and James Charlesworth continued the discussion on the relationship between genre, ideology, and social movement. Paolo Sacchi, "The Book of the Watchers as an Apocalyptic and Apocryphal Text," *Henoch* 30, no. 1 (2008): 9-11. James H. Charlesworth, "What Is an Apocalyptic Text, and How Do We Know That? Seeking the Provenience of the Book of the Watchers," *Henoch* 30, no. 1 (2008): 37-39. Sacchi reviews the terms and distinctions in his prior work. Charlesworth expresses reservations about focusing too much on elements in texts and isolating form from function or ideas from literary genre.

in apocalyptic eschatology, and can grow out of the perspective it provides.”⁸⁶ He implies a looser connection with the genre “apocalypse” in that he emphasizes that other genres can be used by to express the worldview, and mentions the Testament of Levi as having a function at odds with his understanding of the worldview. While Hanson had the last word on none of his three definitions, he is widely followed in distinguishing three terms for three aspects or levels of abstraction. Before moving on to the arguments for and against more radically separating these aspects, we should consider the response to Hanson on two issues: first, alternatives to the three levels of abstraction, and then the resistance to identifying the apocalyptic worldview with apocalyptic eschatology.

While it may be dangerous to blur the nuances between the various three-fold distinctions, similarities can certainly be found between Gunkel’s three elements of *Gattung* and Hanson’s three related but not coincident concepts. One might imagine, however, that the attraction to the number three has more to do with cultural aesthetics than objective properties of the literature. While no alternative proposal has been more influential, it will be worth noting that more than three levels of abstraction have been found when sought. Again, it may be useful to think more in terms of a spectrum or matrix than in absolute categories. James Barr, for the first example, lists a minimum of four levels, “language use... structure... the sort of thing that is told... [and] doctrine.”⁸⁷ These are indeed valid distinctions, even if they could be treated as sub-aspects of the literary genre and worldview. One could still add additional levels of social setting and function, explicit or interpreted. Lars Hartman picks a different (but comparable) three

⁸⁶ Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism,” 30. Also, page 29.

⁸⁷ Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 16.

with sub-types: linguistic/stylistic characteristics, the propositional level, and socio-linguistic function.⁸⁸ Hellholm's approach revels in levels and aspects, but is based generally on form, content and function.⁸⁹ It should be kept in mind that grouping the aspects and levels of abstraction of a text serves for convenience but may require further qualification.

On a related note, we should warn the reader that the apocalypse-apocalyptic-apocalypticism distinction is sometimes used differently from Hanson's proposal. Jean Carmignac uses the equivalents shifted toward the explicit literary features,

Il faut distinguer entre "Apocalypse", qui est une œuvre littéraire, "Apocalyptique", qui est le genre littéraire employé dans une telle œuvre, et "Apocalyptisme", qui est la systématisation des caractéristiques de ce genre littéraire.⁹⁰

As we shall see, Carmignac seeks a strong divorce of the "scientific" literary study of the apocalypses from the theological assertions about "apocalyptic." Although he has not been widely followed in this, James Barr proposes that exemplary cases be called apocalypses and marginal cases be called "apocalyptic," in the sense of apocalypse-esque.⁹¹ Even among scholars who maintain the same basic distinction, the reader must maintain some flexibility when encountering phrases such as, "apocalypticism as a worldview," rather than "the apocalyptic worldview."⁹² In this study

⁸⁸ Hartman, "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre," 332-335.

⁸⁹ David Hellholm, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John," *Semeia* 36 (1986): 13-64.

⁹⁰ Carmignac, "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament," 164-165.

⁹¹ Barr, "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study," 18-19.

⁹² Boccaccini, "Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Contribution of Italian Scholarship," 35. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 14. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic

“apocalypticism” will be used only to refer to a religio-social phenomenon or putative tradition.

2.1.4. The apocalyptic worldview of which eschatology is one part

Hanson’s terminology must be adjusted from “apocalyptic eschatology” to “apocalyptic worldview.” The importance of eschatology in the apocalyptic worldview is still debated. It is best to include eschatology (broadly defined to include personal eschatology)⁹³ as part of the worldview, against the extremes of making it the only part or no part at all. In fact, several aspects of the worldview have sometimes been claimed as “essential,” “key,” or “definitive.” Most of them fit in the broad definition of the worldview defined above through the illocution of the genre, but none should eclipse consideration of the others.⁹⁴ It is worth reviewing debates about approaching the apocalypses through views of eschatology, parentage in prophecy and wisdom, a particular mode of revelation, dualism and the permeation thereof, temple cosmology, or none of the above.

Despite using the term “apocalyptic eschatology,” eschatology is not particularly central to Hanson’s description of the apocalyptic worldview in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*.⁹⁵ Elsewhere Hanson talks about apocalyptic eschatology as “one

Compatibility,” 387. John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London; New York: Routledge, 1997), 8.

⁹³ Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 16.

⁹⁴ See above, Section 1.2.

⁹⁵ Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism,” 29.

strand” among others at the heart of apocalyptic literature.⁹⁶ Earlier scholars had a greater tendency to overvalue one insight as definitive, and reduce everything else to “coloring.”⁹⁷ The tendency may also be found more recently, in Paul Owen’s argument for the primacy of eschatology over cosmology and heavenly secrets in the early apocalypses.⁹⁸ In the 1970s several scholars reacted to the former overemphasis on eschatology,⁹⁹ and since then several scholars in England have followed Christopher Rowland in rejecting eschatology as a major theme of the apocalyptic worldview.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 7.

⁹⁷ So particularly, Vielhauer defined “apocalyptic” as a particular expression of eschatology. Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” 597-598.

⁹⁸ Paul Owen, “The Relationship of Eschatology to Esoteric Wisdom in the Jewish Pseudepigraphal Apocalypses,” in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*, ed. Craig A. Evans (London; New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 122-133.

⁹⁹ The first work dedicated to rejecting the centrality of eschatology appeared in 1978, Graham I. Davies, “Apocalyptic and Historiography,” *Journal of the Old Testament* 5 (1978): 15-28. Carmignac, reacting to the overvaluation of the importance of eschatology and working with a narrow definition of eschatology, rejected not only the importance of eschatology but the possibility of including any such “contents” into the definition of the literary genre. Although I am sympathetic to the attempt to define the genre based on the most explicit elements possible, his extremely formal definitions do not suffice to distinguish the apocalypses from other revelatory literature. Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 11, 13. Similarly, previous scholars had given Stegemann reason to believe that the relationship between apocalypses and eschatology was purely of terminological confusion. Again, his point depends on a definition of eschatology that excludes personal or realized eschatology. Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalypsik,” 500. Rowland also emphasizes the diversity of contents found in his loosely defined genre. Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 70-72. In a review of Collins’ *The Apocalyptic Imagination* and Stone’s *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, Rowland acknowledged the importance of eschatological material, but maintained that it is secondary to the “visionary/vertical dimension.” Christopher Rowland, “Review of: *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*, by John J. Collins; and *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Michael E. Stone,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 37, no. 2 (1986): 489-490.

¹⁰⁰ R. Barry Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul’s Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*, JSNTSup 127 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 284. Lester L. Grabbe, “Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking,” in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 114-115. In a forthcoming article Fletcher-Louis writes, “Whilst the ‘apocalypses’ contain much else besides the transcendent eschatology that is supposed to define apocalypticism, some appear to be practically devoid of a transcendent eschatology.” Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism.”

Fletcher-Louis in particular has accused the *Semeia* 14 definition of being obsessed with eschatology.¹⁰¹ By my read, the definition speaks of transcendence on the temporal axis and uses the adjective “eschatological” in a subordinate clause. Transcendence on the temporal axis includes any “bird’s-eye” view of the meaning of history, often but not exclusively history’s final goal. It may be true that the word “eschatology” is too diverse in its connotations to be useful, and Fletcher-Louis is certainly right to correct any tendency to read eschatology as the heart of the morphological definition of the genre. In other writings, Collins has made clear that eschatology includes personal eschatology, and that eschatology should be neither overemphasized nor denied an essential role.¹⁰² Collins has argued that eschatology is one of the more robust features which distinguish the apocalypses from earlier “prophetic” eschatology, but this is not a claim of the essence of “apocalyptic.”¹⁰³ Collins’ stronger and more basic claim is that apocalypses should be studied in their own right, not primarily as a deviation from a “parent” such as prophecy or wisdom.¹⁰⁴ This brings us to the next approach that should not be considered singularly definitive of the apocalyptic worldview.

¹⁰¹ “The definition demands that an apocalypse be concerned with transcendent eschatology. However, there remain swathes of revelatory material in the apocalypses which have nothing to do with eschatology, nor an obviously ‘transcendent’ kind of eschatology. This suggests that a ‘transcendent eschatology’ is really only incidental to the genre and need not be present in every case.” Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism.” See also, Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 272 n. 55.

¹⁰² Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2nd Edition)*, 10-12.

¹⁰³ John J. Collins, “Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe,” in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 49-50.

¹⁰⁴ “Biblical scholars have always been troubled by the strangeness of apocalyptic literature, and have tried to domesticate it by subsuming it under a more familiar category, such as prophecy or wisdom. Is it not time to stop playing this game and to study apocalyptic literature as a distinct phenomenon in its own right?” Ibid., 51.

Much of the early history of study of the apocalypses and “apocalyptic” was dedicated to comparing and contrasting (negatively) “apocalyptic” and “prophecy.”¹⁰⁵ One development was to balance or replace the view of apocalyptic as the child of prophecy with a view of apocalyptic as the child of wisdom.¹⁰⁶ Although much has been gained by studying apocalypses together with wisdom literature and prophetic literature, it has not been profitable to seek a definition or essence of apocalyptic in terms of prophecy. Prophecy itself is difficult to define, and does not compare easily either as a general abstraction at particular levels of literary genre, worldview, or religio-social phenomenon. At least for purposes of definition and classification, it has been more profitable to study the apocalypses in their own right, as suggested by D. S. Russell in 1964.¹⁰⁷ Recently, however, Lester Grabbe has returned to the task of defining “apocalyptic” as a sub-category of “prophetic,” and “prophetic” in turn as a sub-category of “divinatory” or “mantic.”¹⁰⁸ In the process, Grabbe challenges the arguments advanced

¹⁰⁵ See especially Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*. Charles, for example, lists four points of contrast that distinguish apocalyptic thought: the belief in a blessed future life, the expectation of a new heaven and new earth, the catastrophic end of the world, and a broader unity of history. R. H. Charles, *Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments*, Home University Library of Modern Knowledge (New York: H. Holt and Company, 1914), 18-23.

¹⁰⁶ Gerhard von Rad first proposed understanding apocalyptic as a child of wisdom. Müller refined von Rad’s argument by specifying “mantic” wisdom. VanderKam contributed greatly to the study of the interplay of forms of wisdom, prophecy and apocalyptic thought. Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 2 (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 306. Hans-Peter Müller, “Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik,” in *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971*, ed. P. A. H. de Boer, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 268-293. James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984). James C. VanderKam, “The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought,” in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane*, ed. James D. Martin and Philip R Davies, JSOT Sup 42 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1986), 163-176. See further below, page 233, note 95.

¹⁰⁷ “Despite its likeness to prophecy, it is nevertheless in many respects a new creation with a character and ‘personality’ of its own.” Russell, *Method & Message*, 104.

¹⁰⁸ Grabbe, “Prophetic and Apocalyptic,” 129.

by Koch, Hanson, and Collins, but does not propose a new definition of his own.

Whatever merit there may be in re-examining scholarly consensus, the task of defining the apocalyptic worldview is still best separated from the task of comparing the eschatology of prophetic and apocalyptic literature.

If overemphasis on eschatology and the temporal axis is related to thinking of apocalypses in terms of prophecy, overemphasis on the mode of revelation may be related to thinking of apocalypses in terms of mantic wisdom and divination.¹⁰⁹ It is appealing to define the literary genre or worldview solely or primarily in terms of the revelation of hidden things.¹¹⁰ After all, the word itself implies “uncovering,” not spatial or temporal things revealed. In practice, defining what unites all the apocalypses and distinguishes them from other works cannot be done without saying something about the hidden things revealed. The view of revelation has special significance in the apocalyptic worldview, but cannot claim exclusive significance.

The arguments about over- or under-emphasis on eschatology, relationship to prophecy and wisdom, and mode of revelation are questions of degree among elements implicit in the literary genre. Two other issues offer promising insights into the

¹⁰⁹ Christopher Rowland, “The Intertestamental Literature,” in *The History of Christian Theology, Volume Two: The Study and Use of the Bible*, ed. P. Avis (Basingstoke; Grand Rapids: Marshall Pickering; Eerdmans, 1988), 202-203. Cited in Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 275. Owen suggests that one’s view of the apocalyptic worldview as more about eschatology or more about secret revelation may be influenced by one’s period of study: looking back from Merkabah literature the revelatory element of apocalypses seems more important, whereas looking forward from biblical prophecy, eschatology appears more distinctive. Owen, “The Relationship of Eschatology,” 129-131.

¹¹⁰ See below, Section 2.2.4.3 for Stegemann’s attempt to define the literary genre in terms of heavenly revelation. Rowland is more interested in the essence of “apocalyptic” as an ideology than a literary genre, but similarly finds this essence in the view of the “open heaven,” “Apocalyptic seems essentially to be about the revelation of the divine mysteries through visions or some other form of immediate disclosure of heavenly truths.” Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 71. See also Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 288.

worldview, although the basic point remains that no one issue should be elevated to the singular essence of the worldview. The first of these is dualism and the permeation thereof. Crispin Fletcher-Louis offers an insightful critique of the assumption that dualism defines the apocalyptic worldview.¹¹¹ I agree that “dualism” is not helpful for describing the apocalyptic worldview, and I avoid the term in my own work. Another matter is whether the assumption of dualism pervades North American scholarship on apocalypses, and particularly the *Semeia* 14 definition.¹¹² At any rate, the best recent constructive work on the matter of dualism and the apocalypses has come from Frances Flannery-Dailey, who shows the interest of the apocalypses in *overcoming* ontological, spatial and temporal boundaries.¹¹³

In the same forthcoming article, Fletcher-Louis makes an innovative case for approaching the apocalyptic worldview through temple cosmology.¹¹⁴ This approach shows great potential, and corrects some unfortunate prior assumptions. Temple

¹¹¹ Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism.”

¹¹² “Collins and others who work with his definition in the field of Jewish studies remain attached to the view that apocalypticism is a dualistic worldview... Although the *Semeia* volume speaks of ‘transcendence’ not ‘dualism,’ ... it is really the transcendence of an ontological and temporal dualism that the definition has in mind.” Ibid. Without dwelling on the claim of what the definition has in mind, one should notice the difference between positing a dualistic worldview and positing a worldview of the transcendence of dualism. Flannery-Dailey’s language of “permeability” is perhaps more clear on this, but comparable in meaning. Fletcher-Louis goes on to suggest an escape from the assumption of dualism by appreciating the homology of imagery in the apocalypses and Daniel 7 in particular, not unlike Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2nd Edition)*, 106. For Viehauer’s claim that “the essential feature of Apocalyptic is its dualism” see page 41 in the present work.

¹¹³ Frances Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*, JSJSup 90 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 272. Frances Flannery-Dailey, “Lessons on Early Jewish Apocalypticism and Mysticism from Dream Literature,” in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*, ed. April D. De Conick (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 241, 247.

¹¹⁴ Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism.” Fletcher-Louis builds on the contribution of Margaret Barker, “Beyond the Veil of the Temple: The High Priestly Origins of the Apocalypses,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51, no. 1 (1998): 1-21.

cosmology is still not a singular essential feature of universal, pervasive and robust significance, but the proposal warrants further consideration and refinement. The present work deals with views of the temple as part of the temporal axis, particularly the question of whether the temple will be replaced with a new temple and a new creation. One could say that Jubilees is like other apocalypses in its concern with the temple and its heavenly counterpart, but different in the view of the current Jerusalem temple as adequate and permanent. Fletcher-Louis' proposal calls for more analysis along these lines in the future.

Finally, it should be noted that Barry Matlock argued extensively for abandoning hope of identifying any apocalyptic worldview whatsoever.¹¹⁵ One can understand Matlock's reaction to a long series of assertions about the essence of "apocalyptic," particularly in Pauline scholarship. He does not deny the significance of the category "apocalypses," only that we need the abstraction "apocalyptic" to make comparisons between ideas in Paul and ideas in the apocalypses. Although Koch, Hanson and Collins addressed similar concerns, Matlock seems to view their efforts as putting band-aids on a corpse that should simply be buried once and for all.¹¹⁶ The present work still speaks of an apocalyptic worldview as a cluster of compatible ideas typically implicit in the use of

¹¹⁵ "The grander designs of 'apocalyptic eschatology' and 'apocalypticism', it is hoped, will soon be put to rest." Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 298. "I have tried to suggest... we relinquish the idea of having some 'second term'—'apocalyptic', 'apocalyptic eschatology', 'apocalypticism', or whatever—floating about beyond the literature and seeming to make some historical connection with it." Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 291. Matlock also quotes Barton to this effect, "This has the effect of abolishing the noun 'apocalyptic'. As the name of a literary genre, 'apocalypse' is indispensable. But Rowland seems to me already to have shown that the attempt to find any unifying theme among all the apocalypses is doomed to failure." John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1986), 201.

¹¹⁶ See, for example, Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 288-289, 291 n. 98.

the genre “apocalypse,” but Matlock offers a valuable reminder that the worldview is not a thing in itself.

In conclusion, Hanson’s term “apocalyptic eschatology” must be revised to avoid the suggestion that the apocalyptic worldview consists exclusively, essentially, or even primarily of eschatology. Likewise, no other single issue or theme can be taken as definitive. While it makes sense to start with the illocution of the literary genre for the broad outline of views typically implied, this starting point must remain open to addition, and be used humbly as a rubric for talking about texts, rather than an object of study in itself.

2.1.5. The radical divorce

While Koch, Hanson and Barr maintained some relationship between the genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview, Carmignac and Stegemann (and to some extent Stone) called for a complete divorce. This could be seen as an overreaction to the terminological and conceptual confusion noted by Koch and Barr, but the merits of their proposals should be considered in their own right. In the following sub-section we will consider the case for some relationship between genre and worldview, and the next section will consider the possibility of defining the genre morphologically. Indeed, it will not be possible to define the genre based only on the most explicit literary forms without including some literary contents (as opposed to worldview contents). The basic principle, however, is shared. The definition and study of the apocalypses should begin with the explicit features and build thereon in moving toward the hypothetical, speculative, and reconstructed. For Carmignac and Stegemann a keyword is “scientific.” The study of

ancient literature may not benefit from limiting itself to the scientific method, but clarity can be gained from objectivity in definitions.

Michael Stone's postscript in "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," is primarily concerned with critiquing the attempts to define the genre "apocalypse" and "apocalyptic" with lists of characteristics and exemplary cases, as we shall consider in the following section. Stone emphasizes that "apocalyptic eschatology" does not explain the apocalypses, that it is not limited to the apocalypses, and that by previous definitions few if any apocalypses are "truly apocalyptic."¹¹⁷ This much is all true and should be kept in mind, but should qualify and not prohibit explicating the worldview typically conveyed by the apocalypses. In 1984 Stone elaborates, maintaining precision but emphasizing the need for separation, "Clarity is to be achieved only if a clear distinction is drawn." While in 1976 Stone proposed that the term "apocalypticism" be abandoned, in 1984 he recognizes its validity as long as the apocalypses are not reduced to apocalypticism, "An illusion persists... that by defining apocalypticism something has been said about the apocalypses.... [Each] must be dealt with in its own right."¹¹⁸ Stone's points are valid as far as they go, but should not be taken as a rejection of the possibility of a link between the literary genre and a typical set of ideas.

¹¹⁷ "Finally, it may perhaps be suggested that the terms 'apocalyptic' and 'apocalypticism' be abandoned altogether. They will continue to confuse the issue as they tend to imply an identity between the way of thought they designate and the apocalypses. The writer does not deny the tremendous importance of this pattern of thought in the apocalypses, yet it is not exclusive to the apocalypses. Indeed the 'truly apocalyptic' apocalypses are the exception rather than the rule." Michael E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, ed. Werner E. Lemke, Patrick D. Miller, and Frank Moore Cross (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 443.

¹¹⁸ Michael E. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Assen, Philadelphia: Van Gorcum, Fortress, 1984), 394.

Jean Carmignac calls for a more radical divorce. It is true that no one distinctive trait defines the worldview of the apocalypses apart from other genres, and again we agree that “apocalyptic” should neither be reified nor defined by one essential idea or a list of characteristic doctrines. Carmignac considers three options to be mutually exclusive: as a theology, as a literary genre, or as a literary genre which conveys a theology.¹¹⁹ Unfortunately, his critique of the last option is mostly a critique of Gerhard von Rad. Carmignac is of course right that there is not a single uniform systematic theology which all the apocalypses convey and which is found only in apocalypses.

Car un genre littéraire peut convenir à plusieurs théologies et chaque théologie peut s'exprimer dans des genres littéraires différents. Définir l'un par rapport à l'autre, c'est confondre deux plans. La science ne peut rien gagner à une telle confusion, qui est en elle-même non-scientifique.¹²⁰

More subtle possibilities need to be considered, however. While the genre does convey a plurality of theologies, overlap and patterns can be found within that plurality. While that cluster of overlapping ideas is not exclusive to the apocalypses, that does not answer the question of whether the genre expresses some typical notions. Admittedly, the cluster does not add up to “une certaine théologie.”¹²¹ While a literary genre should not be defined with reference to the worldview it typically conveys, and the apocalyptic worldview is not limited to the apocalypses, the apocalyptic worldview can be defined as the worldview that is typically found in the apocalypses. Carmignac leaves no room for

¹¹⁹ At Uppsala Carmignac does adopt the distinction between apocalypse, apocalyptic and apocalypticism, but dedicates them all to aspects of genre, maintaining the rejection of any term for a worldview derived from ἀποκάλυψις. Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyptique dans l’Ancien Testament,” 164-165.

¹²⁰ Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 19.

¹²¹ Ibid.

an apocalyptic worldview in his effort to deal objectively and scientifically with the apocalypses. Adherence to the most objective standards is a noble interest but can be taken to extremes, as we shall see again when we consider the possibility of defining the genre.¹²²

Hartmut Stegemann likewise limits the term “apocalyptic” to a literary phenomenon. Only apocalypses can be called apocalyptic, except in small isolated instances when another work directly imitates the apocalypses.¹²³ Again, the scientific ideal prohibits calling ideas “apocalyptic” in connection to other works, “Meiner Auffassung nach ist ein solches Vorgehen grundsätzlich falsch und vom wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt her illegitim.”¹²⁴ Two further points are particularly interesting about Stegemann’s argument. First, along the lines of our distinction above between *Gattung* and genre, Stegemann rejects the existence of an apocalypse *Gattung*. However,

Allenfalls kann man von einem literarischen “genre” sprechen, wenn man diesen Begriff nicht im Sinne von “Gattung” versteht, sondern sich ausschließlich an inhaltlichen Kriterien orientiert (so z. B. J. J. Collins 1979).¹²⁵

Although Collins speaks of both form and contents of the literary genre, Stegemann is right that Collins’ definition avoids the more speculative content of the worldview that

¹²² As we shall see, Collins distinguishes worldview from literary genre, but includes both literary form and literary contents in the definition of the literary genre. Carmignac dismisses not only the possibility of a theology associated with the apocalypses, but also any reference to literary contents in a definition of the literary genre. Carmignac’s noble effort to base his definition only on the most explicit and formal features unfortunately fails to distinguish the apocalypses from other revelatory literature or the dreams of Joseph in Genesis.

¹²³ Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 499-500.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 499.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 527 n. 107.

comprises a *Gattung*. Another salient point in Stegemann's treatment will lead us to the next sub-section, on the case for some relationship. Although Stegemann vehemently opposes the identification of eschatology (which he defines narrowly) with the apocalyptic worldview, he does accept the possibility that conceptual content is inherently implied in a literary form. As it happens, and as we shall discuss in the next section, Stegemann attempts a definition that focuses only on the manner of revelation. From this he says that the idea of heavenly secret knowledge is implied by the definition.

Denn der für die "Apokalyptik" zentrale Gedanke, der literarisch die Apokalypsen konstituiert, ist nicht das—nur tatsächlich häufig benutzte—Geschichtskonzept der "Eschatologie", sondern die Mitteilung von "himmlischem Geheimwissen", das durch diese Schriften "offenbart" wird...¹²⁶

Differences in the definitions of the literary genre and eschatology notwithstanding, Stegemann is certainly correct that a set of ideas is directly implied by the use of a genre.

In summation, while the above emphases and conclusions in the interest of radically separating the literary genre from the worldview cannot be accepted, a number of important points come out of the discussion. The scientific interest in objectivity is noble to the extent that it is possible. The definition of the genre "apocalypse" should begin with the more explicit features (even if further description is inevitably speculative). An understanding of the apocalypses and their genre must begin with the texts, not a preconceived notion of apocalyptic theology. The adjective "apocalyptic" should refer to what is typically true of the apocalypses. Even from the most formal definition of a literary genre a certain "illocutionary" implication of conceptual contents follows.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 500.

2.1.6. The case for some relationship

The case for some relationship between the genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview can be argued in two ways. First, one could study the apocalypses inductively to see what conceptual features they all share. This method has clear advantages, despite the amount of study required to identify accurately the conceptual features of a large number of texts. In the following chapters we will examine Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses for a certain base set of conceptual features, although we will by no means claim to exhaust all the conceptual features of any of those texts. Before beginning such a detailed evaluation of the sources, some sound logic can tell us what conceptual features we can expect to find in a genre. The conceptual implications of the formal features of a genre have been called the “illocution” of the text, or what it says in speaking the way it speaks. This notion is partly implicit in the minor point made by Stegemann above, and further developed by Hartman, Hellholm, Collins, and others.¹²⁷

Once a morphological definition of the literary genre is achieved one can ask what the use of the specific elements of the definition inherently suggest. As we already saw in Stegemann’s essay, the framework of revelation implies the relevance of heavenly secret knowledge (which one might naturally seek to contrast with earthly public knowledge). As we shall see, the literary contents of transcendence on the spatial axis suggest a worldview that maintains the significance of non-human beings and hidden places for human understanding. The literary contents of transcendence on the temporal

¹²⁷ Lars Hartman, “Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” *Ibid.*, 334. Hellholm, “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John,” 13-64. Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 11-32.

axis suggest a view of history that cannot be seen from the present but can be seen in a broader perspective which encompasses the beginning, end, or internal pattern of history. Each of these specific expected implications should and will be tested against the textual evidence. Further, the specific implications should not outweigh the more general principle that a genre creates a reader expectation (*Lesererwartung*).¹²⁸

Hanson reversed the reified concept of apocalyptic and advanced the idea that “apocalypse” could be defined as a literary genre without reference to its worldview or social setting. This trend, especially in extreme forms, has aroused concern that the short-sighted pursuit of clarity has reduced the significance of “apocalyptic” to literary genre.¹²⁹ In response to the concern of reductionism it should be emphasized that the purpose of a definition of a genre is not to encompass all the typical features of a text or even a body of texts.¹³⁰ Further study can and should take place, but a definition by itself should indulge in no more speculation than absolutely necessary to distinguish a genre from related genres. Although Koch, Barr and Collins call for terminological clarity and place study of the literature as logically prior to theological generalizations, they do not dismiss the importance of theological investigation.¹³¹ While Carmignac and Stegemann

¹²⁸ Hartman, “Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” 331.

¹²⁹ See especially Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 17-48. Also, Eibert Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” *JSJ* 18 (1987): 144.

¹³⁰ Sturm criticizes the *Semeia* 14 definition as dry and minimalist, “transcendence may sound less like the heart of apocalyptic and more like a lowest common denominator of the genre.” Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 25. It is worth being clear that the morphology of the genre does not claim to be the heart of any worldview or religious social movement.

¹³¹ Sturm asserts, “If one takes literary genre as a starting point for research, the ideas of apocalyptic are important but *secondary*, as general features characteristic of the literature.” Ibid. Although Koch and Collins speak of a clear definition based on literary analysis as logically prior to conceptual

seek to disconnect the sectarian documents of Qumran from the language of “apocalyptic,” most scholars would acknowledge that the worldview that is defined as typical of the apocalypses need not be limited to the apocalypses.

Hanson did not attempt to provide a morphological definition of the genre, or even to demonstrate that the body of literature could in practice be distinguished without reference to criteria based on worldview and *Sitz im Leben*. This question received significant attention in the 1970s, particularly from the Apocalypse Group of the SBL Genres Project. While a number of earlier alternatives warrant consideration, and some of the critical response contributed some worthwhile clarifications, with *Semeia* 14 the SBL Apocalypse Group succeeded in providing a morphological definition of the literary genre “apocalypse.”

2.2. The possibility of defining the genre “apocalypse” morphologically

In this section we seek the best standard by which to establish the use of the genre “apocalypse” in the Book of Jubilees. We expect a good definition of the genre to reflect accurately a pattern in the ancient texts that conveyed meaning to the ancient audience (even if it was not named and defined until later). The genre “apocalypse” can be defined morphologically as it was in *Semeia* 14. A number of protests call attention to important clarifications and qualifications, but the morphological definition is valid and useful for what it is designed to do. One crucial distinction for this section is the distinction between

assertions about the “essence of apocalyptic,” they do not require a disjunction as in Sturm’s phrase, “important but secondary.” Logical sequence does not imply degrees of importance. The definition of the genre does not claim to be the most important part of the study of any text.

a definition and “a complete study of a genre.”¹³² Although at times the tasks of definition and description have been seen as mutually exclusive, each serves a separate and legitimate purpose. A definition should allow one to identify use of the genre as objectively as possible by stating what is true of all the apocalypses and what distinguishes them from works which are not apocalypses. It should provide a standard by which terminology can be used consistently and precisely, and by which variation can be gauged. It need not tell us everything we would like to know about what is typical in a particular text, or even exhaust everything that may be true of all the apocalypses.

Although a number of definitions and valid insights have been offered, the definition of the genre in *Semeia* 14 has not been surpassed for objectivity or functionality (given the purpose of a definition just mentioned and discussed below). Before coming to the *Semeia* 14 definition we should consider some earlier alternatives and the purpose of a definition of a genre. We will then consider the *Semeia* 14 definition and the resistance and clarifications that have followed. Separate sub-sections will be dedicated to the function amendment of *Semeia* 36 and prototype theory.

2.2.1. The earlier alternatives

Even before Hanson separated definitions for the genre “apocalypse” and apocalyptic worldview, some definitions could be considered attempts to define the genre morphologically. These can be grouped into two basic approaches, the “exemplary case” approach, and the “lists of characteristics” approach, reborn as the “family resemblance

¹³² Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 1-2.

model.” Whatever insight these approaches contribute to describing the apocalypses, they are not efficient definitions.

The “exemplary case” approach has the advantage of being able to describe a set of continua along which a marginal case can be described as more or less like what are taken to be the prime examples (sometimes a single prime example or a non-existent hypothetical ideal). The exemplary cases would typically include the Apocalypse of John, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch, as well as Daniel and 1 Enoch in part or entirely. Although this approach can be traced to a time when fewer apocalypses were known and two in particular were given special status as a result of their canonicity, more recent proponents can be found. James Barr, for example, proposes that the term “apocalypse” be used only for the exemplary cases, and “apocalyptic” be used more in the sense of “apocalypse-esque,” i.e., comparable to the exemplary cases in some regards but not enough to be an exemplary case.¹³³ What is gained in flexibility is lost, however, in precision. Even if scholars could agree on a set of exemplary cases or a constructed ideal, it would remain impossible to convey a specific classification with such terminology. At best, each use of the term would be clearly qualified as to the manner and degree to which a work is like an exemplary case, along with the assumed importance or hierarchy of the various comparable features. Although such detailed study is indeed desirable and sometimes necessary when a work has multiple affinities, a precise definition is more efficient. Furthermore, a precise definition does not prohibit consideration of marginal cases with multiple affinities, but rather provides a standard by which one can describe more specifically the affinities and variations.

¹³³ Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 18-19.

The “exemplary case” approach can often be found in conjunction with the “list of characteristics” approach. Many lists have been offered,¹³⁴ but the issue is not so much the problems with any one item or any one list, but the facts that these lists do not claim to be true of all the apocalypses, and no one apocalypse contains all the items.¹³⁵ Thus the lists by themselves were at best descriptions of some more-or-less distinctive features that “often” or “sometimes” can be found in apocalypses. The descriptive lists might be considered definitions when coupled with a hierarchy of definitive characteristics or a specific formula for how many apocalyptic characteristics constitute an apocalypse, but no such proposal has gained traction. James Barr combines the “exemplary case” and “list of characteristics” approaches,

What we have is bundles of features on various levels; perhaps no work is so perfect and ideal an example of apocalyptic that it embodies all of these features, but substantial clusters of these features normally constitute sufficient reason to use the term apocalyptic, and still larger groupings of them, under more rigorous criteria, constitute adequate grounds for the use of the term apocalypse.¹³⁶

This is not so much a definition as a case for keeping terminology loose and flexible, based on description and the intuition of the scholar. This case continued to be made after the *Semeia* 14 definition was proposed.¹³⁷ Descriptions do indeed have the advantage of

¹³⁴ Lücke, in the first modern critical study of the apocalypses, offers one of the more reasonable lists, summarized by Sturm, “a universal perspective as the scope of revelation, a particular reckoning of time, pseudonymity, an artistic presentation, a combination of visions and images, and the interpretive mediation of angels.” Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 18. For more lists see Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” 583-594. Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 24-33. Russell, *Method & Message*, 105.

¹³⁵ Hanson and Stone have been particularly critical of this approach. Hanson, “Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment,” 33. Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things,” 440.

¹³⁶ Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 18-19.

¹³⁷ Sanders proposes what he calls an “essentialist definition.” Sanders, “The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses,” 458. Rowland’s description also relies heavily on the intuition of the scholar. Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 70-72.

being able to say more without getting bogged down in exceptions. Definitions have their own separate purpose, however, and they are not mutually exclusive. There may be some gray area, as some definitions rely somewhat on the intuition of the scholar, and some descriptions achieve greater objectivity than others. As much as possible, terminology should be objective and mutually agreeable. This would bring us to the next sub-section, the purpose of a definition, but first we should consider a variant on the “list of characteristics” approach, the “family resemblance” approach.

The “family resemblance” approach represents an attempt to derive a definition from the lists of characteristics. This approach asserts that a meaningful classification cannot be defined on the basis of features that are always true, but only on the probability that several of a list of possibilities are true. The common analogy for the family resemblance model is drawn from the biological sciences, in the taxonomy of species. It is asserted that a classification of animal species cannot be stated objectively based on features that all member species have in common, but only as a series of related species. Each has significant overlap with one or more “neighbors,” but one end of the chain may have nothing in common with the other end. Rather than evaluating the legitimacy of the analogy,¹³⁸ we should focus on the core issue of whether the apocalypses can be defined based on “always-true” criteria. The basic method of the family resemblance model was proposed with respect to the apocalypses in 1976 by John G. Gammie.¹³⁹ Gammie avoided dealing with Hanson’s distinction, and sought to define “apocalyptic” on the

¹³⁸ Ironically, while Carmignac and Stegemann called for “scientific” standards of objectivity, science is here marshaled to deny the possibility of objectivity.

¹³⁹ John G. Gammie, “The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel,” *JBL* 95 (1976): 193 n. 16. The strength of Gammie’s approach is that it recognizes that the genre operates at the level of framework, and it dismisses the idea of a single essential feature.

basis of framework, constituent parts, and “ideational elements.” Given this starting point, one might agree that a precise definition could not define a corpus bound at all three levels, and thus it would be necessary to resort to a preponderance of optional elements. We have already begun to see, however, the advantages of approaching piecemeal the study of all things apocalyptic, starting with the literary forms. Alastair Fowler also promoted the family resemblance model as a general theory of genre.¹⁴⁰ Fowler’s point, however, is not that the family resemblance model provides a definition or is even preliminary to a definition, but that definition is not possible. This is true if one takes “definition” to be exclusive classification without the ability to qualify variation and overlap, and “genre” as encompassing the totality of what is typical.¹⁴¹ It is worth remembering that the definition of the genre in *Semeia* 14 does not do all that one might like it to do. Tigchelaar also praised the family resemblance model.¹⁴² As we shall see again, Tigchelaar makes a good case for not stopping with the definition.¹⁴³ He contributes greatly to the description of the apocalypses, but does not refute the possibility of defining the genre morphologically. More recently, genre theorists have developed “prototype” theory as a refinement of the family resemblance model.

¹⁴⁰ Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), 39-41. See especially page 41 for the history of the theory beginning with Stewart and Wittgenstein.

¹⁴¹ Fowler denies that genres can be defined in an absolute sense, but not that they can be identified. “The character of genres is that they change. Only variations or modifications of convention have literary significance. This is not to say that literature cannot be identified. Certainly I should wish to avoid defeatism (or historical relativism) in this regard.” Ibid., 18.

¹⁴² Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” 139. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End*, 8.

¹⁴³ The family resemblance model appeals to Tigchelaar as an aspect of an evolutionary model with its emphasis on diachronic development. We shall return to the issue of synchronic definition and diachronic study.

Prototype theory may initially sound like the exemplary case approach, but rests on different foundations. Section 2.2.6 will discuss the potential of prototype theory as a way forward, building on *Semeia* 14, but not replacing it. Finally we come to detailing the purpose of a definition of a literary genre as here conceived.

2.2.2. The purpose of a definition

The purpose of a definition of a literary genre, as here conceived, can be treated under three points. First, the definition should define the corpus on a practical level. Second, it should ground discussion in a data set by which assertions can be verified or falsified. Third, it should provide a standard by which variation can be measured. Again, a definition need not explain everything that is typical about a body of texts.

First, a definition should define a class in such a way that members can be identified as easily and objectively as possible. It should state what is true of all the members and what distinguishes the class from related classes, and particularly the super-category (in the case of the apocalypses, revelatory literature). Sturm's critique of the *Semeia* 14 definition, for example, should be taken as a compliment—it not only “may” but should, “sound less like the heart of apocalyptic and more like a lowest common denominator of the genre.”¹⁴⁴ It should also be able to handle new evidence; i.e., if it is inductive it should avoid features that the set might have in common by coincidence. While some interesting patterns have been found in apocalypses, a feature (e.g. the catchword “glory”) should not be considered definitive if a text could be considered an

¹⁴⁴ Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 25.

apocalypse by common sense if it lacked that feature. This relates to what John Collins described as “inner coherence.”¹⁴⁵

Second, it should ground assertions in a corpus of texts by which assertions can be verified or falsified. As Koch and Barr illustrate in detail, it frequently happened that generalizations about apocalyptic and the apocalypses were based on vague notions that could not be verified or falsified with reference to a body of texts.¹⁴⁶ A clear definition does not censor what can be said, but it calls for precision. Thus an assertion about the apocalypses might need to be qualified in some way, such as the historical apocalypses, the early apocalypses, the canonical apocalypses, the Enochic apocalypses, etc. If one wishes to describe something as apocalyptic, it should be demonstrably typical of the appropriately defined and qualified set of texts.

Finally, a definition should provide a standard by which variation can be measured, or as Collins has stated, “A definition, then, serves not only to identify the common elements, but also to provide a foil against which the variations in particular works can be highlighted.”¹⁴⁷ The ideal of a precise class is not confounded by the existence of marginal cases. Rather, it is precisely the precision of the class that allows one to state clearly what is typical and variant about the use of a genre in a particular text. Only after defining the genre apocalypse and the basis for establishing the apocalyptic

¹⁴⁵ Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 10.

¹⁴⁶ James Barr makes this point with an example from Jürgen Moltmann, “... while apocalyptic does conceive its eschatology in cosmological terms, yet that is not the end of eschatology, but the beginning of an eschatological cosmology or an eschatological ontology for which being becomes historic and the cosmos opens itself to the apocalyptic process...” Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 31.

¹⁴⁷ Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 19.

worldview can one meaningfully make an observation such as, “the sectarians at Qumran appear to have held an apocalyptic worldview but to have produced no apocalypses of their own.”¹⁴⁸ The existence of works that make use of more than one genre does not refute the possibility of defining a genre. On the contrary, defining each of two overlapping classes allows one to describe the overlap meaningfully.

2.2.3. The *Semeia* 14 definition

The Apocalypse Group of the Society of Biblical Literature’s Genres Project was active from about 1975 to 1978 and consisted of Harold W. Attridge, Francis T. Fallon, Anthony J. Saldarini, Adela Yarbro Collins, and was chaired by John J. Collins.¹⁴⁹ The work of this group was published in *Semeia* 14, with an introduction by John J. Collins which included a “master paradigm” that described significant features, a delineation of types and sub-types, and most importantly, a literary definition of the genre:

The common core of constant elements permits us, then, to formulate a comprehensive definition of the genre: “Apocalypse” is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ John J. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 428.

¹⁴⁹ Adela Yarbro Collins, “Introduction,” *Semeia* 36 (1986): 1.

¹⁵⁰ Emphasis removed. John J. Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” *Ibid.* 14 (1979): 9.

Some of the resistance discussed in the next section leads to some worthwhile clarifications, but this definition achieves the purpose of the definition just outlined and has become widely accepted.¹⁵¹

The definition follows the concept of genre discussed above, and pursues the aim to base terminology in the explicit features of the preserved texts. It builds on the distinction between genre, worldview and sociological setting. It takes a synchronic phenomenological approach to identifying what is constant in the genre in late antiquity. The method is inductive in that it begins with a generally accepted list of apocalypses and then identifies the common elements. The definition states no more than is true of all the apocalypses, and no more than is necessary to distinguish them as a class. It is possible that more can be true of all the apocalypses than is listed in the definition of the morphology of the genre. The definitive elements are distinct, however, in two criteria. First, Collins maintains that the definition has an “inner coherence.” This contrasts, for example, with approaches to definition that include elements that might be called superficial coincidences, such as “the catchword glory,”¹⁵² or “autobiographical in form.”¹⁵³ Even if it were true that all known apocalypses use these forms, it is hard to imagine that if a text were newly discovered that resembled the apocalypses in all other ways, then it would be classified as a non-apocalypse on this basis alone. At risk of reverting to subjective assertions of what is essential about the apocalypses, the criterion

¹⁵¹ Resistance can be found in as much as scholars avoid or implicitly deny the need for a literary definition of the genre, but it can at least be maintained that no alternative literary definition of the genre has gained greater acceptance.

¹⁵² Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 32.

¹⁵³ Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” 86.

of inner coherence moderates the limitations of the inductive method, such that we can reasonably expect to be able to classify new discoveries with this definition. Inner coherence also facilitates the study of the typically implicit worldview.

The other criterion balances in the other direction. To the extent possible, the definition uses elements that are explicitly present in the texts,¹⁵⁴ and least likely to remain subject to scholarly intuition, speculation and reconstruction. The extent to which that is possible is limited by the need to assemble enough common elements to distinguish the corpus. Jean Carmignac, for example, remains even more firmly grounded in objective forms, but does not succeed in producing a definition that distinguishes the genre from the symbolic visions of Jacob and Joseph in the Book of Genesis.¹⁵⁵ The *Semeia* 14 definition includes both literary form (the narrative framework) and literary contents (the transcendent reality disclosed within the framework). The relatively explicit literary contents are not to be mistaken for the contents of the implied worldview, however. As far as literary contents are concerned, temporal and spatial transcendence are reasonably unmistakable, even if they are general as such and can take a number of forms. At least as far as the present study is concerned, there is no real doubt that temporal and spatial transcendence can be found in Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses. Thus, if we think of form and content as a continuum, the *Semeia* 14 definition starts with the most formal elements that are true and distinctive of all the apocalypses and proceeds into content only as far as is necessary to distinguish precisely

¹⁵⁴ John J. Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," *Ibid.* 14 (1979): 2.

¹⁵⁵ Carmignac admits that these meet his definition, dismissing them only in that they are too short to be called apocalypses. Carmignac, "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament," 169.

the borders of the classification. If more speculative elements turn out to be true of all the apocalypses (and it would certainly be worth studying), they would nevertheless remain unnecessary for the minimal purpose of a definition of a genre considered here.¹⁵⁶

2.2.4. Resistance and clarifications

Much of the response to the *Semeia* 14 definition runs along the lines of complaints and desiderata for what it did not try to do, or for not going far enough in describing and explaining the apocalypses. If we keep in mind the purpose of a definition, and understand that definition and description are not mutually exclusive, these ideas can be seen as complementing, rather than undermining, the *Semeia* 14 definition. Some points legitimately need to be taken into account as clarifications and reminders that much more needs to be studied than the generic classification. After evaluating the perceived conflict between definition and description, we will consider four basic responses: the desire to say more, the desire to say less, the resistance to the creation of artificial boundaries, and the push for a diachronic or evolutionary approach even at the level of definition of terminology. The following sub-section will treat the function amendment.

¹⁵⁶ We shall discuss below *Semeia* 36 and the function amendment. Although the larger sense of a literary genre can include literary function, function and the intent of the author are inherently more speculative than the elements treated in *Semeia* 14, and the classification of texts does not change with the amendment. We will therefore conclude that the amendment is not necessary for the literary definition of the genre.

2.2.4.1. The supposed exclusivity between definition and description

While scholarly consensus rarely comes down to a vote, that is apparently what happened at the end of the Uppsala colloquium. The ayes went to “*contra definitionem, pro descriptione*.” In his introduction to the published volume, Hellholm notes the multiplicity of definitions offered and interprets the conflict as “a clear indication of the necessity for a hermeneutic mediation between *inductive* and *deductive* methods also in the area of apocalyptic research.”¹⁵⁷ In a retrospective near the ten year anniversary of the colloquium Collins said of the vote,

This did not represent a consensus on proper procedure, but was an expression of fatigue and a recognition that much more time would be needed to mediate the differing viewpoints. The final resolution was a diplomatic evasion of the issue at the end of a very stimulating, but exhausting, conference.¹⁵⁸

For what the perspective of someone who was not able to pronounce “apocalypticism” in 1979 may be worth, it seems that the vote also took place at the end of a very stimulating but exhausting decade, one in which much work was duplicated. Although *Semeia* 14 had apparently been published before the Uppsala Colloquium (August 12-17, 1979), it is equally apparent that many participants already had their conceptions and definitions fixed. It can hardly be surprising that no one definition gained immediate consensus.

What may be surprising is that “definition” and “description” appear as mutually exclusive, such that “*pro descriptione*” has anything to do with “*contra definitionem*.” Perhaps “*iam descriptio, nondum definitio*” would have been more appropriate. Although

¹⁵⁷ Emphasis original. David Hellholm, “Introduction,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 2.

¹⁵⁸ Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 12.

this argument is not frequently made, Tigchelaar expresses an opposition to definitions when he says,

A definition is not a prerequisite for historical studies, and might even prove to be an impediment.... Description... clears the way for a better understanding of the historical complexity and variety one encounters in the texts freely labeled apocalyptic.¹⁵⁹

Tigchelaar does admit that the *Semeia* 14 definition, “enables us to see more clearly the variations.”¹⁶⁰ Although the purpose of a literary definition of a genre as considered here has certain limitations, when those limitations are clearly recognized Tigchelaar’s fear seems undue.

2.2.4.2. The desire to say more

Much of the critical response to the *Semeia* 14 definition seeks a definition that says more about the apocalypses. Although it is possible that more can be found to be always true of the apocalypses than the minimal definition of the genre, saying more usually results in excluding texts or crippling the usefulness as a definition with words like “often” and “sometimes.” The desire to say more comes in three basic forms. The first two overlap with what has already been addressed.

The first form of desire to say more relates to what has already been said about the distinction between definition and description. Much more can be said as description, but not definition. John Collins distinguished the frequent characteristics of the “master

¹⁵⁹ Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” 144.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.: 142.

paradigm” from the definitive characteristics which are always true.¹⁶¹ Following the “*contra definitionem pro descriptione*” sentiment at Uppsala, Stegemann added an afterword describing frequent characteristics beyond his definition.¹⁶² The *Semeia* 14 definition does not explain everything about the apocalypses. Many significant characteristics are “sometimes” or “often” true, and can certainly be legitimately studied. The family resemblance model, again, would be justified only if it were truly impossible to distinguish the genre based on features that are always true. The master paradigm and the various lists of characteristics are valuable as descriptions, not definitions.

The second form of desire to say more relates to what has already been said about the distinction between the apocalyptic worldview and the genre “apocalypse.” Richard Sturm, for example, fears that defining the genre morphologically threatens to reduce a century and a half of scholarship on “apocalyptic” to the literary genre of a few texts. Sturm favors the view of “apocalyptic” as a theological concept, and fears that a focus on the genre will exclude the possibility of speaking of apocalyptic thought in Paul, for example. Sturm’s concern about Paul is comparable to the discussion of the sectarian literature at Qumran, and warrants clarification. Although Stegemann and Carmignac sought to exclude the sectarian texts found at Qumran from the discussion of the apocalyptic worldview, Collins recognizes that the worldview implied in the genre can be expressed in other genres.¹⁶³ We should answer Sturm’s question, “If one approaches

¹⁶¹ Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 8-9.

¹⁶² Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 526.

¹⁶³ Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 3-33. Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 496-530. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 403-430.

apocalyptic primarily as a literary genre, must persons who did not write apocalypses, like Jesus or Paul, be neglected or ignored?”¹⁶⁴ The short answer is clearly “not at all,” but we might also add that clarity could follow from a well defined standard for comparison. To the extent that the worldview of Paul is typical also of the apocalypses, one can still use the adjective “apocalyptic” to describe his worldview. To the extent of the variation or uniqueness of Paul’s thought, a more specific qualifier might serve better. The literary definition of the genre provides a standard of a corpus of texts by which features can be identified as typical or variant; it does not limit the study of what is typical and variant in a text.

The third form of desire to say more pursues a focus on sub-genres or a more narrow classification. The genre does indeed cover a great area, a long period, and a diversity of theological tendencies. More can said if one claims what is true of fewer texts. In *Semeia* 14, Collins described two sub-genres, the heavenly journey and the historical apocalypses, but found coherence between them in that they both have some degree of spatial and temporal transcendence.¹⁶⁵ Martha Himmelfarb emphasized the coherence of the sub-genres, and the differences between them, concluding that they should be considered originally separate genres.¹⁶⁶ Indeed, more could be said if one were speaking only for one sub-genre or the other. For the purposes of the present study, Jubilees can fruitfully be compared to both cosmic-journey and historical apocalypses,

¹⁶⁴ Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 25.

¹⁶⁵ Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 16.

¹⁶⁶ Martha Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), 60 n. 68. Collins discusses Himmelfarb’s points sympathetically in Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 11-32. and Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 13.

and represents at least one case for treating the two sub-genres together under the classification “apocalypses.” *Semeia* 36 will be primarily of interest to us in the following sub-section on the function amendment, but these essays also pursued what is generic about individual texts or smaller sets of texts.¹⁶⁷ Focusing only on the Apocalypse of John and the Shepherd of Hermas, David Hellholm finds an intriguing pattern that the central revelatory message constitutes a literary climax.¹⁶⁸ Although Hellholm elaborates a complicated methodology in the interest of taking some of the subjectivity out of “central” and “climax,” by no means has this been proven true of all the apocalypses, and Aune shows that it is also true of a work that has not been considered an apocalypse.¹⁶⁹ We should pay particular attention to the qualifier of Aune’s proposed definition, “with special reference to the Apocalypse of John.”¹⁷⁰ While the autobiographical form and literary climax may be patterns found in multiple apocalypses, these characteristics can not be considered definitive of all the apocalypses. Perhaps different sub-genres or sub-sub-genres remain to be defined, but saying much more than the *Semeia* 14 definition is unlikely to speak for all the apocalypses.

¹⁶⁷ Collins, “Introduction,” 2.

¹⁶⁸ David Hellholm, “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John,” *Ibid.*: 53. See also Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” 73.

¹⁶⁹ Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” 74. One might also consider the “inner coherence” issue. Would one say a text is necessarily not an apocalypse if it resembles the apocalypses in all ways but this?

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*: 86.

2.2.4.3. The desire to say less

A number of critiques and proposed definitions attempt to say less, either to focus on a more “essential” theme, remain more formally objective, or remain closer to the etymological origins of “uncovering.” As noble as these intentions may be, they fail to distinguish the apocalypses from the super-category of revelatory literature. The proposals of Stegemann, Carmignac, Sanders and Rowland should each be considered. All of these avoid any implication of eschatology. Although previous scholars erred more in the opposite direction by identifying a very particular understanding of eschatology as the principal and definitive concern of apocalypses and apocalyptic thought, the eradication of any sense of eschatology, personal or otherwise, is an overreaction.

Hartmut Stegemann proposed the strongest and most interesting of the alternative definitions. Sticking to the etymological sense of ἀποκάλυψις, his definition focuses on particularities of the “uncovering” that distinguish the apocalypses from other revelatory literature. Although he defines eschatology particularly narrowly (to avoid personal or realized eschatology), one can see the advantage of defining the genre without approaching the muddy topic of eschatology. Stegemann begins by defining revelatory literature more broadly,

Mit “Apokalyptik” bezeichne ich ausschließlich ein *literarisches* Phänomen, nämlich die Anfertigung von “Offenbarungsschriften”, die Sachverhalte “enthüllen”, die sich nicht aus innerweltlichen Gegebenheiten, beispielsweise aus dem vorgegebenen “Erfahrungswissen” ableiten lassen, sondern die sich dem Autor und dem Leser nur erschließen durch den Rückgriff auf “himmlisches Offenbarungswissen”.¹⁷¹

¹⁷¹ Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 498. “By ‘Apocalyptic’ I mean exclusively a literary phenomenon, namely, the preparation of ‘revelatory writings’ which ‘reveal’ circumstances, not from worldly conditions, for example those which can be derived from

Thus far Stegemann does not claim to distinguish the apocalypses, but rather says in detail what *Semeia* 14 says briefly with, “a genre of revelatory literature.” The attempt to distinguish the apocalypses within the revelatory literature follows,

Nicht jede Mitteilung “himmlischer Geheimnisse” freilich ist damit zugleich auch bereits “Apokalyptik”, ebensowenig jede einzelne “Enthüllung” von Aspekten, deren rechtes Verständnis anderen Menschen verborgen ist. Sondern bei “apokalyptischer Literatur” muß es sich schon um ein regelrechtes Buch handeln, das speziell zu dem Zweck abgefaßt worden ist, “himmlisches Geheimwissen” bewußt als solches zu traktieren und es dennoch einem bestimmten Leserkreis zu “offenbaren”.¹⁷²

Indeed, the “reveal-conceal dialectic”¹⁷³ is an important feature for the view of revelation to be discussed in Chapter 4. The problem is only with the functionality of this insight for the purposes of defining a genre. In evading the mud-puddle of eschatology Stegemann leaped into the murky depths of authorial intent (*bewußt, Absicht* in the next sentence) and reconstructed original audience (*Leserkreis*). Although Stegemann strongly denies the possibility of defining “apocalyptic” as a *Gattung*,¹⁷⁴ he here wanders from basing his definition on explicit literary features. In fact, the “reveal-conceal dialectic” belongs more properly to a consideration of the worldview, and could easily spread into reconstructed sociological setting. One should also keep in mind William Adler’s case for

purported ‘know-how’, but are only opened for the author and the reader by resort to ‘heavenly revealed knowledge’.”

¹⁷² Ibid., 498-499. “To be sure, not every communication of ‘heavenly mysteries’ is therefore at the same time also ‘Apocalyptic’, nor every individual ‘unveiling’ of aspects whose right understanding is hidden to other people. But by ‘apocalyptic literature’ it must concern a proper book, that is written specially for the purpose, consciously so as to conceal ‘heavenly mysteries’ and yet to ‘reveal’ to a certain circle of readers.”

¹⁷³ This phrase is used by Aune for the same basic idea. Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” 84.

¹⁷⁴ Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 499, 527 n. 107.

not taking at face value “esotericism as a literary motif.”¹⁷⁵ Less importantly but also worth noting, Stegemann raises more problems than he solves by limiting the genre to “ein regelrechtes Buch.” A definition should be able to handle (without simply excluding) works which I prefer to call “making use of more than one genre,” which have previously been called, “mixed genres” or “mixed affinities.” Furthermore, the implied contrast with “wisdom” creates problems already in Sirach, where one might find elite revealed wisdom that meets Stegemann’s definition.¹⁷⁶ Of course the close relationship between apocalypses and wisdom literature should be studied, but it can be studied more clearly if one begins with distinctive terminology. Stegemann’s insight contributes to the study of the apocalypses, but he does not provide the most efficient definition available.

As already mentioned, Jean Carmignac promotes a “scientific” definition based only on the most explicit formal criteria. Following Gammie, he also rejects the importance of eschatology in the apocalypses, and rightly rejects the possibility of defining the genre on the basis of a definitive element of the worldview. Carmignac proposes a few variations on his definition, but none suffices to distinguish the apocalypses in a rigorous way from other forms of revelatory literature. Carmignac first proposes the definition,

Genre littéraire qui présente, à travers des symboles typiques, des révélations soit sur Dieu, soit sur anges ou les démons, soit sur leurs partisans, soit sur les instruments de leur action.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁵ Adler, “Introduction,” 13ff.

¹⁷⁶ Randal A. Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 8 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995), 91-95.

¹⁷⁷ Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 20.

To this he adds, “Car c’est le rapport du monde visible avec le monde invisible qui est l’objet propre de l’Apocalyptique.”¹⁷⁸ In a postscript to the same work Carmignac comments on the *Semeia* 14 definition, rejecting the last part of the definition, “which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another supernatural world.”¹⁷⁹ At Uppsala, Carmignac proposed a more succinct version, “Genre littéraire qui décrit des révélations célestes à travers des symboles.”¹⁸⁰

The main issue with Carmignac’s definitions is that they do not rigorously distinguish the apocalypses as they have been traditionally understood (as disputed as that may be) from a great deal of prophetic literature and even from the dreams of Jacob and Joseph in Genesis.¹⁸¹ In response to the last example, Carmignac says simply that “Certes, ces songes sont exprimés en des récits trop courts pour qu’on ose leur décerner le titre ‘d’Apocalypses’.”¹⁸² Rather than applying his scientific standards to defining how short an apocalypse can be and still be an apocalypse, Carmignac continues by hypothesizing that one finds in these dream narratives the origin of the apocalypses. Carmignac does not insist, as does Stegemann, that an apocalypse must be a complete work composed with a certain intent, or even that it have a narrative framework,¹⁸³ but

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.: 21.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.: 33.

¹⁸⁰ Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyptique dans l’Ancien Testament,” 165.

¹⁸¹ Recently, however, Frances Flannery-Dailey has returned approvingly to Carmignac’s suggestion that the apocalyptic worldview originates in the dream tradition reflected in Joseph’s dreams in Genesis. Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 276. Flannery-Dailey, “Lessons on Early Jewish Apocalypticism and Mysticism from Dream Literature,” 240 n. 30.

¹⁸² Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyptique dans l’Ancien Testament,” 169.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 165 n. 8.

perhaps it would be an improvement. Whatever clarity Carmignac gains by avoiding eschatology, he loses in trying to distinguish the allegorical visions of prophets such as Ezekiel from the symbolic revelations of the apocalypses.¹⁸⁴

Carmignac's proposal to cut short the *Semeia* 14 definition warrants comment as well. Carmignac is not necessarily wrong to point out that eschatology ventures from the strictly explicit formal features in the direction of content, but in practice it is not too difficult to determine if a text mentions the issue of eschatology, especially if one brackets the question of what the text says about it. Temporal transcendence can take various forms, including a view from the beginning, a view from the end, or arguably just a particularly structured view. As Collins has made clear, eschatological salvation can include personal eschatology.¹⁸⁵ With these clarifications, temporal transcendence can be assigned to the relatively explicit literary features, with the theological implications left to the worldview. Carmignac apparently omits the spatial transcendence only for the sake of brevity, since it overlaps with his inclusion of the partisans and instruments of the invisible world. While temporal transcendence is not the sole definitive feature of the apocalypses, this element cannot be omitted without the classification collapsing onto adjacent revelatory literature.

Sanders and Rowland propose definitions that are not so much alternatives to the *Semeia* 14 definition as alternatives to the idea of defining the genre in a rigorous way. Sanders proposes what he calls "the essentialist definition," around the combination of

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 166-169, particularly 168.

¹⁸⁵ Collins, "Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism," 16. Also, Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," 89.

the themes of revelation and reversal.¹⁸⁶ He identifies the essentialist definition with the traditional definition because, although it involves significant subjectivity, it attempts to get at the heart of what motivated the composition of apocalypses and how they function. He sees in the apocalypses social realities, “even if they do not constitute one tightly defined literary genre.”¹⁸⁷ In effect, Sanders questions whether the study of Jewish apocalyptic literature really improved in the 1970s with the contributions of Koch, Stone, Hanson and Collins. Rather than reviewing the previous section in which I conclude otherwise, let us ask simply whether the essentialist definition meets the purpose of a definition discussed above, to distinguish a body of literature. Sanders asserts that, “the themes of revelation and reversal, when the reversal has to do with a group—either Israel or the righteous—are in all the works being discussed; and in that combination they are in no others.” I have found no publications that second this claim, and some that find this combination widely in the prophetic literature.¹⁸⁸

Although Christopher Rowland’s revised dissertation was published in 1982, it is important to keep in mind what Rowland says in his preface, “This book was completed in January 1979, and only one or two additions have been made to it since then.”¹⁸⁹ Thus, Rowland’s work must be the last monograph completed independent of the influence of *Semeia* 14, Jean Carmignac’s essay, and the Uppsala colloquium.¹⁹⁰ Rowland

¹⁸⁶ Sanders, “The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses,” 456-458.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 458.

¹⁸⁸ Collins, “Introduction,” 2. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 9-10.

¹⁸⁹ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, ix.

¹⁹⁰ For other influential articles see Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 11. Gruenwald’s *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* was completed in 1977. Ithamar Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, Bd. 14 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), xi.

distinguishes the apocalyptic worldview from the genre “apocalypse,” which he defines as revelation in a threefold structure of legends, vision, and admonitions.¹⁹¹ His major point, however, is not that this structure is true of all the apocalypses and distinguishes them from other works, as is the purpose of a definition treated above, but that “a definition of apocalyptic should not be too restricted but attempt to do justice to all the various elements in the literature.”¹⁹² In particular he wishes to deemphasize eschatology, and generally emphasizes the diversity of modes and content.¹⁹³ He correctly dismisses some older notions, particularly that apocalyptic represents a cohesive religious system and contrasts starkly with rabbinic thought.¹⁹⁴ Like Sanders, however, Rowland is interested in what is essentially true, and not what is true of the entirety of a distinctive classification, “apocalyptic seems essentially to be about the revelation of the divine mysteries through visions or some other form of immediate disclosure of heavenly truths.” Perhaps we should not be overconfident with our definitions and classifications, but neither should we abandon hope for precise definitions as tools for further study.¹⁹⁵ Rowland’s resistance to a strict definition will lead us to our next sub-sub-section, the fear that the definition of the literary genre produces new canons and artificial boundaries.

¹⁹¹ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 50. Significantly for the following chapters, Rowland notes that Jubilees fits the formal structure even though its contents do not seem apocalyptic. However, Rowland and I are operating with very different definitions of the genre.

¹⁹² Ibid., 70.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 48, 72.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 71.

¹⁹⁵ The definition of the genre is not an end in itself. “Genres have to do with identifying and communicating rather than defining and classifying.” Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 38.

2.2.4.4. The resistance to artificial boundaries

In a sense the push for definitions in the 1970s began with Klaus Koch's call for precise and consistent use of terminology. Precise classification and clear boundaries have the *potential* to create artificial canons in scholarship and isolate specializations from relevant context.¹⁹⁶ The danger is worth keeping in mind, and we will not argue that it has never occurred. We will be clear, however, that *Semeia* 14 states that this should not be the case, and point out briefly how John Collins, for example, has used the definition in the past not to create boundaries, but describe relationships. *Semeia* 14 includes as "extremely important" the "related literary categories, such as oracles, testaments and revelatory dialogues."¹⁹⁷ Collins' recognition of the link between wisdom literature and the apocalypses can be seen even before *Semeia* 14 in 1975.¹⁹⁸ The application of definition and typology can be seen more fully developed in "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility."¹⁹⁹ It is precisely the replacement of "impressions" with definitions of wisdom and apocalyptic that makes possible the recognition of compatibility. One need hardly continue with other examples, such as the

¹⁹⁶ It has also been suggested that the very notion of genre is an artificial boundary. It is certainly true that not all literature observes the strict boundaries of the Aristotelian model of genre, but current genre theory, using cognition theory, recognizes that categories are fundamental to articulation and perception, and that necessary defining features exist. The key is not to stop there. A morphological definition does not prohibit further discussion of *how* the literary morphology is used, or on what levels a work can be typical. It helps to speak of "use of" or "participation in" a genre, rather than membership in an absolute sense. See page 4, note 1 above.

¹⁹⁷ Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," 18.

¹⁹⁸ John J. Collins, "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," *JBL* 94 (1975): 218-234. Von Rad made a similar connection, and a divorce from prophecy, on the basis of theological conceptions of history.

¹⁹⁹ Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," 165-185.

treatment of 4QInstruction by Collins and his student Matthew Goff,²⁰⁰ to recognize that generic definition need not carry with it “ideals of generic purity.”²⁰¹

2.2.4.5. The push for a diachronic definition

Semeia 14 focused on “phenomenological similarity, not historical derivation.”²⁰²

It did not deny the importance of the historical dimension for the study of the genre, it merely claimed that the recurring literary characteristics could be defined independently. The definition of the genre states what is typical of all apocalypses; it does not claim how it became typical or chart the development of internal specifics. Both synchronic definition and diachronic analysis are valid. García Martínez and Tigchelaar dispute, however, Collins’ claim that literary description and identification are logically prior to study of the history and social function.²⁰³ We have already seen the diachronic emphasis in Gunkel’s concept of *Gattung*, but a more immediate source is to be found in Fowler’s “life and death” or “evolutionary” models of generic development.²⁰⁴ Although

²⁰⁰ John J. Collins, “The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium; 168 (Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003), 287-305. Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, STDJ 50 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003).

²⁰¹ Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility,” 404.

²⁰² Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 1.

²⁰³ Florentino García Martínez, “Encore l’apocalyptique,” *JSJ* 17 (1986): 224-232. Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” 137-144.

²⁰⁴ As we have already seen, Fowler rejects the very possibility of definition of a genre and the purpose of a definition of a genre described above. While it may be true that the *Semeia* 14 definition does not tell us everything we would like to know about what is typical of the apocalypses, diachronically or synchronically, it does succeed in establishing a classification. It should be added that if the biological analogies of genres (life and death, or evolution) are not fundamentally flawed, they at least lend themselves to being taken too far. I have not seen the biological analogy successfully applied to the

chronological specificity will be important in our subsequent consideration of the worldview typical of the apocalypses, a “minimalist” definition of a literary genre as here conceived can and should focus on what is true of all the apocalypses in antiquity. Direct influence between writers is worth studying, but delves into more speculative elements, including sociological setting. Just as more can be said of a sub-genre, more can be said of the apocalypses at any one “stage,” but a broad morphology of all the apocalypses remains valid.

2.2.5. The function amendment

A complete understanding of genre includes not only its form and contents, but also its literary function. In 1986 *Semeia* 36 proposed a number of amendments to the morphological definition of *Semeia* 14 in order to account for function.²⁰⁵ Function cannot be disregarded, but it can be separated in the logical sequence of study. For the

apocalypses. Fowler’s own list of qualifications could be read as reasons to abandon the analogy. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 42-43. See also, Alastair Fowler, “The Life and Death of Literary Forms,” *New Literary History* 2 (1971): 199-216.

²⁰⁵ *Semeia* 36 illustrated the difficulty in defining the function of the genre “apocalypse,” but did not arrive at a clear consensus. David Aune, David Hellholm, and Adela Yarbro Collins proposed different statements of function. John Collins accepted statements of function to varying degrees. Already in 1982 Collins accepted the basic proposal of the literary function of illocution, and expanded on the basis of the *Semeia* 14 definition. John J. Collins, “The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 93, 110. In the first edition of *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (1984), Collins discussed an earlier iteration of Hellholm’s proposal and proposed his own formulation, “The function of the apocalyptic literature is to shape one’s imaginative perception of a situation and so lay the basis for whatever course of action it exhorts.” John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 32. The second edition updates the footnotes to reflect *Semeia* 36 but maintains the same position. In 1989 (published 1991) John Collins accepted the function proposed by Adela Yarbro Collins with emphasis that, “social setting cannot be inferred from literary genre, which can accommodate multiple social settings.” Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 19.

preliminary stage of defining use of the genre, the *Semeia* 14 definition stands without need for amendment.

Although it is possible to speak of literary function of a genre while maintaining a clear separation from authorial intent, worldview and social setting, it is not trivial to do so.²⁰⁶ If one further seeks to maintain the standards of the *Semeia* 14 definition by stating what is true of all the apocalypses, then it becomes extremely difficult to make definitive statements of the function for the genre.²⁰⁷ The most successful statements of function rely on the principle of illocution. For example, it seems to follow from the morphological element of the spatial axis that apocalypses interpret earthly circumstances

²⁰⁶ While the sociological function depends on a reconstructed *Sitz im Leben*, a literary function adheres closely to the explicit features of the texts. Although the insistence that a statement of function is indispensable to a definition of a genre at first seems to revive the theory of *Gattung* promoted by Hermann Gunkel, both David Aune and David Hellholm distinguish sociological function from literary function.

David Aune in particular emphasizes this point, "In most discussions of the function of apocalyptic literature, the notion of 'function' is frequently understood, explicitly or implicitly, as 'social function,' i.e., as a quest for the original *Sitz im Leben*, or life setting of apocalypses. Apocalypses are often, and not incorrectly, understood as a form of protest literature in which the oppressed rights of a minority are legitimated by divine revelation. Yet it is precisely this aspect of apocalyptic literature [that is] most often hidden from the view of modern scholars and in many cases irrecoverable. The concept 'function,' however, has many meanings, necessitating a distinction between *literary* function and *social* function (J. J. Collins, 1982:92-94, 110-11)." Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," 89. In the work to which Aune refers, Collins does not use the terms literary or social function, but does make the same basic distinction, "Despite the uncertainty of *Sitz im Leben*, the function of the Book of Watchers can be seen to a considerable extent from its internal structure. Here we can speak with L. Hartman of the illocution of a text... It seems safe to say that consolation and exhortation are typical illocutions of apocalypses." Collins, "The Apocalyptic Technique," 110. Collins also finds implicit in the *Semeia* 14 definition, "the transposition of the frame of reference." Collins, "The Apocalyptic Technique," 111. See also, Hartman, "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre," 334.

Hellholm describes a matrix by which the distinction between form, content and function is valid at all levels of abstraction. Thus, Hellholm suggests that the literary genre has form, content and function, and *Sitz im Leben* has its own form, content and function. Hellholm, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John," 13-64.

²⁰⁷ Aune frames his definition, "with special reference to the Apocalypse of John," and Adela Yarbro Collins, already in the introduction to *Semeia* 36, pointed out how Aune's definition does not apply to all the apocalypses. Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," 86. Collins, "Introduction," 4, 7.

in light of the supernatural world, and from the temporal axis that they interpret present circumstances in light of the future.²⁰⁸ Even to the extent to which these implications are true, they do not go very far to distinguish the apocalypses.²⁰⁹ Again, however, the possibility of irony limits how absolutely we can establish even the most basic implications.²¹⁰ It is one thing to say that the form and contents of the genre typically imply a certain function, but does it follow that they always do? How should one describe a text that uses typical form and contents towards an atypical function? If a parody news show uses the genre “evening news” ironically, does that mean it does not use the genre?

One might answer “yes” in the sense that ironic and non-ironic use of the genre, with their different functions, should be considered different genres. This is where I find it helpful to say not that a show *is* the evening news or Jubilees *is* an apocalypse, but that they *make use* of genres in a certain way that requires further comment.²¹¹ They are not “exemplary cases” of the genre, and they do not function typically, yet they cannot be understood properly without reference both to the genre that they use and how they use it. When I argue that Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse,” I mean only that it uses the

²⁰⁸ Adela Yarbro Collins’ function amendment builds on the immediate implications of the *Semeia* 14 definition also in that “by means of divine authority” follows from the revelatory framework, “... intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority.” Collins, “Introduction,” 7.

²⁰⁹ Hellholm adds, “Intended for a group in crisis with the purpose of exhortation and/or consolation.” This statement is both speculative and vague. If we leave open how the group is defined and by what measure the crisis is perceived, it is hard to imagine what Jewish literature of the second temple period would be clearly excluded. David Hellholm, “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John,” *Ibid.*: 27.

²¹⁰ For example, one might conclude that a person who speaks in a serious tone of voice (form) and says “I’m completely serious” (content) *intends* to be taken seriously (function). However, the ironic use of seriousness in stand-up comedy is practically a staple.

²¹¹ See page 4, note 1 above.

morphology of the genre, and consider the question of whether it functions typically or atypically to be a separate and logically posterior question. *Semeia* 14 provides a satisfactory basis for identifying the use of the genre. *Semeia* 36 contributes insight into the function implied in the illocution of the genre. For the purposes of this dissertation, the more basic function of the genre “apocalypse” is to create reader expectations of the worldview typically conveyed by the apocalypses.

2.2.6. Prototype theory

Disciplinary specialization has often isolated scholars of biblical literature from scholars of literary theory. One recent exception is Carol Newsom’s article on the literary genre “apocalypse” in light of developments in genre theory, particularly prototype theory. As Newsom points out, *Semeia* 14 seems to anticipate several of the insights that later gained traction among more general studies of genre: *Semeia* 14 began with mutually agreeable prototypes and from there studied what is typical of them; *Semeia* 14’s “inner-coherence” resembles the “gestalt notion;” *Semeia* 14’s phenomenological approach anticipates the point that a reader’s use of a genre does not presume knowledge of the history and evolution of the genre.²¹² Prototype theory is particularly useful in breaking down the binary and exclusive view of genre classification as an end in itself. Thus, a case like Jubilees is a problem for a narrow approach to genre classification, whereas prototype theory brings a different set of questions. Namely, how is Jubilees like and unlike apocalypses that are more readily recognized as such? Prototype theory does

²¹² Newsom, “Spying out the Land,” 443-445.

not replace precision concerning particular aspects that can be typical in literature, including literary morphology and worldview. Rather, it is a different way of saying that typical elements can be used in atypical ways. Again, the question is not whether Jubilees is an apocalypse, but how Jubilees uses the literary genre.²¹³

The prototype model developed as a correction to the family resemblance model. John Swales illustrated how “a family resemblance theory can make anything resemble anything.”²¹⁴ David Fishelov criticized the family resemblance model as an overused escape from the despair of finding fundamental common features.²¹⁵ Fishelov does not address apocalypses in particular, but he does use “sonnet” to illustrate the point that sometimes a genre can be very clearly defined according to fixed morphological features, even if the holistic study of a genre would also include the complete cluster of formal, stylistic, and thematic features.²¹⁶ Only sometimes is it not possible to define a genre based on always-present features, but Fishelov argues that it usually is possible to find necessary conditions at some level. Fishelov acknowledges the importance of the “additional cluster of characteristics that is dynamic and variable.”²¹⁷ Building on Fishelov, Sinding outlined a hierarchy of necessary, default, and optional features.²¹⁸ The

²¹³ Above, page 4.

²¹⁴ John Swales, *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 51.

²¹⁵ “I would like to suggest that Wittgenstein’s concept, at least in one of its interpretations, has perhaps become too fashionable, too little scrutinized. Instead of being a methodology of last resort, it has become the first and immediate refuge in the wake of disappointment with one or other rigid definition made up of a confined list of characteristics.” David Fishelov, *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), 54, see also 66.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 8, 13-15.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 60.

²¹⁸ Sinding, “After Definitions,” 200.

features together constitute a gestalt complex or schema.²¹⁹ Applied to apocalypses, it becomes clear that the study of the gestalt requires more than the *Semeia* 14 definition, but the morphological definition of the necessary literary components constitutes an important foundation.

Like the family resemblance model, the prototype model is often illustrated by analogy from the taxonomy of species. In the taxonomy of birds there is in fact a scientific definition of “birds” that is true of all birds. However, cognitive science (and common sense) shows that an eagle or robin is more readily recognized as a bird than a penguin or ostrich (at least in North America).²²⁰ From the standpoint of human cognition, eagles and robins are prototypical whereas penguins and ostriches are not; they are more typical, or typical in more ways. The prototype model resembles the exemplary case model, but is rooted in cognitive science, rather than judgments of quality or direct influence (penguins are not poor imitations of eagles or evolved from eagles). The problem remains of deciding exactly what are the prototypes and what is prototypical about them, but we at least move beyond all-or-none expectations of taxonomy. Applied to the present work, Jubilees is a penguin. It fits the category at the level of literary genre, but does not “fly” at the level of worldview. In a sense the present work answers the question of prototype theory: how is Jubilees like the prototypical apocalypses, and how does it differ?

²¹⁹ Ibid.: 194-198.

²²⁰ Swales, *Genre Analysis*, 51-52.

The first conclusion of *Semeia* 14 remains true today, “it is in fact possible to identify a coherent and recognizable literary genre, which may appropriately be labeled ‘apocalypse.’”²²¹ The definition of the literary genre succeeded in its goals of distinguishing a body of texts in which assertions could be grounded and variations measured, and it has not been surpassed. It does not tell us everything we would like to know about the apocalypses, but it does tell us what is and is not an apocalypse with the most objective possible criteria. More importantly, the definition builds on consistent and coherent patterns in the texts, and not on the intuition and reconstructions of modern scholars. Not only does the definition allow us to identify the use of the genre in the Book of Jubilees, it leaves us confident that the genre is not anachronistic, but communicated meaning in the ancient context. The definition also distinguishes literary genre from worldview and social setting. It allows us to distinguish the manner of communication from what is being communicated, and thus maintains the possibility of irony.

As we go on to compare Jubilees to contemporary apocalypses, the *Semeia* 14 definition will provide a three-part structure: revelation, the spatial axis, and the temporal axis. The principle of illocution leads us to expect that a worldview will be implicit in each of the three major parts of the definition of the genre. Additional insights can be incorporated into this structure.

²²¹ Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 18.

CHAPTER 3

THE TEXT OF THE BOOK OF JUBILEES

Before comparing Jubilees with contemporary apocalypses on views of revelation, the spatial axis and the temporal axis, we should clarify the extent to which we can assume the preservation, unity, and date of the Book of Jubilees. Each must be qualified to some extent, but we can be relatively confident with positive positions on all three issues. The manuscripts available preserve the book reasonably well. The work is a coherent composition, probably the work of a single author, and relatively free of insertions. The work can be dated relatively precisely to the years following 159 BCE.

Because the argument of this dissertation treats Jubilees in its historical context, it is essential that we consider carefully the reliability, unity and date of the text as we know it. Although the redaction and scribal history of a text can warrant study in its own right, we need to have a good idea whether a given passage, phrase or nuance stands in the literary context of the rest of the work, and what literature (and to a lesser extent, what events) can be treated as contemporary. To be clear, my argument is not that Jubilees was redacted from apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic sources, or that apocalyptic or non-apocalyptic passages were inserted into the work. In the broader strokes, this will become clear in the chapters on the elements of the genre and the worldview. It is precisely in the use of the genre “apocalypse” that Jubilees inverts the apocalyptic

worldview. On the level of genre and worldview, Jubilees 23 fits inseparably within the framework of the book as a whole. In this chapter we turn to a lower level of abstraction and address the possible protests against reading the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees as a unified composition from the mid-second century BCE.

3.1. The reliability of the texts available

With certain qualifications in mind, we can be reasonably confident in the manuscript traditions of Jubilees and the critical edition produced by James VanderKam in 1989.

The first qualification is that the work is preserved in its entirety only in Ethiopic. The Ethiopic version is itself a translation of a Greek translation of a Hebrew original.¹ Needless to say, the translation process can produce errors and flatten nuance in word choice. It is by no means trivial to reconstruct the Hebrew original or the Greek that can explain variants in Latin and Ethiopic.² One might also imagine that the Greek and Ethiopic versions of Genesis-Exodus influenced the translations into Greek and Ethiopic, respectively. In 1977 James VanderKam argued that this was not significantly the case.³

¹ The Greek also served as the basis for a Latin translation partially preserved in one palimpsest. The book has also been translated from Hebrew into Syriac. Crislip suggests the possibility that the entire work was translated into Coptic, although only excerpts have been preserved. Andrew Crislip, "The *Book of Jubilees* in Coptic: An Early Christian *Florilegium* on Family of Noah," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 40 (2003): 40.

² The translations into Modern Hebrew by Goldman and Hartom do not claim to reconstruct the original, although they certainly can be helpful. M. Goldman, "ספר היובלים," in הספרים החיצונים, ed. Abraham Kahana (Jerusalem: Makor, 1978), 216-313. E. S. Hartom, "ספר היובלות," in הספרים החיצונים: ספורי אגדה (Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1965).

³ James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 113, 116.

When Hebrew evidence is not available, and more than one Hebrew word could explain the preserved versions, we cannot safely argue from the details of word choice. Although there are times when we would certainly like to be more certain of the Hebrew original, the argument of this dissertation does not depend on a small number of words.

The second major qualification is that the oldest Ethiopic manuscript dates from the 14th-15th century.⁴ Although many fragments from fourteen or fifteen ancient manuscripts were found at Qumran, they preserve a very small percentage of the text (words or letters from 215 of 1307 verses, or 16%).⁵ A small but helpful paraphrase of Jubilees 10 is preserved as an introduction to the ספר נח published by Jellinek.⁶ Additional Hebrew evidence exists but does not directly reflect a text of the Book of Jubilees.⁷ The main contribution of the evidence from Qumran is to gauge the reliability of the Ethiopic and Latin manuscripts. Fortunately, the level of agreement is remarkably

⁴ VanderKam dates it to the 14th century, Baars and Zuurmond to the 15th. James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2 vols. (Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1989), 1.xv. W. Baars and R. Zuurmond, "The Project for a New Edition of the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 9 (1964): 72. VanderKam attributes his dates to R. Zuurmond, "Het oordeel over Kaïn in de oud-joodse traditie," *Amsterdamse cahiers voor exegese en bijbelse theologie* 3 (1982): 115 n. 18.

⁵ Milik counts 15 by including 4Q217, which VanderKam excludes from his count of 14. James C. VanderKam, "The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*, ed. Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 12 (Leiden, New York: Brill, 1992), 640. See also, James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 16.

⁶ Adolph Jellinek, "ספר נח," in *בית המדרש* (Yerushalayim: Sifre Vahrmann, 1967), 155-160. The relevant portion is also printed as an appendix in R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906). A translation is given by Martha Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of Jubilees in Medieval Hebrew Literature," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. John C. Reeves (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 129-130.

⁷ See VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.ix-xi. See also, Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of Jubilees," 115-141. William Adler, "Jacob of Edessa and the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Chronography," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. John C. Reeves (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 143-171.

high. On occasion, the Ethiopic tradition preserves a better text than some of the fragments at Qumran. For example, three instances of dittography appear in 4Q221.⁸

There is some danger of circular argumentation when dealing with a manuscript that could fit in Jubilees but does not match the Ethiopic text. It is theoretically possible that a small fragment reflects a different version of Jubilees but cannot be identified as a version of Jubilees because it is small and does not agree with the more complete versions. For example, Kister identifies 4Q176 fragment 21 as 29 letters of Jubilees 23:30-31. Among VanderKam's reasons for rejecting this identification is the lack of correspondence with the Ethiopic version.⁹ Fortunately, the fragments which are large enough to identify with certainty as a version of Jubilees overwhelmingly agree with the later manuscripts. It should also be noted that "Pseudo-Jubilees" is not a version of Jubilees. If it depends on Jubilees at all it alters its source into a different kind of composition.¹⁰ VanderKam speculates that Milik coined the term because, "the texts employ language that is familiar from and to some extent characteristic of *Jubilees*, but the documents themselves are not actual copies of Jubilees."¹¹

⁸ VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 94. Also, James C. VanderKam and Jozef T. Milik, "Jubilees," in *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts Part 1*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, et al., DJD 13 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 65. Also, see below on 11QJubilees fragment 9.

⁹ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.ix. VanderKam discusses further evidence in VanderKam, "The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," 639. For more on the criterion of agreement with the Ethiopic see VanderKam, "The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," 643 n.2.

¹⁰ James C. VanderKam, "The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, ed. Shemaryahu Talmon, James A. Sanders, and Craig A. Evans, Biblical Interpretation Series 28 (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997), 261.

¹¹ VanderKam and Milik, "Jubilees (DJD 13)," 142. See also, VanderKam, "The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees," 242.

Even when we lack comparative evidence we can detect and sometimes correct corruptions in the Ethiopic, as VanderKam's notes illustrate. Textual problems as a result of scribal error are sadly inevitable, but we should distinguish scribal error from deliberate manipulation.¹² Fortunately, the former is reasonably limited (perhaps by virtue of the canonical status of Jubilees in the Ethiopian tradition¹³) and the latter is never more than speculative. Even when we have no help from the Qumran fragments or the Latin palimpsest, we can be reasonably confident in the textual tradition.

VanderKam's 1989 critical edition draws from 27 Ethiopic manuscripts, 15 of which were fully collated, the 15 Hebrew fragments available at that time, the Latin palimpsest edited by Ceriani, the fragments from the Greek and Syriac chronographers, and a number of other sources which attest the influence of the book but contribute less to textual studies. VanderKam's critical edition surpasses previous editions methodologically, in addition to the greater number of sources used. Although Charles' intuition was a remarkable tool, VanderKam verifies the relationship between text families with systematic analysis. He also quantifies the agreement of the Ethiopic manuscripts with the Hebrew fragments from Qumran to determine the preferred base text. Although the notes should always be consulted, VanderKam's edition also differs from prior editions in its reluctance to emend and reconstruct in the absence of textual evidence.

¹² The lacuna at Ethiopic Jubilees 13:25 in a passage on Melchizedek may at first appear to be a deliberate attempt to suppress something about a controversial biblical figure, but closer examination seems to suggest a simple scribal error in the major manuscript tradition. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.81.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 2.xviii.

Milik first asserted the reliability of the Ethiopic version in 1956, and subsequent discoveries qualify but do not negate his conclusion.¹⁴ In 1977, based on 14 fragments from Qumran, VanderKam claimed, “It is clear that the best critical text which can be obtained from the Ethiopic manuscripts reproduces the Hebrew original with remarkable, though not complete precision.”¹⁵ The Hebrew fragments that became available since 1977 call for only slightly further qualification of this statement. 4Q176 fragments 19-20 had actually been published in 1968, but were first identified as belonging to Jubilees in 1987. These 79 letters do not challenge the reliability of the Ethiopic tradition. In 1989 VanderKam could still safely conclude “the words and letters that have been made available demonstrate, when compared with the complete and much later Ethiopic version, that the text of the book has been preserved with great care across the centuries.”¹⁶

The next major publication of Jubilees fragments occurred in 1994 by VanderKam and Milik in DJD 13. Eight copies of Jubilees were published in their entirety (there had been various preliminary publications¹⁷). With more evidence came more variants, but VanderKam and Milik could still claim, “In most cases the surviving Hebrew words and the text that can be reconstructed around them show that the Ethiopic

¹⁴ Jozef T. Milik, “Le travail d’édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran,” *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956): 60. See further, VanderKam, “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” 637.

¹⁵ VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 95.

¹⁶ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.xi.

¹⁷ One fragment of 4Q221 had already been published in 1966, and others had seen a preliminary publication in 1991. James C. VanderKam and Jozef T. Milik, “The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 243-270.

has preserved the text in accurate form.”¹⁸ Certainly where applicable DJD 13 should be consulted in addition to the apparatus and notes in VanderKam’s 1989 critical edition.

Detailed analysis of the variations between the Hebrew and Ethiopic manuscripts lies outside the scope of this study, but the larger fragments published in DJD 13 may suggest an intriguing possibility. The oldest manuscript of Jubilees, 4Q216, dates from the second century BCE, and reflects the most variations with the Ethiopic tradition (though mostly minor in significance).¹⁹ Another fragment large enough to warrant significant comparison (4Q219) dates from the Herodian period, and presents “virtually no disagreements” with the Ethiopic tradition.²⁰ Even from this limited evidence we have cause to ask not of the extent to which the Ethiopic texts agree with “the Hebrew,” but of the degree of variation within the early Hebrew transmission of the text. It seems likely that, apart from minor scribal error, the Book of Jubilees enjoyed more precise textual fixity in the subsequent centuries of transmission than it did in the first. If one focuses on the text critical details of Jubilees, it begins to appear that the Ethiopic tradition preserves *one* ancient Hebrew text very well, which may not be the oldest (or the poorest) of the ancient Hebrew texts. As interesting as the minor variations may be to the text criticism of Jubilees, even the relatively significant variations in phraseology between the Ethiopic

¹⁸ This comment was made with regard to 4Q216. Similar comments were made with regard to the other texts substantial enough for comment on textual character. VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees (DJD 13),” 4.

¹⁹ VanderKam, “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” 640. See also, VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees (DJD 13),” 4. Perhaps the most intriguing possibilities are the cases where the Hebrew cannot be read but suggests room for more text than can be reconstructed from the Ethiopic. For example, there is room for about 1 ½ lines on angelic sabbath observance at fragment 7 lines 6-7 (pp. 21-22). Among the fully preserved variants, most are in prepositions or the additions or subtraction of a “כל” or “זאת.”

²⁰ VanderKam, “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” 641, 646.

and the oldest of the Hebrew manuscripts generally do not impact the level of genre and worldview considered in this dissertation.

Since 1994 only minor textual advances have been made. In 1998 11QJubilees was republished by García Martínez and Tigchelaar. 11Q12 fragment 9 is particularly relevant because it reflects one of the more substantial variations from the Ethiopic versions. The Ethiopic of 12:29 contains a line of poetry in addition to what could possibly fit in fragment 9 (without postulating a marginal correction), here indicated in italics,

[ויאמר] לו תרח א[ביו]
לך בשלום
אל עולם יישיר דרככה
ויהוה ע[מכה ויש] מרכה מכול רע]

ወየሀብ : ላዕሌክ : ሣህለ : ወምሕረተ : ወጥገሰ : በቅድመ : አለ : ይፌእዩክ

[ולא ימשול בכה כול בני אדם לעשן] תכה רע
[לך בשלום]

His father Terah said to him:
Go in peace.
May the eternal God make your way straight;
May the Lord be with you and protect you from every evil;
May he grant you kindness, mercy, and grace before those who see you;
And may no person have power over you to harm you.
Go in peace. (Jubilees 12:29)

García Martínez and Tigchelaar comment, “Ethiopic has a line which is apparently missing in our text,” but do not elaborate.²¹ In 1977 VanderKam considered the possibility of a loss in the Hebrew tradition or an addition in the Ethiopic tradition.²² He

²¹ Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, “11QJubilees,” in *Qumran Cave 11*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, DJD 23 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 209, 218.

²² VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 49.

concluded that the older witness should be preferred, but he could not explain how or why an addition would have developed here. In my judgment, the poetic structure favors the originality of the “extra” line to fill out a second distich. Especially in the absence of a parallel elsewhere that could influence a longer blessing, a scribal omission seems more likely than a spontaneous (and apparently isolated) composition of a new line. Even if we give preference to the (much) older manuscript, however, no theological tendency could explain such an addition. Even if the variation were a strike against the reliability of the Ethiopic tradition, we could by no means extrapolate that variations of a certain sort are likely to be additions.

In 1999 Émile Puech suggested that 4Q484 is a copy of Jubilees, and raised the count of total manuscripts to seventeen or eighteen.²³ Even if the suggestion is correct, such a small fragment would be of little or no help for establishing the text history of Jubilees. It would be interesting if Jubilees moved up even further in the rankings of most attested works at Qumran, but one would have to apply Puech’s standards of identification evenly to make such a comparison. Our certainty will always remain limited by the accidents of preservation.

In 2001 Hanan Eshel attempted to identify a fragment with 11QJubilees. The identification is based on Eshel’s reading of twenty-four letters in three lines and the assertion that, “The writing in this fragment resembles that of 11QJubilees.”²⁴ There is nothing about the language of the fragment that particularly suggests Jubilees. His reconstruction requires a column width greater than the other columns in 11QJubilees,

²³ Émile Puech, “Une nouvelle copie du Livre des Jubilés: 4Q484 = pap4Jubilés^j,” *RdQ* 19, no. 74 (1999): 261-264.

²⁴ Hanan Eshel, “Three New Fragments from Qumran Cave 11,” *DSD* 8, no. 1 (2001): 4.

and a shorter text than would be reconstructed based on the Ethiopic. Eshel's claim does not affect the count of how many copies of Jubilees were found at Qumran. Even if the identification is accepted, the reconstruction is highly speculative, and constitutes thin evidence for a shorter original version of Jubilees, or a dependent shorter version. As above, there is a certain danger of circularity in rejecting an identification of a fragment with Jubilees if it does not agree with the Ethiopic, but still a security in that the largest and most certain fragments confirm the Ethiopic, and only the smallest and most reconstructed fragments would require significant variation.

A papyrus in Coptic containing passages from Jubilees was published in 2003. The variants in this text are not likely to represent a better text than the Ethiopic or challenge the reliability of the Ethiopic manuscripts in general. They will, however, be relevant to detailed study of Jubilees 4:33; 7:14-16; 8:28-30; 9:27 and 15:3.

I am aware of no other textual evidence that has become available since VanderKam's 1989 critical edition.²⁵ There is more evidence that reflects the influence of the Book of Jubilees, but does not help us confirm any particular textual readings. We can conclude that VanderKam's critical edition, along with DJD 13, provide a reasonably reliable text of the Book of Jubilees. Although two translations and centuries of copying limit our confidence in the accuracy of the Ethiopic text, the known inaccuracies are best identified as scribal error, not a pattern of theological or other revision. Of course, just

²⁵ Two desiderata do remain, however. First, with more careful attention and modern imaging technology it may be possible to read more of the Latin palimpsest than was possible for Ceriani. Second, it may be the case that a copy of Jubilees made it to the Qaraite Synagogue in Cairo much like the Damascus Document. The Qaraite attribute beliefs about "Mastema" (a term fairly distinctive to Jubilees) to the Sadducees (to whom they also attributed the Damascus Document). Quotation or paraphrase of Jubilees may remain to be found in the texts from the Cairo Geniza. See Yoram Erder, "שר משטמה' בחיבור קראי," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 243-246.

because the manuscript evidence does not suggest major textual corruption does not mean that the entire Ethiopic Jubilees comes from a single author with no additions or subtractions. We now turn to the question of the coherence of the composition of the Book of Jubilees.

3.2. Coherence of composition

The Book of Jubilees is a remarkably unified composition. Many scholars hold it to be completely unified,²⁶ while some find evidence of insertions or redaction of previous compositions. Almost all agree that one can speak of a unified composition or redaction of Jubilees, even if component sources or minor insertions are claimed as qualifications. The minimum argument of this section pertains to the coherence of chapter 23 internally and within the book. Although the chapter strains expectations and is indeed unique, it does not follow that the chapter or the book comes from multiple authors. In addition to the minimum argument, we can gain broader insight into the composition of Jubilees by considering additional challenges to the unity of the composition. Most of the attempts to qualify the unity of Jubilees pose no challenge to the argument of this dissertation. If one views the Book of Jubilees as the product of a series of compositions, redactions and insertions, then my core argument applies to a stage when chapter 23 existed in a revelatory framework such as the one provided by chapter 1. One might take my arguments about the author of Jubilees as applicable to the

²⁶ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 17-18. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis* (London: A. and C. Black, 1902), xlv-xlvii.

redactor of Jubilees. My own view remains, however, that the Book of Jubilees is a remarkably coherent composition that could have come from a single author.

I do not hesitate to speak of the author of Jubilees as an individual person. I do not think that the author wrote the book in a single sitting, for a single purpose, to express a single idea. Clearly the author knew and was influenced by a significant number of written and oral sources, but I do not find evidence that the author copied extended passages directly from written sources other than Genesis and Exodus. The book may indeed be the product of a lifetime of study and composition by a person who may have been dedicated to the study and teaching of Jewish traditions. The author may have been unconcerned with certain details, such as arithmetic, and tolerant of certain redundancies and inconsistencies. I find many of the “contradictions” that have been claimed to be valid but mislabeled observations. One can legitimately point to seams in the compositional process. Nevertheless, seams can exist in the work of a single person.

3.2.1. Four general comments on theories of multiplicity of authorship

Before considering individual challenges to the unity of Jubilees, four basic comments apply to the general discussion. The first is the simple fact that none of the individual challenges has gained scholarly consensus thus far. At most, certain patterns emerge. Leora Ravid’s claim that the sabbath laws in Jubilees 50:6-13 were inserted gained support, with modification, from Kister and Segal, but has been rejected by Doering and VanderKam.²⁷ For the reasons developed in this dissertation, Jubilees 23 has

²⁷Leora Ravid, “הלכות השבת בספר היובלים נ 6-13,” *Tarbiz* 69, no. 2 (2000): 161-166. VanderKam’s article on the unity of the Book of Jubilees deals with the particulars of 50:6-13 but covers many of the

attracted attention and, by failing to conform to scholarly expectations, has been seen as incompatible with the rest of the book. Even here it is striking that no two scholars offer the same claim for what parts of Jubilees 23 should be excised.²⁸ Although this point does not apply to very recent proposals, such as Segal's 2004 dissertation published in 2007, the weight of scholarly consensus will justify spending less time on the theories that were presented more than thirty years ago.

Second, there is no manuscript evidence for any of the theories of redaction or insertion. The evidence from Qumran has already disproved a number of points and theories,²⁹ and has supported none of them. There is no evidence that any passage circulated separately, in a different order, or was missing. Although it is not impossible

broader issues of unity raised by Testuz, Wiesenberg, Davenport and Ravid. James C. VanderKam, "The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6-13 and the Unity of the Book," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, JSJSup 119 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 267-284. Lutz Doering, "Jub 50:6-13 als Schlussabschnitt des Jubiläenbuchs—Nachtrag aus Qumran oder ursprünglicher Bestandteil des Werks?," *RdQ* 20, no. 79 (2002): 359-387. Menahem Kister, "על שני מטבעות לשון בספר היובלים," *Tarbiz* 70, no. 2 (2001): 297 n.47. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 19-20.

²⁸ Michel Testuz identifies 23:11-32 as an interpolation; Werman views 23:9-15, 17-18, 25-30a, 31-32 as an older source interpolated by the author of the rest of the book; Davenport identifies 23:14-20, 22-31 as the product of the first redactor. Kister wonders if an interpolation might start with verse 12, presumably through the end of the chapter. Berner views 23:14-31 as an addition. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 40. Cana Werman, "ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן: לשאלת היחס בין השניים," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 43. Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, Studia Post-Biblica 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 46. Menahem Kister, "לתולדות כת האיסיים: עיונים בחזון החיות, ספר היובלים וברית דמשק," *Tarbiz* 56, no. 1 (1986): 6 n.21. Christoph Berner, "50 Jubilees and Beyond? Some Observations on the Chronological Structure of the Book of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

²⁹ Two examples: First, 4Q216 and 4Q221 have preserved intact two of the passages that Testuz took to be additions (1:7-25,28; 23:11-32). If they were added, they must have been added earlier than Testuz imagined. 4Q221 also preserves parts of six other chapters, confirming that the chapter existed in the larger context of the Book. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 39-42. Second, Davenport found a contradiction between a source which imagined the angel *writing* Jubilees and a source which imagined the angel *dictating* Jubilees. 4Q216 later confirmed what VanderKam had already suggested in 1981, that the confusion results from the resemblance of the *qal* and *hiphil* forms of the root *ktb*. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 15. James C. VanderKam, "The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 26 (1981): 209-217.

that some small fragment that has been identified as a copy of Jubilees is in fact a copy of an independent composition later incorporated into Jubilees, there is no positive evidence for such a possibility.³⁰ As discussed above, 11Q12 fragment 9 may suggest an added or deleted line of poetry, but this was never suspected previously nor would have been suspected given any of the criteria for identifying interpolations. All of the remaining theories postulate redaction or interpolation prior to the earliest manuscript evidence. On one hand, the evidence is fragmentary and a number of passages could well have escaped the fortune of preservation. On the other hand, relatively speaking, Jubilees is a well attested document at Qumran. Even if the manuscript evidence does not disprove every theory, it does form a pattern in that it has disproved some challenges to the unity of Jubilees and proved none. The theories of redaction and insertion depend not on physical evidence, but on subjective claims that conceptual contents are contradictory or inconsistent.³¹

A third general comment refers to the theories of interpolation by a Qumran scribe from Testuz,³² Davenport,³³ and Ravid.³⁴ Each of these tacitly assumes that the text preserved in Ethiopic derives from a text copied by a Qumran sectarian.³⁵ Although

³⁰ Naturally, we are not considering here manuscripts of sources that were known to the author of Jubilees but not incorporated directly.

³¹ The conceptual differences are often of such a minor nature that one can easily imagine a single author maintaining two strands of thought, or else they point not to problems with the unity of authorship but to problems with modern categories and perceived exclusivity of ideas.

³² Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 42.

³³ Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 16. See also, VanderKam, "The End of the Matter?," 272.

³⁴ Ravid, "הלכות השבת בספר היובלים נ 6-13," 161-166.

³⁵ Cana Werman claims that the book as a whole was written by a Qumran scribe, but there is nothing tacit about her argument. Werman, "ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן," 37-55.

this is possible, it is not a safe assumption. There are no parallels for sectarian documents from Qumran being exported, translated and copied, and we have no reason to believe that Qumranic recensions of non-sectarian documents ever displaced textual traditions outside the sect.³⁶ A copy of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice was found at Masada, but this hardly establishes extra-sectarian circulation. The copy of the Damascus Document in the Cairo Geniza is best explained by the fact that 1947 began the most recent but not the first series of discoveries in the Judean Desert.³⁷ The possibility that an interpolation by a Qumran sectarian *per se* made it into the Ethiopic is rather unlikely. If anything, one might speculate more generally that a person with an editorial interest comparable to what we know from the Qumran sectarian documents made an interpolation. None of the pluses found in the Qumran manuscripts but not the Ethiopic suggest a sectarian interpolation.

Finally, even if the observations that I identify as seams in the compositional process are taken as evidence of plurality in composition, redaction, and insertion, it remains the case that Jubilees is a *relatively* coherent document among its contemporaries in ancient Jewish literature. Ultimately, an argument that the alleged inconsistencies could have been maintained by a single author does not require that there could only have been a single author, as opposed to a closely aligned school or tradition. Even if one chooses to accept all the possibilities that may be suggested by source and redaction criticism, one must keep in mind that the types of evidence and the degrees of inconsistency are nothing like what we have in the cases of the Pentateuch, the books of 1

³⁶ Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 156ff.

³⁷ James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), 1-3.

Enoch, Sirach, Daniel and so forth. At most, Jubilees *could* be a composite text with a somewhat complex history of composition, redaction and insertion. Unlike many contemporary and older ancient texts, Jubilees at least *could* have been composed by a single author.

3.2.2. Some specific arguments

The specific arguments against the unity of the authorship of Jubilees range from abstract evaluations of literary style, tone and theological priorities, to specific points of conflict in the chronological and legal implications. They also range from claims that have been firmly refuted, to claims that come down to emphasis, semantics, or deeper questions of how we should conceive of authorship within a tradition in antiquity. Some argue for interpolations into a coherent composition, while some argue for layers and sources behind a coherent redaction. We will not consider every case that has ever been made against the unity of Jubilees, but we will sample some of each type. First, we will consider some older evaluations of literary style and tone from Davenport and Testuz, and more recently Kister. We will also consider a recent claim by Werman to distinguish two theological interests in Jubilees 23. We will then consider some of the claims of contradictions in details, first by surveying a number of contradictions that have already been resolved, then looking more closely at a chronological problem noted by Dimant. Finally, we will come to the seams between the primarily narrative and the primarily legal traditions of which Jubilees is built, as studied by Kister and Segal.

In what is by far the most ambitious application of form and redaction criticism to the Book of Jubilees, Gene Davenport listed a number of criteria for detecting strata of

composition and redaction.³⁸ Of these, perhaps the one most appropriate to Jubilees is the identification of seams between prose and poetry, although they are better taken as seams in composition than redaction. In most cases where we might have reasons to believe that the author borrowed interpretive traditions, we have every reason to believe that the author retold the tradition in a new way. Poetry, on the other hand, has a greater tendency to hold its literary shape. The fact that alleged conceptual contradictions do not align with breaks between poetry and prose perhaps itself speaks in favor of unity of authorship. Michel Testuz offers an exception, however, in the prose and poetry curses in Jubilees 24. Although I ultimately find the two curses or parts of the curse to be well within the range of compatibility necessary for a single author, I do find this to be one of the more likely cases of a seam, perhaps composed on different days and in different moods. Here Isaac curses the Philistine(s), first in prose using the plural “Philistines” and then in poetry using the collective singular, “he.” The prose section is more specific, and could perhaps be understood as an explanation of the poetry section. For example, while the poetry seems to suggest failed alliances with and captivity by the nations, the prose explains more specifically, “the Kittim.” Although I do not find it likely that the prose is an addition (with Testuz), or necessary to imagine that the poetry was copied from an earlier author, I do find it legitimate to distinguish a poetic curse and a prose explanation as components of what became a single continuous utterance in the mouth of Isaac.

Testuz also speaks of a difference in tone, which, unlike the poetic seams, continues to appear in current theories of multiplicity of authorship. Jubilees 24 may not be the best example, but Testuz is generally right that one occasionally finds in Jubilees

³⁸ Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 80.

specific and vitriolic rants about certain nations, such as might be consistent with a reaction to a recent event, and at other times a general and dry contempt for the nations. Like Testuz, Menahem Kister observed three degrees of harshness in Jubilees 23. Although he speculated that this may indicate different sources edited together, he appropriately admitted the speculative nature of such a suggestion.³⁹ It seems to me that the simplest explanation comes from considering the nature of the task. The author was writing something like a history based on older sources, but also had a perspective on history based on contemporary circumstances. While the author could maintain a calm “academic” contempt toward some nations or nations in general, in some cases the matter became more personal and the same author “lost his cool,” as it were. It is certainly not rare among historical apocalypses to gloss over vast expanses of history and then spend more and harsher words on the present circumstances.⁴⁰ We need not conclude from this tendency a plurality of authors, such as a “calm contempt source,” and an “angry source.”

Canan Werman notices similar seams, building on Kister but more confidently reconstructing sources.⁴¹ She notices two different types of guilt (and punishment) in

³⁹ “It seems that these rough edges likely indicate that we perhaps have a joining of different sources, and among them an apocalypse (beginning with verse 12, ‘in those days’?). However, there is no way to be certain of the matter.” Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 6 n.21. My translation.

⁴⁰ The contrast between general historical groups and specific recent groups within a review of history is noted by Werman. She attributes the disparity to different sources. Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת,” קומרן, 43.

⁴¹ Ibid.: 37-55. In addition to the different structures of sins, sinners, and punishments discussed in this paragraph, she also argues from structural aesthetics. She claims that if Jub 23:16, 19-24, 30b is excised then one is left with a four period progression (antediluvian, flood to Moses, Moses to present, and future) with a chiasmic structure in the last two periods (diminished lifespans-suffering-guilt-summary-guilt-suffering-diminished lifespans). I find it arbitrary to assign Jubilees 23:15 to the present and Jubilees 23:17 to the future, and read the same verses (if one accepts her categories and interpolations) as anything but chiasmic (lifespan-suffering-lifespan-suffering-sin-lifespan-suffering mixed with sin-[interpolation]-sin-suffering mixed with sin-[interpolation]-lifespan-suffering). She also suggests a contradiction between an older source that copied from Hesiod and a later author that opposed Hellenism. The connection to Hesiod is thin and there is no reason to believe the author of Jubilees would have considered the ancient traditions

Jubilees 23: a general guilt that applies to the nations, and a covenantal guilt that applies to Israel.⁴² She observes an important issue in Jubilees that pertains to the different standards of testimony, sin, and judgment that apply to the gentiles and to Israel. The observation is not best explained, however, by postulating that one author thought the gentiles were sinful and another author thought Israel had been sinful.⁴³ The same author certainly could have thought both and incorporated both into a single chapter.

In addition to the more abstract “contradictions” related to multiplicity of tone, concerns and interests, a number of contradictions in the details and implied details of the composition have been claimed. We will start with some more isolated and mundane claims, and move towards the most systematic claim (by Segal in particular) that the author of the halakhic material incorporated but did not write the narrative material. Some of the more mundane claims have already been disproved. For example, Gene Davenport claimed a contradiction on whether the angel dictated or wrote the Book of Jubilees. This claim was refuted with argumentation in 1981,⁴⁴ and later by manuscript evidence from 4Q216. Michel Testuz claimed a contradiction between use of the names

of descending quality of life and metals to be an exclusively Hellenistic tradition. As in the Book of Daniel, the similarities stop well short of suggesting dependence. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 93.

⁴² Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 43.

⁴³ The treatment of the problem that Israel seems to suffer as much as (and even more than) other nations despite their special relationship with God seems to have been triggered by the pattern in Genesis that lifespans continue to diminish universally, even in the case of one as righteous and chosen as Abraham. The solution in Jubilees seems to be that earth and humanity as a whole are diminished by defilement. Israel has the ability to separate from and cleanse itself of that defilement because of their special covenantal relationship with God. To the extent that Israel mingles with the nations, however, they are punished both with the nations for their defilement (diminished lifespans), and in addition to the nations for their covenantal infidelity (invasion and captivity).

⁴⁴ VanderKam, “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees,” 209-217.

Mastema (frequent in Jubilees) and Belial (Jubilees 1:20 and 15:33).⁴⁵ Although the simplest explanation is to simply imagine a thesaurus-like substitution of synonyms by a single author, it is not clear to me that Belial is here a name synonymous with Mastema, rather than a form of the impersonal noun בליעל found often in the Tanakh. In both places in Jubilees it appears in construct, once describing a spirit and once a people.⁴⁶ Ernest Wiesenberg calculated two chronological structures in Jubilees,⁴⁷ and has been corrected by VanderKam.⁴⁸ Ravid's perception of a hermeneutical contradiction is doubted even by those who accept the basic claim of insertion.⁴⁹

We might take a closer look at one of the chronological issues that Devorah Dimant identified as evidence of sloppy redaction.⁵⁰ Jubilees 4:21 reads,

ወሀሎ : እንከ : ምስለ : መላእክተ : አምላክ : ስድስተ : ዘኢየሴልወሳት :
ዓመታተ ::

[JCVK] He was, moreover, with God's angels for six jubilees of years.
(Jubilees 4:21)

Genesis 5:22 reads,

וַיְהִי לֶךְ חַנּוּךְ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־מֶתוֹשֶׁלַח שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיֹּלֶךְ בָּנִים
(Genesis 5:22) : וּבָנָיו

⁴⁵ Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 41. For the present purposes the variant forms *Beliar* and *Belial* are not distinguished.

⁴⁶ See further page 289 below.

⁴⁷ Ernest Wiesenberg, "The Jubilee of Jubilees," *RdQ* 9, no. 3 (1961-1962): 3-40.

⁴⁸ James C. VanderKam, "Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees," in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, JSJSup 62 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 522-544.

⁴⁹ See note 27 above.

⁵⁰ Devorah Dimant, "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch," *Vetus Testamentum* 33, no. 1 (1983): 21 n.17.

In the Book of Jubilees a jubilee consists of 49 years.⁵¹ In Dimant's view, Jubilees 4:21 intended to refer to 300 years, and was written by an author who counted a jubilee as fifty years. She concludes, "This shows that Jubilees borrows from various sources, often without reconciling the contradictions."⁵² In some cases like this, one might think that the contradiction is no more than a compression of detail, reducing "six jubilees and six years" to "(circa) six jubilees"⁵³ or "six jubilees (plus change)."⁵⁴ It might also be possible to understand 294 years as an interpretation or "making more precise" (מדויקדק) of the 300 years as a reference to a 294 year calendrical cycle. A more likely explanation presents itself. Jubilees understands the time Enoch spent "touring with angels," as taking place between the time Enoch fathered Methuselah and the time Enoch fathered other children. Jubilees reads the 300 years as the time of Enoch's "life" between begetting Methuselah and his translocation. Of these, 294 were spent touring with angels, followed by six more of fathering children and testifying.⁵⁵ Thus, the chronology of Enoch's life would be: age 65, beget Methuselah and start to tour with angels; age 359, return from tour and start fathering more children (and testifying); age 365, translocation to Eden.

⁵¹ Jubilees does, however, use the concept of the jubilee as a fiftieth unit. The chronology of the Book presents the jubilee of jubilees (fiftieth jubilee) as a jubilee of release and return. See appendix 6.6.6 for the possibility that Jubilees anticipates a jubilee of years (fiftieth year) release and return in the "eschatological" period of purity.

⁵² On a minor note, an implication of Dimant's argument is that the source text here also calculated time in terms of jubilees, but by a different definition of jubilee.

⁵³ James C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 13, no. 1 (1978): 235 (316 in reprint).

⁵⁴ 4Q227 fragment 2 preserves [...] ששה יובלי שנים [...], making a textual omission less likely, although it should be pointed out that this is a manuscript of "Pseudo-Jubilees," not Jubilees.

⁵⁵ A similar explanation has been presented by VanderKam. James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London; New York: Routledge, 1998), 121, n. 18. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 33.

Jubilees accounts for the remaining six years; there is no contradiction. Jubilees resolves the question that results from interpreting “walked with God” as “toured with angels,” namely, where did Enoch father a plurality of sons and daughters if he was touring with angels all of the last three hundred years of his life?

We have seen that a good number of the “contradictions” in Jubilees are very minor or not contradictions at all. I do not wish to argue, however, that Jubilees contains *no* inconsistencies. Indeed, recent scholarship has produced insight into the compositional seams in one of the most fundamental tasks of Jubilees: the interweaving of legal material in the narrative material of Genesis-Exodus and dependent traditions. By all accounts, Jubilees inherits and depends upon a wealth of narrative and legal traditions. Although individual examples and arguments may be debatable, it at least seems agreeable that redundancies, inconsistencies, and even contradictions can be found in the implications of certain details in Jubilees. The question, however, is whether these kinds of inconsistencies necessarily imply a multiplicity of authors.

In my view, many minds produced the traditions in Jubilees, but one author composed the text which brings them together with remarkable, but not perfect, acumen. The author of Jubilees was constrained by the narrative and legal material received, and by the theological claim of their compatibility. The author could not “make up” legal rulings or received traditions about the ancestors. The author seems to have proceeded with the theological claim that the oral and written legal and narrative traditions of Judaism, properly understood, are not only consistent but mutually illuminating.⁵⁶ From a

⁵⁶ James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 17.

historical-critical perspective, this claim is problematic. Especially when one is speaking of contradictions in the implications rather than overt statements, one should not ask what contradictions are in Jubilees, but what contradictions in the received tradition did the author fail to resolve. Moreover, one should keep in mind that the original audience was rational by its own standard, not the modern historical-critical standard. The original audiences were likely sympathetic to the pursuit of harmony and consistency in the received traditions, and disputed only the qualifier, “properly understood.” Thus, we should view the reconciliation of traditions in Jubilees not with contempt for the seams, but appreciation of the overall genius.

Menahem Kister distinguishes the traditions in Jubilees that originally existed for *aggadic* purposes, from those that originally existed for *halakhic* purposes. Kister follows Albeck and Baumgarten in studying the contradiction between the halakhic implications of Jubilees 7:1-7 and 7:35-37. Assuming the text is sound (see the notes in VanderKam 1989), the first passage suggests that Noah made wine from the fruits of the fourth year produce, and drank the wine on the first day of the fifth year. The second passage prescribes sanctification of fourth year produce as first fruits, released in the fifth year. Albeck resolves the problem with the distinction that Noah, but not all his sons, represented priests.⁵⁷ Baumgarten distinguishes the redemption of the fourth year produce in the fifth year from the redemption of the fifth year produce.⁵⁸ Kister finds their arguments forced. We do not need to adjudicate the details. Even as a disputed

⁵⁷ Chanoch Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, Bericht der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums 47 (Berlin: Berlin-Schöneberg, 1930), 32-33.

⁵⁸ J. M. Baumgarten, “The Laws of Orlah and First Fruits in Light of Jubilees, The Qumran Writings, and the Targum Ps-Jonathan,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 38 (1987): 198 n.10.

example, Kister's conclusion is likely correct as far as it goes, "Different traditions were included in the Book of Jubilees, and it stands to reason that not all of them were sectarian."⁵⁹ The crux of the matter becomes apparent in another formulation by Kister, "The story was not created to serve the halakhic purposes of the Book of Jubilees, but rather existed independently."⁶⁰ Several questions arise. Does multiplicity of purpose imply multiplicity of authorship? Assuming such a story did exist independently in some form, where do we draw the line between authorship and redaction?

3.2.3. Segal's theory of the redaction of Jubilees

Michael Segal extends Kister's program with a systematic study of the composition of Jubilees.⁶¹ Segal argues for replacing the idea of an author of Jubilees with a redactor. The redactor is responsible for the legal passages, chronological framework, and narrative framework (chapters 1-2, 23, and part of 50), but not the rest of the narrative contents. These narratives came from a variety of written and oral traditions.⁶² The major implication is that we cannot speak of one worldview for the

⁵⁹ Menahem Kister, "Some Aspects of Qumran Halakhah," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*, ed. Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 12 (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1992), 585.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 587.

⁶¹ Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*. This is the published version of his dissertation, written under Menahem Kister, Michael Segal, "ספר היובלים: שכתוב המקרא, עריכה, אמונות ודעות" (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2004). Parts of the argument appeared elsewhere, including Michael Segal, "The Relationship Between the Legal and Narrative Passages in 'Jubilees'," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 203-228. Michael Segal, "עיון מחודש בסיפור הכניסה לגן עדן," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 111-125.

⁶² "The final product, as known to us today, is not the work of one individual, but a compound of different traditions and sources. The redactor's contribution can be found in the chronological framework

entire book of Jubilees, but only for the redactional layer.⁶³ The present work is basically compatible with Segal's argument. The difference between calling the person responsible for the book as we know it "the author" or "the redactor" is partly semantic, but partly points to different conceptions of authorship in Jubilees and in antiquity generally. Even where compositional seams can be detected, I do not find unresolved contradictions at the level of worldview, and do not limit discussion of the worldview to certain passages. However, I do concede as a point in favor of Segal's basic observation that the clearest passages indicating the distinctive worldview of Jubilees have been identified by Segal as the redactional layer.⁶⁴ It probably is the case that Segal has successfully identified passages in which the (final) author more clearly and explicitly presents personal views and agendas. I would simply emphasize a point that Segal seems sometimes to concede and sometimes to neglect. Namely, the (final) author's use of received tradition is not passive copying, but active reworking that changes the theological meaning to fit a new framework. I would call that process authorship and that product a coherent composition. The author's worldview can be found in the reworking of traditions, even if a tension is inherent in reworking traditions already in tension. I would add that the legal material too draws from received traditional authorities.

throughout the book, in the legal passages juxtaposed to the rewritten stories, and in those passages that share the same unique terminology with the legal passages." Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 35.

⁶³ "The recognition of the complexity of this material allows for an accurate investigation of the redactor's perspective, in contrast to those expressed in his sources." Ibid., 264, similarly 14, 318.

⁶⁴ Segal's list on page 24 is not a complete list of passages he includes in the redactional layer. To these must be added chapters 1, the rest of 2, 5:13-18, 19:26-29, most of 23, and 50:1-5, 13b. Ibid., 30 n.80, 141, 238 n. 24, 247 n. 1, 258 n. 2, 318.

Before elaborating on the disagreements, several fundamental agreements should be emphasized. First, Segal and I seem to agree that there was no version of Jubilees prior to the halakhic and chronological layer, only miscellaneous independent sources.⁶⁵ Second, we seem to agree that the work as we have it is basically the same coherent product of that second century author/redactor, with few or no complete passages added in the following centuries.⁶⁶ Third, we agree in rejecting the opposite extreme, which Segal identifies as the state of scholarship.⁶⁷ Certainly Jubilees uses traditions other than the Pentateuch, and we cannot imagine that everything found in Jubilees but not a version of the Pentateuch is the invention of a single mind.⁶⁸ Fourth, we agree that the use of extant sources and traditions involves active (I would say creative) adaptation: “altering its emphases... new theological construct” (169, 268), “did not merely copy... incorporated... within a new framework” (177), “Thus the earlier traditions were preserved, but were infused with a new meaning regarding the question of the origin of evil in the world” (180), “message of the story was changed” (264), “the redactor did not limit himself to copying and joining existing sources, but also integrated them within the framework of a new literary composition” (317), “the redactor did not quote his sources word for word as he found them, but rather inserted certain changes into them” (318).

⁶⁵ Ibid., 320.

⁶⁶ The only exception being 50:6-13a, which is essential to neither of our arguments. Ibid., 19-20.

⁶⁷ Many scholars recognize, however, that one of the main innovations of Jubilees is to take narrative material from Genesis and related traditions, and impose a halakhic and chronological structure. Segal is not overturning the state of scholarship as much as he claims, but contributing to it by testing, confirming, and demonstrating the general observation with specific textual analysis.

⁶⁸ “Scholars generally compare the rewritten stories directly with the Pentateuch. Every difference, except for those that can be attributed to a textual witness of the Torah that Jubilees may have relied upon (...), is considered the work of ‘the author of Jubilees.’ All of the many, various phenomena have been attributed to this one putative author.” Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 10-11, likewise 21, 35, 264.

Specifically, we agree that we can see the author/redactor's *modus operandi* in the use of the Book of the Watchers.⁶⁹ The dependence on a written source is clear, but so is the transformation. The transformation is not just a reformulation and an addition, but a theological change in the view of evil. Finally, we can agree that the author/redactor did not resolve all the tensions implicit in attempting to reconcile a diversity of traditions and theological presuppositions into a single heavenly source.⁷⁰

The disagreement begins with what to call such a process. Literary production fills a spectrum from anthologizing without interference (although even selection and ordering can be creative), to the hypothetical modern ideal of purely original creation. On such a spectrum, a distinction between redaction and authorship is valuable, but redaction implies arranging, reducing, and bringing together with small amounts of new material as “glue.” Authorship in antiquity should not be understood to exclude dependence on sources. If the “redactor” of Jubilees did not write the narrative passages, we have to ask who wrote the reworked rewritten material?⁷¹ Of course we need to be aware that Jubilees used many sources, not all of which are otherwise known to us. Since we know Jubilees was creative in adapting those stories, we cannot exclude the rewriting from our study of the authorship, or the rewritten from our study of the composition.

Just as we should appreciate Jubilees according to ancient, not modern, conceptions of authorship, so too should we avoid imposing modern standards of

⁶⁹ Ibid., 142.

⁷⁰ “However, despite the attempts to create a new, unified composition, the interpretive difficulties discussed above demonstrate that the author was not completely successful in his task.” Ibid., 137 n. 86.

⁷¹ “At times, the rewritten story in Jubilees is itself based upon another, already extant rewritten story, which was part of a different composition.” Ibid., 137.

consistency. Jubilees attempts to weave together a wide variety of traditions (both narrative and legal), and reconcile them with a complicated set of theological presuppositions. Whatever tensions (especially in minor implications) remain after such an undertaking attest to the difficulty of the task, not the sloppiness of the effort. It is dangerous for us to judge how much or what kind of tension can exist within the worldview of a single person, especially a person engaged in reconciling Jewish traditions.⁷² It is a mischaracterization of Jubilees to describe it with contemptuous language such as “incoherent,” “illogical,” and “incomprehensible.”⁷³ It undervalues the acumen involved in weaving together various traditions to claim the author/redactor “did not attempt to resolve the difficulties.”⁷⁴ Segal’s best arguments stem from patterns in language and concern, but the contradictions are not nearly as contradictory as Segal suggests. We should briefly consider some of the best examples of contradictions.

The one clear example of a contradiction that even a non-hostile reader could notice without examining implications appears in Jubilees 28:17. There we read that Leah gave birth to four sons, while at that point in the story she should have given birth to only two. The contradiction is a matter of three words, and it is easy to imagine that a transmitter who “knew” Leah had four sons “corrected” a text that said she had two. The chronology of the sons of Jacob is complicated, so it is not the extreme of sloppiness to make such a mistake. It is possible, but not necessary, that such confusion was motivated by a concern for propriety, if Jacob’s intimate relationships overlapped.⁷⁵

⁷² Cf., “One person presumably possesses a unified worldview.” *Ibid.*, 33.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 30, 317.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 318.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 85-91.

Moreover, if the contradiction is only three words, then we already have reason to suspect Segal's claim that, "The contradictory elements in the book are always differentiated by their genres."⁷⁶ There is a legitimate observation behind the overstatement. While it is not helpful to argue that the legal passages are distinguished from the non-legal passages by the use of legal terminology, it is helpful to observe that Jubilees treats chronology as a legal matter.⁷⁷ Segal is correct to point to patterns in language and the most direct expressions of worldview, but the reader must scour Segal's footnotes or Jubilees itself to realize that the lines of language, genre and worldview are not so clear-cut. Segal does identify some narrative passages as belonging to the legal/chronological layer.⁷⁸ "Mastema" is an example of distinctive terminology that Segal asserts is absent from the legal/chronological layer,⁷⁹ but 19:28 and 49:2 should be admitted as exceptions. In other cases, the identification of a passage as legal, narrative, or chronological is not so clear. For example, Jubilees 41:23-26 is not clearly set apart from its surroundings by genre. Similarly, one of Segal's arguments works only if Jubilees 3:17 is *not* chronological, "When the conclusion of seven years which he had completed there arrived—seven years exactly—in the second month, on the seventeenth, the serpent came and approached the woman."⁸⁰

That brings us to another example of a "contradiction," one which illustrates the subtlety of the tensions, and how they go back to issues that are already complicated in

⁷⁶ Ibid., 317.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 227-228, 301.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 31 n. 80, 238 n. 24, 247 n. 1, 258 n. 2.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 126 n. 59.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 52.

the tradition.⁸¹ According to Jubilees 3:17, Adam entered the Garden of Eden on the seventeenth of the second month, whereas some reasonable math would lead one to expect him to have entered four days earlier. The confusion goes back to whether Adam was created on the sixth day or the third day. If one thinks in terms of Genesis 1, Adam was created on the sixth day, but if one thinks in terms of a calendar that begins with the creation of the sun, then Adam was created on the third day. Both ideas exist in the tradition and any implicit confusion could have existed within a single person, and even more so in the history of transmission (especially if, as Segal argues, there was an exegetical motive to make both fit).⁸² In fairness to Segal, not all of his “contradictions” are in such minor implications.⁸³ He argues that, even though the redactor thoroughly reworked the worldview of the Book of the Watchers, there remains a basic tension within Jubilees over whether evil existed from the beginning of creation or was introduced later.⁸⁴

The other tensions are less explicit and more easily explained as “overkill.”⁸⁵ Segal is aware that the tensions have explanations, but invokes Occam’s razor to argue

⁸¹ Segal calls this example the “most significant.” Ibid., 21.

⁸² Ibid., 55-56.

⁸³ Segal is more persuasive in arguing positively that the redactional layer has a striking ideological consistency in beating the same drum, as it were. It should be enough to say that specific concerns of Jubilees are concentrated in certain passages (or a certain type of passage). The alleged contradictions with other passages are less persuasive and ultimately unnecessary. Ibid., 324.

⁸⁴ As expanded below in Chapters 5 and 7, Segal and I agree that Jubilees rejects the view of the Book of the Watchers, but we do not agree on the view that it promotes, or whether that view is consistently maintained in the book.

⁸⁵ Segal refers to James L. Kugel, *In Potiphar’s House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1990), 256-257. James L. Kugel, *The Bible As It Was* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997), 28-34.

that it is simpler to explain all the contradictions with a comprehensive theory of composition than with individual nuances.⁸⁶ Even if Segal's solution has a simple elegance, the demonstrations of the contradictions are long and complicated. Jubilees takes on complicated problems, particularly in projecting law and justice onto the patriarchal narratives. The complicated solutions in Jubilees are only fitting the problems.

If we do not project modern standards of authorship and consistency on the ancient world, we can still call the person who produced Jubilees the "author" and the composition itself "coherent." I would emphasize the skill with which the author combines traditions into a literary and theological unity, leaving relatively few, relatively minor seams to allow the modern scholar to reconstruct the composition of the work. That said, Segal is largely convincing in many insights into the process of composition.

3.3. The Book of Jubilees was composed in the second century BCE, probably shortly after 159 BCE.

Whether one emphasizes redaction or composition, most scholars agree that the Book of Jubilees existed essentially as we now know it by the middle of the second century BCE. Giving a precise date is difficult by all accounts. It is made somewhat easier to the extent to which Jubilees is a unified composition, and somewhat harder to the extent to which Jubilees develops older traditions. Even the work of a single author could have come together over a number of years. The best arguments for date depend on

⁸⁶ Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 27.

persistent patterns in the work, and a few passages in which the veil of pseudonymity blows in the wind of historical circumstances.

The Book of Jubilees was written in the second century BCE. The certainty of this range depends more on the luck of preservation of external evidence than on any clear indications within the book. Early scholars advanced theories that dated Jubilees as early as the Persian period or as late as the Jewish response to Christianity.⁸⁷ Even today, the evidence for a precise date within the second century is not as strong as we might like. Scholars mostly favor a date towards the middle of the second century, based especially on parallels with 1-2 Maccabees.⁸⁸ A date in the first third of the century can still be

⁸⁷ Rowley, Charlesworth and VanderKam offer surveys of older scholarship on the date of Jubilees. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 84-90. James H. Charlesworth, "The Date of Jubilees and of the Temple Scroll," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 24 (1985): 193. James C. VanderKam, "The Origins and Purposes of the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum*, 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 4-16.

Dillmann (followed by Schürer) correctly observed that Jubilees presumes (parts of) 1 Enoch and an existing temple cult, but erred in accepting a first century CE date for those parts of 1 Enoch. Dillmann, "Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis," 88-94. Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3rd ed., 3 vols., vol. 3 (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1898), 3.277.

Rönsch read the prohibition of spilling blood as opposition to the Christian rite concerning the Last Supper. H. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Reisland], 1874).

Zeitlin dated the book to the early second temple period, "when it could be hoped that opposition to the Pentateuch would not be wholly futile." Solomon Zeitlin, "The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance," *JQR* 30 (1939): 31. Solomon Zeitlin, "Criteria for the Dating of Jubilees," *JQR* 36, no. 2 (1945): 187-189.

Albright found enough Greek place names to require composition in the Hellenistic period, but still found evidence for great antiquity (early 3rd century, possibly late 4th) in allusions to Canaanite legend and an angelology closer to Job than Enoch and Daniel. William Foxwell Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1940), 266-267 (346-347 in second edition).

⁸⁸ Most scholars in this category follow VanderKam's thorough treatment in 1977 which narrowed the date "almost certainly... between 161 and 140 BC and probably between 161 and 152 BC." In subsequent studies VanderKam has reinforced this judgment. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 284. VanderKam, "Origins and Purposes of Jubilees," 20.

defended, usually based on the argument that Jubilees is silent about the decrees of Antiochus Epiphanes in 167 BCE.⁸⁹ A date in the last third of the century can also be

Earlier defenses of this approximate range include the following.

Bohn (followed by Littmann) placed Jubilees in a time when the Hasidim still went hand in hand with the new Maccabean dynasty. F. Bohn, "Die Bedeutung des Buches der Jubiläen: Zum 50jährigen Jubiläum der ersten, deutschen Übersetzung," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken; eine Zeitschrift für das gesamte Gebiet der Theologie* 73 (1900): 167-184. E. Littmann, "Das Buch der Jubiläen," in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, ed. E. Kautzsch (Freiburg; Leipzig: Mohr [Siebeck], 1900), 31-38.

Jaubert notes the double meaning of "Judah," implying Judah Maccabee when dealing with Judah the patriarch in the war narratives. Annie Jaubert, *The Date of the Last Supper* (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965), 125-128.

Not including scholars who simply follow VanderKam, additional arguments for this date have been made by the following.

Berger adopts the late end of VanderKam's suggestion, 145-140 BCE. Klaus Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Band 2 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981), 300.

Schwarz focuses on the imperative for national identity at the beginning of the Maccabean revolt. Eberhard Schwarz, *Identität durch Abgrenzung: Abgrenzungsprozesse in Israel im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert und ihre traditionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen: zugleich ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Jubiläenbuches*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe XXIII, Theologie 162 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1982), 102-126.

Endres also studies Jubilees as a response to the decrees of Antiochus Epiphanes. John C. Endres, "Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees" (Dissertation, Vanderbilt, 1982), 238. Revised for publication as, John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, CBQMS 18 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987).

The revision of Schürer by Vermès, Millar and Goodman places the book shortly after the death of Judah Maccabee. Emil Schürer et al., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*, revised ed., 3 vols., vol. 3, part 1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1885, 1986), III,1,313.

⁸⁹ Meyer and Albright dated the composition to the beginning of the century. Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart; Berlin: Cotta, 1924), 2.45ff.

Finkelstein, Wacholder, Nickelsburg, Goldstein and Knibb read the book as a reaction to events under Antiochus Epiphanes, but prior to the decrees of 167 BCE. Louis Finkelstein, "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded)," *HTR* 36, no. 1 (1943): 24. Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*, Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, no. 8 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1983), 42. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 73-74 (78-79 in first edition). Jonathan A. Goldstein, "The Date of the Book of Jubilees," in *Semites, Iranians, Greeks, and Romans: Studies in Their Interactions* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 161-180. Michael A. Knibb, "Jubilees and the Origins of the Qumran Community," in *Inaugural Lecture in the Department of Biblical Studies, King's College, London, 17 January 1989* (1989), 16-17.

defended on arguments that Jubilees refers to events and issues from the reign of Hyrcanus I, or a general tendency to date texts as late as unambiguous evidence allows.⁹⁰ A number of scholars are content that a precise date within the century lies outside the scope of our knowledge.

Although this dissertation could work, perhaps with some modifications, for any date within the second century, the best of the evidence and the scholarly consensus do suggest a higher probability for a date in the years following 159 BCE. If one favors an earlier date, then my treatment of the Animal Apocalypse and Daniel as contemporary apocalypses may raise an eyebrow. Even still, I would suggest that apocalypses and the apocalyptic worldview existed earlier in a similar form, even if some of the best of the preserved evidence dates from slightly later (the Book of the Watchers dates earlier). If one favors a late date, then my omission of Qumran sectarian literature might be a

Finkelstein also notes the lack of sectarian strife and identifies the support of the institution of the high priesthood but criticism of the current high priests as matching well the high priesthods of Jason and Menelaus.

Kugel suggests a date even before 175 and defends his view that Aramaic Levi depends on Jubilees. James L. Kugel, *The Ladder of Jacob: Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and His Children* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 155.

⁹⁰ Charles' arguments have not withstood the test of time, even among those who accept his dates from 135-105 BCE. For example, he claims that the title "priest of the Most High God" was particular to the Hasmonean period, but in fact Jubilees could have known it from Genesis 14:18. In his commentary he identifies verses in Jubilees 23 with events of the 160s. Charles, *Jubilees*, xiii.

Testuz followed Charles for the base text, and posited three insertions from 62-38 BCE. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 25-42.

Mendels aligns the concerns in Jubilees with the political events around 125 BCE. Doron Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land*, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum* 15 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987), 57-88.

Werman claims the book was written by a member of the Qumran sect at the end of the century. Werman, "ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן," 38-39.

problem. In such a larger project, I would still justify treating the sectarian and non-sectarian evidence separately.⁹¹ The concepts of literary genre and worldview in the body of this dissertation are broader than any one text or sect. The date makes the biggest difference when we ask *why* the author of Jubilees might have used the genre “apocalypse” ironically. At an early date, one might wonder if the apocalyptic worldview was developed enough to be parodied, and at a later date there may be more comparative evidence for harmonization of ideas that had previously been held in opposition. The date of composition will make a difference on a number of smaller points, and it is therefore worthwhile to spend some pages reviewing the evidence and arguments already available, and hopefully adding something new.

In the next sub-section I will treat the implications of the paleography of the oldest manuscript of Jubilees and some texts which depend on Jubilees. I will then turn to the texts on which Jubilees depends. Then I will review the principal parallels in Jubilees with issues and events known from 1-2 Maccabees, including the Hellenization issues of the gymnasium and circumcision, the way the wars of the patriarchs are imagined, and finally the historical allusions in chapter 23.

⁹¹ Even Cana Werman, who argues that Jubilees was written by a Qumran sectarian, admits that it differs in that it is written for an outside audience and thus assumes different authority and a different tone than the “internal” sectarian literature. Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 37-55. Schubert made a similar point that the figure of Moses is used to address a broader public than the Teacher of Righteousness. Schubert, *Tradition und Erneuerung*, 264.

3.3.1. The oldest manuscript and texts which presume Jubilees

This sub-section will consider the external evidence for the latest possible date of Jubilees. It will proceed in two parts: the more certain evidence followed by the more speculative evidence. Among the more certain evidence I include the paleographical dating of the oldest preserved copy of Jubilees, and the citation of Jubilees in the Damascus Document. The implication of *how* the Damascus Document uses Jubilees will bring us to the second part. A number of more speculative points are worth noting and even reflect a scholarly consensus, but ought to be bracketed as less certain until more thorough studies can focus on the relationship between the composition of Jubilees and the sect that copied Jubilees and produced the Damascus Document. The most strictly minimal interpretation of the data requires a date for the composition of Jubilees before 100 BCE, but the evidence further suggests a date earlier than the consolidation of an exile community around the authority of the Teacher of Righteousness.

The older portion of 4Q216 (not counting the first leaf repaired at a later date) has been dated on paleographic grounds to circa 125-100 BCE by Milik and VanderKam. To the best of my knowledge, this much has not been seriously challenged. One does occasionally find selective phraseology, either as “circa 125” or “circa 100,” but this seems to be a subjective preference within the firmer but broader range. It seems safe to say that 4Q216 is not an autograph.

The Genesis Apocryphon, Aramaic Levi, and the Temple Scroll all seem to have some relationship with the Book of Jubilees, but are themselves difficult to date, and therefore do not help with the dating of Jubilees. Jubilees may depend on versions of

Aramaic Levi⁹² and the Genesis Apocryphon,⁹³ but there is better evidence for excluding an early second century date. The Temple Scroll, on the other hand, more likely presupposes Jubilees, but does not establish the firmest or the earliest date by which Jubilees must have existed.⁹⁴

The earliest clear reference to the Book of Jubilees *per se* (not its sources) is the Damascus Document. Perhaps the most legitimately questionable part is the date of the Damascus Document, or these portions thereof, but a date around the turn of the last century before our era seems to be agreeable. The Damascus Document clearly cites Jubilees in column sixteen, and refers to it rather directly in column 10. In column 16, lines 1-6 we read not only the ancient title of the work, but several of the concepts and phrases associated with it.⁹⁵

עמכם ברית ועם כל ישראל על כן יקים האיש על נפשו לשוב אל
תורת משה כי בה הכל מדוקדק *vacat* ופרוש קציהם לעורון
ישראל מכל אלה הנה הוא מדוקדק על ספר מחלקות העתים
ליובליהם ובשבועותיהם וביום אשר יקים האיש על נפשו לשוב
אל תורת משה יסור מלאך המשטמה מאחריו אם יקים את דבריו
... על כן נימול אברהם ביום דעתו *vacat*

... a covenant with you and with all Israel. Therefore, one will establish
for oneself to return to the Mosaic law, for in it everything is made clear.

⁹² Kugel, however, argues that Aramaic Levi assumes and summarizes an interpretation that Jubilees develops as an innovation. Kugel, *The Ladder of Jacob*, 155. See also, Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 9 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996).

⁹³ Thus the original editors, Avigad and Yadin. Fitzmyer, however, argues that the Genesis Apocryphon expands Jubilees. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*, 3rd ed., Biblica et Orientalia; 18B (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004), 26-28.

⁹⁴ Charlesworth weighs the possibilities and favors the priority of Jubilees. Charlesworth, "The Date of Jubilees and of the Temple Scroll," 193-204. 4Q524 has been dated to 150-125 BCE, but it is no simple matter to identify this text with the Temple Scroll as we know it from later manuscripts found in cave 11.

⁹⁵ See also 4Q271 fragment 4 column 2.

As for the exact specification of the periods of Israel's blindness from all this, it is made clear in the Book of the Divisions of the Times According to Their Jubilees and Weeks. Thus on the day one establishes for oneself to return to the Mosaic law, the angel Mastema will stop going after him (if he keeps his word). Therefore Abraham circumcised himself on the day he knew about it. (Damascus Document 16.1-6)

“The Book of the Divisions of the Times According to Their Jubilees and Weeks,” or at least “The Book of the Divisions of the Times,” serves as the ancient title of the Book of Jubilees.⁹⁶ Devorah Dimant raises the possibility that some or all of this was not a title but a description of a book, but even as a description it uniquely fits the Book of Jubilees.⁹⁷ We know Jubilees was valued and highly available in the community (bracketing for now that the number of copies suggests authoritative which suggests likely to be cited). Dimant notes that other texts do speak of divisions of times in terms of Jubilees and weeks, but those texts do not begin to fit the description here.⁹⁸ The work referenced here is a book, which can probably be distinguished from a text such as 4Q319 *Otot*. It must predate the Damascus Document. It must specify the times when Israel turns a blind eye (which Jubilees 1 and 23 do). These criteria combined eliminate any other preserved text to which the Damascus Document could possibly refer. Further looser associations with the Book of Jubilees include the explicit requirement of returning to the Law of Moses (e.g. Jub. 23:26), the idea that turning to the Law of Moses grants

⁹⁶ See particularly the prologue, but also 1:4; 1:26; 1:29; and 50:13. 4Q216 attests to the antiquity of the phrase, and 4Q217 may be another early example of a work that refers to Jubilees by this name.

⁹⁷ Devorah Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3-4,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint: Essays Presented to Eugene Ulrich on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Peter W. Flint, James C. VanderKam, and Emanuel Tov, VTSup 101 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 246ff. Devorah Dimant, “בני מנחה לשרה; מחקרים בפילוסופיה יהודית ובקבלה: שמים - תורת המלאכים בספר היובלים לאור כתבי עדת קומראן וילנסקי מוגשים לפרופסור שרה א' הלר וילנסקי,” ed. Moshe Idel, Devorah Dimant, and Shalom Rosenberg (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 99 n.9.

⁹⁸ Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions,” 247.

immunity from demons in general and Mastema by name, and the idea of circumcision as effecting immunity from Mastema.⁹⁹ There can be no doubt that the Damascus Document post-dates Jubilees in *that* it uses Jubilees; the more subtle point is that the Damascus Document must *significantly* post-date Jubilees based on *how* it uses Jubilees (see below, page 153).

The use of Jubilees in the Damascus Document also appears in column 10. Here, the Damascus Document does not cite the book by name, but authorizes a rule on a paraphrase of Jubilees 23:10-12. CD column 10 lines 7-10 read,

ואל יתיצב עוד מבן ששים שנה ומעלה לשפוט את העדה כי
במעל האדם מעטו ימו
ובחרון אף אל ביושבי הארץ
אמר לסור את דעתם
עד לא ישלימו את ימיהם

No one age sixty or older should serve as judge of the community, for
by the sin of humanity one's days are diminished,
and by the wrath of God at the inhabitants of the earth
God decreed to divert their knowledge,
before they complete their days. (Damascus Document 10.7-10)

This paraphrases Jubilees 23 with some interpretation, but no other text matches better than Jubilees 23:10-12,

... ቅድመ : ገጸ : እከይ : ወጸግበ : መዋዕላቲሁ : ወኩሉ : ትውልድ :
ዘይትነሣእ : እምይእዜ : ወእስከ : ዕለተ : ደይን : ዐባይ : ይረስኡ : ፍጡነ :
ዘእንበለ : ይፈጽሙ : ክልኤ : ኢዮቤልዉ :: ወትከውን : እንተ : ተነድጎሙ :
እእምሮቶሙ : እምርስኦሙ : ወተክትት : ኩላ : እእምሮቶሙ : ወበውእቱ :
መዋዕል : እመ : ሐይወ : ብእሲ : ኢዮቤልዉ : ወመንፈቀ : ዓመታት :
ይብሉ : በእንቲክሁ : ኢብዝነ : ሐይወ : ወመብዝነተ : መዋዕሊሁ : እማም :
ወስራሕ : ወምንዳቤ : ወአልቦ : ሰላመ

⁹⁹ This last point can be gathered from the interpretation in Jubilees of Exodus 4:24-26, the pattern of Abram's indirect conflict with Mastema prior to his circumcision (particularly the connection via the ravens), and the discussion of circumcision laws in Jubilees 15:26-34, which identifies circumcision as the mark which guarantees forgiveness of sins and protection from angels of destruction.

[JCVK] ... in view of wickedness—and reached the end of his time (literally: completed his days). All the generations that will come into being from now until the great day of judgment will grow old quickly—before they complete two jubilees. It will be their knowledge that will leave them because of their old age; all of their knowledge will depart. At that time, if a man lives a jubilee and one-half of years, it will be said about him: ‘He has lived for a long time’. But the greater part of his time will be (characterized by) difficulties, toil, and distress without peace. (Jubilees 23:10-12)

The concepts and the language overlap significantly, beyond what could be explained as mutual derivation from Isaiah 65 and Psalm 90: the diminishment of knowledge in old age, the completion of days, and the idea of general human wickedness as the cause of diminished lifespan and knowledge.¹⁰⁰ The number “sixty” comes neither from Jubilees 23 nor the passages behind Jubilees, but seems to be logically derived from the facts that people die in their early 70s, and lose knowledge before they die (perhaps indirectly from Leviticus 27:7). The word “wrath” does not occur in these verses, but later in the chapter (23:22) we do read from 4Q176 fragment 20 “קצף” (→ ὀργή → መቅደድ). Although the concept of wrath is not absent from Jubilees 23, the emphasis and extension to this unit might fit with the suggestion below that the sectarian interpretation of Jubilees reflects a tone of alienation and bitterness absent in the composition of Jubilees. Thus we come to a series of observations based on implications and impressions that may be widely held by scholars, but still should be taken with a degree of reservation and a desideratum for more thorough study.

¹⁰⁰ Kugel proposed that the root בָּהַל in Psalm 90:7 could have been interpreted to mean, “in your wrath we are bewildered.” In this case, Psalm 90 could directly provide the elements of sin, wrath, mortality, and senility. This is an intriguing possibility, but one might legitimately desire evidence of such an understanding of בָּהַל prior to the Amoraic period. Pending further study, and in light of the other evidence that Jubilees was utilized in the composition of the Damascus Document, Jubilees remains a more likely direct source than Psalm 90. James L. Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 334.

Based only on a minimal interpretation of the paleography of 4Q216 and the use of Jubilees by the Damascus Document, one might still suggest that Jubilees was written as late as 101 BCE and then copied and used by the Qumran sectarians in 100 BCE. A number of observations suggest that a significant amount of time must have passed between the composition of Jubilees and the use of Jubilees by the Qumran sectarians. Almost all scholars accept that Jubilees is pre-sectarian or at least non-sectarian.¹⁰¹ The positive view of the high priesthood and Jerusalem temple exclude an exile community at odds with the Hasmonean high-priesthood.¹⁰² The legal differences are noteworthy, even though one might expect legal judgments to change over time within a community.¹⁰³ A more subjective, but ultimately persuasive, set of observations amounts to the generalization that *Jubilees does not present itself as sectarian*. As discussed in the chapter on the spatial axis, Jubilees does not divide Israel into groups, especially for purposes of salvation.¹⁰⁴ It presents its calendar as if it has always been in force and only

¹⁰¹ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 21. Schürer et al., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*, 314. Werman is one recent exception. She does not deny the significant differences between Jubilees and the sectarian literature, but she argues that the differences can be accounted for by imagining that Jubilees was written for an external audience and the accepted sectarian literature written for an internal audience. Thus, for the purposes of propaganda, Jubilees makes the group look like brave heroes who stand up against evil, while in the internal forum there is no denying they were chased out and persecuted. One wonders when the initiates received the bad news. See note 110 below for Werman's response to the disparity in the basis of authority.

¹⁰² VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 281.

¹⁰³ Lutz Doering, *Sabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 281. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 281. Also, some calendrical texts follow a schematic lunar calendar at odds with Jubilees. On an exegetical matter, 4Q252 "corrects" the flood chronology of Jubilees.

¹⁰⁴ Testuz, however, takes an exclusive group within Israel as the first point of connection between the Damascus Document and Jubilees. The textual evidence, a reference to the "elect ones of Israel" (Jubilees 1:29), could be easily explained as the election of all Israel or the election of the priests who serve in the Jerusalem temple under discussion. The positive view of the Jerusalem temple is in fact a very non-sectarian view. Testuz's better, but still flawed, argument comes from the assumption that the calendar of Jubilees was always necessarily sectarian. Even Testuz recognizes that Jubilees differs from the Damascus

recently challenged, and will be soon restored.¹⁰⁵ As has long been observed, Jubilees lacks the defensive and polemical tone and the general bitterness of the documents that are readily identified as sectarian.¹⁰⁶

It has been suggested that the Qumran sectarians accepted no new writings (other than their own) after their foundation, and that they distinguished the authority of the more broadly received literature from the authority of their own group, particularly the Teacher of Righteousness.¹⁰⁷ Whatever qualifications may come from more detailed study, the basic observation appears to hold up. Both the way Jubilees authorizes itself, and the way its authority is treated at Qumran suggest pre-sectarian composition of the Book of Jubilees. Jubilees makes no mention of the Teacher of Righteousness or any charismatic individual, but rather derives its authority from received authoritative literature, the genre “apocalypse” and a variation on pseudepigraphy. The authors of the sectarian documents seem not to have employed the genre “apocalypse”¹⁰⁸ or pseudepigraphy of this type,¹⁰⁹ drawing rather on the authority of the Teacher of

Document in that the former community is not yet separated from the rest of the people, while the latter assumes a closed community in exile. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 180-183.

¹⁰⁵ Zeitlin made this point but assumed that the calendar debate had been “long dead” by the Maccabean period. Zeitlin, “The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance,” 14-15.

¹⁰⁶ “It is especially noteworthy that the Book of Jubilees reflects none of the bitterness which was engendered by the break between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.” Finkelstein, “Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded),” 23. The same point had been made by Zeitlin. Zeitlin, “The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance,” 1-31.

¹⁰⁷ Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 161 n.76.

¹⁰⁸ Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 404. David E. Aune, “Qumran and the Book of Revelation,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 626.

¹⁰⁹ “Of the presence of pseudepigraphic texts at Qumran there can be no doubt, since the ‘library’ possessed multiple copies of Jubilees and 1 Enoch as well as testament-type works. It is important to note that neither of these works is claimed by scholars to be of Qumranic origin. Moreover, I believe that one could argue that fully-pseudepigraphic works such as these were not composed at Qumran. It might even be

Righteousness.¹¹⁰ Indeed, the Qumran sectarians seem to have treated Jubilees the same way they treated other authoritative literature. 4Q228 cites Jubilees with the same citation formula that otherwise is only used to introduce works that were eventually included in the Hebrew canon (with perhaps one exception, a reference to an unknown work, “Levi, son of Jacob”).¹¹¹ Even within the Damascus Document, Jubilees is treated rather like scripture. Column 16 assumes the authority of Jubilees, and the term פרוש may specifically connote authoritative literature of the received variety.¹¹² Likewise, in column 10 Jubilees is assumed as an authority for a rule. This same passage, however, may point to an interpretive distance between the author of Jubilees and the interpreter of Jubilees in the Damascus Document. The wrath of God is turned up, and the optimism that things are already gradually improving is turned down.

It can be dangerous to speak from generalizations and impressions of sectarian origins and the status of scripture. It can also be dangerous to lose sight of the big picture. However it may best be described and defended, Jubilees is a thoroughly pre-sectarian

claimed, based on the authoritative status of Jubilees within other Qumran texts, that its pseudepigraphy was taken at face value, that is, that its ascription to Moses was accepted just as Second Temple authors generally accepted the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.” Moshe J. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick, and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 9.

¹¹⁰ Werman explains the differences in authority according to the assumed audience. For external propaganda, the authority of the charismatic founder could not be assumed. This assumption seems not to be verified by phenomenology of charismatic movements. The early Christians, for example, seem not have suppressed their opinion of their central figure when recruiting new members.

¹¹¹ James C. VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 5, no. 3 (1998): 396.

¹¹² VanderKam on the citation of Jubilees in CD 16, “That the word *perush* (‘the exact determinations’) is employed is probably also significant: elsewhere it is associated with biblical books. The term translated ‘strictly defined’ is used in the first line of the same column in connection with the Law of Moses.” VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 154.

document. Some span of transmission must separate its composition from its use and copying by the Damascus Document group at the turn of the century. Jubilees could not have been composed as late as the last decade of the century. In my estimation, the same logic prohibits a date in the 120s, and furthermore any time after the establishment of the Teacher of Righteousness as a charismatic leader of a sect. If there are any cases of literature at Qumran that is neither received as authoritative literature at the origin of the community nor composed by the sectarians, those cases do not begin to match the extent to which Jubilees was used and copied at Qumran.

3.3.2. Texts which Jubilees assumes

Jubilees reflects knowledge of a number of traditions which can be found in texts dated to the second century, but with the Enochic literature in particular we find specific references to datable texts. From the description of the writings of Enoch in Jubilees 4 we can be confident that the composition of Jubilees postdates the composition of the Book of the Watchers, some form of an Enochic Astronomical Book, and the Animal Apocalypse.¹¹³ It also seems reasonably likely that Jubilees indicates awareness of the entire Book of Dreams and all or part (introduction, the Apocalypse of Weeks) of the

¹¹³ James C. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 114, 119. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001), 72. Michael A. Knibb, "Which Parts of 1 Enoch Were Known to Jubilees? A Note on the Interpretation of Jubilees 4.16-25," in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum, H. G. M. Williamson, and David J. A. Clines, JSOTSup 373 (London; New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 260.

Epistle.¹¹⁴ Although the evidence of knowledge of the Book of the Watchers and a form of the Astronomical Book is most clear, these points of reference do not help us narrow a date within the second century BCE.¹¹⁵ The Animal Apocalypse is the best case for narrowing a date for the composition of Jubilees after 165 BCE.

Jubilees refers to and reflects parallels with the Animal Apocalypse. While Jubilees 4:18 may fit better with the Apocalypse of Weeks and/or a version of the Astronomical Book, 4:19 refers directly to a dream encompassing the whole of human history.

ወዘከነ : ወዘይከውን : ርእየ : በራእየ : ንዋሙ : ዘከመ : ይከውን : ዲበ :
 ደቂቀ : እንሰ : እመሕያው : በትውልደሙ : እስከ : አመ : ዕለተ : ደይን :
 ኩሎ : ርእየ : ወእኒመረ :: ወጸሐፎ : ስምዐ : ወእንበሮ : ዲበ : ምድር : ላዕለ :
 ኩሎ : ደቂቀ : እንሰ : እመሕያው : ወለትውልደሙ ::

[JCVK] While he slept he saw in a vision what has happened and what will occur—how things will happen for mankind during their history until the day of judgment. He saw everything and understood. He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all mankind and for their history. (Jubilees 4:19)

The specific language of “testimony” may suggest the Apocalypse of Weeks, but the emphasis on the dream fits better with the Animal Apocalypse.¹¹⁶ The Animal

¹¹⁴ The strongest argument for a reflection of the Apocalypse of Weeks or the entire Epistle comes from Jubilees 4:18 (see also 4:19; 7:29 and 10:17), which describes a testimony for mankind concerning the weeks of the jubilees. The use of the term “testimony” is suggestive, but Jubilees 4:18 implies calendrical testimony more than the testimony based on the division of history into weeks found in the Apocalypse of Weeks. Perhaps the “testimony” in 4:19 suggests an additional historical testimony, rather than a reprise of the calendrical testimony. VanderKam and Nickelsburg favor the likelihood that Jubilees refers to at least parts of the Epistle (the testamentary opening [93:1-2] and the Apocalypse of Weeks), while Knibb considers the evidence dubious. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, 114. Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 72. Knibb, “Which Parts of 1 Enoch Were Known to Jubilees? A Note on the Interpretation of Jubilees 4.16-25,” 261.

¹¹⁵ Allusions and parallels to these works appear in Jubilees 4:15-26; 5:1-12; 7:20-39; 8:1-4; and 10:1-17.

¹¹⁶ VanderKam also suggests that “until” would fit better with the Apocalypse of Weeks because it develops less of what happens *after* the judgment. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, 114.

Apocalypse also offers a more detailed assessment of what will happen during human history. Jubilees also parallels the Animal Apocalypse in other passages. Both the Animal Apocalypse (85:3) and Jubilees 4:20 give the name of Enoch's wife as Edna (the last vowel is confirmed by Qumran manuscripts), and place the dream vision before Enoch's marriage. Jubilees 7:22 also parallels the Animal Apocalypse 86:4 in specifying three classes of giants. As the rest of this dissertation will show, it is easy to imagine that the author of Jubilees held the Animal Apocalypse as a prime model of the genre "apocalypse" and the apocalyptic worldview. Even if some of these traditions could have been transmitted independent of the Animal Apocalypse, the cumulative evidence helps secure a date for the composition of Jubilees after the Animal Apocalypse.¹¹⁷ Although a form of the tradition may go back to the third century, the Animal Apocalypse as we have it can be firmly dated to 165-160 BCE.¹¹⁸ For confirmation that Jubilees knows, or at least could have known, a form of the Animal Apocalypse from the 160s BCE we turn to the historical circumstances and events reflected in Jubilees.

¹¹⁷ Ruiten observes that Jubilees does not copy the Book of Dreams word for word, and concludes from this that Jubilees knows the traditions but not the text. The situation is similar with the Book of the Watchers and the Astronomical Book. Yet, the number of non-linguistic parallels, along with the image of Enoch as a writer of books and the literary nature of the works in question, strongly suggest that Jubilees knows, but does not copy, these Enochic texts. J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, "A Literary Dependency of Jubilees on 1 Enoch?," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2005), 90-93.

¹¹⁸ Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 360-361, 398. Patrick A. Tillier, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 78-79.

3.3.3. Historical circumstances and events reflected in the concerns, images and language of Jubilees

A number of issues and images in the Book of Jubilees match with issues and events which can be dated from external sources to the 160s BCE. To be sure, Jubilees stays generally within the setting of the ancient narrative, and only rarely turns to the interpretation of current events. Only in chapter 23 can we significantly rely on the general principle for dating apocalypses, identifying the last event to have actually occurred (chapter 1 offers less specificity). Even here, however, scholars have read different events into the vague allusions. Before turning to Jubilees 23, we will consider the extent to which the concerns with nakedness and circumcision narrow the date of composition, and the extent to which the wars of the patriarchs echo the Maccabean wars. The cumulative consideration of all the evidence suggests a date of composition following 159 BCE, but any one argument remains assailable on its own. The arguments against a date following 159 BCE consist mainly of reminders that one point or another is ambiguous, and assertions that other dates remain possible. Be that as it may, no positive argument or series of probabilities can establish a later date.

The better question is not what decade is the single most likely date for the composition of Jubilees, but how certain we can be with this date. In my opinion it is not the alleged alternative evidence that limits our certainty, but the methodological limitations inherent in the imbalance of sources available to us. There is no doubt that the issues and images in Jubilees parallel issues and images in 1 and 2 Maccabees. But are we seeing puppy dogs in clouds? If we had as detailed sources of the wars of Hyrcanus would we find as many parallels? Is it possible that major events during the

intersacerdotium were capriciously lost to history? This limitation is real and needs to be kept in mind, but is not in itself an argument for another date. Furthermore, several of the arguments below identify when something was most likely to be an issue, not the only time it could have been an issue. Concerns with circumcision, nakedness, and certain hostile neighbors could have been penned at any time in the second century BCE.¹¹⁹ The author could have been reacting to a problem that only later climaxed into a bigger problem. In the other direction, the author could have used a source that reacts to a crisis that died down considerably by the time of the composition of Jubilees itself. These are the limitations of knowledge inherent in the study of antiquity, and are not reasons to abandon the most probable in favor of the merely possible. The limitations do not excuse us from considering the Book of Jubilees within the historical context of the most likely decade of composition.

The Book of Jubilees is concerned with issues that were contested by an assimilationist party within Judaism and the external forces of Antiochus Epiphanes. Chief among these are the prohibition of public nudity and the insistence on infant circumcision.¹²⁰ The first of these issues appears in Jubilees primarily in 3:30-31 and 7:20.

**ወለአዳም ፡ ባሕቲቱ ፡ ወሀቦ ፡ ይክድን ፡ ኃፍረቶ ፡ እምኩሉ ፡ አራዊት ፡
ወእንስሳ ፡፡ በእንተዝ ፡ ተአዘዘ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ጽላት ፡ ላዕለ ፡ ኩሎሙ ፡ እለ ፡
ያእምሩ ፡ ፍትሐ ፡ ሕግ ፡ ይክድኑ ፡ ኃፍረቶሙ ፡ ወኢይትከሠቱ ፡ ከመ ፡
አሕዛብ ፡ ይትከሠቱ ፡፡**

¹¹⁹ As noted by Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 89.

¹²⁰ Further potentially datable issues include the enforcement of eating non-kosher food in 2 Macc 6:7, the commandment of idolatry in 1 Macc 1:47, and the prohibition of sabbath observance in 1 Macc 1:45. The issue of war on the Sabbath in Jubilees 50:12 parallels the issue in 1 Macc 2:31-38.

[JCVK] But of all the animals and cattle he permitted Adam alone to cover his shame. For this reason it has been commanded in the tablets regarding all those who know the judgment of the law that they cover their shame and not uncover themselves as the nations uncover themselves.

(Jubilees 3:30-31)

ወበዕሥራ : ወሰማኒቱ : ኢዮቤልወሳት : አኀዘ : ኖኅ : የአዝዝ : ለውሉደ :
 ውሉዱ : ሥርዓተ : ወትእዛዛተ : ኩሎ : ዘያአምር : ፍትሐ : ወአስምዐ :
 ላዕለ : ውሉዱ : ከመ : ይግበሩ : ጽድቀ : ወከመ : ይክድኑ : ኃፍረተ :
 ሥጋሆሙ : ወከመ : ይባርክዎ : ለዘ : ፈጠሮሙ : ወያክብሩ : አበ : ወእመ :
 ወያፍቅሩ : አሐዱ : አሐዱ : ቢጾ : ወይዕቀቡ : ነፍሶሙ : እምዝሙት :
 ወርኩስ : ወእምኩሉ : ዐመዓ ::

[JCVK] During the twenty-eighth jubilee [1324-72] Noah began to prescribe for his grandsons the ordinances and the commandments—every statute which he knew. He testified to his sons that they should do what is right, cover the shame of their bodies, bless the one who had created them, honor father and mother, love one another, and keep themselves from fornication, uncleanness, and from all injustice. (Jubilees 7:20)

Much could be said about the interpretation in these verses of the source material in Genesis and Leviticus, and the implied legal status of the sons of Adam and Noah who should know but do not know the law. The point that helps with dating Jubilees is that these verses concern not only nakedness, but the nakedness distinctive to the gentiles, which matches the Hellenistic custom of naked athletics and exercise.¹²¹ Again, this could have been an issue at practically any time in the second century, but is known to have been particularly an issue in the disputes culminating in the Maccabean revolt. 1 Macc 1:10-15 dates to 175 BCE the rise of an assimilationist movement that, among other

¹²¹ Kister has argued that the concern in Jubilees with nakedness need not suggest a Hellenistic assimilation movement, but could rather describe the halakhic differences within Judaism that distinguish the Essenes. Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסורים,” 6-7 n.26. The specific emphasis in Jubilees that this kind of nakedness is characteristic of the gentiles, however, strongly suggests the γυμνάσιον rather than scatological halakhic disputes. Yet there may still be a relationship between the early response to the γυμνάσιον and the later, more extreme, prohibition of all forms of nakedness, even privately. It seems plausible that the earlier prohibition may have been taken more and more literally and absolutely, leading to the later legal material. Although we have seen some studies that consider Jubilees as legal interpretation of older material, it seems very possible that Jubilees itself became the basis of legal interpretation, only later producing the specific concerns with nakedness that distinguish the Essenes.

things, built a naked center in Jerusalem according to the custom of the nations (ᾠκοδόμησαν γυμνάσιον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις κατὰ τὰ νόμιμα τῶν ἐθνῶν [1 Macc 10:14, similarly 2 Macc 4:9]).¹²² Although Greek customs such as naked athletics could have been an issue earlier or later, the specific challenge over the issue between major groups in Judaism is only documented under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.¹²³ The issue of nakedness is one among many reasons to believe that Jubilees was written partly as a reaction to the assimilationist movement described in 1 Macc 1.¹²⁴

A similar but slightly more complex situation exists in chapter 15 when Jubilees expands on the circumcision of Abraham. Kister has correctly observed that 15:25-26 would not make sense directed against a Hellenizing assimilationist party that rejected circumcision altogether, as described in 1 Macc 1.¹²⁵

ወዘሕግ : ለኩሉ : ትውልድ : ዘለዓለም : ወአልቦ : ክስብተ : መዋዕል ::
 ወአልቦ : ተዐድዎ : አሐተ : ዕለተ : እምሰማኒ : መዋዕል : እስመ : ሥርዓት :
 ዘለዓለም : ውእቱ : ሥሩዕ : ወጽሑፍ : ውስተ : ጽላተ : ሰማይ ::

[JCVK] This law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days, nor omitting any day of the eight days because it is an eternal ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. (Jubilees 15:25)

¹²² The literal translation of γυμνάσιον into English as gymnasium does not adequately convey the implication in Greek, but not English, of nakedness.

¹²³ Finkelstein perhaps overestimates the extent to which Hellenistic customs involving nudity were purged from Israel by the Maccabean wars, but whatever issues of cultural exchange and assimilation may have continued to occur among individuals and smaller groups, the assimilationist movement described in 1 Macc 1 is unique in the second century. Finkelstein, “Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded),” 20. See also, Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 90. Werman, however, asserts that the anti-Hellenistic polemic in Jubilees is better explained by issues within the court of John Hyrcanus at the end of the century. Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 38-39.

¹²⁴ VanderKam, “Origins and Purposes of Jubilees,” 20-22.

¹²⁵ Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 6-7 n.26.

Verse 26 goes on to threaten that one who is not circumcised on the eighth day will be counted as a gentile, which would hardly concern one who sought to make a covenant with the gentiles and undo all forms of separation (1 Macc 1:11).¹²⁶ It is not essential that we reconstruct the other side of the dispute from the Mishnah, which allows an exception to the eight day count in the event of illness or the Sabbath. From Jubilees alone it certainly stands to reason that the opponent in 15:25 circumcises at the wrong time, but does not reject circumcision on principle. We cannot stop there, however, and assume that because Jubilees is concerned with the halakhic matter of the proper time for circumcision that Jubilees is not also concerned with those who refuse to circumcise at all. If 15:25 addresses those who circumcise on the wrong day (out of laxity or differing legal traditions, perhaps with some interpretation of Exodus 4:25), 15:33a addresses those who circumcise in the wrong way, and 15:33b-34 addresses those who forego circumcision altogether in order to make themselves like the nations.

ወኩሎሙ : ውሉደ : ቤልኣር : የጎድጉ : ውሉደሙ : ዘእንበለ : ክስበት :
 በከመ : ተወልዱ :: ወትከውን : መዓት : ላዕለ : ውሉደ : እስራኤል : ዐባይ :
 እምነበ : እግዚአብሔር : እስመ : ጎደጉ : ኪዳኖ : ወእምቃሉ : ተግኅሡ :
 ወወሐኩ : ወፀረፉ : በከመ : ኢገብሩ : ሥርዓቶ : ለዝ : ትእምርት :: እስመ :
 ገብሩ : ነፍሳቲሆሙ : ከመ : አሕዛብ...

[JCVK] All the people of Belial will leave their sons uncircumcised just as they were born. Then there will be great anger from the Lord against the Israelites because they neglected his covenant, departed from his word, provoked, and blasphemed in that they did not perform the ordinance of this sign. For they have made themselves like the nations...
 (Jubilees 15:33-34)

¹²⁶ Kister is correct to find a polemical amplification here, but it should be noted that the Septuagint and Samaritan versions of Genesis 17:14 also specify “on the eighth day,” as do Genesis 17:12 and Leviticus 12:3 in all recensions.

Thus, Jubilees has more than one concern regarding circumcision, but one of them is a group of Israelites who deliberately avoid circumcision in order to make a covenant with the foreign nations, leading to punishment of all Israel (presumably by an outside force).¹²⁷ Although a general concern with circumcision could be dated to anytime in the second century BCE, the **ⲉⲗⲁⲓ ⲙⲁⲓⲁⲓ** (literally: children of Beliar) parallel in particular the υἱοὶ παράνομοι who undid their circumcisions (1 Macc 1:11, 15).¹²⁸

It is clear enough that Jubilees was composed after 175 and not so late that resentment of the assimilationist party subsided (although that alone does not limit greatly the latest possible date). A further question, going back to Finkelstein and Rowley, is whether Jubilees knows the decrees of Antiochus of 167 BCE.¹²⁹ As we shall see again in more detail when we consider Jubilees 23, I believe that Jubilees does indeed postdate the persecution of Antiochus, but downplays it as the consequence of the internal problem of Jewish infidelity, not the cause of the problem in itself.¹³⁰ In Jubilees

¹²⁷ It may also be tempting to find in Jubilees a condemnation of the “forced” circumcision/conversion of Idumea by John Hyrcanus (*Antiquities* 13.257). Himmelfarb is certainly correct that Jubilees rejects intermarriage and it may even follow that Jubilees rejects conversion to Judaism. However, I do not find any reference to conversion in Jubilees 15. Although circumcision of “one born in your house” is required on the 8th day, Jubilees 15:12 in fact endorses the circumcision of non-descendents of Abraham. Although intermarriage and conversion may have been issues especially so during the time of Hyrcanus, it does not follow that Jubilees could only have been written during this time. Martha Himmelfarb, “Jubilees and Sectarianism,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2005), 131.

¹²⁸ Forms of παράνομος translate בליעל twelve times in the Septuagint.

¹²⁹ Rowley holds that the concern with circumcision in Jubilees requires a date after the decrees of Antiochus in 167 BCE. Finkelstein holds a date between the rise of the assimilationist party in 175 and the events of 167, which included the enforced ban on circumcision. Finkelstein, “Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded),” 23-24. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 90.

¹³⁰ John Collins noted along the same lines, “The crisis perceived in Jubilees, however, is not the political crisis or the persecution, which dominates the book of Daniel. It is rather the crisis of piety, occasioned by the neglect of the solar calendar and disregard for the laws. The crisis is primarily within the Jewish community.” Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 84.

15 we do indeed find persecution by Antiochus, but reduced to, “Then there will be great anger from the Lord against the Israelites” (15:34). The portrayal of Antiochus in Jubilees does differ from that of 1 Maccabees, which places less emphasis on the internal division (1 Macc 1:11-15), and more emphasis on Antiochus as the external aggressor and oppressor against a united Israel (1 Macc 1:43-63, especially 48 and 60). If one accepts uncritically the portrayal of Antiochus in 1 Maccabees (and Daniel), it may indeed seem strange to reduce Antiochus’ decrees of 167 to “punishment from the Lord” in the Deuteronomistic sense. Yet even from 1 Maccabees,¹³¹ and more so from 2 Maccabees¹³² and Josephus,¹³³ one can easily imagine how the author of Jubilees, writing after 159 BCE, could look back on Antiochus as a pawn used by God to punish the infidelity of Israel. Jubilees, in chapter 15 and elsewhere, de-emphasizes Antiochus, but that does not mean Jubilees was unaware of all the events of his reign. The treatment of circumcision in Jubilees 15 suggests (among other things) an internal Jewish movement against circumcision and at least some of the persecution of Antiochus. Although the sources reflect some confusion in the exact chronology, it does seem that the persecution of Antiochus came in installments of worsening deeds and decrees. Based on chapter 15

¹³¹ In addition to 1 Maccabees 1:11-15, the assimilationist movement appears again to compromise the emphasis on Antiochus as instigator in 1 Macc 1:43, 52; 2:16, 23, and 46.

¹³² See especially 2 Maccabees 5:17 and 6:12.

¹³³ Interestingly, Josephus also downplays the culpability of Antiochus and emphasizes the internal division in Israel as root cause (see especially, *War* 1.31). One might argue that Josephus had other reasons for writing his history in his own way, but it is also clear that Josephus has access to sources beyond 1 Maccabees (perhaps even accounts handed down within his own family), and could quite plausibly have read critically the agenda of 1 Maccabees. Louis H. Feldman, “Josephus’ Portrayal of the Hasmoneans Compared with 1 Maccabees,” in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*, ed. Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 41-42. See also, Isaiah Gafni, “Josephus and I Maccabees,” in *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 116-131.

alone, Jubilees might conceivably date after the initial attacks but before the worst. As we shall see from how Jubilees imagines the wars of the patriarchs and from the historical apocalypse of chapter 23, Jubilees could not have been written in 168 BCE.

3.3.4. Wars

Bohn was the first to date Jubilees by synchronizing the wars in Jubilees with the Maccabean wars, and the most thorough attempt to date Jubilees, VanderKam's 1977 *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, builds significantly on parallels in geographic details of battles.¹³⁴ Although the certainty of VanderKam's argument has been questioned from various angles, no more thorough or more persuasive positive argument has been put forward as an alternative explanation for the battle details in Jubilees that cannot be explained from Genesis.¹³⁵ The details of the arguments, and the limits of their reliability, have already been thoroughly documented and do not lend themselves to summary. Three general points will suffice to review the high probability that Jubilees reflects knowledge of the Maccabean battles of 163 and 161 BCE.

¹³⁴ Bohn, "Die Bedeutung des Buches der Jubiläen," 167-184. Bohn was quickly followed by Charles. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 217-246.

¹³⁵ Doran invokes literary theory to argue that, because Jubilees 34-38 has a literary function, it cannot tell us anything about the historical background of the author. Doran does not document what literary theorist holds these to be mutually exclusive. Doran's argument would be a valid corrective to anyone who holds that the purpose of these chapters of Jubilees is exclusively to retell recent history in prophecy after the fact. Robert Doran, "The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub 34-38; 23:14-32 in Narrative Context," *JSJ* 20 (1989): 1-11.

From the other extreme, Mendels might give the impression that Jubilees was written as a manifesto of territorial expansionism. Mendels is correct that Jubilees is concerned with the relationship between Jacob and Esau, but the Pentateuch itself, along with a number of conflicts in the second century, could explain this concern. Mendels, *Land of Israel as a Political Concept*, 74, 87.

First, there were many conflicts in the second century BCE Levant and there are many conflicts in Jubilees. The presence of a conflict alone is not grounds for dating. This is all the more so given the above consideration that the ancient author lacked our perspective on what was *the* conflict between two groups in the century.¹³⁶

Second, the parallels VanderKam has shown between the wars in Jubilees and the battles of the 160s BCE are specific and unique. Mendels reminds us that Jubilees is not an exact retelling of 1 Maccabees, but his criticism of the details of VanderKam's argument is trumped by the lack of details of his own argument. Mendels relies on the objection that it is not fair to compare details of periods for which we do not have equal amounts of data.¹³⁷ Hyrcanus' territorial expansion of 129 BCE¹³⁸ is one good example of

¹³⁶ Finkelstein reads Jubilees 46 to indicate the Seleucid-Ptolemaic conflict under Antiochus III early in the century. Finkelstein, "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded)," 20-21.

Charles finds parallels to historical events throughout the second century, the latest of which suggest Hyrcanus' conquests of Samaria and Edom around 109 BCE, based on statements about Shechem and Esau in Jubilees 30:4-6 and 38:14. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 6.

Charlesworth rejects Charles' claim, and argues that Jubilees must have been written before 109 BCE, reading 38:14 as a reflection of an ongoing problem, not resolved by Hyrcanus. Charlesworth, "The Date of Jubilees and of the Temple Scroll," 194.

Milik reads the same story to suggest a date no earlier than 128-125 BCE. Jozef T. Milik and Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 58 n. 1.

Berger identifies Jubilees 45:6-11 (closing up the gates of Egypt) with the Death of Ptolemy IV in 145 BCE. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 300.

Alexander finds the anti-Canaanite tone of Jubilees 10:30-32 to evidence the territorial expansion of the Hasmonean state. Philip S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, ed. Donald A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge, England: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988), 102-103.

Testuz links the hatred of the Philistines in Jubilees to the attacks of Jonathan and Hyrcanus. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 34.

¹³⁷ Mendels, *Land of Israel as a Political Concept*, 80.

a historical situation that would have inspired reflection on the relationship between Israel and its neighbors, but it is not the only example. The evidence preserved fails to indicate unique parallels between Jubilees and historical events under Hyrcanus. The parallels with the early Maccabean wars may not all be as clear as we would like, but there are specific parallels and no contradictions that rule out the possibility.

The fact that not all the parallels are of equal weight brings us to a final general point. We can reasonably conclude that the author of Jubilees was not trying to give an exact account of recent wars in a more ancient historical setting. Rather, it seems that the influence was closer to sub-conscious. The author of Jubilees, having lived through wars between Israel and its neighbors, imagined that the patriarchs must have had similar conflicts with their neighbors, and that they must have played out over the same key locations. The tendency to project later developments onto ancient eponymous figures already exists in Genesis, so it is hardly surprising that Jubilees expands this tendency. The point is not that Jubilees is centrally concerned with interpreting recent history, the point is that historical context influenced the concerns and images of Jubilees, and that the events of the 160s BCE best explain those concerns and images.

3.3.5. Possible and probable historical allusions in Jubilees 23

Finally we come to the section of Jubilees which offers the most details in the form of the historical apocalypse. In chapter 23 of Jubilees we find the possibilities and difficulties that one often finds in assigning a date to historical apocalypses. On one hand,

¹³⁸ *Antiquities* 13.254-258 tells of Hyrcanus in Transjordan, Samaria, and Idumea after the death of Antiochus VII Sidetes in 129 BCE. Compare Jubilees 34:2-9 and 38:1-14.

Jubilees describes a sequence of historical events, followed by a sequence of non-historical events. To the extent that we can identify the events that actually occurred before the inaccurate or impossible historical claims begin, we can identify the date of composition. On the other hand, the genre calls for vague or symbolic allusions, voiced as ancient predictions (or predestinations) of later events. As the history of religions school, and especially Gunkel, remind us, these views of history are not created from scratch but by reshaping timeless myths with changing circumstances. Even if an image had a historical referent at one stage, it may have persisted only as a vague image in a later version, making it impossible simply to “decode” a historical apocalypse. Thus even a historical apocalypse is as often marked by timelessness as much as timeliness. It would be no efficient task to review and critique every alternative reading of Jubilees 23.¹³⁹ The overall argument does not depend on specific claims about the historical referents in Jubilees 23. Yet Jubilees 23 does help establish a date of composition in the 150s BCE. Further, since the chapter will be important for other parts of the dissertation, it is worth considering in some detail the possible and likely historical allusions behind the chapter.

Our best sources for the time of Antiochus Epiphanes are 1 and 2 Maccabees, but neither should be mistaken for objective history. Not only do they agree in a clearly biased perspective, portraying the faithful Jews united behind Judah Maccabee in resisting foreign tyranny and a handful of traitors, they disagree with each other on a number of accounts. Daniel, the Animal Apocalypse, Josephus and other sources potentially aid historical reconstruction on specific points (such as the fate of the last

¹³⁹ For a creative challenge to the scholarly mainstream, see Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 37-55. Wacholder denies that Jubilees 23 refers to historical events of the second century BCE. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, 244.

Oniads).¹⁴⁰ Caution and efficiency, however, demand that we avoid the disputed details and focus on the broader patterns. Incidental details support the argument only to the extent to which they can be extricated from the bias of the sources. Similarly, Jubilees has its own bias. We cannot assume that the righteous and wicked of one source correspond to the righteous and the wicked of another source, or that there were only two positions or groups on any particular issue. Rather, we begin with the basic pattern in Jubilees 23 and build specificity from there. The basic pattern of the “recent history” verses of Jubilees 23 is as follows: a dispute between Jewish groups over religious authority leads to serious violence in which many Jews are killed; neither group is innocent and the violence fails to establish a legitimate high priesthood; as a result of these events a gentile army invades and causes great destruction; thereafter a (probably non-violent) group studies the law properly, which is credited with initiating an improved situation.

From there we move to the details of Jubilees 23:16-27. Block text from Jubilees 23 is presented in bold. For economy of space and due to the historical rather than literary nature of the parallels, this sub-section will quote texts in English only.

[JCVK] 23:16 During that generation the children will find fault with their fathers and elders because of sin and injustice, because of what they say and the great evils that they commit, and because of their abandoning the covenant which the Lord had made between them and himself so that they should observe and perform all his commands, ordinances, and all his laws without deviating to the left or right.

¹⁴⁰ For more on the historical sources and their problems, see Daniel J. Harrington, *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution* (Wilmington, Delaware: M. Glazier, 1988).. On the particular issue of the last Oniads, perhaps the best of the many discussions of the contradictory evidence is James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests After the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 214-222.

The text does not make clear whether the ones guilty of sin and injustice are the youths, the elders, or both, and we should not be quick to assume that the “children” are righteous in accusing their elders. Although the Animal Apocalypse and the Damascus Document more clearly side with the youths, we should not assume Jubilees is referring to the same conflict or shares the same perspective. In fact, a number of incidents could match with youths accusing elders.

This verse could match with Simon making accusations against the high priest of the elder generation, Onias.

Simon... made false accusation that it was Onias who threatened Heliodorus and instigated the whole miserable affair. (2 Macc 4:1)

In this case, it would seem likely that the author of Jubilees would have shared the view of 2 Maccabees that it was not Onias but the accusers who were guilty of sin and injustice.

Although “abandoning the covenant with the Lord” could be a generic epithet for one whose religious ideas differ from one’s own, the accusation particularly fits the movement described in 2 Macc 4:10-17 and 1 Macc 1:11-15,

¹¹ In those days certain renegades (υἱοὶ παράνομοι) came out from Israel and misled many, saying, “Let us go and make a covenant with the Gentiles around us, for since we separated from them many disasters have come upon us.” ¹² This proposal pleased them, ¹³ and some of the people eagerly went to the king, who authorized them to observe the ordinances of the Gentiles. ¹⁴ So they built a gymnasium in Jerusalem, according to Gentile custom, ¹⁵ and removed the marks of circumcision, and abandoned the holy covenant. They joined with the Gentiles and sold themselves to do evil. (1 Macc 1:11-15)

Yet another possibility could fit with the image of a group of upstart youths revolting against the elder, ruling authority. Although 1 and 2 Maccabees portray Judah Maccabee rising up against foreign persecution and a handful of Jewish traitors, a critical

reading of 1 Maccabees shows that the Maccabean revolt was in no small part an internal dispute. According to this scenario we might imagine that those “guilty of sin and injustice” were Jason and Menelaus, but if we look past the hagiographic bias of 1-2 Maccabees, we have reason to believe that the author of Jubilees had halakhic qualms with Judah Maccabee. From other parts of Jubilees we know that the author would not have approved of Judah fighting on the sabbath (Jubilees 50:12, *contra* 1 Macc 2:40). From the continuation it becomes clear that Jubilees disapproves of *all* of the Jewish groups involved in violence against other Jews.

Jubilees 23:16 may be intentionally multivalent, but among the possible candidates for the accusing youths are the υἱοὶ παράνομοι of 1 Macc 1:11, the party led by Judah, or even the party led by Simon.¹⁴¹

23:17 For all have acted wickedly; every mouth speaks what is sinful. Everything that they do is impure and something detestable; all their ways are (characterized by) contamination, and corruption.

1-2 Maccabees certainly make the case for describing Jason and Menelaus as sinful, but “all” indicates that Jubilees condemns not just one side but the entire civil conflict. Even based on 1 Maccabees it is easy to imagine that quite a few Jews could have found the violent rampages of Mattathias and Judah against other Jews inappropriate (e.g., 1 Macc 2:44).¹⁴²

¹⁴¹ Other scholars: For examples of scholarship that seeks parallels between the accusation here and those in the Animal Apocalypse and Qumran sectarian documents, see Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” esp. 8-9. Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 37-55. Rofé assumes this verse identifies the elders with the sinners and fits a larger pattern of ageism distinctive of the Essenes and Qumran sect. Alexander Rofé, “Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Ruth Clements, John J. Collins, and Gregory E. Sterling, STDJ 51 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 3-4. This dissertation in general is challenging the tendency to flatten the distinctive features of Jubilees into those of contemporary apocalypses and the sectarian documents of Qumran.

¹⁴² Other scholars: Testuz thinks Jubilees approves of the “holy war.” Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 34.

23:18 The earth will indeed be destroyed because of all that they do. There will be no produce from the vine and no oil because what they do (constitutes) complete disobedience. All will be destroyed together—animals, cattle, birds, and all fish of the sea—because of mankind.

If we seek confirmation of such a famine in the historical sources we may find it in the famine of 1 Macc 9:23 (160 BCE), or perhaps 1 Macc 6:54 (c. 162 BCE), which is dubiously attributed by 1 Macc to the sabbatical year.¹⁴³ The first part could be explained as the direct effect of Judah's destructive tour through the land, whereas the natural famine would fit with the broader notion that God punishes the Jewish civil war first with famine and then with chastisement by foreigners.

23:19 One group will struggle with another—the young with the old, the old with the young; the poor with the rich, the lowly with the great; and the needy with the ruler—regarding the law and the covenant. For they have forgotten commandment, covenant, festival, month, sabbath, jubilee, and every verdict.

In light of the next verse it is likely that this verse refers to an overt struggle between two parties rather than general halakhic chaos in the absence of religious authority, although the latter is not out of the question. It is important to note that Jubilees approves of neither party; both have abandoned the commanded calendar. Again the allusion could be general, referring to the entire time of civil strife in Israel. If one looks for more specific allusions at least two possibilities present themselves. On the earlier end, the riot of Lysimachus and the violent encounter between Jason and Menelaus would both count as Jewish groups struggling with each other (2 Macc 5:5-7). We have no particular reason to believe that this struggle was aligned with class, but that may have

¹⁴³ Pastor defends the historical reliability of the account. Jack Pastor, "The Famine in 1 Maccabees: History or Apology?," in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, JSJSup 118 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 31-43.

been, or Jubilees could be using a literary flourish to express widespread civil strife. The other major possibility appears in 161 BCE when the supporters of Alcimus clashed violently with the supporters of Judah Maccabee (1 Macc 7). It does seem that all of the above groups would have used (or have gone on to use) a luni-solar calendar, so the statement that all the sides abandoned the commanded calendar does not limit the historical possibilities.

23:20 They will stand up with swords and warfare in order to bring them back to the way; but they will not be brought back until much blood is shed on the earth by each group.

This verse illustrates Jubilees' assessment of the futility of the civil war. Given the earlier possibility, one could say that Jason (a relatively legitimate high priest) stood up with swords and warfare to bring Jerusalem back to the right way from Menelaus (2 Macc 5:5-7). The continuation fits as well. Although Jason temporarily succeeded in taking Jerusalem and "then slaughtered his fellow citizens without mercy..., he did not gain control of the government" (2 Macc 5:6-7). Similarly, the fighting between the supporters of Alcimus and the supporters of Judah in 161 BCE (1 Macc 7) could be seen as ineffective at anything but slaughter. 1 Maccabees does not portray Alcimus as one who makes any serious claim to bring anyone back to the right way, but some seem to have acknowledged him as a relatively legitimate high priest (1 Macc 7:13-14). Alcimus may have been more successful than Jason at retaining the high priesthood (1 Macc 7:21), but he certainly did not succeed in unifying the Jews.

23:21 Those who escape will not turn from their wickedness to the right way

This verse teases specificity, but in fact several candidates could be accused of escaping and defiling the holy of holies. Menelaus escapes from Jason to the citadel in 2

Macc 5:5, and Jason takes refuge in 2 Macc 5:7. Judah escapes often, particularly from Apollonius (2 Macc 5:24), the conspiracy of Alcimus (1 Macc 7:11), and likewise Nicanor (1 Macc 7:30).

because all of them will elevate themselves for (the purpose of) cheating and through wealth so that one takes everything that belongs to another.

Jason, Menelaus and Alcimus have certainly been accused of elevating themselves to the high priesthood through cheating and bribery. Judah did not refuse the spoils of his campaigns (even if he did indeed give a fraction to charity; 2 Macc 8:28).

They will mention the great name but neither truly nor rightly. They will defile the holy of holies with the impure corruption of their contamination.

“Mentioning the great name” could refer to false oaths (e.g., Alcimus in 1 Macc 7:15), or to presiding illegitimately as high priest, going along with the following sentence. The sources are mixed on whether Judah ever claimed the high priesthood for himself in any explicit way. It seems likely that he did, not just because Josephus says so (*Antiquities* 12.414), but because the accounts in 1-2 Maccabees seem so implausible. He might at least have been accused of defiling the holy of holies even if he made only modest claims as a “proxy” high priest after “purifying” the temple and during those many years when Alcimus was not in Jerusalem or there is no high priest recorded at all. It seems more likely that the consequences of Judah’s tenuous claim were so deleterious as to be written out of the Maccabean account.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ Other scholars: Berger identifies this verse with the Hasmonean high priesthood following 153 BCE. “Bezieht man mit Hengel Jub XXIII 21 auf das Versagen der Makkabäer, so kann sehr wohl die Errichtung des hasmonäischen Hohenpriestertums ab 153 v. Chr. mit im Blick stehen.” Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 300. My translation, “If, with Hengel, Jubilees 23:21 refers to the failure of the Maccabees, then very probably the establishment of the Hasmonean high priesthood starting from 153 BCE can also stand in view.”

Jubilees 30:15 could support an argument that the defilement of the holy of holies pertains not (or not only) to direct contact (such as an illegitimate high priest), but to the consequences of exogamy and impurity throughout the nation. Although there is clearly a connection between Jubilees 23:13, 21-22 and 30:15, the two types of sin need not be mutually exclusive. Most likely the author attributes the disastrous Jewish civil war both to exogamy and impurity among the broad causes, and also to murder and illegitimate ambition to the high priesthood among the more immediate causes.

23:22 There will be a great punishment from the Lord for the actions of that generation. He will deliver them to the sword, judgment, captivity, plundering, and devouring. 23:23 He will arouse against them the sinful nations who will have no mercy or kindness for them and who will show partiality to no one, whether old or young, or anyone at all, because they are evil and strong so that they are more evil than all mankind. They will cause chaos in Israel and sin against Jacob. Much blood will be shed on the earth, and there will be no one who gathers up (corpses) or who buries (them).

Although 1 Maccabees does not portray the Seleucid armies as punishment from the Lord, Jubilees offers here a perfectly Deuteronomistic explanation of persecution by foreign nations as punishment for internal sin. (2 Macc holds that the sin of Israel allowed the temple to be desecrated, but still blames Antiochus.) Two superlative examples of destruction at the hand of foreign armies stand out. Unfortunately 1 and 2 Maccabees leave confusion in the details of the chronology, but it certainly happened that Antiochus attacked Jerusalem and imposed harsh persecution on its inhabitants (probably as a series of incidents; 1 Macc 1:20ff; 2 Macc 5:11; 6:1; see also Daniel 11:25, 29). Later on, in 160 BCE, Bacchides invaded, causing such destruction as to inspire a strong superlative even by the standards of 1 Maccabees,

There had not been such great distress in Israel since the time prophets ceased to appear among the people. (1 Macc 9:27)

Both incidents, as well as the preserved records indicate, would qualify for such a harsh description. Another criterion that fits both possibilities is the “Deuteronomistic” perspective that the invasion results from Jewish sin. Although 1 Maccabees portrays the persecutions by Antiochus as utterly unprovoked, Josephus and 2 Maccabees (in different ways) portray Antiochus as reacting to Jewish civil war and/or conspiracy. As for the later possibility, even 1 Maccabees does not manage to avoid the impression that the invasion is the result of civil strife over competing claims to the high priesthood (1 Macc 7:5).

One detail does, however, suggest the more recent foreign invasion in 160 BCE. Although the image of unburied bodies is not unique, Jubilees here echoes Psalm 79.

שָׁפְכוּ דָמָם | בְּמַיִם סְבִיבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם וְאֵין קוֹבֵר:

They shed their blood like water around Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them. (Psalm 79:1)

On one hand, Psalm 79 could just be a generic way of describing a massacre. On the other hand, I am aware of only one other instance in which the Psalm is applied to a historical event, and that is the massacre of the pietist scribes in 1 Maccabees 7:16-17.

But [Alcimus] arrested sixty of them and killed them in one day, according to the text of Scripture: The flesh of your saints they have strewn, and their blood they have shed round about Jerusalem, and there was no one to bury them. (1 Macc 7:16-17)

The connection between 1 Maccabees 7 and Psalm 79 is further supported by the previous two verses, first in that the Seleucid-backed Alcimus could have been associated with gentile defilement of the sanctuary, and second in that the victims of the massacre are called pietists (חסידים). Making Jerusalem into ruins, besides the general neglect of the sanctuary, was later a particular part of Alcimus’ legacy in that he began to tear down

the wall of the inner court (1 Maccabees 9:54; see below for further reason to believe the composition of Jubilees postdates the death of Alcimus).

מִזְמוֹר לְאַסָּף
אֱלֹהִים בָּאוּ גוֹיִם | בְּנַחֲלָתְךָ טָמְאוּ אֶת־הַיֵּכָל קִדְשְׁךָ שָׁמוּ אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם לְעֵיִים:
נִתְּנוּ אֶת־נַבְלָת עַבְדֶּיךָ מֵאֵכָל לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם בְּשַׁר חֲסִידֶיךָ לְחִיתוֹ-אַרְצָךְ:

A psalm of Asaph
O God, the nations have entered your domain,
defiled your holy temple, and made Jerusalem into ruins.

They have left the bodies of your servants as food for the birds of the sky,
the flesh your pious ones to the beasts of the earth. (Psalm 79:1-2)

It seems plausible that a particular event, whether it was uniquely a massacre or not, came to be identified with Psalm 79 and was described as such in two unrelated documents, Jubilees and 1 Maccabees. If the author of Jubilees identified as a pietist, as has long been held,¹⁴⁵ it seems all the more plausible that such a recent event would have been mentioned. Nothing can be called certain based on so vague an allusion, but if there was a “Psalm 79 massacre,” and the chronology of 1 Maccabees is intact, it can be dated to 160 BCE.

23:24 At that time they will cry out and call and pray to be rescued from the power of the sinful nations, but there will be no one who rescues (them). 23:25 The children’s heads will turn white with gray hair. A child who is three weeks of age will look old like one whose years are 100, and their condition will be destroyed through distress and pain.

The absence of one capable of rescuing might suggest a judgment on the ability of Judah Maccabee to create more security than conflict. If it is a general reference, it would be difficult to date since Judah was frequently on the run himself, achieving vengeance but

¹⁴⁵ VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 251 n. 79.

not protection. If it is a specific reference, then it could match Judah's failure to support the pietist scribes as they were massacred (1 Macc 7:10-16).¹⁴⁶

23:26 In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way. 23:27 The days will begin to become numerous and increase, and mankind as well—generation by generation and day by day until their lifetimes approach 1000 years and to more years than the number of days (had been). ... They will complete and live their entire lifetimes peacefully and joyfully.

The gradual restoration described here fits best with the period of peace starting in 159 BCE, but two other possibilities warrant consideration. First, one might think that the entire idea of any improvement is merely wishful thinking. The significance of the gradual restoration will figure prominently in the chapter on the temporal axis, but we can point out in a preliminary way that the claim here that the restoration has already begun is very historically plausible, unlike the fantastic restorations typical of historical apocalypses. To the extent that the author of Jubilees has students, verse 26 is certainly realized. The promise of things gradually getting better would have been tenable for at least one period (following 159 BCE). Just because the hopes for restoration are typically unrealized in apocalypses does not mean they are unrealized here. In fact, it seems likely that the author is not simply promising an unreal future but taking credit for a real but

¹⁴⁶ In general, we do not have good reason to believe the Book of Daniel as we know it directly influenced the Book of Jubilees. The name Daniel appears in Jubilees 4:20 for Enoch's father-in-law, with no distinctive connection to the Book of Daniel. The name can also be found in Ezekiel and Ugaritic myth. William Foxwell Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1957), 347 n.16. However, two distant echoes may appear here. We will consider later the possible (inverse) parallel between the whitened children here and the whitened *maskilim* of Daniel 11:35 (also 12:10). Unfortunately, a parallel between two vague references is itself little help, but one might find a resemblance between "there will be no one who rescues" here, and the previous verse in Daniel, "they will receive little help." The context of the origin of a pious group fits also. At this point in the discussion, the possibility that Jubilees here refers (ironically) to the origins of a (competing) group known as *maskilim*, can bear no weight for the purposes of dating Jubilees.

reasonably good present. In this view, it was not the multiple calls to arms of the preceding civil wars that brought peace, but non-violent Torah study with the proper teacher. If it is true that the author condemns civil war and promotes non-violent Torah study as the means to bring about salvation, then the second alternative possibility is easily dismissed. According to the second possibility, the beginning of the restoration here is realized in the early victories of the Maccabees. Although Judah's followers might have imagined that a golden age was dawning as a result of their piety through their military campaigns, no military component to "seeking out the laws" is implied in Jubilees. Rather, as the next verse indicates, humans have no role in driving out their enemies (Jubilees 23:30). The gradual and peaceful restoration of longevity in Jubilees simply does not match the tenuous and violent victories of Judah.

Thus we come to what I think *is* the most plausible historical context for the non-violent, gradual return to better days in Jubilees 23. In 159 BCE Alcimus died of natural causes and Bacchides abandoned the occupation (1 Macc 9:56-67). Although we would certainly like to know more about religious and civil authorities in Jerusalem between 159 and 152 BCE, the reports of peace in 1 Maccabees 9:57 and 73 are supported by the likelihood that if dramatic conflict was taking place then something would have been preserved of it. 1 Maccabees 9:58-72 does record a conspiracy against Jonathan in 157 BCE, but it seems not to have led to a widespread conflict. The author's specific claim that lifespan will gradually lengthen was hardly verifiable, but the diminishment of violent deaths would be a promising start. If the author of Jubilees could not have ignored the clash of 157, then a date between 159 and 157 seems likely, although any time between 159 and 152 fits well enough with the evidence. Among the other reasons for believing that the investiture and militarization of Jonathan in 152 BCE (1 Macc 10:21) is not

reflected in Jubilees,¹⁴⁷ we can add that this and the ensuing events would have conflicted with Jubilees' image of non-violent Torah piety gradually spreading through Israel.¹⁴⁸

23:30 [God] will expel his enemies. The righteous ... will see all their punishments and curses on their enemies.

It is very possible that no actual historical connection should be sought for this part of the description of the restoration. However, two historical events might have inspired the notion that this process was beginning. The first possibility would again require us to assume that when God expels God's enemies God is doing so through human armies. Based on this assumption, the expulsion of enemies could refer to any of the victories attributed to Judah Maccabee, particularly the defeats of Nicanor (1 Macc 7:26-50; 2 Macc 8:35; 15:28). However, reading the text carefully but contrary to what one might expect by extrapolating from other texts, Jubilees does not indicate that human armies function as proxies for divine victory. Rather, the bloodless withdrawal of Bacchides in 159 BCE fits uniquely well with the image of invisible forces expelling a gentile tyrant (1 Macc 9:57). This would also fit well with the idea that God imposed the punishment of painful and untimely death on Alcimus, in light of the fact that the central curses and punishments of Jubilees 23 are illness and mortality. Although 1 Maccabees attributed the death of Alcimus and retreat of Bacchides to the impiety of Alcimus, the author of Jubilees could certainly have seized on this event in support of the claim that

¹⁴⁷ VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 249-252. In particular, the author's view of the Jerusalem high priesthood is very favorable except for the interruption in the civil war years (Jubilees 31:13-17; 45:16; 49:21; 23:21). It is not plausible that the author of Jubilees would have appreciated the high priesthood of Jonathan, suggesting that the author's high opinion of the office went unchallenged by the stabilization of the Hasmonean high priesthood.

¹⁴⁸ Other scholars: Testuz makes a similar observation but views the last quarter of the second century as the best candidate for a time of peace and prosperity. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 34.

non-violent piety will bring about the age of restoration. If “the righteous” here correspond at all to the pietist scribes of 1 Macc 7:12-13, Alcimus would certainly be chief among their enemies. The basic pattern of painful but natural death would also fit with the death of Antiochus Epiphanes in 164 BCE (1 Macc 6:16).

In conclusion, it is possible to align the basic structure of civil war, foreign occupation, and signs of restoration to the beginning or end of the 160s BCE. Either possibility fits well enough with the other evidence available. (Even if chapters 34 and 37 were influenced by later events, 23 could have been written earlier by the same author or based on earlier experiences.) The broader argument of this dissertation does not require specificity within more than a few decades. That said, it does seem that the later set of identifications is more likely. The details of the famine and the “Psalm 79 massacre” are suggestive, though not conclusive. The critical retrospective on the Jewish civil war is more persuasive. Although the earlier dating is initially attractive, this initial attraction is superficial. First, the conflict between Judah and Alcimus in 161 BCE may pale, in our perspective, in comparison to the conflict between Jason and Menelaus, but a more recent massacre could have seemed more important to the ancient author. Second, given that most of our sources portray Judah Maccabee positively as fighting primarily against foreign aggression, it may be difficult to read Jubilees as critical of Judah Maccabee and the civil bloodshed in which he participated. If we look past both of these distractions, and look for a time when the claim of a non-violent, gradual restoration could be sustained, then the years following 159 BCE become more attractive.

As if often the case with dating ancient texts, we may not have the clear evidence to cast away all doubt, but there is one best explanation of all the evidence available. A number of points suggest, and all the evidence fits with, the probability that the Book of Jubilees achieved its final form in the 150s BCE. The frustration in finding any one clear indicator of date is offset by the quantity of cumulative indicators from so large a work, the coherence of the composition, and the remarkable precision with which it has been preserved in translation. In a field accustomed to building tenuously on the best indicators available, the historical context of Jubilees is relatively certain. Other possibilities may be worth reconsidering as new evidence becomes available, but in the meantime we can be reasonably confident with reading Jubilees in the historical context of the 150s BCE.

CHAPTER 4

THE VIEW OF REVELATION

The genre “apocalypse” typically authorizes new revelation. Jubilees, however, uses the genre to authorize revelation that is already authoritative. Both of these statements require significant qualification, but a difference holds between new and derivative. The Jewish apocalypses typically resonate with authoritative literature or use it as a springboard, but neither the contents nor the authority derive primarily from the interpretation of received literature. Jubilees exercises great creativity, but fundamentally derives its authority from authoritative materials. Any interpretation needs to be authorized in some way, and perhaps to some degree the importance of received scripture needed to be re-authorized. The use of the genre “apocalypse” to authorize an interpretation closely derived from received scripture, however, goes beyond overkill and beyond atypical. The genre “apocalypse” creates reader expectations that something new is going to be revealed, but Jubilees presents something derivative. The contrast between authorizing new revelation and over-authorizing derivative interpretation, with the appropriate qualifications, occupies the first section of this chapter.

The second section will turn to what is said about revelation. Typically in the apocalypses, revelation is mysterious or coded, and only with recourse to special wisdom or additional revelation can the true meaning, and consequently the true path to

righteousness and divine favor, be understood. In Jubilees, however, revelation is fool-proof. Jubilees does not convey meaning in codes, it does not interpret Genesis as if a code or allegory, and it downplays codes and enigmas in Genesis itself. Wisdom is not an important category in the view of revelation; it is neither a prerequisite for righteousness nor a consequence of the study of revelation. One must study the law, but the meanings are not secret, mysterious, or particularly hidden. Covenantal fidelity, with its requirements and rewards, is publicly revealed to all Israel in the received scriptures, regardless of intelligence.

One might describe the basic observation of the first section as the collision of “apocalypse” and “rewritten bible” in Jubilees.¹ One might describe the basic observation of the second section as the separation of “apocalypse” from “wisdom” in Jubilees. I wish to suggest, however, that these are not superficial variations on the use of the genre “apocalypse,” but the ironic use of the genre to subvert the worldview typically conveyed by the genre at the time of Jubilees. An apocalypse is fundamentally an uncovering and implicitly an uncovering of something new and mysterious. We should recognize irony in the uncovering of narratives and laws that are fundamentally familiar.

4.1. The use and view of received authority

The issue of this section is particularly subtle. Although I argue that Jubilees differs from contemporary apocalypses in that it is primarily authorized by its

¹ For a recent review of the benefits and dangers in the term “rewritten bible,” see Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?,” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-196. Bernstein concludes that, properly used, the category has not outlived its usefulness.

dependence on the received scriptures of Israel, I acknowledge gray areas on both sides of the distinction. Contemporary apocalypses do gain authority in their resonances with received authority. They sound like something God, a wisdom hero, or a prophet would say, even though one could not derive the content of what is said from any prior source. On the other side, Jubilees, like any interpretive work, needed to authorize itself. If we approach Jubilees from the perspective of methods of authorizing interpretations we find a difference of degree, since all interpretations use some such methods.² If we approach Jubilees from the perspective of reader expectations based on the genre apocalypse, however, we find a stark division between new and derived revelation.³ Jubilees falls fundamentally on the “derived” side of the spectrum, and contemporary apocalypses fundamentally on the “new” side.

In the broad strokes the case is clear. Often enough, there is no mistaking the difference between mysteries revealed and public traditions rewritten. In some specific instances—Jubilees at its most creative and the Animal Apocalypse at its most derivative—finer analysis is required. Even here, where the points on the spectrum are closest, a distinction can be made. The difference is not apparent if we only check whether derivative and novel points are present, whether familiar authority and re-contextualization take place, and whether the simple sense is challenged. The difference comes down to the end to which received traditions are used. The Animal Apocalypse

² Hindy Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379.

³ This distinction was suggested by George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion,” in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: an Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck, *JSJSup* 80 (Boston, MA: Brill, 2003; reprint, first published in *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers* 33, edited by Eugene H. Lovering, 715-732. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 276-277.

uses scripture, and inherently interprets scripture, but does not review history to the end of interpreting scripture. The review of history builds to the present moment (Animal Apocalypse 90:6), at which point scriptural interpretation falls away and institutions such as the priesthood and temple are discussed only as being radically reformed. Daniel 9 is another interesting case, but the base text is not so much interpreted as overlaid with a new revelation that supersedes the original revelation.⁴

The fact that Jubilees has clear concerns based on contemporary context does not negate the basic point that Jubilees is primarily engaged in interpreting scripture. The question is not whether Jubilees is “pure” exegesis, but whether scripture ceases to be the concern. Sometimes Jubilees solves problems within a passage, sometimes reconciles two passages, and sometimes reconciles scripture with theological presuppositions, but scripture is always on the table. In Jubilees 23, for example, Jubilees departs from rewriting Genesis-Exodus, but is still reacting to an interpretation of Third Isaiah with an interpretation of Deuteronomy 28, etc., as an explanation of current events. We cannot be sure how much of the Levi material in Jubilees is received, but it is clear that the Genesis account of Levi the patriarch is filled out on the basis of other material about the priests and Levites. In some cases, Jubilees is not interpreting Genesis so much as the other texts that give awkward accounts of the origins of priestly and Levitical privilege.⁵

⁴ It is widely observed that apocalypses resonate with received traditions, but are not primarily interpretations. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” 390-391, 429. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 40.

⁵ The Levi material in Jubilees is complicated because we cannot be sure what traditions were received by Jubilees, but even if we were to assume that most of the expansions were “new” in Jubilees, it would still be creativity toward the end of biblical interpretation. It is not necessarily wrong to read Jubilees’ interest in the Levites and the temple as indicative of social location, but the field of play is still scripture. Jubilees infuses the Genesis accounts of Levi the patriarch with other scriptural accounts of Levites and priests. Jubilees shifts the etiology of the priesthood from Moses (who had a certain conflict of interests) and the fallout of the Golden Calf, to merit and heavenly design long before. Historical-critical

Novelty is a spectrum, not a binary characteristic, and it is not always easy to measure. We should underestimate neither the extent to which apocalypses can be derivative, nor the extent to which Jubilees can be creative. Even at the points where Jubilees and the apocalypses most resemble each other, a line can be drawn. Novelty and derivation can take many forms, but at the threshold, the reader expectation of novelty from an apocalypse is satisfied when the authority of the revelatory framework addresses problems beyond mortal capability. The interpretation of scripture by weaving together received texts and traditions, however, was already familiar in the human domain.

Jubilees raises, but does not meet, the expectation of previously inaccessible contents. The irony comes in the fact that Jubilees claims to be, or at least leads the reader to expect it to be, something other than what it turns out to be. The typical apocalypse claims to be new and is new. It claims to be an independent revelation and it is an independent revelation. Jubilees, however, frames itself as if new but is in fact derived. Jubilees claims to be an independent revelation but could just as easily have been “rewritten scripture” without the genre “apocalypse.”

Before exploring the novelty, and limits of novelty, of the Enochic apocalypses, the Danielic apocalypses, and then Jubilees, we should clarify the difference between using a received authority and embracing its worldview. We must understand “received” broadly, without illusions of canon, dogma, or denomination.⁶ Reception was not all or

scholars have interpreted the problems of the origins of the priests and Levites as a long history of struggle between priestly groups (see chapter 5, note 93). Jubilees has a different solution, but is interpreting the same sources, along with other traditions only partially known to us.

⁶ A critical understanding of reception and authority of scriptures and scriptural traditions in the second century BCE is an ongoing project. See VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature,” 382-402. James C. VanderKam, “Questions of Canon Viewed Through the Dead Sea Scrolls ” in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 91-109. Eugene Ulrich, “The Notion and Definition of Canon,” in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A.

none. There was no list that established one work as fixed and supremely authoritative, and another work as unusable. We cannot assume that Jubilees only acknowledges texts with which it agrees. Jubilees could not deny the fact that Third Isaiah and the Book of the Watchers, for example, were part of the tradition, but Jubilees could re-shape the received tradition according to its own worldview. Although we will find that Jubilees embraces the worldview of Deuteronomy more consistently than that of Third Isaiah or the Book of the Watchers, that has no bearing on defining which traditions were received and bore some familiar authority. For practical reasons, we will focus on Jewish traditions known to us in writing, but this is not to deny that received traditions could also be oral or non-Jewish in origin.⁷

Sanders (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 21-35. Eugene Ulrich, "From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text's Authoritativeness," *DSD* 10, no. 1 (2003): 3-25. Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in *The Bible as Book*, ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (London: British Library, 2002), 5-20. John Barton, "The Significance of a Fixed Canon of the Hebrew Bible," in *Hebrew Bible Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 67-83. The social implications of a claim to higher revelation are largely bracketed in the present work, but are addressed in John J. Collins, "Ethos and Identity in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," in *Ethos und Identität: Einheit und Vielfalt des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, ed. Matthias Konradt and Ulrike Steinert, Studien zu Judentum und Christentum (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2002), 51-65.

⁷ The use and view of "foreign" traditions is too thorny an issue to be profitably discussed in the present work, but it does seem promising—if one could move from modern to ancient perceptions of "foreignness" in literature and wisdom—that the apocalyptic worldview suggests that revealed wisdom can be found among all nations, whereas Jubilees holds that the only legitimate revelation is preserved by the Levites in Jerusalem (Jubilees 45:16, "He gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi so that he could preserve them and renew them for his sons until today.").

For influences on the apocalypses from the broader cultural context see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 36-37. Jonathan Z. Smith, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic," in *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity: Essays in Conversation with Geo Widengren*, ed. Birger Albert Pearson, Series on Formative Contemporary Thinkers 1 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 131-156. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 189. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things," 438. Hans D. Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalyptic," *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969): 138. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*. David Winston Suter, "Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 'Enoch' 6-16," *Henoch* 25, no. 2 (2003): 172.

4.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses

I wish to avoid the exaggeration that the Enochic apocalypses are discontinuous with or in opposition to Jewish traditions including the Mosaic Pentateuch.⁸ In the Enochic apocalypses the genre functions to authorize revelation that echoes with the familiar, but is not derivative of previous revelation. The Enochic apocalypses assume and build on previous Enochic apocalypses, as well as other received traditions, but they do not rewrite or sustain a continuous exposition of received authorities. Simply put, the basic method often labeled “rewritten bible” and described by Alexander as centripetal interpretation,⁹ does not describe the Enochic apocalypses.

4.1.1.1. The use of Enochic traditions

Without dwelling on the complexities of the earliest origins of Enochic traditions, there can be no doubt that by the time of Jubilees a set of traditions about Enoch as a

⁸ The view of Moses and the Torah in *1 Enoch* is still debated. Among works emphasizing a positive connection are E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977). Lars Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5*, CB.NT 12 (Lund: Gleerup, 1979). An oppositional relationship, especially prior to the Maccabean revolt, is developed in Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, trans. William J. Short, JSPSup 20 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990). Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*. Andreas Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte 8 (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000). Andreas Bedenbender, “The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSup 121 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 65-79. Nickelsburg tends to fall on the side of negative views, but is more sensitive to the extent to which the Torah influences *1 Enoch* (see note 13). The idea of an Enochic Pentateuch goes back to G. H. Dix, “The Enochic Pentateuch,” *JTS* 27 (1925-1926): 29-42. The notion was advanced by Milik and Black, *The Books of Enoch*. It was first refuted by Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 51-65.

⁹ Centrifugal expansions “take as their starting-point a single episode of the Bible, or a very short passage, and expand it almost beyond recognition.... Rewritten Bible texts are centripetal: they come back to the Bible again and again.” Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 117.

recipient of revelation was received and could be used to help authorize further revelation. One can rightly question whether editorial hands might be responsible for certain framework passages that situate individual revelations in the life of Enoch. Nevertheless, the Enochic apocalypses near the time of Jubilees inextricably depend on the figure of Enoch and allude to the content of previous apocalypses, even if strict consistency is not required. The idea of Enochic revelation is received and Enochic apocalypses can draw on the authority of the figure of Enoch, but the point here is that the content of each apocalypse brings a new revelation. One can certainly speak of redactors reconciling and summarizing, but the corpus builds by accretion of new revelation much more than interpretation of former revelation.

The growth by accretion can be seen already in the combination of the Shemihazah and Asael strands in the Book of the Watchers.¹⁰ Closer to the time of Jubilees, one can see how the narrative framework of the life of Enoch was put to use by the Apocalypse of Weeks. Whether one counts the beginning as 93:1 or 93:3, the Apocalypse of Weeks draws on the experience and revelation of Enoch in particular, in addition to the appropriated language of “Enoch took up his discourse and said...” (Apocalypse of Weeks 93:1, 3). The basic content of the revelation, particularly as it approaches the time of the audience, resonates with but is not derived from former revelation.

¹⁰ Only in a loose sense could the Book of the Watchers 20-36 be called an interpretive expansion of BW 17-19. Michael A. Knibb, “The Book of Enoch in the Light of the Qumran Wisdom Literature,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 168 (Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003), 210.

The Animal Apocalypse demonstrates the limits of derived authority, but still fits the basic pattern of the genre authorizing non-derived revelation. The Animal Apocalypse 86:1—89:1 builds on the Book of the Watchers, among other sources, in the form of summary, not exposition.¹¹ The Animal Apocalypse goes on to develop ideas implicit in the Book of the Watchers about the nature of evil and the *Urzeit-Endzeit* typology of judgment. The Animal Apocalypse also shares an idea of division of history comparable to the Apocalypse of Weeks, uses the figure of Enoch, and adopts the apocalyptic worldview in general.¹² As much as these resonances and continuities may authorize the Animal Apocalypse, the basic ideas are not derivative. The behavior of the seventy shepherds is consistent with the behavior of angels in the Book of the Watchers, but the explanation of post-exilic history as the commissioning of seventy angels to rule Israel is new (see next for the use of Ezekiel 34). It is not surprising that the historical details of the “present” are not derived from former traditions, but it is striking that the imagined restoration has only thematic similarities with other visions of future restoration. Whereas the Animal Apocalypse uses *early* history as an opportunity to connect with familiar traditions, the details of the restoration do not even attempt consistency with previous apocalypses. This is not to say the genre “apocalypse” is fundamentally opposed to reconciling received revelations of the future, only that a reader at the time of Jubilees would expect an apocalypse to use derived elements as a springboard for thoroughly new revelation.

¹¹ See further, Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 359-360.

¹² Nickelsburg places greater emphasis on the dependence of the Animal Vision on the Apocalypse of Weeks, suggesting that the former may be a “massive elaboration” of the later. The common intellectual foundation is clear enough, but evidence of literary dependence is lacking and it would be difficult to argue that the Animal Apocalypse claims or acknowledges such dependence. *Ibid.*, 360.

4.1.1.2. The use of non-Enochic Jewish traditions

The use, and the limits of use, of received scriptures in the Enochic apocalypses have already been thoroughly analyzed by Nickelsburg and others. We need only review some basic points here, since the present argument does not depend on the more controversial points about the understanding of Mosaic authority. We will give more attention to the Animal Apocalypse, which again demonstrates the greatest extent of derivation from received authority of any contemporary apocalypse, yet still differs substantially from the rewriting found in Jubilees.

Before coming to specific examples we might consider some general assessments.¹³ The extent to which the Enochic apocalypses resonate with and presume received scripture is not lost on Nickelsburg,

Thus *1 Enoch* represents a remarkable *tour de force* in the religion of Israel. The authors speak in the language and forms of accepted authoritative Scripture (Torah and Prophets) with all its resonances. However, the explicit authority of the text lies not in these real sources, but in its claim to direct revelation received long before Moses or the prophets lived and spoke.¹⁴

¹³ Ibid., 57-61. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, ed. Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 333-354. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Some Qumran Fragments," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick, and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 91-107. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?," in *Hesed Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*, ed. Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin, Brown Judaic Studies 320 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 123-132. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom and its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah," in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSup 121 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 81-94. Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*. Lars Hartman, "An Early Example of Jewish Exegesis: *1 Enoch* 10:16—11:2," *Neotestamentica* 17 (1983): 16-27.

¹⁴ Nickelsburg, "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture," 346.

In the same article Nickelsburg goes on to emphasize the novelty of the claims of revelation.

The Enochic authors, however, claim *fresh* revelation. They do not quote the Hebrew Scriptures and interpret or rewrite those Scriptures in their own terms. Instead they cut themselves loose from the received texts and create new ones.¹⁵

Although there are many points where the relationship between a received tradition and its use in an Enochic apocalypse can be disputed, we need to step back to see the basic point that concerns us here. For example, if one turns to pages 338-339 in Nickelsburg's aforementioned seminal article on the subject, the language is consistently on the level of, "scriptural nuances... parallels... biblical vocabulary... reminiscent of... language imitating... shaped by biblical accounts."¹⁶ We need not deny the accuracy or the significance of these allusions; we need only observe that the relationship between Jubilees and its sources is radically more direct.

Although a number of classic examples of allusions dominate the discussion of the relationship between Enochic and Mosaic discourse, most of these allusions, whatever the tone or nature of their use, are not the sustained derivative discussions which Alexander calls centripetal. Thus, the dependence on the oracle form, as in Numbers 22, and the blessing in Deuteronomy 33 (BW 1) do not really demonstrate the limit of derivation from received authorities in apocalypses contemporary to Jubilees. The use of Genesis 5-6 as a springboard is obvious, and Ezekiel 1-2 (BW 14) and Isaiah

¹⁵ Ibid., 348-349. I would emphasize a point that Nickelsburg also mentions, that the revelatory setting well before the time of Moses partially accounts for the lack of explicit citation of Mosaic discourse. The issue here is not the lack of direct citation, but the lack of substantial continuity between the "sources" and the resonances. Nickelsburg, "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture," 342.

¹⁶ Nickelsburg, "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture," 338-339.

65-66¹⁷ cannot go unmentioned. In my opinion the most important case for establishing the limit of the extent to which we can say that apocalypses at the time of Jubilees present non-derivative revelation is the Animal Apocalypse, particularly with respect to Ezekiel 34.

Among the many sources that can be identified behind the Animal Apocalypse, none exerts an influence that is as sustained in theme and imagery as Ezekiel 34. Biblical history from Genesis through Kings is glossed. The dependence on Ezekiel 34 (presumably with some help from Zechariah) is more than a gloss. The themes and imagery may be traditional, but Ezekiel 34 offers a substantial concentration of parallels.¹⁸ The works share the imagery of owner/lord, shepherd (adapted), good sheep, bad sheep, and beasts, and the themes of abuse of authority, dispersion, ingathering, divine judgment, and restoration, including a new individual figure.

The resonances of Ezekiel 34 in the Animal Apocalypse certainly convey a degree of authority, simply in the fact of sounding familiar. However, two factors moderate the extent to which we can say the Animal Apocalypse derives authority from Ezekiel: first, and more superficially, the Animal Apocalypse makes no such claim; second, the Animal Apocalypse makes no effort to solve problems within Ezekiel, nor does it justify or explain the transitions from “text” to “interpretation”. The first point, that the Animal Apocalypse does not claim authority from Ezekiel, goes beyond the fact that the figure of Ezekiel is not referred to by name or allusion. The passage that treats Ezekiel’s time not

¹⁷ See Ibid., 336.

¹⁸ Tiller places more emphasis on the extent to which the imagery and themes are traditional, whereas Nickelsburg places more emphasis on the concentration of parallels with Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 59. Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 391.

only fails to allude to this particular prophet, it seems to suggest that the “normal” pattern of prophets calling the sheep back to the right way has already been displaced by the commissioning of seventy shepherds (Animal Apocalypse 89:59-72). The Animal Apocalypse says nothing to suggest a textual relationship, identify the revelatory settings, or account for the similarities as a common source.¹⁹ It is one thing for modern scholars to recognize the direct or indirect influence of Ezekiel 34, but there is no literary acknowledgement of such a dependence. Resonances may be inherently authorizing, but this resonance is not an explicit or primary source of authority for the Animal Apocalypse.

The second point is more substantial. The Animal Apocalypse may be influenced by Ezekiel 34, and interpret it in a general sense, but it does not solve problems within Ezekiel 34, nor does it solve the problems that would follow from close comparison of the two “revelations”. To extend the metaphor of the “springboard,” the Animal Apocalypse bounces on Ezekiel 34 a few more times than the typical allusion in an apocalypse, but still ends up leaping off in a new direction. It does not so much explicate the subtleties of the base text as overlay it with a new layer of revelation. Thus, the Animal Apocalypse does not take up all the images of Ezekiel 34, such as the polluted water (Ezekiel 34:18-19). It does not justify or explain the innovation that the shepherds are neither Jewish nor human. There is no attempt to derive or reconcile the claim that the shepherds are divinely appointed, and will not be judged until an appointed time. The

¹⁹ Contrast this with Jubilees, which claims a relationship with the “first law” (Jubilees 6:22), identifies the revelatory setting as Sinai and Exodus 24 in particular, and uses the heavenly tablets to assert and explain the unity of all valid revelation.

Animal Apocalypse does not claim to interpret Ezekiel 34, nor does it actually do so in the narrow sense of explicating a text.

Individual aspects of the Animal Apocalypse are derivative, but the purpose and conclusion of the work as a whole wanders in a new direction, far from the interpretation of received authority. The genre “apocalypse” authorizes the claim that a fiery abyss will open up and burn the bones of the current temple leadership (90:26-27), not the claim that David ruled Israel after the death of Saul (89:48).

The Animal Apocalypse represents the limit, not the average, of what we can imagine an informed reader would expect from an apocalypse with respect to derivation of authority and contents of revelation. The Danielic apocalypses (especially Daniel 9) bring us to a further set of considerations, but ultimately do not surpass the Animal Apocalypse on the spectrum from new to derived authority.

4.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses

The use of received authorities in the Danielic apocalypses, as in the previous sub-section on the Enochic apocalypses, can be separated into the use of Danielic traditions and the use of other received traditions. The dominant (but not only) point for this sub-section will be the use of Jeremiah in Daniel 9, which is unique among the early apocalypses in explicitly citing a source.²⁰ In order to understand the use of Jeremiah we must first consider the use in the apocalypses of traditions found in the court tales. The apocalypses develop the idea found in the court tales of multiple stages of revelation.

²⁰ John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 359.

Daniel 9 presents Jeremiah as a stage of revelation that is legitimate but incomplete.

Daniel acknowledges the authority of Jeremiah but does not derive its own authority from Jeremiah. The apocalypse is an independent instance of revelation that relates to but does not derive from a former instance of revelation.

4.1.2.1. The use of Danielic traditions

The Danielic apocalypses build on received traditions about Daniel and so appropriate, to an extent, the authority of the Daniel traditions. We should not underestimate the continuities in the Danielic traditions and the extent to which the apocalypses would have sounded familiar and authoritative. These factors moderate, but do not negate, the point that the predominant authorization is the assertion of revelation in the manner of the genre “apocalypse”. We will take as a point of departure that the court tales in Daniel 3-6 predate and influence the formation of the Danielic apocalypses. Daniel 2 should be treated separately. Since it reflects so many features of the Danielic apocalypses (other than genre), we cannot be as confident where it falls amid the formation of apocalypses around traditions framed as court tales.²¹ We are here concerned only with identifying the continuities, not explaining the mechanisms of continuity.²² Similarly, we are not concerned with explaining the origins of Danielic

²¹ An exhaustive study would also be concerned with the Danielic traditions found outside the 12-chapter redaction.

²² For example, are the apocalypses a linear development of a coherent tradition that also produced the court tales, or should we think of a looser connection? There do seem to be enough continuities that we can at least understand why the writers of the apocalypses would be drawn to develop their works in Danielic terms.

traditions, only the point at which apocalypses begin to make use of a received tradition about a wisdom-hero whose adventures included revealed interpretation. The later Danielic apocalypses (and redactions) also build on the authority of the earlier apocalypses. These continuities should be understood as part of the authorizing strategies of the apocalypses. In general, the continuities contribute a sense of familiarity and consistency. On a deeper level, one of the continuities, the idea of multiple stages of revelation, authorizes the underlying claim that revelation is ongoing and subject to amendment. The Danielic apocalypses not only exhibit but defend the principle of new revelation. Thus it is all the more discordant when a reader finds, in Jubilees, fundamentally derivative revelation in the framework of an apocalypse.

Even if one brackets Daniel 2, Daniel 4 in particular illustrates a significant number of continuities from the received Danielic traditions into the apocalypses. Here one finds an enhanced agency of angels (Daniel 4:10, 14, 32), as well as numerically auspicious chronology (4:22, 26).²³ One can find in Daniel 5:26-28 the idea of a declining sequence of kingdoms, which becomes developed in Daniel 2 and 7, along with imminent doom (if not eschatology proper).²⁴ There are similarities in framework between Daniel 4 and 2, and Daniel 7 has even been called a “midrash” on Daniel 2, but Collins distinguishes influence from derivation, “It is a new vision, and the earlier chapter is only one of many influences on it.”²⁵ Collins also notes “echoes of

²³ It is worth distinguishing prediction and numerical auspiciousness from predestination.

²⁴ The decreasing monetary value of kings behind Daniel 5:25 is elaborated by Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 251.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 323, 173.

terminology” that provide continuity between Daniel 7 and the court tales.²⁶ Daniel 5:18-21 is exceptional in that it recapitulates a former court tale, but a more general narrative continuity appears in several places in the work as we have it.²⁷ These facts should caution us against any simplistic generalizations to the effect that apocalypses present purely new revelation without building on received traditions and gaining some authority from the continuity. Yet, on the spectrum from new to derived revelation and authority, Daniel never approaches the extent to which Jubilees derives the content and authority of revelation from received authorities.

Of all the ways in which the Danielic apocalypses build on Danielic traditions, none is more significant for this chapter than the idea of multiple stages of revelation. Indeed, the second section of this chapter will return to the same basic issue from the perspective of elitism of coded revelation. The idea of multiple stages of revelation can be found in the Danielic court tales and developed further in the apocalypses. To aid clarity upfront, I should mention the external but particularly direct formulation found in Peshar Habakkuk:

God told Habakkuk to write down the things that are going to come upon the last generation, but the fulfillment of the period God did not make known to him. (1Q Peshar Habakkuk 7.1-2)

²⁶ Ibid., 311. For more continuities and discontinuities between Daniel 1-6 and Daniel 7, see Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 294. Ideas such as punishment by burning also reappear (Daniel 3:11; 7:11).

²⁷ For example, Daniel 8:27 assumes the work of the king that Daniel was doing in the court tales. Daniel 8:1 refers explicitly to a former vision, and picks up (however loosely) the imagery of animals and horns. Daniel 9:21 refers to the *angelus interpretes* of a prior vision. Daniel 10:12 evokes Daniel 9 for an angel sent as soon as requested (however adapted). Even though the chronological sequence “resets” with the apocalypses, within each part a chronological sequence is presented.

As we shall soon see, Daniel 9 approaches Jeremiah similarly. Nickelsburg has described this idea as “secondary revelation” or “revealed interpretation”.²⁸ I prefer to speak of multiple stages of revelation, partially in anticipation of outlining three stages without implying secondary or tertiary value in the second and third stages. “Interpretation” strikes me as too loaded a term to describe the relationship between the stages, in as much as it may suggest a human activity of derivation.²⁹

The idea of stages of revelation is already found, in some form, in the court tales. Daniel 2, 4, and 5 all include an initial stage of revelation which is divine in origin, legitimate, and meaningful even if the first stage is not sufficient to access that meaning.³⁰ Daniel 4 and 5 do not perfectly fit the emerging pattern at the second stage in that the interpretation is not (or at least not emphatically) a revelation in its own right. Daniel may appear to interpret the initial revelation from his own wisdom. Yet even here the ancient thinker could easily understand Daniel’s wisdom as revealed in a general sense. The divine nature of Daniel’s wisdom appears in Daniel 4:5, 15; 5:11, 14. The interpretation in Daniel 5:26-28 rings more of the miraculous than earthly wisdom.

²⁸ Nickelsburg, “The Nature and Function of Revelation,” 112.

²⁹ Armin Lange has studied the phenomenon of revealed interpretation in the broader context of the eastern Mediterranean in antiquity. Lange emphasizes continuity in the development of practices of re-interpretation. Armin Lange, “Interpretation als Offenbarung: Zum Verhältnis von Schriftauslegung und Offenbarung in apokalyptischer und nichtapokalyptischer Literatur,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 168 (Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003), 17-33. Be that as it may, the end result is a distinctive development, as interpretation claims independent revelation as authority over connection to the original text. See further, Michael Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, ed. Matthias Henze, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 10-28.

³⁰ One issue that is not discussed in this chapter is the view of the availability of revelation and revealed wisdom to other nations. Whereas Jubilees claims that even the antediluvian revelations of the heavenly tablets are transmitted to and preserved by Israel alone, Daniel claims gentiles have access to preliminary revelation and are able to appreciate its explication.

Daniel 2 emphasizes that the second stage is a divine revelation in its own right. Nebuchadnezzar receives a revelation which turns out to be legitimate, but other than motivating him to find a reliable interpretation, the first stage is not sufficient for conveying meaning. The second stage, the interpretation, is itself revealed in Daniel 2:19. The independence of this revelation hardly establishes a dichotomy between revealed information and revealed wisdom. Daniel's prayer makes clear that God not only answers questions, but gives sages the wisdom to understand hidden things (2:21). Daniel 2 both illustrates a second stage of revelation that is fully independent of human reasoning, and also claims that the divine wisdom Daniel used in chapters 4 and 5 is itself a form of revelation. Although we might be quick to observe the difference between a revealed interpretation that comes in a night vision following a direct request to God, and an interpretation that comes from a wise person "on the spot," Daniel 2 seems to be asserting that they are both revelation. Thus, clearly one—and from an ancient perspective three—of the court tales exhibit two stages of revelation. The initial stage is legitimate but not complete by itself.

We should also consider a third stage. If Nebuchadnezzar receives a first stage "revelation" and Daniel a second stage "revealed interpretation," it still remains the case that Daniel does not always exactly understand even the interpretation. It remains for the audience to fulfill the third stage of understanding the historical meaning of the revelation. For example, Daniel may have understood that the mixing of clay and iron indicates a failed marriage (2:43), but it remains for the third stage to identify specifically the individuals in question.³¹ More explicitly, Daniel does not understand in 12:8 what

³¹ Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 170.

the enlightened will understand later in 12:10. The unsealing of the vision is part of the third stage (Daniel 12:4). It might be a stretch for moderns to think of the third stage as a revelation, rather than a realization, but we should not be too quick to dismiss the extent to which insight could be considered revealed wisdom. The point is neither that all stages are equal, nor that one is necessarily better than the other, but that revelation is spread out over stages and some degree of revelation is active at each stage.³²

The idea of multiple stages of revelation underlies all the Danielic apocalypses to varying extents. The major shift is that Daniel's role becomes less active as the second stage revelation is taken over by an angelic figure. Even when the first and second stages are aspects of the same vision, there remains a striking division of vision and interpretation. The first and second stages are least clearly distinct in Daniel 10-12,³³ but in Daniel 12:8-10 the division between the second and third stage is explicit. Daniel 9 is the most interesting case, however, and brings us to the next point on the use of non-Danielic received authorities. The first stage of revelation is not Danielic at all, but the revelation received in the book of Jeremiah. While one should not push too far the comparison between Nebuchadnezzar's dream and Jeremiah's prophecy, in both cases the second stage of revelation does not explicate the first in mundane terms, but constitutes an independent revelation. The first stage is legitimate but not complete by itself.

³² Consider this among many ways in which the reception of revelation was understood to continue transformed in the second temple period, as discussed by Hindy Najman, *Prophetic Ends: Concepts of the Revelatory in Late Ancient Judaism* (2008), forthcoming.

³³ Perhaps this apocalypse presumes the former visions as stage 1 and presents itself as an elaborate stage 2. Thus in Daniel 10:1 the *דָּבָר נִגְלָה* would be stage 1 and stage 2 would be *בִּינָה לֹא בִּמְרָאָה*.

To conclude this point, the continuities in the Danielic tradition are such that the Danielic apocalypses are not entirely new. They do derive contents and authority from received sources to a non-negligible degree. Yet, these continuities are never so substantial that any Danielic apocalypse can be called derivative or a rewriting of a former apocalypse or court tale. Furthermore, one of the continuities from the court tales to the apocalypses, the principle of multiple stages of revelation, is practically a manifesto for ongoing revelation and the possibility that received revelation can continue to be amended in unexpected ways.

4.1.2.2. The use of non-Danielic Jewish traditions

The Danielic apocalypses in general contain resonances with received traditions not unlike those characteristic of the Enochic apocalypses.³⁴ Daniel 9 is an especially interesting case for the use of received authorities in the early apocalypses. Not only is there a citation of Jeremiah, but the explanation of suffering associated with Deuteronomy is cited, “as written in the law of Moses.” Again, to a certain extent, Daniel derives authority from sounding familiar and continuous with the received traditions of

³⁴ For example, the elevation of the little horn in Daniel 8:10 resonates with the hubris of the day star in Isaiah 14:12-15. The *angelus interpres* already appeared in Zechariah 1-6. The throne and related visions of Daniel 7 and 10-12 resonate with Ezekiel and perhaps the Book of the Watchers chapter 14. Daniel 7 is a classic example of elusive allusions to ancient mythic imagery. For further discussion, see Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1985), 482-495. It is important not to deny the basic level at which the Danielic apocalypses are continuous with received traditions. This continuity does not negate the contrast between the basically derivative authority of Jubilees and the basically novel authority of the Danielic apocalypses. Collins says of Daniel 7 what we may call typical of the early apocalypses, “Whoever composed Daniel 7 was a creative author, not merely a copyist of ancient sources. It should be no surprise that his contribution is a new entity, discontinuous in some respects with all its sources.” Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 281-282. The author of Jubilees is also creative, but much more continuous with the received authorities.

Jeremiah and Deuteronomy. Yet, the apocalypse of Daniel 9 does not derive its own authority directly from these sources. We should avoid the suggestion that Daniel 9 rejects the legitimacy of the revelations to Jeremiah and Moses. Daniel 9 does seem to say, however, that these revelations are not adequate by themselves for properly understanding the situation at the time of the audience. Jeremiah's prophecy needs to be amended with an additional revelation in order to be understood properly. Daniel 9 does not interpret Jeremiah in a derivative sense, but rather claims a second stage of revelation. Similarly, Daniel 9 does not polemicize against the revelation to Moses, but it does suggest that the Deuteronomic explanation of suffering, however adequate it may have been in the past, is not the proper way of understanding the situation at the time of the audience. We will consider the view of the revelation of Jeremiah first, then the portrayal of the Deuteronomic explanation of suffering, before concluding with some general comments about the assertions of authority in the Danielic apocalypses.

According to Daniel 9, the word of the Lord is true but the word of Jeremiah is incomplete. Daniel 9:2 begins with the assumption that the word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah is true,

בְּשֵׁנָה אַחַת לְמַלְכוֹ אֲנִי דָנִיֵּאל בִּינָתִי בְּסִפְרֵי מִסְפָּר הַשָּׁנִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְּבַר־יְהוָה
 אֶל־יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא לְמַלְאוֹת לְחָרְבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה (Daniel 9:2)

Jeremiah as we have it mentions the seventy years in three verses, 25:11, 12; and 29:10.

The first mentions the ruin (חרבה),

וְהָיְתָה כָּל־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לְחָרְבָה לְשָׁמָּה וְעַבְדּוֹ הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל שִׁבְעִים
 שָׁנָה: (Jeremiah 25:11)

The main innovation in Daniel 9 is the “interpretation,” which is really an additional revelation, that seventy years are actually seventy weeks of years (Daniel 9:24). While this is the major explicit amendment, Daniel 9 also exhibits some selective reading of

Jeremiah in the understanding of חרבות ירושלם. Jeremiah 29:10 is apparently ignored or disregarded as a different prophecy of 70 years, since the return to the land is not the fulfillment of the prophecy,

כִּי־כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה כִּי לִפִּי מָלְאֹת לְבַבְךָ שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה אֶפְקֹד אֶתְכֶם וְהִקְמַתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם
אֶת־דִּבְרֵי הַטּוֹב לְהָשִׁיב אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה: (Jeremiah 29:10)

In Daniel 9 the return to the land, the anointed ruler, and the rebuilding are only milestones on the way to true restoration (Daniel 9:24-26). The conflict implied in Jeremiah 25:12, that the prophecy is fulfilled with the fall of Babylon, would probably have been considered resolved by the perspective in Daniel 7:12 that the loss of dominion does not constitute an adequate judgment of Babylon. Whatever may have been thought of Jeremiah 29:10 and considered implicit with regard to Jeremiah 25:12, there remains an important insight that only three words of Jeremiah 25:11 play any role in Daniel 9 (חרבה שבעים שנה), and one of them is trumped by a second revelation.³⁵ The acceptance of authority is tempered not only by the removal from context, ignoring problems suggested by the context of Jeremiah, but also by the fact that Daniel 9 goes against other received “solutions” to the seventy years. Daniel implicitly rejects the adequacy of 2 Chronicles 36:20-22;³⁶ Ezra 1:1; and Zechariah 1:12. The extent to which Daniel 9

³⁵ See Collins on the removal of the phrase from context and use “like a symbol in a dream.” Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 359.

³⁶ Fishbane makes a case for understanding Daniel 9 as an interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36:20-22 in light of Leviticus 26. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 482. It is important to recognize that even the “new” revelations do not come out of nowhere, but rich traditions of interpretation. It remains the case that Daniel 9 rejects the simple sense of Jeremiah 25 and 2 Chronicles 36. Relatively speaking, Daniel 9 authorizes its substantial innovation as a new revelation more than an as interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36. Again, there is much gray area on the spectrum of novelty, but Daniel 9 is less a borderline case than the Animal Apocalypse, and even there a line can be drawn between the apocalypses and Jubilees (see above, page 193).

assumes the veracity of Jeremiah 25:11 should not be mistaken for the canon-conscious interpretation that develops in some circles considerably later.

Daniel 9 transforms seventy years to seventy weeks of years not on the basis of a hook in the text, the context, or other received authority, but by claiming equal status as direct revelation. One could point to differences in the concept of revelation claimed in Jeremiah and the concept of revelation claimed in Daniel 9 (such as angelic mediation), but the revelations to Jeremiah and Daniel share the same basic source. Daniel does not denigrate the authenticity of Jeremiah's revelatory experience, but does suggest that Jeremiah did not receive (or did not record) a complete understanding. Jeremiah's revelation is trumped by a second stage of revelation that is not derivative of former revelation, but derives from the same heavenly source as the initial stage. The revised understanding is presented as an explicit revelation, not the product of Daniel's wisdom (but we should not set up fences between explicit narrative revelation and supplementary revelation that comes by way of revealed wisdom). Daniel 9 is rare among the early apocalypses for explicitly citing former revelation, but it is still a new revelation that does not primarily derive contents and authority from Jeremiah.

Although no particular passage is cited, the explanation of suffering assumed in the prayer of Daniel also comes from received authority, particularly the book of Deuteronomy, כִּאֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה (Daniel 9:11, 13).³⁷ Although there are different ways of explaining the Deuteronomistic prayer in Daniel 9, most scholars agree that it is discordant in the context of the Danielic apocalypses.³⁸ I favor the view that the author

³⁷ See Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 350.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 359-360.

incorporated the prayer with full awareness of the tension between the explanation of suffering associated with Deuteronomy and the explanation revealed by the angel in the rest of the chapter.³⁹ The result is not a denial of the authenticity of Deuteronomy as revelation, but an assertion that a different understanding based on new revelation is necessary to understand the present circumstance.⁴⁰

The primary discord is theological, but there are also narrative cues that a different explanation is being offered. First, no one listens to Daniel or lets him finish. The angel departs not as a result of what Daniel says, but at the beginning (9:23), and interrupts Daniel while he was still speaking (9:21). Not only does the angel not acknowledge the “confession” of Daniel, but proceeds to give a very different explanation.⁴¹ Daniel had assumed that the suffering at hand is a result of the sin of Israel and comes as punishment from God to prompt repentance. The prayer also implies that restoration will come about as a result of repentance and supplication for divine mercy. After interrupting Daniel to break the news that his prayer was not worth listening to, the angel informs him that the time of restoration is determined and does not depend on repentance. Daniel 9:24 is somewhat difficult, but it does seem that the iniquity involved is not merely that of Israel. The suffering of Israel cannot be completely explained as

³⁹ This position is defended by Ibid., 348. Likewise Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2nd Edition)*, 108-109. See also Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt* 238-240.

⁴⁰ As discussed in the chapter on the temporal axis, the apocalyptic worldview understands the present moment as a radical departure (for the worse) from the normal progress of history. Deuteronomy could be perfectly adequate as an explanation of “normal” suffering, but not the present eschatological crisis.

⁴¹ As noted by Collins, “the theology of history in Daniel 9 is very different from the Deuteronomic theology of the prayer. The deliverance promised by the angel is in no sense a response to Daniel’s prayer.” Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 360.

punishment for its own sins; rather, Israel must wait while sinners build up sufficient merit for complete destruction (לְכֹלֵא הַפֶּשַׁע).⁴² This idea is not new (Genesis 15:16), but it does complicate the Deuteronomistic explanation. The sin of Israel and the righteousness of God are not the only parts of the suffering equation; evil is permitted to flourish so that the deferred punishment and reward can be greater (צִדֵּק עַל־מִיּוֹם). None of this denies that the explanation of suffering and the proposed response written in the law of Moses was legitimate revelation.⁴³ It does make clear, however, that the present circumstance is not the “normal” circumstance to which Deuteronomy applies. The eschatological sequence is a special time that demands a new revelation in order to be fully understood.

In conclusion, only in an indirect sense do the Danielic apocalypses derive authority from the received authority of Jeremiah and Deuteronomy. There is a familiarity in the continuity, but what is said about the received authorities is that they are not sufficient authorities for the present. Daniel 9 does not solve interpretive problems in Jeremiah and Deuteronomy. Daniel 9 does not claim to explicate what Jeremiah or Deuteronomy mean internally, but to amend them with additional revelation. The major authority of the Danielic apocalypses is the claim to direct revelation provided by the genre “apocalypse”. The figure of Daniel contributes authority (perhaps because he was already associated with second-stage revelation), as do the descriptions of Daniel’s

⁴² “The traditional Deuteronomic theology, then, which envisages the sin of all Israel, is not adequately nuanced for the situation envisaged in Daniel. Undoubtedly the sins for which atonement must be made include the transgression of Jews who forsake the covenant, but the emphasis is not on the punishment of Israel. Rather the idea is that evil must run its course until the appointed time.” Ibid., 354.

⁴³ Collins makes a point about Daniel 9 that is important to the general argument of this dissertation. In Jubilees, as in Daniel, presenting theological understanding in explicit tension with an alternative understanding does not alone constitute polemic. “There is an implicit rejection of the Deuteronomic theology of history in Daniel 9, although the author does not polemicize against it.” Ibid., 360.

response (especially 10:8-9), and the progress of history (*vaticinia ex eventu*). In several places the apocalypses simply assert their own veracity (8:26; 10:21; 11:2; 12:7; see also 2:45). The Jewish apocalypses at the time of Jubilees certainly have enough continuity with received authorities that we can easily identify them as Jewish, but when we look closely we find that the genre typically authorizes fundamentally new revelation.

4.1.3. Jubilees

In the previous two sub-sections we explored the ways in which the typical apocalypses do derive contents and authority from received traditions, while finding that, on a spectrum from new to derived, they are fundamentally new. In this sub-section we will acknowledge the significant ways in which Jubilees is creative and, like any interpretation, needs to authorize itself. From a broad perspective, however, Jubilees is fundamentally derivative from received authorities. This is true not only in how closely it rewrites Genesis and Exodus, but in the way it brings in other received authorities even when it departs from the base. Jubilees packs scripture with more scripture. The typical apocalypses are not devoid of scriptural interpretation, but neither do they go about solving problems in a received text in a sustained or systematic way. The interpretation is typically implicit while the claim to independent revelation is explicit. It is not merely surprising to proceed from an apocalypse framework to a rewriting of publicly received revelations, it is discordant. By the theory of illocution of genre, and by observation of earlier Jewish apocalypses, a reader expects an apocalypse to present revelation that could not be gathered from reason and public knowledge. Jubilees is certainly creative, but derives its content and authority from received scriptures to a degree unlike any prior

apocalypse. Even in the specific cases where the points on the spectrum approach, a line can be drawn between revelation that could only be authorized as independent revelation, and interpretation that could stand as learned but mortal interpretation. Jubilees manipulates the line in that it claims to be independent revelation, leading the reader to expect contents that could not stand on human authority, but in fact delivers the type of content familiar to anyone steeped in the tradition of interpretation.

The main qualification to this sub-section is the extent to which Jubilees must authorize itself as interpretation. First, we shall consider the lesser degree to which Jubilees re-authorizes its base text, Genesis-Exodus. It has been suggested that Genesis needed to be authorized as revelation since, unlike much of the Pentateuch, it does not claim divine authorship.⁴⁴ Although this is an interesting potential problem that might be solved by framing the patriarchal stories explicitly as revelation, it is not clear that the author of Jubilees had this problem in mind, or that the genre “apocalypse” would have been the most efficient way of addressing it. It seems more likely that by the 150s BCE Genesis was considered an integral part of the law of Moses with the same basis of authority.⁴⁵ Jubilees may gesture towards explaining the authority of the received writings, but the primary flow of authority is from the received writings to Jubilees.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 52.

⁴⁵ Najman emphasizes the extent to which Jubilees gains from the pre-existent authority of the Torah, but also notes that the authority of the Torah is bolstered, “the laws endorsed by Jubilees are shown to have the authority of Mosaic Torah, while the authority of Mosaic Torah is at the same time shown to be rooted in a heavenly tradition ascribed to God and known to select individuals since the beginnings of history.” Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSup 77 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 66.

⁴⁶ “Thus they claimed, for their interpretations of authoritative texts, the already established authority of the texts themselves.” Ibid., 45.

A related, and I think more significant, point is the assertion of the timelessness, not just of Genesis, but of the entire law of Moses. 1 Maccabees 1:11 suggests a roughly contemporary movement in Judaism that understood the laws separating Israel from the nations as a “late” development that could be disregarded in favor of a former unity. To this, Jubilees seems to respond that all the laws (and the separation of Israel in particular, Jubilees 2:19) existed from the beginning of creation.⁴⁷ By this explanation Jubilees is not so much authorizing Genesis or Mosaic law *per se*, but authorizing the interpretation that Mosaic law is not temporally limited—there was not a time before it existed nor will there be a time when it is no longer in effect. Thus we come to the next point, the need for Jubilees to authorize itself as interpretation.

We can be reasonably confident that the audience of Jubilees already accepted the authority of the “first law” written for Moses (Jubilees 6:22), which we can identify as some form of the Pentateuch.⁴⁸ The greater need was the need for Jubilees to authorize itself as the dictation Moses received shortly after receiving the written tablets. Najman has contributed greatly to understanding the authority conferring strategies in Jubilees.⁴⁹ She lists separately three strategies that I would group together as the genre “apocalypse” (heavenly tablets, angelic intermediary, reliable recipient), but describes well the

⁴⁷ VanderKam, “Origins and Purposes of Jubilees,” 18-22. This point was recently elaborated by Segal, leading to an important observation, “The perspectives... can be reduced to one fundamental notion: God established the entire world order from the beginning of time.” Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 323.

⁴⁸ See especially Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 100, 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 Bow, and Rodney Alan Werline (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 268-273. We should not think of the Pentateuch so narrowly as to exclude variant readings or teachings that might not have been considered separable from the text in antiquity.

⁴⁹ Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 379-410. Najman, *Seconding Sinai*. See also Najman, *Prophetic Ends*, forthcoming.

authority conferred by recasting biblical traditions, matching the words and solving the problems of the Torah.⁵⁰ This section is particularly concerned with the overkill noticed by Najman, “it is remarkable that Jubilees should employ four different strategies when it might be supposed that one would have sufficed.”⁵¹ I suggest that this would have been even more striking to the ancient audience, such that it would have been discordant to begin with an apocalypse and continue to hear a rewritten form of publicly received scripture. We should underestimate neither the degree to which any interpretation needs authorization, nor the degree to which Jubilees is a creative and novel interpretation. It is significant, however, that no contemporary text brings together “apocalypse” and “rewritten scripture” to such a degree. The rarity of the literary combination points to a tension at the level of typically implied worldview. The use of the genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees cannot be explained simply as over-enthusiastic authorization of rewritten scripture. The genre brings not only authority, but a set of reader expectations that, when not met, creates discord.

Much work has already been done, and no doubt much remains to be done, to demonstrate the use of received scripture in Jubilees.⁵² Jubilees is creative, but always works with received materials. Many themes and passages could be brought to illustrate both the creativity and derivativeness of Jubilees, but for the present purposes two points

⁵⁰ Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 380.

⁵¹ Ibid.: 389, 401.

⁵² For starters, see J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 66 (Boston: Brill, 2000). Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*. George J. Brooke, “Exegetical Strategies in Jubilees 1-2: New Light from 4QJubilees^a,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum* 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 39-57.

will suffice. First we will consider the use of a feature associated with the apocalypses, the heavenly tablets. Then we will look closer at chapter 23, a salient example of a passage in which Jubilees departs from the base text of Genesis-Exodus, but continues to work with received authority.

4.1.3.1. The heavenly tablets

Fortunately, we need not duplicate the extensive work that has been done on the heavenly tablets in Jubilees and in general.⁵³ A simple but powerful point, for the present purposes, builds directly on the work of García Martínez. García Martínez studies all examples of recourse to heavenly tablets in Jubilees and organizes them into five categories, one of which is “new halakot.”⁵⁴ What is most remarkable here is that *the “new halakot” are not very new*. The tablets reveal the familiar, not the fantastic. To be fair, some of the other categories include some fairly innovative emphases.⁵⁵ There is

⁵³ Florentino García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243-260. Martha Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets: The Claim to Authority of the *Book of Jubilees*,” in *A Multifarious Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*, ed. Benjamin G. Wright, Scholars Press Homage Series; v. 24 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999), 25-29. Cana Werman, “The תעודה and the תעודות Engraved on The Tablets,” *DSD* 9, no. 1 (2002): 75-103. Leora Ravid, “המינוח המיוחד של לוחות השמים,” *Tarbiz* 68, no. 4 (1999): 463-471. Leslie Baynes, “‘My Life is Written Before You’: The Function of the Motif ‘Heavenly Book’ in Judeo-Christian Apocalypses, 200 B.C.E.-200 C.E.” (Dissertation, Univ. of Notre Dame, 2004). Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 389-400. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 151. Shalom M. Paul, “Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life,” in *The Gaster Festschrift*, ed. David Marcus (New York: ANE Society, 1974), 345-353. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 313-316.

⁵⁴ García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” 255-258.

⁵⁵ It would take a monograph by itself to consider completely where the 364-day calendar would fall on the spectrum from new to derived. Without resolving every related issue, it is at least plausible that the author and the author’s audience could have viewed this calendar as a received authority. Possible but debatable sources of this authority could have been: 1) memory of the way things used to be, with the assumption that they had always been that way; 2) an interpretation of the Astronomical Book of Enoch;

also a certain need to authorize a decision of which of the received traditions should be emphasized. Still, a brief consideration of the six most novel uses of the heavenly tablets will illustrate that Jubilees derives its authority from received traditions even when it uses a formal feature that cues a contrary reader expectation.

The first “new” legislation is the prohibition of public nudity in Jubilees 3:31. While it may be true that the received codes did not exactly anticipate the Hellenistic gymnasium, two considerations limit the novelty of the prohibition. First, Jubilees ties the prohibition to Genesis 3:21, where God causes Adam and Eve to wear clothes (וַיִּלְבָּשֵׁם). The conclusion that God wants all humans to wear clothes is closely derivative. The second consideration is more complex, but inevitable. Written traditions are significant, but not the only form of received tradition.⁵⁶ Using logic related to the logic associated with “natural law,” a Jewish writer could easily conclude that there is a cosmic reason for the way things have always been done by every (Semitic) society. The prohibition of nakedness is one of the laws taught by Noah in Jubilees 7:20, suggesting that this

and 3) an interpretation of some festival passages that seem to suggest that they always fall on the same day of the week, combined perhaps with an assumption that the day of atonement cannot conflict with the sabbath, or simply a worldview of a balanced and symmetric universe. Furthermore, Himmelfarb observes that in most of the passages García Martínez classifies as “calendar and feasts”, the innovation was the claim that the patriarchs observed the festival calendar, not the festival calendar itself. Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets,” 26. Put in a different way, Jubilees must authorize the claim that the traditional way of doing things has the same authority as the law and covenant set down in the Pentateuch. In this case, the traditional festival calendar is as fixed a part of Israel’s covenant as the other issues fought over under Seleucid rule. Jubilees does *not* authorize the 364 calendar as an innovation. For more on the authority of non-written tradition, see Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 1-18.. For more on the identification of festival calendar with other non-negotiable covenant requirements, see Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 301-303..

⁵⁶ A later articulation of this issue can be found in Josephus, *Antiquities* 13.297, where the Pharisees, unlike the Sadducees, are said to accept regulations handed down but not written. See also Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 1-18.

prohibition was revealed to and incumbent upon all nations, even if Noah's books were only passed on to Shem.⁵⁷

The second "new" law attributed to the heavenly tablets states that a murderer is to be punished by the means with which he murdered (Jubilees 4:32). The idea here is closely related to the *lex talionis* (Leviticus 24:19-20). It is possible that Jubilees is implicitly disputing a tendency to "soften" the *lex talionis* with monetary substitution, as found later in Rabbinic law.⁵⁸ The explicit concern, however, is not whether Cain *should have been* punished, but whether he *was* punished. Genesis does not report the death of Cain, but Jubilees asserts that Leviticus 24 was applied to Cain supernaturally. The law is derivative of Leviticus 24 and the narrative is derivative of the theological principle that God enforces justice.

The third law listed as "new" by García Martínez is the requirement of circumcision on the eighth day. Again, later evidence indicates differences of opinion about whether the day could be delayed, but even if there is a halakhic dispute behind the emphasis on "no circumcising of days," the law itself is directly derivative. Genesis 17:14 mentions the eighth day in the LXX and Samaritan recensions, as do Genesis 17:12 and Leviticus 12:3 in all recensions.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ The relationship between the laws of Noah in Jubilees and the Rabbinic Noahide laws was studied by Finkelstein and Albeck. The relationship may not be direct, but Jubilees does have a concept that some laws are revealed to and incumbent upon all humanity, while others are revealed only to Israel. Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, 34-59. Louis Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," *HTR* 16, no. 1 (1923): 59-61. Louis Finkelstein, "Some Examples of the Maccabean Halaka," *JBL* 49, no. 1 (1930): 21-25. Finkelstein, "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded)," 19 n. 128.

⁵⁸ García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," 255.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 256.

The fourth example is more interesting. According to Jubilees 28:6 the custom cited by Laban of giving the elder daughter before the younger daughter is in fact a law on the heavenly tablets. Of course we cannot completely ignore the possibility that the author's own conscience suggested that this *should* be a law, but the logic is simply the converse of a basic principle in Jubilees. If the patriarchs practiced the laws then the practices of the patriarchs must be law. The word of Laban is probably less the authority than the assent of Jacob. The prohibition of marrying two sisters in Leviticus 18:18 seems to be in the background, although Jubilees does not explain how the law cited by Laban trumps Leviticus 18:18. The issue warrants further study, but for the present purposes it is clear that the law is derivative even though it interprets a custom as a law.

The fifth example, Jubilees 30:9, demands capital punishment for exogamy. Certainly Jubilees is novel in the emphasis on the issue, but the issue is not new (Ezra 9-10; Nehemiah 13:27) and the punishment is probably derived from the interpretation of giving a child to Moloch as exogamy (Leviticus 18:21; 20:2-5). This is not as tendentious an interpretation as it may first appear, since the context in Leviticus 18 concerns sexual relationships and Leviticus 20:5 uses the verb זנה. Any image of Moloch as a demon would only reinforce the interpretation as a prohibition of exogamy, due to the association of gentiles with demons.⁶⁰ Leviticus 21:9 also calls for capital punishment for the daughter of a priest that commits זנות. Again, for Jubilees, narrative example is an

⁶⁰ Cf. Jubilees 1:11. See the chapter on the spatial axis. See also, James C. VanderKam, "The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*," in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* ed. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Diethard Römheld (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 339-364. Todd R. Hanneken, "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apocalypses," *Henoch* 28, no. 2 (2006): 11-25. Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Angels, Demons, and the Dangerous Ones in Between: Reflections on Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in *Jubilees*," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

authority right along with explicit legal formulae. The context here is explicitly Levi's slaughter of Shechem, and Phinehas' violent zeal against intermarriage is present in all but name. The divine approval of the latter in particular (Numbers 25:11-13) leads easily to the conclusion that exogamy is to be punished by death. This is another example of tendentious interpretation and emphasis, but the law is very much derivative of familiar authorities.

The sixth and final example is the law of tithes, including a second tithe, in Jubilees 32:10-15. This is not the place to resolve all the issues related to tithing laws in ancient Judaism.⁶¹ Suffice it to say that, whether the author of Jubilees received or developed the solution, the problem was certainly received. Jubilees differs from the rabbinic solution,⁶² but any solution short of source criticism is likely to conclude that at least two distinct tithes must be taking place. Among the "contradictions" are whether the tithe is given to a priest or a Levite (Deuteronomy 26:3-4; Numbers 18:21) and similarly whether it is "holy to the Lord" or can be eaten by resident aliens, orphans, and widows (Leviticus 27:30; Deuteronomy 14:29). The second tithe is most directly related to the *מַעֲשֵׂר מִן־הַמַּעֲשֵׂר* "tithe of the tithe" (Number 18:26). To be sure, the heavenly tablets authorize one solution to the exclusion of others. Even with this qualification, however, it is significant that Jubilees works with the materials of received authority, as creative as it may be in doing so.⁶³ Any good solution to problems and ambiguities in received

⁶¹ García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," 258. Finkelstein, "Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," 52-53. Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, 30-32.

⁶² Finkelstein, "Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," 52.

⁶³ García Martínez comments, "It is interesting here that the appropriate halakah on tithes is legitimated through recourse to the H[eavenly] T[ablets], which justify the exegesis that has been made upon a biblical basis." García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," 258.

authority derives a certain authority. Recourse to a higher authority by way of the genre “apocalypse” raises the possibility of conspicuous overkill.

Although these six examples exhaust the category García Martínez calls “new halakot,” there are other examples that are somewhat new.⁶⁴ The examples above give a fair, though not exhaustive, sample of the use of the “heavenly tablets” authority in Jubilees. These are not just random examples of not-so-novel interpretations in Jubilees. Although the heavenly tablets are neither fundamental to all the apocalypses nor limited to apocalypses, heavenly tablets are one manifestation of the pattern in apocalypses of asserting direct recourse to heavenly authority.⁶⁵ It would be one thing if Jubilees simply used both authorizing mechanisms in different places. The literary discord comes in the fact that Jubilees frames derivative interpretation as an apocalypse, not only in the general framework of the book, but in specific passages with reference to the heavenly tablets.

A few examples will help illustrate the typical association of “heavenly tablets.” As much as the contents vary, there is never a case, besides Jubilees, when information is asserted to come from the heavenly tablets when it could just as easily have been derived from a known earthly authority. Even when the information is not described as a “secret” or “mystery,” it is novel and otherwise unavailable. In the Epistle of Enoch 103:1-2 the heavenly tablets are the source of knowledge of a “mystery” concerning future events. The Apocalypse of Weeks is likewise introduced with the heavenly tablets as the source

⁶⁴ See note 55 above.

⁶⁵ The “master paradigm” of *Semeia* 14 (1.4) lists “a written document, usually a heavenly book.” Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 6. Baynes attributes greater significance to the heavenly tablets as a constituent element that, among others, determines the genre “apocalypse.” Baynes, “My Life is Written Before You”, 166.

(93:2).⁶⁶ While verses 3-8 could be considered derivative, these verses are mere background for 9-17.⁶⁷ One can speak of traditional motifs and allusions, but on the scale of new and derived, the main part of the Apocalypse of Weeks is thoroughly new. In other sources, especially earlier sources, and sometimes in Jubilees, the tablets are not so much a source of revelation as a record of deeds to be used for assigning reward and punishment.⁶⁸ Still, it is safe to say that the ideas of mysterious revelation available only in heaven, and heavenly tablets in particular, were associated with the apocalypses.⁶⁹

4.1.3.2. Departures from Genesis and Exodus

As indicated by the foregoing, Jubilees persistently weaves other received authorities into its retelling of Genesis-Exodus. Although the vast majority of Jubilees follows Genesis 1 through Exodus 24, there are some noteworthy excurses. Significantly, however, even when Jubilees departs from the narrative of Genesis-Exodus, it works with received authorities. Rather than defining and surveying all the excurses, we will focus

⁶⁶ There may be room to doubt that the introduction was written at the same time as the apocalypse, but the correlation between 93:2 and 93:10 makes clear that it is meant as an introduction to the Apocalypse of Weeks, and not the entire Epistle of Enoch.

⁶⁷ Indeed, the subject of the vision, as posted in the introduction, is not introduced until verse 10, “concerning the sons of righteousness, and concerning the chosen of eternity, and concerning the plant of truth” (93:2).

⁶⁸ For example, the Astronomical Book 81:1-2; Daniel 12:1. García Martínez counts two such uses in Jubilees (19:9; 30:19-22), but also discusses the ambiguity and possible overlap with the six passages he classifies “the Book of Destiny.” García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” 246-250.

⁶⁹ For more on the ancient question of whether revealed wisdom was readily available on earth or required some sort of heavenly journey see Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 92-94.

on one salient example.⁷⁰ Jubilees 23 is of vital interest because it concentrates use of the genre “apocalypse” of the historical type. Jubilees 23 departs from the flow of the narrative in Genesis but continues to depend on received authorities. The chapter begins with the record of the longevity of Abraham in Genesis, and then molds Psalm 90, Isaiah 65, and the covenant curses (Deuteronomy 28 especially, also Leviticus 26) into a historical apocalypse. James Kugel has shown how the use of Psalm 90 is even greater than previously thought.⁷¹ The use of Third Isaiah and especially Isaiah 65 is rather clear, and is especially interesting for our purposes because it demonstrates how a text can be received and used as part of the tradition even if a basic tension exists at the level of worldview. Even if some texts are used more (or in more ways) than others, the concept of received traditions must be understood broadly. There was no such thing as a canon that defined which works were supremely authoritative and which could not be used at all. The dependence on the covenant curses has also been long recognized, although it is striking that the thematic parallels do not mimic the exact wording. These three areas do not exhaust the use of received authorities in Jubilees 23, much less the book as a whole, but they do give a good sample of the flexibility and persistence with which Jubilees uses various traditions. Jubilees is almost always creative, but almost always has some familiar, received authority at the core.

Psalm 90 in Jubilees 23. The relationship between Psalm 90 and Jubilees 23 is not a mere case of thematic or linguistic parallel. Verse after verse influences Jubilees 23

⁷⁰ For further examples and discussion see, Brooke, “Exegetical Strategies in Jubilees 1-2,” 39-57. Brooke rightly emphasizes the integration of Deuteronomy and the prophetic texts, among others, into Genesis-Exodus to create a portrait of overall consistency.

⁷¹ Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse,” 322-337.

on point after point. Kugel is careful to be clear that Jubilees 23 weaves in Psalm 90 but does not simply reword it. The effect is to derive authority from the received psalm for an interpretation that ultimately goes back to Genesis 25:7 (the lifespan of Abraham), “By weaving these other themes in with a few obvious references to Psalm 90, the author of Jubilees could provide the whole chapter with a certain legitimacy.”⁷² Although the dependence on Psalm 90 does not compare to the overall dependence on Genesis-Exodus, the continuity of use of verse after verse distinguishes even this excursus in Jubilees from the tangential allusions typical of the apocalypses.

Psalm 90 itself can be understood as an interpretation of the problem of longevity, such that the first parallel is natural, and might not even be counted as a dependence if not for the continuation.

כִּי אֵלֶיךָ שָׁנִים בְּעֵינֶיךָ כִּיּוֹם אֶתְמוּל כִּי יַעֲבֹר וְאַשְׁמוּרָה בַּלַּיְלָה:

For a thousand years in your eyes are like yesterday gone by,
or a watch in the night. (Psalm 90:4)

Jubilees had already made this familiar interpretation with respect to the death of Adam, “He lacked 70 years from 1000 years because 1000 years are one day in the testimony of heaven” (Jubilees 4:30). The decline of lifespan from a day to a portion of a day (אַשְׁמוּרָה), or a millennium to a portion thereof, is taken up in Jubilees, “For the times of the ancients were 19 jubilees for their lifetimes. After the flood they started to decrease from 19 jubilees...” (Jubilees 23:9). The image of grass withering and drying in the twilight of life, לְעֶרֶב יְמוּלֵל וַיָּבֶשׁ (Psalm 90:6), flows into Jubilees 23:9, 10. Verse 7, as so often in the Psalms, sounds vague at first, but actually fuels a specific point in Jubilees

⁷² Ibid.: 336.

that suffering comes as punishment from God, not an independent force of evil (Jubilees 23:22-23),

כִּי־כָלֵינוּ בְּאַפֶּךָ וּבַחֲמַתְךָ נִבְהָלֵנוּ:

For we are consumed in your anger, terrorized by your wrath.
(Psalm 90:7)

The most direct parallel comes from Psalm 90:10,

יְמֵי־שְׁנוֹתֵינוּ בָּהֶם שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה וְאִם בְּגִבּוֹרֹת | שְׁמוֹנִים שָׁנָה
וְרַחֲבָם עֲמַל וְאֹן כִּי־גַז חַיִּשׁ וְנִעְפָּה:

The days of our years are within seventy, or eighty at best,
but still a rush of stress and affliction, as it passes quickly and is gone.
(Psalm 90:10)

Together with Isaiah 65 (below), this forms Jubilees 23:15,

[JCVK] Then it will be said: ‘The days of the ancients were numerous—as many as 1000 years—and good. But now the days of our lives, if a man has lived for a long time, are 70 years, and, if he is strong, 80 years’. All are evil and there is no peace during the days of that evil generation.
(Jubilees 23:15)

Even more significantly, Psalm 90 provides support for the idea of calendrical rectitude as key to repentance and restoration,

לְמִנּוֹת יְמֵינוּ בֵּן הַדָּע וְנִבְא לִבֵּב חֲכָמָה:

Teach us to count our days properly, that we may come to a wise heart.
(Psalm 90:12)

As we shall see in the next section, Jubilees avoids any suggestion that one needs to be a sage to keep the calendrical and other commandments, but the idea that improper counting of days is part of the problem goes into Jubilees 23:19, and the idea that studying the laws properly brings restoration forms Jubilees 23:26. As one might expect,

restoration of length and quality of life are found both in Psalm 90:14 and Jubilees 23:27-

29. Kugel also shows how Psalm 90:15 is understood in Jubilees 23:27.⁷³

שְׂמַחֵנוּ בְּיָמֹת עֲנִיתָנוּ שָׁנֹת רָאִינוּ רָעָה:

Gladden us (by giving back) the days you took away, the years we saw suffering. (Psalm 90:15)

In Jubilees 23:27 lifespan will be restored to 1000 years and, literally, “to many more years than many days,” or as VanderKam provides, “to more years than the number of days (had been).”

On one hand, Jubilees avoids verbal recycling. On the other hand, Psalm 90 finds more than a passing tangential allusion in Jubilees 23. The Psalm is not the sole foundation of the chapter, but several points in the Psalm appear at several points throughout Jubilees 23. Moreover, most of the parallels had not been noted before Kugel’s 1994 article, causing one to wonder how many other passages in Jubilees are infused with the authority of familiarity just below the horizon of modern scholarship. The closer one looks, the more it becomes apparent that Jubilees packs scripture with more scripture.

Third Isaiah in Jubilees 23. Isaiah 65 is a more complicated situation. Although Third Isaiah does not consistently fall on one side of the differences in worldview between Jubilees and the typical apocalypses, we shall encounter a good number of cases where Jubilees seems to disagree with Third Isaiah.⁷⁴ It is important to distinguish reference to received scriptures from endorsement of the worldview most apparently

⁷³ Ibid.: 334.

⁷⁴ This is hardly surprising, as the relationship between Third Isaiah and the apocalypses has long been recognized. See especially, Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*.

implied. Indeed, as a body of authoritative writings began to take shape out of heterogeneous components, it was inevitable that for any one thinker a preferred worldview would dominate and inform the reading of other texts. Writings were not approached with a “love it or burn it” mentality, and authority could be accepted at different levels and degrees. Thus, it should not surprise us if Jubilees uses Third Isaiah as an authority and takes up the issues while offering interpretations that seem to go against the plain sense. Although a certain degree of looseness with sources, as just seen with Psalm 90, is expected, we will observe some subtle ways in which Jubilees inverts Isaiah 65. Jubilees 23 more than alludes to Isaiah 65, but that does not mean the message is imported without revision.

Third Isaiah in general makes a number of “appearances” in Jubilees and chapter 23 in particular, but Isaiah 65-66 most intersects with the restoration account in Jubilees 23:28-31.⁷⁵ The first example is something of a variation in that the description of the restoration in Isaiah is adapted to describe the decline of history in Jubilees.

לֹא־יִהְיֶה מִשָּׁם עוֹד עוֹלָם יָמִים וְזָמָן
 אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֹא אֶת־יָמָיו
 כִּי הַנָּעַר בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יָמוּת
 וְהַחוּטָּא בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יִקָּלֵל:

There will no longer be an infant or an elder
 Who does not fill out its days.
 One who dies at a hundred years old will be considered a youth,
 And one who falls short of one hundred will be considered cursed.
 (Isaiah 65:20)

⁷⁵ Nickelsburg and Endres have discussed the parallels between Third Isaiah and Jubilees 23. Nickelsburg argues that the cry in Jubilees 23:24-25 relates to Isaiah 63:15—64:1, whereas Endres prefers to describe a more general influence of Third Isaiah. The examples considered here may not be exhaustive, but are the most direct parallels (and some of them are not as direct as one might like). George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, vol. 26, Harvard Theological Studies (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 21-22. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, 58 (1982 86).

This verse influences two verses in Jubilees, the second of which was already mentioned in connection with Psalm 90:10.

[JCVK] At that time, if a man lives a jubilee and one-half of years, it will be said about him: ‘He has lived for a long time’. But the greater part of his time will be (characterized by) difficulties, toil, and distress without peace. (Jubilees 23:12)

[JCVK] Then it will be said: ‘The days of the ancients were numerous—as many as 1000 years—and good. But now the days of our lives, if a man has lived for a long time, are 70 years, and, if he is strong, 80 years’. All are evil and there is no peace during the days of that evil generation. (Jubilees 23:15)

In Chapter 6, on the temporal axis, we will consider the significance of the fact that Jubilees pieces together sources to establish an emphatically gradual decline, and how anything gradual contrasts with the typical view of history in the apocalypses. Here the main point is that Jubilees works with the material of Third Isaiah, which can safely be counted as received authority. A lesser point may also fit a pattern. Notice that Jubilees inverts the analogy—rather than one being reckoned accursed in the restoration, one is reckoned blessed in the decline.

Another fairly clear parallel, with another twist, is found in Jubilees 23:28. Here I include the Ethiopic and the translations of VanderKam and Charles (1902), and again the pertinent words from Isaiah 65:20.

ወአልቦ ልሂቀ ፡
ወአልቦ ስይጸግብ ፡ መዋዕለ ፡
እስመ ፡ ኩሎሙ ፡ ሕፃናተ ፡ ወደቂቀ ፡ ይከውኑ

[JCVK] There will be no old man,
nor anyone who has lived out his lifetime,
because all of them will be infants and children.

[RHC] And there will be no old man
Nor one who is [not] satisfied with his days,
For all will be (as) children and youths. (Jubilees 23:28)

לֹא־יִהְיֶה מָשָׁם עוֹד יָמִים וְזָמָן
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֹא אֶת־יָמָיו
(Isaiah 65:20) כִּי הִנֵּנִי ...

Line breaks are added to VanderKam's texts to aid comparison, and brackets are added to indicate Charles' emendation, which he mentions only in a footnote, "I have added the negative form from a comparison of Is. lxv. 20." VanderKam's translation is certainly acceptable, and probably goes back to שבע ימים, as he suggests.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, Charles is right to notice a parallel and right to notice a discord. Scholars, apparently including Charles himself in 1917, rejected the option of adding a "not" to make the text say what one would like it to say.⁷⁷ Without emending, the discord presumably goes back to the original work; the original audience, like Charles, might have expected the exact opposite. The net meaning is not very different, but it might seem that Jubilees is going out of its way to "mess with" or at least "correct" Third Isaiah. More explicably, Jubilees makes simpler sense of "infant" by moving it to an example of what there will be, not what there will not be. At any rate, it is at least clear that Jubilees is building from familiar authoritative texts. I would not push the suggestion that Jubilees is distorting Third Isaiah more than usual, since Jubilees' baseline for loose re-working of language is fairly high.

Nickelsburg also brings some looser parallels.⁷⁸

זֶאֱבֹ וְטֹלָה יָרְעוּ כְּאַחַד וְאַרְיֵה בְּבִקְרָא יֹאכְלֵתֶבֶן
וְנִחַשׁ עֶפְרָ לַחֲמוֹ לֹא־יָרְעוּ וְלֹא־יִשְׁחִיתוּ בְּכָל־הָרָקָדָשִׁי אָמַר יְהוָה:

⁷⁶ The phrase appears in Genesis 35:29; 1 Chron 23:1; 29:28; 2 Chron 24:15; and Job 42:17 as a way of referring to dying of old age.

⁷⁷ See VanderKam's note *ad loc.* and R. H. Charles and G. H. Box, *The Book of Jubilees; or The Little Genesis* (London, New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; Macmillan, 1917).

⁷⁸ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 21-22. See also the discussion in Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, 59-60 (1982 88-89).

The wolf and the lamb shall graze together,
And the lion will eat grass like an ox.
But the serpent's food is dust!
They will not do harm and they will not destroy anywhere on my holy
mountain, says the Lord. (Isaiah 65:25)

[JCVK] They will complete and live their entire lifetimes peacefully and
joyfully. There will be neither a satan nor any evil one who will destroy.
For their entire lifetimes will be times of blessing and healing.
(Jubilees 23:29)

I would not be too confident that the audience would have made the comparison, but if they did, the implied differences are as striking as the similarities. Here the variations are not linguistic twists but implications at the level of worldview. In anticipation of Chapter 5, we can mention some possible implications that, if true, would be consonant with other findings. First, if the wolf is read to represent a foreigner and the lamb an ethnic Jew (as in the Animal Apocalypse), then Third Isaiah says they will co-exist in Jerusalem, whereas Jubilees says God will remove foreigners from the land of Israel (Jubilees 23:30). The possible connection between “serpent” and “satan” is more complicated; suffice it to anticipate here that Jubilees has a low view of the activity of contra-divine cosmic forces, at least as far as Israel is concerned. Consequently there is no satan to punish, only to be absent. Although Jubilees has a concept of “holy mountain,” the sanctification of the whole land of Israel in Jubilees 4:26 is discussed in 6.6.4.

There are still more suggested parallels, but the remaining can be mentioned only briefly. The parallel between Isaiah 65:13 (good Jews will be radically rewarded, bad Jews will be radically tortured) seems, if anything, an anti-parallel with Jubilees 23:30. The only overlap is the language of servants, contrasted with enemies. In Third Isaiah the vindication of the elect includes the punishment of other Jews. Jubilees avoids or condemns any suggestion of division within Judaism (see Chapter 5), and gives no

weight to vindictive judgment in the eschatological sequence (the nations are excluded from restoration, not tortured; see Chapter 6). There is a similar (anti-)parallel of reward and punishment between Isaiah 66:14 and Jubilees 23:31. Here however, there is also a specific verbal parallel, again inverted. In Isaiah “bones will sprout like grass” (וַעֲצָמוֹתֵיהֶם כְּעֵשְׂבָא יִצְמָחוּ), but in Jubilees “bones will rest in the earth” (ወያዐርፍ : አዕዕምቲሆሙ : ውስተ : ምድር).

All these parallels are possible, but even if several of them are dismissed we can still make the basic point that is relevant here: Jubilees works with Third Isaiah as material even when it wanders off from Genesis-Exodus. Jubilees, at its moments of least “rewritten-ness,” follows received texts more closely than the average apocalypse when most derivative. Jubilees resonates with Third Isaiah and in a way absorbs its authority, even while making other claims to authority. The use of a received authority may invite comparison, but it does not answer the question of whether the worldview is consonant. One can receive an aspect of a tradition less enthusiastically than another aspect of the tradition. Jubilees 23, for example, draws from the apocalypses in genre, Third Isaiah as just discussed, and Deuteronomy as next discussed. The great extent to which Jubilees develops its worldview from Deuteronomy and not the others will be explored in the following chapters.

The covenant curses in Jubilees 23. Finally, Jubilees 23 fills the place of “final woes” in a historical apocalypse with the covenant curses of Deuteronomy 28 (and perhaps Leviticus 26). Although the thematic similarities are unmistakable and a number of images overlap, the dependence is not word-for-word. The closest point of contact is between Deuteronomy 28:49-50 and Jubilees 23:23.

וַיֵּשֶׁא יְהוָה עֲלֵיךָ אֶת מִן־הַמָּקוֹץ מֵאַרְצוֹת בְּאֲשֶׁר יִדְּאָה הַנָּשָׂא
וַיֵּשֶׁא אֶת־לֹא־תִשְׁמַע לְשׁוֹנָהּ:
וַיֵּשֶׁא עַל פְּנֵים אֶת־לֹא־יִשְׁמַע פָּנִים לְזִקְנֹן וְנַעַר לֹא יִחַן:

The Lord will bring against you a nation from far away, from the end of the earth, like an eagle swooping down—a nation whose language you do not understand—an ominous nation that will neither respect old age nor have compassion for a child. (Deuteronomy 28:49-50)

ወያነቅህ ፡ ላዕሌሆሙ ፡ ኃጥአኒሆሙ ፡ ለአሕዛብ ፡ እለ ፡ አልቦሙ ፡
ላዕሌሆሙ ፡ ምሕረተ ፡ ወሃህለ ፡ ወለገጸ ፡ መኑሂ ፡ ኢያደልው ፡ ኢለልሂቅ ፡
ወኢለወሬዛ ፡ ወኢለመኑሂ ፡ እስመ ፡ እኩያን ፡ ወኒያላን ፡ ከመ ፡ ይእከዩ ፡
እምኩሉ ፡ ውሉደ ፡ ሰብእ

[JCVK] He will arouse against them the sinful nations who will have no mercy or kindness for them and who will show partiality to no one, whether old or young, or anyone at all, because they are evil and strong so that they are more evil than all mankind. (Jubilees 23:23; cf. 4Q176 fragment 20)

The description of the foreign invader(s) is certainly similar, but the more significant parallels between the chapters are thematic. Chapter 6 will demonstrate how Jubilees both uses and adapts the covenant curses. The basic theological similarity is the claim that the “woes” of sickness, famine, and invasion are punishments from God intended to prompt sinners to repentance. The main adaptation, as we shall see, is to place the covenant curses in the form of the final woes of a historical apocalypse. Unlike the typical apocalypses, the woes are covenantal punishment, and more strikingly, they are adapted such that they can be understood to have been fulfilled in the past. Somewhat in language and imagery but more so in theology, Jubilees 23 aligns itself with the authority of Deuteronomy 28.

Psalms 90, Third Isaiah and Deuteronomy 28 do not exhaust the extent to which Jubilees 23 uses received authorities. The allusion to Psalm 79:2-3 in Jubilees 23:23 has been mentioned in Chapter 3, Davenport argues for use of Jeremiah 6:23 in the same

verse,⁷⁹ and Wintermute finds a number of other parallels worthy of marginal note.⁸⁰ The examples discussed suffice to give a fair evaluation of the use of received authorities in Jubilees 23. Without downplaying the extent to which Jubilees creatively molds its materials, Jubilees is persistently derivative. Derivative does not mean slavishly deferential, but it does mean that the contents, however rearranged, come from publicly received authority. Even when emphasis is shifted, a degree of authority is derived when the building blocks are derived. Even when Jubilees departs from “rewriting” Genesis-Exodus, Jubilees remains a “rewriting” of received authorities.

Jubilees 23 is a particularly salient example, but only one example of an excursus from Genesis-Exodus that continues to adhere to received traditions. Other examples would lead to interesting questions, such as the existence of a single written “Book of Noah,”⁸¹ the subtleties of manner of use of the Book of Watchers,⁸² the state of patriarch and priest Levi traditions before Jubilees,⁸³ or a non-textual but written map of the

⁷⁹ Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 34 n. 3.

⁸⁰ O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 99-102. In a more general way the theme of declining longevity depends on Genesis through Joshua (see appendix 6.6.1).

⁸¹ See chapter 5 note 24.

⁸² J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten emphasizes the very close verbal adherence to Genesis-Exodus, but finds the connection to the Book of the Watchers so loose that it should not be thought of as a literary dependence. Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted*, 212. Ruiten, “A Literary Dependency of Jubilees on 1 Enoch?,” 93. See also, VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” 229-251. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 179-188. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, 110-121.

⁸³ See note 5 above.

world.⁸⁴ The excurses are important for establishing the limits of derivation, but we should not lose sight of the fact that the vast majority of Jubilees retells and interprets in a very direct way Genesis through Exodus 24.⁸⁵ One must also take into account that the text that became known as the Samaritan Pentateuch is no less received than that which became known as the Masoretic Text, and that even the interpretations, direct as they may be, were often received orally or in texts no longer known to us. All considered, Jubilees is persistently derivative of received authority. Alexander can plausibly suggest that the author of Jubilees “was the recipient of certain traditions which he honestly supposed went back to Moses himself.”⁸⁶ Jubilees is creative in ways more analogous to *objet trouvé* than to sculpture from raw clay.⁸⁷ Jubilees might be best understood as a reconstruction, based on scattered evidence, of heavenly tablets that must exist in order to explain the authority of the received tradition. Jubilees reconciles authorities and postulates a unity in the source of authorities that appear to be disparate, but Jubilees does not unveil new revelation.⁸⁸

The point, however, is not simply that Jubilees differs from contemporary apocalypses in that it can be described as “rewritten” scripture, or that Jubilees differs

⁸⁴ Daniel Machiela, “From Enoch to Abram: The Text and Character of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) in Light of Related Second Temple Jewish Literature” (Dissertation, Univ. of Notre Dame, 2007).

⁸⁵ See note 52 above.

⁸⁶ Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 101. See Jubilees 45:16 for the idea that the Levites preserved all the ancestral teaching in a broad sense.

⁸⁷ The analogy should not be taken too far, however. Authorship in antiquity fills the spectrum of “originality.” Creative reworking based on a large number of sources and traditions is better characterized as authorship than redaction. For a different view, see Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*.

⁸⁸ For the theological claim that the received traditions, and writings in particular, are unitary and consistent, see Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 17.

from other examples of rewritten scripture in that it claims to be an apocalypse. Jubilees makes claims and cues the reader to expect that something new is going to be revealed. If we distinguish the claims from the actual contents, we arrive at a clear discord.

Jubilees claims to be an independent revelation from the highest authority, on par with the Pentateuch itself. It is important to temper this statement with the fact that Jubilees seems to acknowledge the Pentateuch as “first” (Jubilees 6:22), and handed to Moses already written, whereas Jubilees is nominally secondary in that it was dictated.⁸⁹ The independence is also tempered by the fact that the first law and Jubilees are revealed from the same source to the same person in the same place at roughly the same time.⁹⁰ Still, scholars are on the right track to observe that the claim to revelation from the heavenly tablets in the form of an apocalypse is a claim to be on par with, not derived from, the Pentateuch.⁹¹ The ancient audience, like modern scholars, would expect such a claim to introduce a new revelation that qualifies, rather than builds upon, the authority of the “first” revelation.⁹² As we have seen, however, those expectations are not met. The claim does not concord with the actual content.

⁸⁹ See note 48.

⁹⁰ James C. VanderKam, “The Scriptural Setting of the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 13, no. 1 (2006): 61-72.

⁹¹ Nickelsburg, “Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture,” 347. Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets,” 27-28. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 388. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 90. It is also important to be aware that these comments are partly in reaction to the assertion that Jubilees claims to supplant the Pentateuch, particularly by, B. Z. Wacholder, “Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Cambridge 1995, ed. Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and J. Kampen, STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 195-211.

⁹² See, for example, Nickelsburg, “Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture,” 347.

Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse,” in general and in specific cues such as “heavenly tablets,” to create a reader expectation that is discordant with what is actually said. On purely literary grounds this can be labeled irony. The final chapter will turn to the question of intent. We should not jump to conclusions about sociological context. Irony is not necessarily polemic. The shift is relatively subtle. Jubilees does not shut down the possibility of an expanded understanding of revelation; it moves to tether the understanding of revelation to the received traditions, maintaining a unity and consistency. This is another way in which Jubilees, as has long been observed, promotes Jewish unity.⁹³

4.2. The dependence of revelation on wisdom

This section considers simultaneously two strands of one basic observation. (1) The basic observation is that revelation is closely aligned with wisdom in the typical early apocalypses, but not in Jubilees. (2) The first strand concerns wisdom *per se*, particularly the use of the term or a near equivalent,⁹⁴ in the context of a prerequisite to, result of, or identification with receipt of revelation. Jubilees avoids the term almost completely and qualifies the concept. (3) The second strand concerns the view of revelation as coded or otherwise inaccessible. Jubilees has a concept of “seeking” the

⁹³ See VanderKam’s discussion of Rönsch. VanderKam, “Origins and Purposes of Jubilees,” 6. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis*, 520-521. “Es war das jüdische Unionsbuch, eine Formula Concordiae filiorum Israel.” My translation, “It was a Jewish unity-book, a formula of concord of the Israelites.” See also Schwarz, *Identität durch Abgrenzung*.

⁹⁴ We will not ignore the distinction Daniel makes between wisdom and enlightenment, but for the present consideration of a view of revelation as restricted to an elite, they function the same way.

laws, but it does not convey meaning in allegorical or symbolic codes, it does not read Genesis as if coded, and it diminishes codes that do appear in Genesis. (4) The important point for this dissertation is that Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” to frame a revelation that differs in the view of revelation from what a reader would expect from an apocalypse. (5) One might speculate further that what concerns Jubilees is not opposition to wisdom as a general virtue, but as a form of elitism. Jubilees seems to suggest that the laws by which covenantal fidelity and blessings can be achieved are accessible to all of Israel, regardless of intelligence, profession, esoteric initiation, or other form of elitism. The sub-sections will consider the Enochic apocalypses, the Danielic apocalypses, and Jubilees. First, each of the preceding introductory points should be explained further.

(1) The history of scholarship on the categories of “wisdom” and “prophecy” is as complex as that of “apocalyptic” discussed in Chapter 2.⁹⁵ The important development for the present purpose is that “wisdom” can include “revealed wisdom,” along with the

⁹⁵ Among the milestones, Gerhard von Rad challenged the tendency to view “apocalyptic” as the child of prophecy by arguing that the view of history makes it the child of wisdom. Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 306. Müller refined von Rad’s point by specifying *mantic* wisdom. Müller, “Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik,” 268-293. See further on mantic wisdom, VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*. VanderKam, “Prophetic-Sapiential Origins,” 163-176. Hengel developed the category of “higher wisdom through revelation.” Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, 1st American ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 210-218. Smith and Stone advanced the study of the distinctive form of wisdom associated with the apocalypses. Smith, “Wisdom and Apocalyptic,” 131-156. Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things,” 414-452. For discussion on the issues in Q scholarship (especially Kloppenborg and Mack), and as a significant contribution in its own right, see Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility,” 165-185. Goff has worked extensively on the overlap of wisdom and apocalyptic elements, most recently in Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, VTSup 116 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007). For a recent review of scholarship, see Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, JSJSup 115 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 1-24. See also, Torleif Elgvin, “Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998*, ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller, STDJ 35 35 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 15-38. Andreas Bedenbender, “Jewish Apocalypticism: A Child of Mantic Wisdom?,” *Henoch* 24 (2002): 189-196.

types of wisdom associated with the canonical wisdom literature. Not only are the genres “wisdom” and “apocalypse” compatible, the early apocalypses tend to identify wisdom and revelation. Revealed wisdom is not the only kind of wisdom, nor is it limited to the apocalypses, but it is typical of the early apocalypses. Jubilees exhibits a kind of revelation independent of wisdom.

(2) Although there is much more to revealed wisdom than use of the term “wisdom,” and the distribution of the term is not even, terminology provides a quick way of assessing different views of revelation. In the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses wisdom is an all encompassing category for that which is received when revelation is received, and that which defines the righteous. Jubilees, however, divorces revelation from wisdom. Jubilees uses the term twice, once to describe Enoch and once in connection with Joseph, but never uses the term to describe that which is revealed from the heavenly tablets, that which one must have in order to receive revelation, or that which one gains as a result of revelation. Jubilees elevates the intelligence of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but avoids the terminology of wisdom and even attributes the rejection of a form of wisdom to the intelligence of Abram.

(3) The typical identification of apocalyptic revelation with revealed wisdom is related to the tendency to describe revelation as a mystery or to convey it in codes. The issue is not how easily the revelation might be decoded, but the assertion that revelation is mysterious, not easily grasped, or hidden from the ordinary mind. This view of limited access to revelation can be expressed in many forms. Lange has already shown how Jubilees differs from the typical apocalypses in that it rejects allegorical dreams.⁹⁶

⁹⁶ Lange, “Divinatorische Träume,” 25-38.

Jubilees does not communicate in code, it does not read Genesis as if a code, and it downplays coded revelation within Genesis. More generally, Jubilees disambiguates the revelation that is necessary to be righteous and rewarded under the covenant. Jubilees presents the revelation received by Moses as if completely transparent. The laws should be studied in order to be observed, but without the expectation of a new revelation that will supersede the plain sense of the original (as in Daniel 9).

(4) The important point is that the worldview with respect to revelation in Jubilees is different from the worldview that is typically conveyed by the genre “apocalypse.” When a reader encounters the literary features of heavenly tablets revealed through an angelic intermediary to an exemplary human on matters of the cosmic realm and the meaning of history, the reader expects a certain view to be expressed about each of those things. In this case, one expects an apocalypse to convey a view of revelation as coded, mysterious, and accessible only to the wise. The discord between genre and worldview, between what the text leads the reader to expect by way of literary framework and what it actually says about the key issues raised by the framework, constitutes literary irony.

(5) Even without speculating on social context, it is not difficult to imagine what the concern might have been. The issue here seems to be related to the issue to be discussed in Chapter 5, that Jubilees addresses all of Israel without singling out a group for eschatological reward. “Wisdom” is often not just a general virtue attainable by anyone, but a set of learned skills that define an elite scribal class. Jubilees presumably aims to emphasize that the covenant between God and Israel is accessible to and incumbent on all of Israel, even those who do not have the luxury of devoting themselves

to the life of a sage,⁹⁷ even those who do not meditate on enigmas, and even those who are not particularly bright. Deuteronomy 30:11-14 illustrates the issue and the basic position taken by Jubilees:

כִּי הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מְצַוֶּה הַיּוֹם לֹא-נִפְלְאָתָהּ הִוא מִמֶּדֶד וְלֹא רִחֲקָה הִוא:
 לֹא בַשָּׁמַיִם הִוא לֵאמֹר מִי יַעֲלֶה-לָנוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְיִקְחָהּ לָנוּ וְיִשְׁמַעְנוּ אֹתָהּ וְנַעֲשֶׂנָּה:
 וְלֹא-מֵעֵבֶר לַיָּם הִוא לֵאמֹר מִי יַעֲבֹר-לָנוּ אֶל-עֵבֶר הַיָּם וְיִקְחָהּ לָנוּ וְיִשְׁמַעְנוּ אֹתָהּ
 וְנַעֲשֶׂנָּה:
 כִּי-קָרֹב אֵלֶיךָ הַדָּבָר מְאֹד בְּפִיךָ וּבִלְבָבְךָ לַעֲשׂוֹתוֹ: ס

For this commandment which I command you today is not too mysterious for you or far away.

It is not in the heavens, such that one might say, “Who will go up to the heavens to get it for us, such that we could observe and do it?”

Nor is it across the sea, such that one might say, “Who will cross the sea to get it for us, such that we could observe and do it?”

On the contrary, it is very close to you! In your mouth! In your mind! Do it! (Deuteronomy 30:11-14)

Although I do not claim a direct cause and effect, one could imagine the author of an Enochic apocalypse reading Deuteronomy 30 and wondering, “so just what is it in the heavens that is so interesting?,” or the author of a Danielic apocalypse, “what is this mysterious thing over the waters?”⁹⁸ Regardless of whether the author of Jubilees thought of the issue in terms of Deuteronomy 30, it is an apt description of the difference between the view of revelation typical of the apocalypses and that of Jubilees. In contrast to the view of revelation typically found in the apocalypses, Jubilees presents the law and testimony revealed to Moses at Sinai, and consequently the requirements for righteousness and reward under the covenant, as fool-proof.

⁹⁷ The present work does not endeavor to include ben Sira in the comparison, but the reader might occasionally notice that Jubilees seems to be more proximate to ben Sira than the apocalypses on some matters of worldview. Jubilees and ben Sira might agree that one should travel to the temple, not the cosmos, to find appropriate instruction (Sirach 24:23; Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*, 55.), but Jubilees does not share ben Sira’s elitism (see especially Sirach 38:24).

⁹⁸ Bodies of water are a recurring locus of revelation in the Danielic apocalypses (7:2; 8:2; 10:4).

4.2.1. The Enochic apocalypses

The Enochic apocalypses tie revelation to wisdom (best described as revealed wisdom) and view revelation as coded or otherwise accessible only by way of wisdom. The apocalypses vary in the frequency with which the word “wisdom” is used to describe that which is revealed, and in the ways in which the inaccessibility of revelation is expressed. Among the variations, however, one can identify a common worldview that sees revelation as distant and restricted to an elite.

The most numerous explicit identifications of Enoch’s revelation with wisdom occur in the Epistle of Enoch and the Parables.⁹⁹ Even if the Epistle (other than the Apocalypse of Weeks) is dated after Jubilees, the numerous explicit references to Enoch’s revelation as wisdom indicate patterns that had been implicit in the earlier apocalypses, and especially how they were read close to the time of Jubilees. Thus, the Book of the Watchers uses the word “wisdom” rarely (that which will be given to the chosen in 5:8; the fruit which nourishes the holy ones in 32:3, 6; cf. the **חכמה** “knowledge” that humans are destined to understand in 14:3). Be that as it may, Nickelsburg, Argall and Knibb point to language and motifs that show wisdom to be a “comprehensive category” that designates the Book of the Watchers and Enochic literature in general, as well as that which defines the chosen. Among these are the wisdom term “parable” in 1:2, the list of contents in 2:1—5:3, and the pursuit of knowing everything in 25:2.¹⁰⁰ Argall uses 5:8 to argue that, “The phrase ‘to give wisdom’ is a

⁹⁹ Epistle of Enoch 92:1 (cf. 4Q212 fragment 1, column 2, line 23, **חכמה** [חכמה]); 94:5; 98:1,3,9; 99:10; 100:6; 101:8; 104:12; 105:1; Parables 37; 42; 49:3; 51:3; 48:1; 49:1; 61:7, 11; 63:2.

¹⁰⁰ Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 52. See also the observation illustrated from later examples in Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things,” 416-418.

technical expression for Enoch's revelation."¹⁰¹ Knibb discusses motifs such as sapiential admonition based on natural order (BW 2:1—5:4) and places of mystery outside the human realm (BW 17-19).¹⁰² Especially in light of later developments, one can safely conclude that the Book of the Watchers was viewed as a book of revealed wisdom at the time of Jubilees.

Although the Book of the Watchers has been read as an allegory for priestly marriage purity,¹⁰³ the view of revelation as accessible only to a wise elite is better seen in the treatment of the "tree of wisdom" motif. In general, it is important not to conclude from the view of revelation as coded that the meaning is exhausted by the substitution of decoded equivalents.¹⁰⁴ The Book of the Watchers is a good example of an apocalypse the meaning of which is not exhausted by coded equivalents, in this case understanding the Watchers as priests. By means of comparison with Sirach, Argall has demonstrated how the Book of the Watchers uses the tree of wisdom motif to emphasize the remoteness and inaccessibility of wisdom, other than by way of a certain esoteric chain of transmission.¹⁰⁵ Although the Book of the Watchers does not develop the idea of stages of revelation to the same extent as the Danielic apocalypses, the role of the interpreting

¹⁰¹ Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*, 20.

¹⁰² Knibb, "Enoch in Light of Qumran Wisdom," 206-210.

¹⁰³ David Winston Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16," *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115-135. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981): 575-600. The work can also be read as allegorical in the sense of the typology of *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*.

¹⁰⁴ Advanced by Gunkel and emphasized by Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 16-17.

¹⁰⁵ "In *I Enoch*, the great wisdom represented by the Tree is inaccessible to ordinary mortals. It is made known to angels and they, in turn, communicate it to Enoch through interpretations of his visions. Enoch then brings this wisdom from heaven to the chosen and righteous, who 'eat' it (82:3b)." Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*, 94.

angel functions within the same worldview. Even when revelation is right before one's eyes, one still requires interpretation from an authorized figure (e.g. BW 18:14).

The Apocalypse of Weeks explicitly defines “wisdom” as that which is given (one might say revealed) to the chosen (93:10; see also 91:10), and defines the chosen as a group apart from those who stray from wisdom (93:8). The apocalypse itself is part of that wisdom and exemplifies the view of revelation as cryptic. The point is not that the code is particularly difficult to crack, but that revelation is presented as if cryptic and only understood by a chosen few at a chosen time. Regardless of disputed social realities and the ease of cracking the code, the Apocalypse of Weeks uses the literary motif of esotericism.¹⁰⁶ Regardless of how elaborate a chronology might (or might not) be implied in the system of weeks, a week certainly represents something other than a week. The identification of the man that will be saved as Noah and the man that will be taken up as Elijah, for example, may not have been too difficult for the intended audience, but the references are presented as cryptic in the narrative setting. Again, revelation is presented as a code accessible only to the wise.

The Animal Apocalypse does not use a word for “wisdom” in its allegory, but the opening of eyes (90:6, and more frequently the absence thereof) functions the same way as does the revelation of wisdom in the Apocalypse of Weeks. The Animal Apocalypse is also a prime example of coded revelation. Again, the issue is not how many ancient Jews could have actually cracked the code, but that revelation is presented as if a code that is fully understandable only at a special time by an audience that is made to feel special.

¹⁰⁶ For more on separating the literary motif from social reality, see Adler, “Introduction,” 13-16. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” 431-432. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd Edition), 39. Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 339-340.

Wisdom is required to decipher the revelation, and further wisdom regarding current events results from the revelation. Wisdom is not a general virtue that describes all of Israel, but marks the boundaries of an elite group.¹⁰⁷

4.2.2. The Danielic apocalypses

The Danielic apocalypses vary from the Enochic apocalypses in some details of the view of revelation, but share the same basic worldview. Revelation is cryptic and accessible only to an enlightened elite. The elitism is moderated in that greater allowance is made for the “masses” to receive instruction from the enlightened. The masses might become righteous if they heed the enlightened, but they do not themselves become enlightened (Daniel 12:3). The elite are not isolated, but they remain exclusive. The elite are not distinguished by a skill set that can be taught, but by access to ongoing revelation. Revelation continues to be cryptic, as in the Enochic apocalypses, but the “code” moves further beyond the human realm of decipherment.¹⁰⁸ The decoding of revelation is not a matter of wisdom in the sense of human skill, but enlightenment in a purely revealed sense.

¹⁰⁷ See further, Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 52-53. If the discussion is extended to include the Epistle of Enoch, one finds an intermediate group comparable to the multitude in Daniel. In the Epistle 99:10 one finds an opportunity to become blessed, even if one cannot oneself become wise, by listening to the words of the wise. The dominant emphasis in the Epistle is on the wise themselves (see especially 104:12 and note 99 above).

¹⁰⁸ Carmignac held the revelation of secrets which are normally hidden from human intelligence to be essential to the apocalyptic worldview. He distinguishes the apocalypses from Rabbinic literature according to the means employed to excavate secrets from the Torah. Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 10, 20-21.

Thus, the first variation is the avoidance of the root חכם “wise” in favor of שכל (for lack of a better alternative) “enlightened.” For the purposes of comparing views of the elite accessibility of revelation, enlightenment is every bit as elite as wisdom and more so. “Wisdom” comes off almost badly, as a human skill vastly inferior to the access to heavenly revelation associated with enlightenment. Or rather, true wisdom is a trait that humans cannot fully possess, but only God, who reveals it as God wishes (Daniel 2:20-21).¹⁰⁹ Thus, in the book as a whole,¹¹⁰ the root חכם usually refers to the Babylonian professionals whose skill is markedly less than the revelation of an enlightened person. Wisdom is still a part of Daniel’s mortal skill-set (Daniel 1:4, 17, 20), but Daniel denies the sufficiency of mortal wisdom.

וְאַנְהָ לֹא בַחֲכָמָה דִּיאִיתִי בִּלְמִן־כִּלְחִיָּא רְזָא דְנָה גְּלִי לִי לְהֵן עַל־דְּבִרְתֵּי דִּי פִשְׁרָא
לְמַלְכָּא יְהוּדָעוֹן וְרַעֲיוֹנֵי לְבָבָא תַנְדָּע:

As for me, this mystery was not revealed to me by means of my own wisdom (superior as it is to all mortals), but in order to make known to the king the fact of the interpretation, so that you can know your own thoughts. (Daniel 2:30)

Although the orthodoxy of the Queen may be suspect, she too seems to recognize a difference between mortal wisdom and access to divine wisdom,

אִיתִי גְבֵר בְּמַלְכוּתָא דִּי רוּחַ אֱלֹהִין קִדִּישִׁין בֵּה וּבִיּוֹמֵי אָבוּד נְהִירוֹ וְשִׁכְלָתְנֹו וְחֲכָמָה
בְּחֲכַמְת־אֱלֹהִין הַשְׁתַּכַּחַת בֵּה ...

¹⁰⁹ The idea that wisdom and knowledge come from God is not new. What is striking is the emphatic contrast between learned human skill and revealed enlightenment. Rofé, “Revealed Wisdom,” 1-11.

¹¹⁰ We are justified in not limiting the consideration to the apocalypses because the court tales establish the view of revelation that is used in the apocalypses. To an extent the authors of the apocalypses may have cast their worldview into the court tales (particularly in Daniel 1-2 and occasional redactional glue). To a further extent the view of revelation in the court tales may have attracted the authors of the apocalypses to attach the apocalypses to the court tales. The court tales cannot be the only basis for establishing the view of revelation in the apocalypses, but they are foundational.

There is a man in your kingdom that has a divine holy spirit. In the days of your father he was found to have illumination, enlightenment, and wisdom like the wisdom of the gods... (Daniel 5:11)

Again in Daniel 5:14, Daniel's wisdom needs to be qualified as different from ordinary wisdom, but "enlightenment" requires no qualification.

Apparently building on the view of wisdom as a human skill, the apocalypses never use the root חכם. The root שכל can be used rather loosely (Antiochus Epiphanes has it in the sense of "cunning" in 8:25; it seems to reflect a human activity in 9:13), but usually refers to a specific group and the (mediated) divine action which defines them.

The near identification of enlightenment with revelation appears in Daniel 9:22,

וַיֹּבֶן וַיְדַבֵּר עִמִּי וַיֹּאמֶר דְּנִיָּאל עֲתָה יֵצְאֵתִי לְהַשְׁכִּילָךְ בִּינָה:

He explained it to me, saying, "Daniel, I have just now come out to enlighten your understanding." (Daniel 9:22)

In Daniel 1:17 enlightenment is given by God to Daniel, with a scribal connotation (הַשְׁכִּיל (בְּכָל-סֵפֶר, cf. 9:1). Access to this enlightenment defines Daniel himself as a משכיל in 1:4, and also a latter-day group of משכילים to be identified as the circle of composition (Daniel 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10). The latter-day enlightened ones show no humility in identifying themselves with Daniel, as the most significant difference is that they understand even more than Daniel himself did (12:8, 10).

Thus we come to an additional perspective on the view of revelation in stages already raised in the previous section. In Daniel, revelation is not a deposit left behind in the distant past to be preserved and passively studied. Rather, revelation is ongoing and cumulative, such that understanding improves with new revelation. The revelation at

Sinai was not complete (cf. Jubilees 1:26¹¹¹), the prophecy of Jeremiah was not final (Daniel 9:24), and even the vision of Daniel was not immediately understood (12:8). The latter-day משכילים concern themselves with former prophecies and visions, but they reserve for themselves the final stage of revelation. Like Daniel, they have access to divine revelation, and they have the further advantage of seeing the events unfold in their own days.

Chapter 5 will return to the view of divisions of humanity for purposes of restoration (i.e., Daniel holds the enlightened up for special reward while Jubilees admits no eschatological divisions within Israel). The point for the present is that Daniel views revelation as accessible only to an enlightened elite, comparable to the identification of wisdom and revelation in the Enochic apocalypses. To a certain extent Daniel opens up the elitism by allowing the multitude to be instructed by the enlightened, but allowing the public to obey is hardly a democratic reform. The enlightened distinguish themselves from the masses not by teachable skills or knowledge, but by access to ongoing revelation. God reveals wisdom and enlightenment to the wise and the enlightened, not all of Israel (see again Daniel 2:21).

Another implication of the view of multiple stages of revelation is that all revelation becomes cryptic, regardless of whether it had seemed cryptic. The writing on Belshazzar's wall offers a particularly cryptic first stage of revelation (Daniel 5), and Daniel 2 emphasizes the independence of the second stage so much so that it occurs without knowledge of the first stage of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Daniel 2 also uses the

¹¹¹ "First and last" in Jubilees 1:26 indicates completeness, not necessarily eschatology, as is frequently found in Chronicles, הָרֵאשִׁיטִים וְהָאַחֲרִיטִים (1 Chronicles 29:29; 9:29; 2 Chronicles 12:15; 16:11; 20:34; 25:26; 26:22; 28:26; 35:27).

language of secrets (רִזְיוֹן, Daniel 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47) and mysteries (מִסְתָּרֵהָא, Daniel 2:22) for that which God reveals. Curiously, however, cognate language is not found in the apocalypses, even though the contents could be called mysterious to Daniel even after they are revealed (8:27; 12:8). The apocalypses are persistently cryptic, whether they are “deliberately elusive” (especially Daniel 7),¹¹² or round-about ways of referring to things such as units of time (time, times, half a time; two thousand three hundred mornings and evenings). The most significant implication comes from Daniel 9. Jeremiah’s prophecy had seemed anything but cryptic, but the meaning turned out to be other than what it appeared to mean. The received prophecy is decoded, “like a symbol in a dream.”¹¹³ By extension, all of received scripture can be treated as a first stage of revelation, subject to amendment.¹¹⁴

It is common for ancient interpreters to treat received scripture as “cryptic” to an extent. Kugel uses the word to describe a common assumption among ancient interpreters, and Jubilees both describes and exhibits a process of “seeking out” the commands.¹¹⁵ As we shall see, however, Jubilees draws the line with allegorical codes. It may never be clear how the author of Jubilees justified certain modifications of the received texts of Genesis and Exodus, but it is at least clear that Jubilees never makes the move Daniel makes. Daniel treats all revelation, whether in received scriptures or in

¹¹² Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 296.

¹¹³ Ibid., 359.

¹¹⁴ In the words of Fishbane, “Prophetic words are no longer predominantly living speech, but rather inscribed and inscrutable data whose true meanings are an esoteric mystery revealed by God to a special adept and his pious circle (cf. Dan 9:22-23, 10:14-21, 11:33-5, 12:9-13).” Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 484.

¹¹⁵ Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 15. Jubilees 23:26.

visions, as a code that can be amended with further revelation, showing relatively little regard for the original.

Daniel differs from the Enochic apocalypses in significant ways, but shares use of the literary genre “apocalypse” and the basic view of revelation as cryptic and accessible only to a wise elite. The genre necessarily raises the issue of revelation, and typically presents that which is revealed as mysterious, ambiguous, esoteric and elite, reserved for a particular group at a particular time.¹¹⁶ Jubilees, however, uses the genre to frame what it claims was revealed clearly at Sinai for all Israel to understand and obey.

4.2.3. Jubilees

In Jubilees revelation is fully accessible to all of Israel. This is most striking in what it does not say, but also in some positive emphases. Jubilees never uses language of “secret” or “mystery,” and uses the word “wisdom” only twice, neither of which compares to the “comprehensive category” of wisdom in the Enochic apocalypses or enlightenment in Daniel. Only in a very general sense are “sapiential motifs” used. Jubilees does not use codes, symbols or allegories, and downplays them where they appear in Genesis. The worldview of Jubilees also comes out in some positive emphases. Most generally, the revelation of the heavenly tablets at Sinai is presented as public instruction for all Israel for all time. Jubilees elevates the intelligence of Abraham, for example, in such a way that effectively critiques a kind of wisdom. In general, Jubilees pursues a course of disambiguation, not reveling in enigmas.

¹¹⁶ The idea that the Danielic apocalypses are intended for a time other than the time of Daniel is emphasized in 7:28; 8:19, 26; 10:14; 12:4, 9.

The differences are at times dramatic and at times subtle. The claims Jubilees makes seem to leave some problems unresolved, especially from a modern perspective. It may be difficult to get past the perspective of a Jubilees as a pseudepigraphon that inherently implies the inadequacy of former revelation and invents “new” revelation, or views former revelation as an inaccessible secret code. Yet, as Alexander¹¹⁷ and Kugel¹¹⁸ have already suggested, the author of Jubilees claims and appears to believe that the Book of Jubilees sets down the instructions and clarifications¹¹⁹ that were revealed to Israel at Sinai.¹²⁰

4.2.3.1. Revelation without the elitism of wisdom

Jubilees strikingly avoids the distinctive language and motifs of “wisdom,” particularly in the context of access to revelation. In more subtle ways, Jubilees elevates the intelligence of biblical heroes without, or even in opposition to, certain aspects of “scribal” or “mantic” wisdom. The net effect is to emphasize the claim that the heavenly

¹¹⁷ “The likeliest explanation is, however, that he was the recipient of certain traditions which he honestly supposed went back to Moses himself.... The author of Jubilees may have felt that he was simply collecting and editing the esoteric traditions that had been faithfully passed down in priestly circles from the time of Moses to his own day.” Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 101.

¹¹⁸ “Suppose we were to be able to talk to the author of Jubilees and say, ‘Come on, what’s all this with the heavenly tablets and the angel of the presence? You made this up!’ The author could reply in all seriousness, ‘not a word.’” Kugel’s point had more to do with the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy in general—how an author can assume an identity to such an extent that the imagined or reconstructed conversations take on a reality of their own. This point would not distinguish Jubilees from contemporary apocalypses, but it remains significant that Jubilees is a prime example of a pseudepigraphon in which it is relatively easy to see how the author found the basis to reconstruct or imagine content. March 18, 2004, Liss Lecture, Univ. of Notre Dame; confirmed by correspondence August 21, 2007.

¹¹⁹ In the word of the Damascus Document, מְדֻקָּדֵק (CD column 16 line 3).

¹²⁰ See also, Najman, *Seconding Sinai*.

tablets were made clearly accessible to all of Israel. This emphasis is not unique in Jewish thought in antiquity, but it contrasts sharply with the view of revelation typical of the apocalypses.

Jubilees does not often appear in scholarly discussion of wisdom and the apocalypses. When Benjamin Wright set out to study wisdom in Jubilees for the 2007 Enoch Seminar, which was mostly dedicated to Jubilees, he confirmed the lack of distinctive sapiential features in Jubilees.¹²¹ Although he went on to discuss less distinctive motifs, such as parent-child instruction, the most striking observation is the initial observation, the absence of wisdom features. Indeed, the words “mystery” and “secret” never appear, and the word “wisdom” appears only twice.¹²² One of these is merely a variation of Genesis 41:39 on the lips of Pharaoh about Joseph, “We will not find a man as wise and knowledgeable as this man, for the spirit of the Lord is with him” (Jubilees 40:5).¹²³ This verse is also the closest Jubilees comes to a sapiential usage of

¹²¹ Benjamin G. Wright, “Jubilees, Sirach, and Sapiential Tradition,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

¹²² Determined by searching an electronic copy of VanderKam’s translation. The translation is so literal that it seems safe to conclude that the Ethiopic term ጥበብ is not otherwise used. Margin of error remains possible in circuitous phraseology for the concept of wisdom, text variants not used in the translation, and the usual remote possibility that a word or passage was lost to the Ethiopic manuscript tradition.

For later examples of the view of scripture study as a means for unveiling נסתרות, see the discussion of the Damascus Document and Community Rule in Gary A. Anderson, “The Status of the Torah Before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Document and the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 10-19. Jubilees may have a concept of not-yet revealed laws in Jubilees 33:16, but nothing remains unrevealed after Sinai.

¹²³ Jubilees 42:2 omits the detail in Genesis 44:5 about Joseph performing divination with a cup, an activity that could be linked to mantic wisdom.

አእምሮ “knowledge.”¹²⁴ The other mention of wisdom does not come from Genesis directly, but the received expansions about the figure of Enoch.

(11QJub frag. 3 ln. 2) [n]שאר הו vac[at

ውእቱ : ቀዳሚ : ተምህረ : መጽሐፈ : ወትምህርተ : ወጥበበ : እምእንለ :
 እመሕያው : እምእለ : ተወልዱ : ዲበ : ምድር :: ወዘጸሐፈ : ተእምረ :
 ሰማይ : በከመ : ሥርዓተ : አውራጊሆሙ : ውስተ : መጽሐፍ :: ከመ :
 ያእምሩ : እንለ : እምሕያው : ጊዜ : ዓመታት : በከመ : ሥርዐታቲሆሙ :
 ለለ : ወርኅሆሙ ::

[JCVK] He was the first of mankind who were born on the earth who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky in accord with the fixed patterns of their months so that mankind would know the seasons of the years according to the fixed patterns of each of their months. (Jubilees 4:17)

This is a fair description of the figure of Enoch developed in the received traditions, plus some emphasis on calendrical rectitude. Jubilees is not opposed to understanding the figure of Enoch as a wisdom hero from the chosen line, but Enoch’s wisdom is not a paradigm which all subsequent recipients of revelation (ultimately all of Israel) must follow.¹²⁵

As has long been recognized, Jubilees receives Jewish traditions that develop the figure of Enoch in the paradigm of the eastern sage, making him the first of scribes

¹²⁴ God has knowledge in Jubilees 2:2. The tree of knowledge (not wisdom) appears not where one would expect in chapter 3, but later in Jubilees 4:30. As for humans, knowledge is never mentioned positively. It is evil in Jubilees 5:2, and departs in 23:11. Although Rofé found in this a movement of opposition to the idea that wisdom comes with age, the term here need not have any sapiential connotation, polemical or otherwise. Rofé, “Revealed Wisdom,” 3-4.

¹²⁵ There are, however, those who hold the figure of Enoch and the Enochic worldview as foundational to the view of revelation in Jubilees. See Kvanvig, “Jubilees—Between Enoch and Moses,” 246-261. In recent works Boccaccini is moderating the claim that Jubilees develops directly out of Enochic Judaism. Boccaccini, “From a Movement of Dissent to a Distinct Form of Judaism,” forthcoming. Cf. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 86-98.

whose wisdom includes astronomy and a body of learning well beyond literacy.¹²⁶ Again, Enoch's wisdom is not a general virtue attainable by all, but a set of learned skills that define the "scribal" profession. Jubilees does not polemicize for or against the figure of Enoch, or a certain kind of professional wisdom. The issue is more subtle: How does the worldview of the author shape the portrayal of Enoch? What is developed, and what is adapted or left behind? If we focus only on the issue of revelation, three emphases stand out. First, the lessons Enoch learns about calendar are transmitted to all the children of Eve, not an elite school of professional sages or esoteric "chosen righteous." Second, Enoch's astronomical learning is carefully limited to calendrical rectitude. Observing the signs of heaven (ⲉⲧⲏⲙⲓ ⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛⲓ) for any other purpose is strictly forbidden. Third, Jubilees embraces written-ness as a means of ensuring accuracy, but leaves behind the associated activities of sages. Writing is a device for guaranteeing public record, not an elite or cryptic channel of secret wisdom. Though somewhat adapted, Enoch is still allowed to be Enoch, the originator of wisdom in the mode of eastern sages, and he fits into Jubilees' account of revelation-history. Enoch is a sage who receives revelation, but not all who receive revelation are sages. Wisdom and the figure of Enoch have their place in Jubilees, but they do not define the view of revelation. Other recipients of revelation are taught to write, but are not otherwise associated with the term "wisdom" or the activities of the sages.

¹²⁶ VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 180-185. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 263-269. The fact that Enoch also offers incense points to the connection between Babylonian scribal curriculum and Jewish priestly curriculum, on which see, Henryk Drawnel, "Priestly Education in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (*Visions of Levi*) and *Aramaic Astronomical Book* (4Q208-211)," *RdQ* 22 (2006): 547-574. More recently, Henryk Drawnel, "Some Notes on Scribal Craft and the Origins of the Enochic Literature," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

For example, Abram’s realization of God’s absolute sovereignty would have had the potential to take the form of “revealed wisdom.” In fact, Jubilees crafts Abram’s intellect in such a way that avoids revealed and mantic wisdom, and carefully limits the legitimacy of astronomical wisdom.

[
 עם [תרח אביו בחרן שני שבועי שנים *vacat* ובשבוע השני]
 בחמש] ה בו ישב אברם בלילה בראש החודש השביעי להביט אל
 הכוכב]ים מערב עד בקר לראות מה מעשה השנה בגשמים ויהי
 הואה] יושב לבדו ומביט ויבוא דבר בלבו ויאמר כול אותות
 הכוכב]בים
 (11QJub frag. 8 lines 1-6)

ወበሳድስ ሰባዔ ሰዓመት ጎምሉ ሎቱ ነበረ ስብራም በሌሊት ፡
 በሠርቀ ፡ ወርሃ ፡ ሳብዕ ፡ ከመ ፡ ያበይን ፡ ከዋክብተ ፡ እምሰርክ ፡ እስከ ፡
 ነግሀ ፡ ከመ ፡ ይርእይ ፡ ምንተ ፡ ግብረ ፡ ዓመት ፡ በዝናማት ፡ ወሀሎ ፡
 ውእቱ ፡ ባሕቲቱ ፡ ይነብር ፡ ወያሌይን ፡ ወመጽእ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ልቡ ፡ ቃል ፡
 ወይሌ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ተአምረ ፡ ከዋክብት ፡ ወተአምሪሃ ፡ ለወርሃ ፡ ወለፀሐይ ፡
 ኩሉ ፡ በእደ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለምንት ፡ አነ ፡ እትኃሠሠ ፡ ለእመ ፡
 ፈቀደ ፡ ያዘንም ፡ ነግሀ ፡ ወሰርክ ፡ ወእመ ፡ ፈቀደ ፡ ኢያወርድ ፡ ወኩሉ ፡
 ውስተ ፡ እደሁ ፡ ፡

[JCVK] In the sixth week, during its fifth year, Abram sat at night—at the beginning of the seventh month—to observe the stars from evening to dawn in order to see what would be the character of the year with respect to the rains. He was sitting and observing by himself. A voice came to his mind and he said: ‘All the signs of the stars and the signs of the moon and the sun—all are under the Lord’s control. Why should I be investigating (them)? If he wishes he will make it rain in the morning and evening: and if he wishes, he will not make it fall. Everything is under his control’.
 (Jubilees 12:16-18)

Enoch may have known the proper use of observing the signs of the sky (fixing a calendar), but the eastern sages err in attempting to fix the *character* of the year. Jubilees limits Enoch’s licit astronomical observation to calendar (Jubilees 4:17), and traces the illicit kind of astronomical observation to the watchers, by way of Kainan (Jubilees 8:3; cf. BW 8:3). Abram learns to write, but the rest of the package of sagely wisdom is left

behind. Most importantly, Abram (like Noah, Isaac, Jacob, Levi and Moses) does not have to be “wise” in order to receive revelation.

Jubilees elevates the intelligence of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but never fashions them into wisdom heroes. Most revelation is elite in that it is limited to the chosen line, but the receipt of revelation is not a special skill limited to a sagely elite. Jubilees lacks not only the language of “wisdom,” but any trace of the elitism of the **משכילים** over the **רבים**, or the chosen righteous who consume wisdom like fruit. The issue can be illustrated with an example outside the apocalypses. Ben Sira denies that one can become wise if occupied with tending herds (Sirach 38:25), but for Jubilees, this kind of wisdom is of little use to the herdsmen Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In the next sub-section we will consider some of the individual revelations received by the patriarchs for how they disambiguate allegory and vague meaning. To conclude this sub-section we will consider the prime example of radically non-elite revelation, the Sinaitic revelation of law and testimony to all of Israel.

It is easy to think of Jubilees as revelation involving heavenly tablets, the angel of the presence, and Moses, and forget about the people of Israel at the base of the mountain. Jubilees does not vary from Exodus in the point that the revelation is for all of Israel. The point only stands out in comparison with the apocalypses. The revelation contained in Jubilees is not intended only for a later generation, it is not limited to a chosen few, it is not sealed up or kept secret. It is instruction on how to keep the covenant that is binding on all of Israel. Jubilees both asserts that it is for all Israel, and carries out the program of accessibility throughout the book.

From the first verse after the prologue, Jubilees introduces itself as revelation received by Moses “so that you may teach them” (**כִּי־תִלְמַדְתֶּם**, Jubilees 1:1). Jubilees

provides frequent reminders of the ultimate recipients of the revelation, **ወእንተ ፡ አዝዝ ፡ ለደቂቀ ፡ እስራኤል** “Now you [Moses] command the Israelites...” (Jubilees 2:26, 29; 6:13, 20, 32; 15:28; 28:7; 30:11, 17, 21; 33:13, 18; 41:26; 49:15, 22). Other explicit statements include, **ዝንቱ ፡ ሕግ ፡ ወስምዕ ፡ ተውህበ ፡ ለደቂቀ ፡ እስራኤል ፡ ሕግ ፡ ዘለዓለም ፡ ለትውልደሙ** “This law and testimony were given to the Israelites as an eternal law throughout their generations” (Jubilees 2:33; 3:14; 49:8).¹²⁷ Jubilees also provides for continuity of the teaching office, “He [Jacob] gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi so that he could preserve them and renew them for his sons until today” (Jubilees 45:16).¹²⁸ The concern for continuous written transmission also relates to the assertion of reliable, distortion-free transmission, which brings us to the next sub-section. By itself, there is nothing shocking to the idea that revelation was given at Sinai to all of Israel with no distinction of an esoteric group, hidden away for a distant time, or a requirement of special wisdom skills in order to grasp the revelation. The discord comes as this thoroughly public, fool-proof revelation is framed as an apocalypse.

4.2.3.2. Revelation made unambiguous and accessible

Dramatically different from the apocalypses, and even compared to the base text of Genesis, Jubilees disambiguates revelation. Jubilees avoids allegorical symbolism and

¹²⁷ Like Deuteronomy 29:21, Jubilees 1:5 refers to a future generation who will suffer divine punishment before realizing their errors. From a historical-critical perspective this may be the actual original audience (still like Deuteronomy), but Jubilees claims to have been instructed to all of Israel for all time.

¹²⁸ The lack of sectarian division of Israel will come to the fore again in chapter 5, on the spatial axis. The distinction of the Levites is traditional and public, not comparable to the groups singled out in the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses.

potentially ambiguous visions. Jubilees does not communicate in code, does not read Genesis as if a code, and downplays codes that do appear in Genesis. Jubilees introduces angelic teachers not as interpretive guides of fantastic visions, but as tutors for language and memory skills, guaranteeing the clarity and accuracy of the laws and testimony.

We begin with the observation of Armin Lange that Jubilees rejects the allegorical dreams typical of apocalyptic literature.¹²⁹ The issue is not whether God communicates in dreams, but the allegorical nature of the dreams.¹³⁰ Lange follows Artemidorus in distinguishing allegorical dreams from theorematic dreams, which are understandable without interpretation. Jubilees adds only theorematic dreams, minimizes the allegorical aspect of the dreams of Joseph, and recasts Enoch's dream vision as theorematic.

Among the examples of dreams added, but conspicuously unlike the apocalypses in directness and objectivity, is Levi's dream,

ወንደረ : በይእተ : ሌሊት : ውስተ : ቤቴል : ወሐለመ : ሌዊ : ከመ :
 ሢምዎ : ወረሰይዎ : ለክህነት : ለአምላክ : ልዑል : ኪያሁ : ወውሉዶ :
 እስከ : ለዓለም :: ወነቅሀ : አምንዋሙ : ወባረኮ : ለእግዚአብሔር ::

[JCVK] That night he stayed at Bethel. Levi dreamed that he—he and his sons—had been appointed and made into the priesthood of the most high God forever. When he awakened, he blessed the Lord. (Jubilees 32:1)

¹²⁹ Lange, “Divinatorische Träume,” 25-38. Lange also deals with the Genesis Apocryphon and concludes, “allegorische Träume zur Abfassungszeit des Jubiläenbuches positiv fast ausschließlich in Werken verwendet wurden, die der apokalyptischen Bewegung nahestehen oder aus ihr stammen” (page 35). My translation, “Allegorical dreams were used at the time of the composition of Jubilees almost exclusively in works which are close to the apocalyptic movement or originate from it.” The present argument approaches exclusivity differently because of the distinction of literary genre, worldview and movement. If the worldview is typical and distinctive of the apocalypses it is apocalyptic even when found outside the literary genre. The movement of origin is irrelevant for the present discussion.

For a broader discussion see Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*.

¹³⁰ Jubilees seems to interchange dreams and visions. Compare Genesis 15:1 (vision) and Jubilees 14:1 (dream).

Another unambiguous dream in addition to the base text is also found in Jubilees 41:24, where Judah is told that he is forgiven. The heavenly tablets appear in dreams, but these are not symbols of anything other than tablets, and the message is never ambiguous (see Jubilees 32:21).

Lange finds allegorical dreams in Jubilees only in the retelling of the Joseph story, and even then downplayed. Joseph's dreams of the sheaves and the stars are simply omitted (Genesis 37:5-9). Jubilees mentions that Joseph correctly interpreted the dreams of the butler and baker, but does not recount the dreams themselves (Jubilees 39:16-17; Genesis 40:8-23). The dreams of pharaoh are also assumed as necessary to advance the story, but not only are the contents omitted, any dramatic tension about the interpretation is spoiled from the first sentence, "At that time the pharaoh had two dreams in one night about the subject of the famine which would come on the whole land" (Jubilees 40:1).¹³¹ Jubilees is not trying to replace Genesis or polemicizing against the legitimacy of allegorical dreams in Genesis, but Jubilees does present its own revelation according to its own worldview of no-nonsense revelation. Whatever complex and ambiguous stories may have been received by Israel, the bottom line of covenantal fidelity, the law and the testimony, is completely unambiguous.

Similarly, Lange continues, Jubilees 4:19 refers to a dream vision of Enoch (presumably the Animal Apocalypse or the entire Book of Dreams) with no mention of any symbolism. We might add that there is also some variation in the response of Enoch and the audience. The Animal Apocalypse concludes with Enoch disturbed and weeping

¹³¹ Werman studies the tendency in Jubilees to diminish dramatic tension. Cana Werman, "היחס 'לגויים' בספר היובלים ובספרות קומראן בהשוואה להלכה התנאית הקדומה ולספרות חיצונית בת התקופה" (Dissertation, Hebrew University, 1995).

(90:41-42), while Jubilees 4:19 emphasizes the objective clarity, “He saw everything and understood.” The Enochic apocalypses are not always clear on whether Enoch’s revelation was made public or kept esoteric, but Jubilees emphasizes the public nature of Enoch’s testimony, **ወጸሐፎ ፡ ስምዐ ፡ ወአንበሮ ፡ ዲበ ፡ ምድር ፡ ላዕለ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ደቂቀ ፡ እንሰ ፡ እመሕያው ፡ ወለጎውልዶሙ** “He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all the children of Eve and for their generations” (Jubilees 4:19).

Lange’s study advances the present argument, even though his conclusion operates with slightly different categories. Lange concludes that Jubilees opposed the apocalyptic movement and cannot be called apocalyptic, but he does not separate literary genre, worldview and movement.¹³² The view of revelation as cryptic is part of the worldview, not the definition of the literary genre, even if the worldview is typically implicit in the illocution of the genre. The worldview of Jubilees on this issue is not the worldview typically found in apocalypses, but that does not necessarily indicate the literary genre used (or the social origin of the work).

In addition to the allegorical dreams considered by Lange, there are other examples of disambiguation in Jubilees. For example, Genesis 49 was a hotbed of ambiguous meaning, particularly the prediction of the royal destiny of Judah.

לֹא־יִסּוּר שִׁבְט מִיְהוּדָה וּמַחֲקֶק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילָה¹³³ וְלֹא יִקְהַת עַמִּים:

The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler’s staff from between his feet, until tribute comes to him; and the obedience of the peoples is his.
(Genesis 49:10, NRSV)

¹³² Lange, “Divinatorische Träume,” 35.

¹³³ Qere: שִׁילָה

Jubilees makes only a brief mention of the deathbed blessings of Jacob at that particular place in the story.

benedixit israhel filios suos priusquam moreretur et indicavit
quaecumquaecumque uentura essent eis in terra aegypti nouissimis diebus
Et benedixit eos. et ioseph benedixit dupliciter in terra

Israel blessed his sons before he died. He told them what would happen to
them in later days in the land of Egypt. He blessed them and blessed
Joseph with double territory. (Jubilees 45:14)¹³⁴

It is not the case, however, that Jubilees gives no further account of Jacob's prediction.

The first change is that Jubilees moves the revelation to explain how Jacob knew all this.

Genesis 49 gives no indication of how or even that Jacob's oracle was divine revelation, but Jubilees attaches it to an elaborated revelation event at Bethel. The second change is that the revelation is not oracular in the sense of poetic ambiguity, but becomes a matter-of-fact statement.

Interestingly, however, Jacob is not the first to receive revelation about the future role of Judah. Earlier, a spirit of prophecy had descended into Isaac's mouth,

ወለይሁዳሂ : ይቤሎ : የሁብከ : እግዚአብሔር : ኀይለ : ወጽንዐ : ከመ :
ትኪደመ : ለኩሎመ : እለ : ይጸልኩክ : መኩንን : ኩን : አንተ : ወአሐዱ :
እምነ : ውሉድክ : ለውሉደ : ያዕቆብ

[JCVK] Then he said to Judah: May the Lord give you the power and
strength to trample on all who hate you. Be a prince—you and one of your
sons—for Jacob's sons. (Jubilees 31:18)

¹³⁴ Although it does not matter for the present purposes, this translation comes from the Latin, rather than VanderKam's preferred reading from the Ethiopic, as discussed in chapter 6 note 118. The issue there is whether Jubilees reads בְּאַחֶרֶת הַיָּמִים from Genesis 49:1 to mean the future relative to Jacob but not the second century, or future in a sense of unrealized eschatology. Even if one favors the Ethiopic text over the Latin, there is an additional, if not absolute, emphasis that Jacob foretells what will happen *in Egypt*. The word order in Ethiopic and Latin makes it unlikely, but not impossible, that “in Egypt” indicates where Jacob told them what would happen, not where it would happen. Ethiopic manuscripts 21, 35 and 63 (from the first, third and fifth best families), like the Latin, lack a conjunction between “in the land of Egypt” and “in later days.”

Jacob also received at Bethel a revelation that overlaps in content with Genesis 49:10,

[ואת הארץ והפרייתיכ] ה והרבייתיכה במאוד מאוד ומלכים ממכה יהיו]
[וימש] לֹא בכול מדרוך כִּי] רגל בני אדם ואתן לזרעכה את כול הארץ אשר תחת]
(4QpapJub^h 1 ll. 1-2)

ወይቤሉ : ካዕበ : አነ : ውእቱ : እግዚአብሔር : ዘፈጠርኩ : ሰማየ : ወምድረ :
ወአልህቀክ : ወአበዝነክ : ፈድፋደ : ጥቀ : ወነገሥት : እምኔክ : ይከውኑ :
ወይኤንኑ : በኩለሄ : ወእደ : ኬደ : አሰረ : ውሉደ : ሰብእ ::

ubicumque fecerint uestigium pedum suorum aduersus filios hominum

He spoke to him a second time: “I am the Lord who created heaven and earth. I will increase your numbers and multiply you very much. Kings will come from you, and they will rule wherever they set foot against anyone.” (Jubilees 32:18)¹³⁵

A more general connection is made between Genesis 49 and Jubilees 32.

וַיִּקְרָא יַעֲקֹב אֶל־בָּנָיו וַיֹּאמֶר הֵאֱסֹפוּ וְאֶגִּידָה לָכֶם אֶת אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא אֲתֶכֶם בְּאַחֲרִית
הַיָּמִים:

Jacob called his sons and said, “Gather around so I can tell you what will happen to you in days to come.” (Genesis 49:1)

[הלי]לה והנה מֹלֵךְ [אך] (4QpapJub^h 1 line 5)

ወርእየ : በራእየ : ሌሊት : ወናሁ : መልእክ : ይወርድ : እምሰማይ : ወሰብዑ :
ሰሌዳት : ውስተ : እደዊሁ : ወወሀቦ : ለደዕቆብ : ወአንበሶን : ወአንበበ : ኩሉ :
ዘጽሐፍ : ውስቴቶን : ዘይከውን : ሉቱ : ወለውሉዱ : በኩሉ : ዓለማት ::

[JCVK] In a night vision he saw an angel coming down from heaven with seven tablets in his hands. He gave (them) to Jacob, and he read them. He read everything that was written in them – what would happen to him and his sons throughout all ages. (Jubilees 32:21)

Jubilees is not at all opposed to the idea that Jacob received revelation about the destiny of Judah. The striking shift, for the present purpose,¹³⁶ is that Genesis 49 was an

¹³⁵ Again, this translation follows a reading defended elsewhere. The problem is not relevant to the present issue. See 6.6.3.

¹³⁶ There are, of course, other interesting issues in these texts, including the formulation of the royal prophecy with respect to a single figure, not a dynasty, and the tendency (or complete replacement, depending on the manuscript) toward fulfilling the prediction in the past (relative to the 2nd century) history of Israel, rather than the eschatological future.

ambiguous oracle with no mention of how Jacob gained his knowledge, and Jubilees turns it into a matter-of-fact, perfectly clear revelation with all the authority of God, the heavenly tablets, the angel of the presence, and continuous written transmission. This same revelatory sequence brings us to an additional point, the transformation of angelic teaching from interpretive guide of the wonders of the cosmos, to a tutor in language and memory skills.

There are subtle but noteworthy differences in the way angels teach in Jubilees compared to the typical apocalypses. More will be said in Chapter 5 about how Jubilees develops transcendent figures from the spatial axis. The point relevant to the view of revelation is that, in the apocalypses, angels typically provide explanations of otherwise ungraspable wonders, and even their interpretations often leave an enigma or two. The authority of their revelation is often taken for granted, or indirect as a general divine commission.

In Jubilees, the angels have less autonomy in that they transmit revelation from the heavenly tablets, not their own voices (Jubilees 6:35).¹³⁷ When angels are not simply delivering or dictating tablets, they are tutoring the skills required to guarantee reliable written transmission. They may offer an occasional aside about what should be obvious from the heavenly tablets (e.g., the chosen place for the temple is Jerusalem, not Bethel; Jubilees 32:22), but they do not provide independent interpretations of ungraspable mysteries. Thus, in the revelation to Jacob at Bethel just discussed, the angel facilitates the revelation by delivering the heavenly tablets and guaranteeing an accurate copy.

¹³⁷ “For I know and from now on will inform you—not from my own mind because this is the way the book is written in front of me...” If one takes it as a contradiction that the angel seems to offer occasional asides, then it is an ancient contradiction. Jubilees, consistently or not, presents the revealing angel as a zero-interference transmitter.

ወይቤ ፡ ያዕቆብ ፡ እግዚአ ፡ እፎ ፡ እዚካር ፡ ዘከመ ፡ አንበብኩ ፡ ወርኢኩ ፡
 ኩሎ ፡ ወይቤሎ ፡ አነ ፡ አዜክረክ ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ወዐርገ ፡ እምነቤሁ ፡ ወነቅሀ ፡
 እምንዋሙ ፡ ወተዘከረ ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ዘእንበበ ፡ ወዘርእየ ፡ ወጸሐፈ ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ነገረ ፡
 ዘአነበበ ፡ ወዘርእየ

[JCVK] Then Jacob said: “Lord, how shall I remember everything just as I have read and seen”? He said to him: “I will remind you of everything”. When he had gone from him, he awakened and remembered everything that he had read and seen. He wrote down all the things that he had read and seen. (Jubilees 32:25-26)

In the case of Abram an angel is assigned the relatively mundane job of teaching, *NELC 100: Introduction to Classical Hebrew* (Jubilees 12:25-27). The overall trend suggests a worldview. Revelation is not an angelic interpretation of cosmic mysteries to a bewildered recipient, followed by an esoteric chain of transmission. Rather, revelation consists of clear and direct instructions through a passive angelic messenger to a well-trained and supervised copyist, passed down (or re-revealed) in a continuous line. The ultimate source of revelation is the heavenly tablets, and they were completely revealed to all Israel at Sinai. This revelation was fool-proof and need only be preserved and studied, not amended.

The individual points considered in this chapter constitute various perspectives on the same coherent worldview with respect to revelation. The accessibility of revelation relates to the public reception of revelation, which relates to the familiarity of authority. Like Deuteronomy 30, Jubilees emphasizes that there are no excuses for covenantal infidelity. Everything that one needs to know can be easily known, and indeed is already known from the received tradition. In a sense, Jubilees may inherently be a work of creativity and “decoding,” or at least searching, of tradition. Nevertheless, Jubilees does obey its own rules. Revelation has a single source, and so must be consistent with and

derived from received revelation. The traditions of Israel attributed to Sinai are sufficient for all time, including both before Sinai and beyond the eschatological turning point to eternity. The revealed covenant is incumbent on, and hence accessible to, all of Israel. Jubilees testifies to the sufficiency of the tradition far more than it challenges it.

The worldview conveyed in Jubilees is not particularly surprising in the general context of Judaism in antiquity, nor is it surprising that one text would differ in worldview from other texts. The surprise is that one worldview is conveyed in the framework of a literary genre that typically conveys a contrary worldview. From the first chapter of Jubilees, and in frequent reminders throughout the text, Jubilees presents itself as a revelation of heavenly tablets through an angel to an exemplary ancient figure. Jubilees uses the genre as defined in *Semeia* 14 and exemplified by prior works such as the early Enochic apocalypses and Daniel. The use of the genre creates reader expectations. These expectations come from observation of prior examples, as well as an inherent implication in the illocution of a genre. A reader expects an apocalypse to convey new, mysterious, and elite revelation partially because that is what other apocalypses convey, and partially because such a claim lends itself to authorizing revelation that cannot be authorized by more mundane means. The use of a genre itself conveys meaning, and the decision to frame Jubilees as an apocalypse bears special significance, since it could have been framed as “fidelity to the eternal covenant for dummies.” In purely literary terms, we can observe irony in the fact that Jubilees uses a genre to create a reader expectation of a worldview that is inverted and implicitly critiqued.