

Kristian Aanestad

# *The Question of Origin*

*Placing the Book of Jubilee within a Mosaic, Qumranic, or Enochian  
context.*

MASTER'S THESIS  
RELIGIOUS ROOTS OF EUROPE



FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHEOLOGY, HISTORY, CULTURAL STUDIES AND RELIGION  
SPRING 2012



The Question of Origin  
Placing the Book of Jubilees within a Mosaic or Enochian context

Kristian Aanestad

Copyright © by Kristian Aanestad 2012, AHKR, University of Bergen, Spring 2012

## ***Contents***

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	ix
Introduction	1
Method and structure	3
Context and Pitfalls	5

### **Part One – A presentation of contexts, literary corpuses, and scholarly perspectives**

The Mosaic tradition - Origin of the Torah	11
The Enochic Writings	16
The Qumran Corpus	21
The Book of Jubilees	26

### **Part Two - Comparing narratives, ideologies, inter-textual notions of sin, and textual aims**

The Enochic narrative - an alternative beginning	33
The Book of Watchers – the origin of sin	34
Differences between <i>Book of Watchers</i> and <i>Apocalypse of Weeks</i> – Inconsistencies within the Enochic tradition	36
Book of Jubilees – the bastard of Enoch and Moses	41
Enoch in Jubilees	42
The Watchers in the Book of Jubilees	44
Sin and Punishment in Book of Jubilees	47
Calendar and Chronology	48

The Jubilees as an apocalyptic counter-narrative or - as an alternate alternative	50
--	----

**Part Three – Evaluating theories and categories, and placing  
the Book of Jubilees in a religious context.**

New perspectives, old theories	57
Examining theories	58
Scribal traditions	61
The Idea of an Canon	62
Jerusalem vs. Qumran	65
Dating the Book of Jubilees	67
Conclusion	68
Bibliography	71

## *Preface*

A couple of years ago I was challenged with a question that introduced me to various theories concerning relations between ancient Jewish texts. I was asked to explain the difference between Mosaic literature and the literature referred to as Enochian. A task that sounds easy enough. But after reading up on the subject I was only left with more unanswered questions that demanded my attention, resulting in me abandoning my former plans of writing about representations of the early Christian underworld and focusing on the early Jewish literary traditions, and more specifically on the relations between the Mosaic, Enochic and Qumranic literary corpuses. The *Book of Jubilees* seemed to be key text to understanding those relations as it was referred to by a number of great scholars, but its origin and authors seemingly never agreed upon.

In this thesis I present my own perspective on the relations between the early Jewish traditions as I attempt to place Jubilees in a historical context and to identify the probable author or authors of the text. While researching and writing this thesis I have received several valuable tips and hints along the way and I owe several people my thanks. First of all I would like to thank my mentor Einar Thomassen for all the help he has given me. This thesis would not have been the same without his help. Secondly I would like to give thanks to my brother Andreas Aanestad, a fellow student of religion, for rescuing me from drowning in literature and for guiding me through bad grammar. I would also give thanks to Amrita Kaur, Kjetil Bergrem and Vegard Sørhus for proofreading large parts of the thesis. Thanks to Helge S. Kvanvig for pointing me to the essential literature needed for writing for this thesis. And last, but by no means least, I would give thanks to Natalie Sagstad for keeping me in check when I would rather play the harmonica than write, as well as keeping me fed.

*Kristian Aanestad*

*University of Bergen, Spring 2012*





## *Abbreviations*

Jub	– Book of Jubilees	(Book)
AW	– Apocalypse of Weeks	(Book)
AB	– Astronomical Book	(Book)
BP	– Book of Parables	(Book)
BN	– The Birth of Noah	(Book)
DV	– Dream Visions	(Book)
EE	– Epistle of Enoch	(Book)
D	– Deuteronomist	(Possible author)
E	– Elohists	(Possible author)
P	– Priestly	(Possible group of authors)
Y/J	– YHWE	(Possible author)
1.En	– Textual references to 1 .Enoch	(Text corpus)
DSL	– Dead Sea Library	(Collection of ancient Judaic texts)
Gen	– Genesis	(Book)
Dan	– Daniel	(Book)
Deut	– Deuteronomy	(Book)
Exod	– Exodus	(Book)
Ezek	– Ezekiel	(Book)
Neh	– Nehemiah	(Book)



## *Introduction*

Judaism in the second temple period (530BCE to 70CE) consisted of many different religious groups, which has resulted in a multitude of literature. It has been notoriously hard to track down the origin of many of these texts as we know little about the relations between the groups and their ideologies. In this thesis I focus on one such text, namely the *Book of Jubilees*, and attempt to find its origin within the second temple period's different traditions. In order to do this I explore different text corpuses and their relevance for my search. The result from my research is used as a foundation on which I base my final analysis. The *Book of Jubilees* was discovered in the language of Ge'ez in Ethiopia, where it is a part of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church's canon. Later there were discovered several fragments of copies in the Dead Sea Library near Qumran, these in the Hebrew language.

What is special about the *Book of Jubilees* is that it recounts much of the same narrative as Genesis and Exodus, but at the same time adds elements known from the Enochian corpus, another text corpus of unknown origins. It contains a new narrative, a retelling of the traditional Judaic religious narrative we know from the Hebrew Bible. At the same time the text manages, to a certain extent, to incorporate elements from different traditions. It is fascinating how it manages to incorporate these elements, and how the different narratives are fused together to create a new narrative, in which there are no obvious polemics between the traditions. The origin of the book is debated.

That is why I have chosen the text of Jubilees as the subject for my thesis. In attempts to understand the context in which ancient Judaic texts originated scholars have compared literary corpuses, searched for filiations, and traced translations backwards when trying to place it among certain known, or more obscure, religious groups. I will refer to much of their research in this thesis, and by the means of historical criticism and the literature on the subject I will examine texts for clues which can be used to find a place for the *Book of Jubilees*.

Key elements that will be explored are, 1) the fall of the angels, a depiction found in the Mosaic Genesis, the Enochic *Book of Watchers*, as well as in *Book of Jubilees*, 2) the origin of sin in the different narratives explored, 3) The relationship between the different traditions as presented in their texts, and, 4) The scribal culture and theories concerning possible authors.

## *Method and Structure*

To identify the origin of the *Book of Jubilees* (from now abbreviated Jub) I find it natural to use historical criticism. By comparing Jub with the Hebrew Bible, the Enochic writings, and what we know of the scribal culture at Qumran, I will try to identify which religious corpus Jub relates most to. Then I will explore what we know of the historical context in which these groups existed in an attempt to answer the questions of when and where it was written. Historical criticism, or higher criticism as it also is known as, is often used as a reference to the method developed by several German scholars within biblical studies from the eighteenth to the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> The method is still viable and is very suitable for the aim of a thesis such as this.

The aim of the method is to identify the origin of a text, or several texts, based on literary analysis. The cornerstone of the method is the comparative approach, as the identification of differences and similarities are essential to get an understanding of the intra-textual relations. According to James R. de J. Jackson historical criticism is an attempt to find the original meaning of a text, to understand them as they were understood when new.<sup>2</sup> While it is impossible to achieve a perfect understanding of the original meaning it should still be the aim for the scholar to get as close as possible to its intended message. This is one aspect of the method, a crucial one, but it does not cover the complete method, for the research on literary styles and evolution of writing is also an essential part which I explore within this paper.

There is always room for a model, and mine is the research done on the synoptic gospels in the New Testament, as that is close to what I attempt to do in this thesis when it comes to the historical context as well as both are religious narratives. When scholars compared certain factors in intra-textual research, such as the literary styles used and similarities within the gospels, they identified several authors behind the gospels in the New Testament, as well as possible connections between those authors. Today the most accepted

---

<sup>1</sup> For example Julius Wellhausen and Jean Astruc who I return to in part one.

<sup>2</sup> Jackson. R. de. J. 1989:3-4

model is a two source model, in which it is assumed that the gospels of both Matthew and Luke were influenced by the gospel of Mark as well as the unknown Q-source.<sup>3</sup> So not only has there been identified a connection between authors, but there are also scholars who claim there is a still unknown document because of similarities between the gospels which cannot be explained by the gospel of Mark alone. Building on earlier literary research and through doing a comparative research of my own I try to explore the literary and religious context in which Jub originated.

In the first part of this thesis I will examine the Mosaic Judaic tradition of the time, with a focus on the Hebrew Bible, and then mainly on the Torah. This is followed by an examination of the Enochic writings, with a focus on the *Book of Watchers* and the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (from now on abbreviated BW and AW), the Qumran texts, and of course Jub itself. I focus on the basics of certain texts within the different traditions and possible fractions within those traditions, as well as age, location, languages, and its placement in the general corpus of the given tradition. In the second part of the thesis I will look at the differences between the content of the texts. I will compare Jub with the Enochic writings and the Mosaic Hebrew bible, and try to identify similarities, and maybe even more importantly differences between the historical narratives found within the texts. In the third part I discuss possible relations between the texts found in part two with the information from part one. I analyse which of the current theories and arguments concerning the scribal culture and possible author groups are probable, and which are not. By examining the text both on a factual (date, geographical locations, language, historical context; from part 1) and a content oriented (differences between the religious texts; from part 2) level, I will try to unravel the question of Jub's origin and map its presence among the different text corpuses.

When it comes to the theories presented in this paper, my own or those of other scholars, I feel I have to mention my thoughts about the criticism of "The Idol of Origins", as it is relevant for what I try to achieve in this paper.<sup>4</sup> While reading up on early Judaism and relations between the religious groups I noticed that several scholars found the research on filiations between religions troublesome. The idea is that one does not need to trace everything further back by exploring filiations, and if one chose to do so anyway one should be careful. I feel I should mention this aspect of the historical methodology as that is exactly what I attempt to do in this paper, and at the same time express that I do not share much of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Abakuks. 2006:49

<sup>4</sup> Marc Bloch first used the term in *The Historian's craft*. 1961. I found the reference in: Baumgarten. 2005:256

concern presented by other scholars. Albert I. Baumgarten believes that the creation of a family tree is less productive than comparative research, and that the survival of parts of a major religious context is “far too complex and accidental to be meaningfully traced by a teleological historical method.”<sup>5</sup> He proposes to look at the second temple period with the eyes of a biologist, to use the new biological paradigm and view it as a time of numerous alternatives, and thus many possible endings.<sup>6</sup>

We should view the period as a context in which the possibilities were many, as we know they were, with the different religions presented by different rulers and travellers in a time of religious revolution which followed Alexander the Great and then the Hellenistic era.<sup>7</sup> It is possible to look at a period of numerous alternatives and speculate in how those alternatives came to be. If anything one need both perspectives to fully understand the religious terrain. And one of the main jobs of biologists is the categorization of genealogical relations. When sharing an ancestor, the differences are what become important.

### *Contexts and Pitfalls*

To navigate the religious and general cultural context found in early Judaism is no easy task, and often proves difficult for the scholar as there are many uncertain factors. By choosing to focus on Jub, I had to understand the academic field as well as the text corpuses in order to map the origin and the spread of the text. We still have aspects that are known to us, or we have hypotheses which, according to most scholars, are plausible. One is that the texts from the given period are probably written by a privileged few, the educated elite of the communities. To be able to write impressive stories such as those discussed in this paper would demand a certain amount of education and time, which most people did not have. We are also aware of the languages in which the texts are written, even if we are not always sure about the original language. The problem of language is relevant when it comes to the text in question in this thesis, as there have been found copies in Hebrew, Latin, Ge'ez, Syriac, and it is probable that there was a Greek version as well. We also know where the texts were found, which give us the possibility to track changes within the texts from different locations.

---

<sup>5</sup> Baumgarten. 2005:261

<sup>6</sup> Baumgarten. 2005:261

<sup>7</sup> In the first centuries before and after CE there was an enormous boost in language, information, and trade, making it possible, if exaggerating a tad, to speak of it as many religious revolutions.

However there are several pitfalls we need to avoid, the primary of which would probably be our own notions of authorship and scribal tradition, as well as the uncertainty of how information travelled within the ancient cultures. It is easy to picture a lone author writing a book and signing it when done. However, this is not how we know the text in question or the scribal culture at the time. There are also questions concerning the spread of information at the time. It is possible that religious groups, even within a relatively small geographical area did not know of each other, or at least did not know the way of life of the other groups. Through comparison we can try to identify shared world views, look for different literary styles within a text, and maybe find errors of translation. Compared with the ancient Middle East, we have an incredible access to information, which makes it possible for me to build upon and compare academic hypotheses, which is part of what I will do in this thesis.

Within religious studies there are probably few areas that have been more thoroughly researched than Judaism, as an autonomous religion, and as the precursor of Christianity. The resources are outstanding, with Flavius Josephus's *Antiquities of the Jews*, which give us an introduction to the Jewish culture and history, and it is even written for a non-Jewish audience, which makes it an introduction to the Jewish society at the time. Philo's philosophical reflections on large parts of the Jewish society, as well as much of the literature which became a part of the Jewish literary canon, give us an insider perspective as opposed to non-Jewish authors such as Pliny, Dion of Prusa and Hippolytus of Rome who give an outsider perspective.<sup>8</sup>

As impressive as the sources are, the truth is that the obscurity of early Judaism still confuses scholars today. Several books have been written about the ruins and texts found near Qumran, which were discovered in the 1940s. Scholars are still unsure of what the settlement's role were, and even of what kind of community that left almost 900 scrolls hidden in caves nearby. And when one looks to the ancient sources one often finds competing views. Often one does not even know the name of the community or authors behind the texts that have been found, as with the texts that are called "Enochic," a name given because of the role given to Enoch as the protagonist in the texts. We know little about what the authors called themselves, or were called by others at the time.

In the last years things have changed drastically, and the scholarly fields around the Enochic writings, and the writings connection to the Mosaic tradition as well as the Qumran

---

<sup>8</sup> Dion of Prusa is also known as; Dio Cocceianus and Chrysostom.



community have experienced a boost of interest. This is largely because of the publishing of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and later the foundation of the Enoch seminar, which consists of a group of international specialists who focus on second temple Judaism and the Christian origins and whose research work has been important for my thesis.

There are several theories which concern themselves with Jub, and they often attempt to place it in an Enochian, Qumranic or Mosaic category. Enochian because it is clear that the Enochic literature has been an inspiration for Jub, Qumranic because of all the copies that have been found at Qumran, while much of the narrative seems to be from the Hebrew Bible, thus the Mosaic category. Could it be a rewritten Torah, a counter story, an attempt to add material to the Mosaic tradition, or even an autonomous religious text? I will attempt to answer all these questions in this thesis.

When it comes to the primary sources used in this paper I present them thoroughly in the first part of the thesis, as I have dedicated the first part to explore the empirical data along with necessary research history, thus there is no reason to mention them here.



## **Part One**

**A presentation of contexts, literary corpuses, and scholarly perspectives.**



## ***The Mosaic tradition – Origin of the Torah***

To get an idea of the relationship between Jub and the Mosaic tradition we need to focus on three aspects, 1) the scribal culture and the historical context in which the texts were produced, 2) the spread of such texts in the given historical context, and, 3) similarities between Mosaic scriptures and Jub. Luckily, the Mosaic tradition has been debated for centuries, first by the Jews themselves, and later by biblical scholars, which have resulted in there being much data for me to explore when researching the historical context of the Mosaic tradition. The problem is that the origin of the Torah is still very uncertain ground. Point three is debated in part two of the paper. Scriptural references and citations from the Hebrew Bible in the paper are from the NSRV.<sup>9</sup>

The Hebrew Bible, the *Tanakh*, is the main Mosaic scripture. It was probably canonized over a long period following the return from the exile and into the common era. It is usually divided into three parts; the *Torah*, the *Neb'im*, and, the *Ketubim* (the law, the prophets, and the writings.) For a long time the narration found in the Torah was treated as history, and critical research of the texts in the Hebrew Bible was first introduced by Richard Simon in 1687, with his work *Critical History of the Old Testament*, which led him into an unfavourable position with both the Catholic and the Protestant Church.<sup>10</sup> Later, a French catholic, doctor Jean Astruc<sup>11</sup>, claimed that there was a possibility that Genesis, the first text of the Torah, was written by two authors. His evidence for this was the different use of YHWE and Elohim in the text. This, as well as the works of several other scholars led way for Julius Wellhausen, a German biblical scholar whose work has been influential in later biblical research, and whose hypothesis is still taught today.

---

<sup>9</sup> *The HarperCollins Study Bible*. 1989

<sup>10</sup> Barstad. 2003:49

<sup>11</sup> Boadt. 1984:81

The hypothesis presented by Wellhausen, later often referred to as the Wellhausen/Graf hypothesis<sup>12</sup>, claimed that there are actually four authors or scribal groups that can be identified in the Torah; 1) YHWE, abbreviated Y or J<sup>13</sup>; 2) Elohist, abbreviated E; 3) Deuteronomist, abbreviated D; and; 4) The Priestly Source, abbreviated P.<sup>14</sup> He proposed the chronology as I presented it, Y as the first and P as the last. This hypothesis, which is called the *Documentary hypothesis*, has worked as a model on which much of the later biblical research is based.<sup>15</sup> According to Wellhausen the the Y/J and E sources of the Bible were written before the D source, which he dated to the late seventh century.<sup>16</sup> This places the first three sources in the monarchical period before the exile of a substantial part of the Jewish community to Babylon, which started in 587 BCE and on a grander scale in 597 BCE.<sup>17</sup> If one believes Wellhausen's hypothesis this would indicate that most of the Torah is truly old. The P source, which Wellhausen claims is from the time of the exile, then patched together and edited the three original sources into the Torah as we know it.<sup>18</sup> Today most scholars place the original sources at a much later date, in the exilic period or even later. This is largely because of Hans Heinrich Schmid's contribution to the biblical research in *The so-called Yahwist* in 1976, in which he argues that several texts show literary styles that are of a much later date than proposed by Wellhausen and his followers.<sup>19</sup>

The Canadian John Van Seters is one of the scholars who place only one source in the pre-exilic period. He believes lesser parts of the Torah to be from an older source, but claims that the Y/J and P sources actually were written in the exilic and post-exilic period as supplements, and he questions the existence of an E source entirely.<sup>20</sup> The idea of an original text that is then supplemented can be called *supplementary hypothesis* and its adherents search for the original source of the Torah, but often disagree as to what content actually is

---

<sup>12</sup> Karl Heinrich Graf worked was a great inspiration for Wellhausen. He placed the law after the prophets, and this was to be an eye opener for Wellhausen, as can be seen in *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. 1885: 3-4

<sup>13</sup> J as Wellhausen wrote in German

<sup>14</sup> Barstad. 2010:50

<sup>15</sup> One could speak of the older and the newer documentary hypothesis, but within the limits of this paper I find it unnecessary to go through all the differences. A lot has been written on the subject, and if one wants to get a summary of the differences, Nicholson does a great job in presenting it; Nicholson. 1998:8

<sup>16</sup> Nicholson. 1998:14

<sup>17</sup> Murphy. 2002:19

<sup>18</sup> Nicholson. 1998:21

<sup>19</sup> Nicholson. 1998:97 (In text) and footnote 7 at the same site.

<sup>20</sup> Seters, Van. 1975:310-311

the original.<sup>21</sup> A contemporary of Van Seter and Schmid who presented another possibility in *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*,<sup>22</sup> was Roger, N. Whybray. He claims that there is not enough evidence for the Documentary hypothesis and he proposes an alternative approach where he only acknowledges one author. This could be called the *Fragment Hypothesis*, as he proposes that the single author worked with fragments of different sources to which he added some of his own work. He also attacks Van Seter and other scholars, who argued there existed an original text which the rest of the Torah is based upon. He claims that there is no reason to believe that the first version of the Torah was not also the last.<sup>23</sup>

The problem with this perspective is that it does not explain the different literary styles found within the text. Documentary and supplementary hypotheses can explain this by the assumption of several authors, or editing of the original story, but with one author it would be strange to find different literary styles, even if he was an historian who based the narrative on different fragments of texts. Whybray claims this was because the author chose not to use, or did not know, the literary methods that would give the story smoother transitions and language.<sup>24</sup> While we so far have focused on the chronology of the composition of the Torah, there are also questions concerning the historical narrative as presented in the Torah. Within *biblical minimalism*, also called the Copenhagen School, the authenticity of the historical narrative written in the Torah is compared with archaeology and knowledge of history. In his article “What Separates a Minimalist from a Maximalist? Not Much”<sup>25</sup> Phillip Davis sums up several archaeological factors that raise doubts about the history of Jews and Israel, as presented in the Torah. What is interesting is that it is not archaeological discoveries that raises these doubts, but rather the lack of them, as there is found almost no evidence for the Jews being in Egypt, or traces of warfare in Canaan, as it is written in the Torah. This does not mean that the texts cannot be helpful in finding the textual base of the Jewish religion, but that it

---

<sup>21</sup> Svend Tengström could be placed under the supplement hypothesis as well but differ from Van Seter in what he considers the original text. While Van Seter focuses a version of Deuteronomy (that extends from Deuteronomy to second kings), Tengström claim Genesis to Joshua was not part of the original text. Nicholson. 1998:97 (In text,) and footnote 6 same site. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht DeWette was one of the first who aired the idea of an original document in the beginning of the nineteenth century, thereby making him one of the first “supplementarists,” while Van Seter could be said to have revived that tradition. Nicholson. 1998: 97

<sup>22</sup> Whybray. 1987

<sup>23</sup> Whybray. 1987:232-233

<sup>24</sup> Whybray. 1987:234-235

<sup>25</sup> Davies. 2000:26

is plausible that the narratives themselves might not tell a true tale when it comes to much of Israel's history.

In 2007, with the publishing of *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, Karel Van Der Toorn presented a theory that places the birthplace of the Hebrew Bible within the scribal culture connected to the temple.<sup>26</sup> He compared scribal practices found in Judea with ancient Mesopotamian and Egyptian practices, and he claims there are many flawed conceptions about the scribal culture of early Judaism. He emphasises the fact that the persons who wrote the texts should not be considered authors in the way that we think of authors. The scribes of the texts found in the Hebrew Bible were trained to copy and modify older texts, not invent new ones like a lone person who wants to make a name for himself.<sup>27</sup> The author would represent a guild of scribes, which then again would work for the temple and the palace.<sup>28</sup> These are not all new ideas, far from it, but the picture given by Van Der Toorn is one of a scribal culture in which there was much secrecy and where the scribes would be interested in keeping their privileges for themselves. Thus his perspective focus more on the aspect of religious power than most previous theories mentioned, as well as it limits the scribal training almost entirely to the temple.

Van Der Toorn's perspective is interesting when it comes to the theme of this thesis, as it could indicate that it is likely that the authors of Jub and the Enochian corpus would have been trained at the temple in Jerusalem. There would probably be limited possibilities for scribal training outside the temple if we accept Toorn's claim of secrecy within the guilds. The close relationship between the temple and the palace for which Van Der Toorn advocates could also indicate that secular politics might have affected the religious narratives to a further extent than previously assumed. Within the Enochic literature there are verses that imply a pollution of the temple in Jerusalem, which might be a reference to a mix of religious and secular power. This will be discussed in part two.

Van Der Toorn's theory has been criticized. Van Der Toorn himself mentions that some scholars (without referring to names) believe the literacy in the Palestinian area to have been exceptionally high, as they used the alphabet instead of the cuneiform or hieroglyphs

---

<sup>26</sup> Toorn, Van. Der. 2007

<sup>27</sup> Toorn, Van. Der. 2007:27

<sup>28</sup> Even though Van Der Toorn gives a good argument concerning the notion of authorship, I find no problem using the term as long as one is aware of the implications, and I will continue using the term. Toorn, Van. Der. 2007:51-109



used by the Mesopotamian and Egyptians.<sup>29</sup> This would make a closed scribal group less plausible. In a review of the work, the theologian Richard Weis criticises Van Der Toorn for not including the scribal practice at Qumran, as he claims this might affect the picture given by Van Der Toorn.<sup>30</sup> It is indeed strange not to mention Qumran in such a work on scribal culture in the Middle-East.

Within the Jewish tradition the Levites have been entrusted with much of the responsibility that concerns the temple and the scriptures. Their role as scribes in the Hebrew Bible could hold some clues when it comes to the the composition of the texts. According to Van Der Toorn there were tensions between the Jerusalem priesthood and the Levitical priests and this becomes evident in several texts in Torah.<sup>31</sup> This could be of importance for this thesis as Levi and his sons are mentioned as the holders of the all the books, handed down by Jacob in Jub (45:16.) In Deut (18:6-8) it is written that the Levites shall be paid the same as the priests in the temple of Jerusalem, while in Ezek (44:29-24, 44:10) it is said that they would work beneath the true priests, which according to Ezekiel were the Zadokite priests. It is seems that in certain traditions, for example the one found in Jub, and in Deut (33:10), the Levites worked with the Torah. It is thus possible that tensions between the priesthood at the temple and the Levites (at least some of them) could have ended in a split, where a group of Levites decided to part with the priesthood, and maybe even Jerusalem, and created their own branch of Judaism (Enochic, Qumranic?). This merely indicates a possibility of such a split, but is not necessarily unlikely when one compares Deuteronomy and Ezekiel.

In this overview of the history of biblical criticism we find that there are not many elements concerning the composition of Hebrew Bible where the scholars agree. One aspect that stands out as an important factor, on which most scholars seems to agree, is the priestly framework of the Torah. Either scribes connected to the temple wrote the whole texts, or they edited the older texts, or they added material to make the transitions between existing texts better. It is also possible that the scribes both edited and added to the texts. When it comes to the spread of the Torah, as well as the rest of the Hebrew Bible, it is difficult to say much without an established date of composition. If the texts were kept only by the clergy, and possibly the Palace, it would be within a closed environment and not spread as written texts but orally by the priesthood at the temple. This is claimed by Van Der Toorn, but he also

---

<sup>29</sup> Toorn, Van. Der. 2007:11

<sup>30</sup> Weis. 2010:3

<sup>31</sup> Toorn, Van. Der. 2007:89-96

believes that the texts could later have been spread when scrolls become cheaper, which then again made it a duty for all Jewish men to own a Torah.<sup>32</sup> The Torah was translated into Greek, the Septuagint, in the third-century BCE, and it could then reach a larger audience, as Greek was spoken throughout most of the Mediterranean at that point.

This thesis focuses mainly on second temple Judaism, but I make a short note on the theory of a *Council of Jamnia*, a council that some believe took place at the end of the first century CE.<sup>33</sup> It is argued that after the destruction of the temple in 70CE, the end of the second temple period, Jamnia became one of the important centres for Jews. According to *Encyclopaedia Britannica Academic Edition*, the final canon was fixed at a council held there.<sup>34</sup> Others claim that the council only discussed already established traditions and did not concern the canon.<sup>35</sup> So while the existence of such a council is uncertain it was accepted as a fact for a long time, and thus has affected Old Testament research. The possibility of there ever being held a council at Jamnia will not play a big part in this thesis, but I come back to the possibility later in the thesis as it could answer several questions concerning the spread of the mosaic tradition.

As we turn to the Enochic literature we move into a different, and even more obscure literary corpus, where the research is newer compared to research on the Torah and the Hebrew Bible.

### *The Enochic writings*

The similarities between certain elements of the narrative found in Jub with that of the Enochic literature and then especially the Book of Watchers are striking. The similarities are presented in more detail in part two of this thesis.

The Enochic writings forms three books, or texts corpuses, 1 – 3.Enoch, and it is the first, 1.Enoch that is discussed in this paper, as it is believed to be, at least parts of it, the oldest of the three subdivisions of Enochic literature. So references to the Enochic tradition or literature in this thesis are to 1Enoch. The Hebrew Bible has been known for a long time, since Jews probably brought the texts with them as they established themselves outside Jerusalem, where it was translated into Greek and later used by the Christians. The Enochic

---

<sup>32</sup> Toorn, Van. Der. 2007:20

<sup>33</sup> Jamina is the Greek name for the city, in Hebrew the town is called Jabneh.

<sup>34</sup> URL cited under *Jabneh* in my bibliography

<sup>35</sup> Newmann. 1976:248-249

literature on the other hand, was rediscovered in 1773 by the Scottish explorer James Bruce, and its role in the Jewish religious sphere was, and still is, obscure.<sup>36</sup>

1.Enoch is a corpus of texts which most commonly are divided into five parts, and two appendices. They are: The Book of the Watchers (1-36, abbreviated BW), The Book of Parables (37-71, abbreviated BP), The Book of Luminaries/The Astronomical Book (72-82 abbreviated AB), The Dream Visions (83-90, abbreviated DV), The Epistle of Enoch (92-105, abbreviated EE), as well as The birth on Noah (106-107, abbreviated BN), and, Another Book by Enoch (108, abbreviated AE).<sup>37</sup> The observant reader would notice that there are certain chapters missing above, and that is probably because some of the chapters have been mixed up in earlier translations, as well as the addition of some editorial parts has changed the original structure of the texts. Parts of the texts (91:1-9, and, 91:18-19) can be referred to as a narrative bridge that smoothens the transitions between the different books of the text corpus by bridging them together.<sup>38</sup> The reasons why we refer to it as the Enochic writings, or the Enoch literature, are because of the role given to Enoch in these texts, where he is given the role as the narrator, the protagonist and sometimes prophet.

The full text corpus was discovered in Ethiopia in the language Ge'ez, as we later see that Jub was as well, and have been translated by several philologists.<sup>39</sup> Later several fragments of the texts, in Aramaic, have been found, most notably in the Qumran caves, which makes it possible to compare different copies and attempt to identify changes to the texts, making new and improved translations possible. Scriptural references and citations from the Enoch literature in this thesis are from *1 Enoch – A New Translation*, by George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam.<sup>40</sup>

While the full version of 1.Enoch was found within the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, where it is a part of their canon, and thus is best known in the Ge'ez language, it is believed that the Enoch tradition started in Judea. Fragments of the Enochic writings is found in Latin, Hebrew and Aramaic, but it is reasonable to believe that the original texts was either written in Arameic or Hebrew, or possibly both, as the use of Latin was limited in the religious

---

<sup>36</sup> Boccaccini. 2005:2

<sup>37</sup> Nickelsburg and VanderKam. 2004:1. The order of the texts are used as presented in the same book.

<sup>38</sup> The order of the texts is different with different scholars, as; VanderKam. 1995B, includes most of what later is referred to as the narrative bridge by Nickelsburg. 2004, in the Epistle of Enoch.

<sup>39</sup> Richard Laurence, August Dillmann, and Johannes Flemming have all participated in translating the Enochic writings. Boccaccini. 2005:2

<sup>40</sup> Nickelsburg and VanderKam. 2004

traditions of Judea.<sup>41</sup> VanderKam argues that what he recognizes to be the oldest texts within the text corpus, namely AB and BW, would be from the third century BCE.<sup>42</sup> The reason for dating AB so far back is because of fragments from an Aramaic copy of the text found at Qumran, which scholars have dated to the end of the third, or the start of the second century BCE. According to palaeographical dating the texts were probably written earlier, as there is no reason to believe the version in question is actually the original. VanderKam does not exclude the possibility that the text is older, but believes one should be cautious and accept a third century BCE dating.<sup>43</sup> Taking VanderKam's argument into consideration this would place the first Enochic writings at the same time or after the translation of the Torah into the Greek Septuagint, and probably centuries, at least decades, after the origin of the texts found within the Torah. The argument, if valid, makes it possible that the narratives in the Torah were known for the writers of the Enoch Literature, a claim I later in the thesis will argue is probable. The same argument goes for BW which was found in several copies at Qumran, making it one of the oldest texts in 1.Enoch.

VanderKam argues that the other Enochian text I focus on in this thesis, AW (93:1-10; 91:11-17 abbreviated AW,) is from the second century BCE. This time the date is set because of the content of the text, as the text speak of certain troubled times, or weeks, which VanderKam believes one can identify in the history of Israel. The writer of the text, according to VanderKam, tries to make it seem like what he already has prophesied about the ancient times has is true since what he has prophesied about the current age was correct. Based on these clues in the text, VanderKam places AW a couple of years before the Maccabean revolt about 165 BCE.<sup>44</sup>

BW and AW are narrations that cover much of the same content as in Genesis, probably because the narrations originate from a common source, or because the Enoch literature was inspired by the Mosaic scriptures. However the narration found in BW elaborates on certain verses in the Mosaic Torah and while it often uses the same framework, it changes, or adds information. This is very clear in BW, and later we see that one finds

---

<sup>41</sup> The Romans reformed certain parts of the religious institutions in Israel, and their presence created tensions. But they tolerated the Jewish religions, as it was an ancient religion and thus should be revered, along with most of the Jewish customs. Of course Titus later razed the Temple, but according to most scholars that were after the origin of the Enochic literature.

<sup>42</sup> VanderKam. 2008:17

<sup>43</sup> VanderKam. 2008:18

<sup>44</sup> VanderKam. 2008:62-63

similar elaborations in Jub as well. This is discussed in part two, but in this part it would suffice to say that the existence of what seems to be elaborations on the Mosaic scriptures would indicate that the authors of the texts within 1.Enoch were familiar with the Mosaic scriptures, or at least the Mosaic tradition.

But the question of the authors behind the Enoch literature is difficult, as the texts themselves do not mention the name of the authors, nor name communities or areas from which they originate. According to Van der Toorn's argument that the scribal situation in Jerusalem was one of a closed group or community, we could argue that the authors of Enoch would be found within Jerusalem as the texts show knowledge of advanced literary methods. An element which might counter this argument of a closed scribal group at the time of the Enochic literature's origin (200-300BCE) would be the Qumran texts, forgotten by Van der Toorn. It is improbable to find such a collection of texts outside Jerusalem if the scribal tradition was closed. This of course leads to a new question, namely why was the Enochic texts at the Qumran at all, along with most of the Hebrew Bible, and copies of Jub? It could seem that the texts from the Qumran caves could be at least as important as Jub when one tries to understand the religious relations of early Judaism, as examples from several religious traditions found at the same place. Without the Dead Sea caves the literature available to the scholars would be limited and a thesis such as this would have much less data as a foundation.

There are theories that try to explain the origin of the Enochic literature and its role in the historical context. One theory tries to explain the relationships between all the groups mentioned so far, and if true, it also explains the the origin of Jub. Building somewhat on the *Groningen Hypothesis*, a theory I focus more on in the Qumran part of this thesis, that claims the Qumran community was a branch of the larger Essene movement, Gabriele Boccaccini presented a theory which has been called the Enochic - Essene hypothesis. In *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*, Boccaccini presents an intricate map of the origins of what have been identified as different religious groups.<sup>45</sup> According to this theory, there was a split within the religious centre of Jerusalem in pre-Maccabean times, with an Enochic group on one side and the Zadokites, the ancient clerical group, on the other. Here one can find the first literary differences between the early Mosaic and what Boccaccini believes to be the Enochic group. He believes the oldest texts of 1.Enoch (AB, BW and part of DV; 85 -90) is from this period, and this could explain

---

<sup>45</sup> Boccaccini. 1998

what some believe to be polemics against the Jerusalem priesthood within these texts.<sup>46</sup> Later he reasons that the differences between the Zadokite group and the Enochic group softened somewhat and that in this period there was a new split. The Enochic group then turns into the Essene group. During this transition the Jub is supposed to originate, a perspective that could explain the mix of narratives. But there was a third split, which can be placed either at the same time as the Enochic Judaism turned to the Essene movement, or at a later stage from the then existing Essene group. This time what we know as the Qumran community split from the Enochic/Essene group, which explains why only the first texts of the Enoch literature are found at Qumran.<sup>47</sup>

This theory is very interesting as it explain most parts of the early Judaic religious terrain, and it even connects all the data, explain the filiations. Even if most scholars welcome the theory as a possibility to get a new perspective on the early Judaism, the general view seems to be that the theory is too grand, and ignores too many “ifs”. VanderKam points to the fact that much of the information received from sources such as Philo and Josephus contains no references to the Enochic ideas. Not even the fall of the angels as found in BW is referred to.<sup>48</sup> The usage of the term “Enochic Judaism” is also pointed out as problematic by William Adler, as he finds it problematic that the Enochic literature is not mentioned more frequently if it had central place in the Enochic/Essene community.<sup>49</sup> So there are problems with the theory, but the question is if it should be pushed aside completely or just refined. I come back to aspects of this theory later in the thesis, as it gives an interesting perspective that I believe can help see the possibilities of relations between the religious groups at the time.

Boccaccini’s hypothesis actually places the texts of Jub at a certain time and location, and it explains the perplexing mixture of Enochic and Mosaic elements. According to Occam’s razor this theory introduces few new assumptions but connects what we already have, and thus is the most probable theory yet. But even though the explanation is intuitive and tempting, there are factors we should not forget. The first is the Idol of Origins as mentioned in the method part of the paper. While I have no problem confessing a desire to understand the filiations of religious groups one should beware to not place all the religious groups on one small family sapling. The religions might and probably do relate to each other

---

<sup>46</sup> 1.Enoch 15: 3-4 is probably the most famous part of the BW which can be interpreted as polemical against the priesthood (i.e.Zadokites).

<sup>47</sup> This summary of the theory if based on James R. Davila’s reflections on the theory, 2005:356

<sup>48</sup> VanderKam. 2005:392

<sup>49</sup> Adler. 2005:387

at certain points, but it might be far back, as there were several different religions that surround the Mediterranean as well as the Middle-East and further east. By this I do not claim that Boccacinni is wrong in his hypothesis, just that when it comes to religion, especially ancient religion, the multitude of different religious groups often make such a small family tree unlikely.

Van Der Toorn's claim that the scribal practice in Jerusalem was closed, which I mentioned earlier, could work along with Boccaccini's theory. That is if both the Enoch group and the Zadokite group were trained within the temple or the palace. Or it can be modified into two closed groups, which still limit the scribal practice.

There is little doubt that the Qumran settlement and the Dead Sea scrolls is in a central position in unravelling this puzzle, but the problem is of course that first one must figure out the nature of Qumran, which is in itself a puzzle.

### *The Qumran corpus*<sup>50</sup>

The earliest fragments of Jub were found near Qumran, along with fragments from thirteen other copies. Why they were found there is still an unanswered question, but it seems that the people that stored away hundreds of manuscripts in caves close to Qumran are in some way connected to Jub.<sup>51</sup>

The first texts from the Qumran caves, that is the first Dead Sea scrolls, were found and sold off by Bedouins about 1946/7. When merchants and scholars alike understood what had been found the archaeological race began, and with the political turbulence in the Middle-East at the time the scholars lost quite a few of the texts. Luckily in years after the discovery of the literary corpus most of the texts were found, bought and kept safe by universities, private scholars and the nation of Israel (which captured several texts from museums during the six-day war).<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> I choose to speak of Qumran as both as the archaeological site as well as the library of Dead Sea scrolls, even if they are two different geographical locations, since it is very likely that the texts found in the caves near the Dead Sea belonged to the inhabitants of the Qumran settlement. Especially cave 4 A and B, which was right by the ruins.

<sup>51</sup> VanderKam. 2009:3-4

<sup>52</sup> Elgvin. 2009:27

11 caves were found all in all, almost nine hundred scrolls, with only ten-fifteen in good condition, written in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek.<sup>53</sup> These had been sealed off in the mountainside to avoid robbers. At first, in the fifties, it was only fragments from cave 1 that were published, while all the rest was kept by a group of Christian scholars who worked under a mandate given to them by the nation of Jordan. Later rumours claimed that much of the fragments from cave 4 were problematic for Christianity and the Vatican, which was why they remained unpublished.<sup>54</sup> In the end of the eighties and up to the nineties photos of fragments were leaked and in the end the Dead Sea scroll library was opened for scholars.<sup>55</sup> The effect of this is of course that the texts from the first cave have received more attention and built up a general view of the texts found in the caves as they were the only texts available for decades.

Today, after most texts have been published, scholars are free to work with them as they are translated and published in several editions. But then the inevitable questions have to be asked. What are these texts? And whose are they? There are hundreds of fragments, of which not all are readable or even translated yet. One possibility is to divide the text corpus into texts that are also found in the Hebrew Bible, texts that are probably composed by the Qumran community themselves, and the rest, which would include the copies of Enochic texts. Where Jub would fit in is debated and will be discussed more below as well as in part two and three of the thesis.

When dating these texts there are three main ways to do it, the first is to compare the circumstances presented in the text with the knowledge of history we have today. But this is only possible if the texts actually bring up facts from the contemporary context, which is not at all that common among the Qumran Corpus. The second way is by radiocarbon dating the scrolls and the ink. This seems like a more accurate way to date the literary corpus. And while it is a good method on which we can trust the result in most cases, it is possible to reuse scrolls made of animal hides, which can create an illusion of a text being older than it actually is. According to Torleif Elgvin certain texts that comment on the creation of the Qumran community and that have been radiocarbon dated reveal that the scrolls are from about 100BCE, while a later more accurate accelerator carbon dating of fourteen other Qumran texts reveals texts from the fourth century BCE until the first century CE.<sup>56</sup> The third and probably

---

<sup>53</sup> Elgvin. 2004:42

<sup>54</sup> As claimed by the controversial journalists and authors Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh. 1993

<sup>55</sup> Elgvin. 2009:29-34

<sup>56</sup> Elgvin. 2009:45



most used way to date is by palaeographical dating, in which the literary style as well as the evolution of language is used to date the texts. Emmanuel Tov even claims that the scribes at Qumran had their own literary system, an own scribal practice, in which they all used certain text structures and ways of marking structural changes to a text.<sup>57</sup> If this is the case, this would mean one could identify the texts produced by the Qumran community.

I realize that the term Qumran Community can be seen as problematic, as several scholars argue that one should not use the term because of convenience and habit when there are so many uncertain factors, and neither archaeological nor literary evidence are enough to support the term.<sup>58</sup> I agree that one should not use the term because of habit alone, and I am careful to not use it in such a way in this thesis. When I use the term in this thesis I refer to people who were associated with the geographical area of Qumran and the caves of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as opposed to those who were not.

If one analyses the literary corpus it might be possible to find the date when the possible Qumran splinter group came into existence as well. For while the archaeologist might date the Qumran settlement, this would not clearly reveal the “right” Qumran settlers, as there probably was some kind of settlement at the site before the group that left the Dead Sea library established themselves. According to some scholars the settlement at Qumran in question was established at the end of the second century BCE, for convincing reasons, namely that several of the texts that concern the community are believed to originate at the mid or end of the second century BCE. According to textual analyses done by Emmanuel Tov, some of the texts that were written at Qumran, as they are written in the identifiable Qumran way, were copied in the mid-second century BCE, which would point towards religious literary activity in the area at that time, or earlier.<sup>59</sup> Some scholars also claim to find clues within the Enochic literature, as certain passages in DV (90:5-8) speak of a new generation that tries to teach righteousness to their parents who do not listen, and could refer to a parent

---

Bonani., Ivy, Wöfli, Broshi, Carmi, and Strugnell. 1992

<sup>57</sup> Tov. 2009:262

<sup>58</sup> Some scholars that have advocated carefulness with the term are; Hempel, Charlotte “The Groeningen Hypothesis: Strengths and Weaknesses,” Elgvin “The *Yahad* Is More Than Qumran”, and Piovanelli “Some Archaeological, Sociological, and Cross-Cultural Afterthoughts on the “Groningen” and the “Enochic/Essene” Hypotheses”; all published in *Enoch and Qumran origins – New light on a forgotten connection*. (ed: Gabriele Boccaccini) 2005. Hempel: 254-255, Elgvin: 273-279, Piovalelli: 366-372

<sup>59</sup> Elgvin. 2005:273-275

group of the Qumran settlement in question.<sup>60</sup> Other clues may come from ceramic and coins found in among the ruins and the caves. Loads of ceramics and several hundred coins were discovered, of which the oldest ceramic seems to be from the second century BC and the latest at the beginning of CE. The coins seem to span from the beginning of the third century BC to the first century CE. When one considers all the evidence it seems like Qumran was inhabited from the second century BC until the first century CE.<sup>61</sup>

According to the *Groningen Hypothesis*, which I touched upon in the previous section, the Qumran community was a splinter group of the larger Essene movement. The parent of the hypothesis, García Martínez, claims the main disputes that resulted in the Qumran community branching of the larger Essene movement were problems that concerned the calendar, which affected religious rituals.<sup>62</sup> That the Qumran communities were connected to the Essene movement has been debated for a long time, and often the Qumran community is believed to have been the entire Essene movement. This is not an undisputed view among scholars who focus on this period in Jewish religious history today, as much evidence goes against this. According to Philo and Josephus, two Jews invaluable for scholars who attempt to understand early Judaism, the Essene group probably numbered several thousand members.<sup>63</sup> The Qumran settlement on the other hand, according to archaeological research, seems only large enough for approximately around 150 inhabitants.<sup>64</sup>

Given that the main argument in the Groningen hypothesis is correct, that Qumran is a part of the greater Essene movement, there are three possible ways to look at this, each with major repercussions in how we understand both Qumran and the Essenes. The three possibilities are Qumran as one of many Essene settlements, Qumran being the main settlement and the headquarters of the Essene movement, or, Qumran as a smaller splinter group.<sup>65</sup>

If it was just one of many, the literary corpus found at Qumran might be that of a typical Essene settlement, and we could assume Jub was an important text given the amounts of copies, but we have no other settlements to compare with, a fact that speaks against

---

<sup>60</sup> Dimant. 1993:57-76

<sup>61</sup> VanderKam. 1995A

<sup>62</sup> Hempel. 2005:254-255

<sup>63</sup> References found in Boccaccini. 2005:303. Philo; Quod omnis probus liber sit 75. Josephus: Jewish Antiquities 18.21.

<sup>64</sup> Boccaccini. 2005:303

<sup>65</sup> Boccaccini. 2005:304

Qumran being one of many settlements. This is also one of Boccaccini's major arguments against theories that claim Qumran were one of many settlements. Another argument is that Philo and Josephus claimed the Essenes lived in colonies within existing villages, and not in secluded settlements.<sup>66</sup> Other non-Jewish authors, like Dio of Prusa and Pliny, on the other hand, seem to place the Essenes in a town near the Dead Sea, which might be identified as Qumran.<sup>67</sup> When one considers all this information it seems unlikely that there were several settlements like Qumran.

If Qumran was the headquarters of the Essene movement the literary corpus would give insight into the whole movement and the Dead Sea Library would be easier to comprehend, as it would be logical that the headquarters kept copies of their most important literature. At the same time one could argue that the literature believed to be written in Qumran should be understood as the values, beliefs and rules of the whole Essene movement. An argument against this notion is that nobody writes about Qumran as an administrative centre for the Essenes, which would be likely if it indeed was. One can also use the counterargument that neither Philo nor Josephus mentions Qumran, but it is possible that a small centre like Qumran needed not be mentioned as the authors wrote more generally about the Essenes values and customs. The silence surrounding Qumran as a possible administrative centre is alarming, but it is not good enough evidence to exclude the possibility entirely.

The third option, which seems to be the one in favour these days, and on which Boccaccini builds up parts of his Enochic – Essene hypothesis, is that Qumran should be viewed as a smaller splinter group. If this is the case Qumran would not be representative for other possible Essene groups. As mentioned above, Boccaccini finds this likely as only the first part of the Enochic writings is found at Qumran, and since there seem to have been no additions to the Qumran corpus, not considering their own writings, after a certain point in time. Another argument that speaks for this option are passages that seem to point towards a split between the Qumran community and another group, which might have been the Essenes.<sup>68</sup>

In conclusion it is hard to dismiss the possibility that Qumran was an administrative settlement for the general Essene movement, which could explain much of the popularity of Jub, but according to scholars, the evidence seems to point more towards it being a splinter

---

<sup>66</sup> Boccaccini. 2005:305

<sup>67</sup> Goodman and Vermès 1989:58

<sup>68</sup> Boccaccini. 2005:307-309

group. But before I move on to the next section it is important to not see the Essenes as the only possible inhabitants of Qumran. While it is the most accepted perspective today, there are other competing views. Lawrence Schiffman proposes that one should view the inhabitants of Qumran as Zadokite, as many of the rites that concern themselves with purification used at Qumran are similar to rites presented in rabbinical literature as Zadokite.<sup>69</sup> The Chicago professor Norman Golb has advocated a theory that the ruins at Qumran are actually the remains of a fort used by Jews against the Romans, a theory which has met criticism as the fort would be placed at a strategically poor location.<sup>70</sup> The ruins being that of a villa are also mentioned as a possibility, because of the traces of furniture and the location of the different buildings. An argument against this idea would be the location of the ruins, as the location would be a strange place to build a villa, especially as there is an oasis nearby.<sup>71</sup> Whatever the answer, they seem to have liked Jub.

### ***The Book of Jubilees***

The text is a very interesting narrative with the potential of unravelling relations between the Mosaic tradition, the Enochic writings and the Qumran settlement. That is, if its origin is discovered and the reason for writing such a text is understood. Scriptural references and citations concerning Jub in this thesis are from *The Book of Jubilees*, translated by James C. VanderKam.<sup>72</sup>

The narrative is believed to have existed in several different languages throughout the times, and fragments of copies are found in Latin, Hebrew and Ge'ez as well as excerpts in Syriac and Greek. The chain of translation is not perfectly clear but VandeKam argues well for there being a Hebrew base that has then been translated into Syriac and Greek, of which the Greek version probably worked as the base for the Latin and Ge'ez versions.<sup>73</sup> The earliest fragments from Jub are from Qumran. A document which James C. VanderKam and József T. Milik argue is from no later than 100BCE, but might be even older, while the youngest copy from Qumran is from the first century CE. The dates presented here are palaeographical

---

<sup>69</sup> Schiffman. 1990:64-73

<sup>70</sup> Golb. 1980:1-24

<sup>71</sup> VanderKam. 1995A:27-28

<sup>72</sup> VanderKam. 1989

<sup>73</sup> VanderKam. 2009:3-22

datings.<sup>74</sup> We do not know for sure that there has been a Syriac version of the text, but writers within the Syriac tradition have referred to the text, and there are several citations, which make it probable.<sup>75</sup> That there has been a Greek version would be even more likely, even if we do not actually have a Greek copy, as the Greek language was the main language of communication throughout the Mediterranean for centuries and there seems to have been a Greek base for both the Latin and Ge'ez versions.<sup>76</sup>

Jub was mostly unknown to western scholars until the 1840s when the Ge'ez version was brought from Ethiopia, where it is still considered a canonical text by the Ethiopian Jews and the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. However references to the text have been around for a long time, if one knew where to search. In *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*<sup>77</sup> the German bibliographer Johann Fabricius presented several citations from what seems to be both Greek and Latin versions of Jub.<sup>78</sup>

Within the rabbinical Midrash literature there are stories similar to those found within Jub, and this could indicate that some of the stories within Jub which diverged from the traditional Mosaic narrative were known outside its writer's thoughts.<sup>79</sup> To decide which of the three possibilities, the author of Jub, the authors of the Midrash literature, or another unknown part, from which the story originate is difficult.

With Jub as with most texts from the other traditions discussed in this thesis the authorship is obscure. And even if there are several copies, there is only one text, and one story that is told. The differences between the versions might help answer many questions about editing and adding to older copies, but there is no greater literary corpus to compare it to like we did with the Mosaic and Enochic literary traditions. That is, if the text is not a part of the previously mentioned text corpuses. This is discussed more extensively later in this thesis, but for now we focus on some theories that concern themselves with the authorship and the possible editing of the text.

---

<sup>74</sup> VanderKam and Milik. 1991:246

<sup>75</sup> VanderKam. 2009:10-11

<sup>76</sup> VanderKam. 2009.4-21

<sup>77</sup> The books are from 1722-23 and the citations mentioned could be found at pp 849-864 in the first volume, and pp.120-122 in the second volume. References found in VanderKam. 2009:3

<sup>78</sup> VanderKam. 2009:3

<sup>79</sup> The Midrash literature in question is *The Book of Asaph* (Book of Noah) and *Midrash Wwayyissā'û*. These are more deeply discussed in VanderKam. 2009:3,8-9.

Jub has for a long time been considered the work of one author, a view that according to Michael Segal should be questioned as there are many arguments that point towards it being the work of several authors and/or editors.<sup>80</sup> According to some scholars, most inconsistencies within the text, or between the different texts, could be explained as either general human error by the author, or later problems in translation of the text. Within certain versions of the text itself, two authors are mentioned, namely Moses and what is called the angel of presence, while in other versions Moses is the sole author. These differences are according to VanderKam errors of translation, and they should not be used to support claims of multiple authors or editors, as he believes the versions in which Moses is the only author to be the original.<sup>81</sup> Segal on the other hand is able to present several contradictions from within the texts that he claims could only be explained by Jub being a composition with multiple authors.<sup>82</sup> Most of the contradictions are dates that do not add up and the rest are passages discussing legal processes that do not match with the actual punishments within the narrative.

While these contradictions should be studied, I find it problematic to use them as a final argument for there being multiple authors for two reasons. The first is that many of the contradictions identified by Segal are minor contradictions, and they often consist of what could be understood as normal human error, as in one argument where the text count 50 years in a jubilee while it is supposed to be 49.<sup>83</sup> The second would be the fact that in an editorial process one would believe contradictions such as those referred to by Segal would be sorted out. As seen with the Hebrew Bible earlier in the thesis the editing of texts is believed to have been a way to smooth transition and sort out literary inconsistencies within certain texts, not add them.

While I do not consider Segal's claim strong enough this does not prove that there was only one author of Jub. As discussed earlier the nature of scribal practice in early Judaism is by many believed to have consisted of scribal groups in which the authors worked as part of a group. It is thus somewhat unlikely that the text is written by one single person and that it should have avoided several stages of editing. The answer might be found within the text, as the balance between the Enochic and Mosaic literature might give us some clues as to which tradition is favoured at certain stages in the text, revealing the origin and thus bringing us

---

<sup>80</sup> Segal. 2009:22-35

<sup>81</sup> VanderKam. 1981:209-217

<sup>82</sup> Segal. 2009:26-34

<sup>83</sup> Segal. 2009:26

closer to placing the text within a literary tradition, which in the case of the Mosaic or Qumranic tradition would give us a probable location as well.





## **Part Two**

**Comparing narratives, ideologies, inter-textual notions of sin, and  
textual aims**



## *The Enochic narrative - an alternative beginning*

Early in Jub there is a reference to texts written by Enoch, and it is a possibility that these texts are found within 1.Enoch, and certain scholars, whose views I present later, even claim the texts in question are BW and/or AW. There is little doubt that Jub presents narratives that are connected to other traditions, and parts of Jub seem to be especially similar to BW. On the other hand the chronology of Jub, which I will explore later in this part, might indicate influence from AW. I therefore focus on these texts and the filiations between the texts to establish a context in which we could justify comparing them with Jub.

The narrative found within 1Enoch contains several ideas that seem to go against the Mosaic tradition on which modern Judaism is founded. Already in the first chapter of the first book (BW) Enoch is mentioned as a man behind words of blessing and is given a very prominent role as the protagonist. This might give us some valuable information. The author or authors of at least BW and probably other Enochic books chose an antediluvian character as their hero, a role that many scholars believe mirror the role Moses has in the Mosaic tradition. I see several reasons for the choice of Enoch as the protagonist. The first is his status in the Hebrew Bible, for even if he is only briefly mentioned, the description in Gen 5:24 is somewhat mystical; “Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him.” The verse might be understood in several ways, but according to the Mosaic traditions it does not refer to an ordinary death, but implies that Enoch ascended to heaven, and thus never really died. The mysterious nature of Enoch in the Hebrew Bible would make him a very good candidate for a narrative in need of a protagonist. The second reason is the fact that Enoch is an antediluvian figure, which places him at the beginning of times. This gives him authority because of his antiquity alone, places him earlier than Moses as well as close to the affairs of the fallen angels and their offspring, which are a central part of both BW and Jub. The use of Enoch as a protagonist is just one of the many differences in early Judaic sources.

*The Book of Watchers – the origin of sin*

The narrative in BW concerns itself partly with the origin of sin. It doesn't refer to the Hebrew tradition in which Eve was the first sinner but claims the first sins originated with a group of angels who are called the Watchers, hence the title of the book. According to the second chapter of BW all things created followed certain natural laws, except man, and obviously a certain group of angels. For the angels intruded upon the earth and mixed with earthly women who gave birth to hybrid creatures. These creatures were horrible giants that brought chaos.

7:1 These and all the others with them took for themselves wives from among them such as they chose. And they began to go in to them, and to defile themselves through them, and to teach them sorcery and charms, and to reveal to them the cutting of roots and pants.

The angels taught their wives and sons spells and knowledge that were not for mankind, like warfare, forging of weapons, and as quoted above sorcery. The angels were defiled when they mixed with mortal women, while nothing is mentioned about the opposite being the case, of the women being defiled. This might be interpreted as the angels being changed as a result of crossing sacred laws. They quit being sacred angels and rather become profane, as in the true meaning of the word.<sup>84</sup>

7:3-6 They were devouring the labour of all the sons of men, and men were not able to supply them. 4/ And the giants began to kill men and devour them. 5/ And they began to sin against the birds and beasts and creeping things and fish, and to devour one another's flesh. And they drank the blood. 6/ Then the earth brought accusations against the lawless ones.

Mankind had no way to stop these giants, and when food became scarce the giants fed on mankind. What is to be interpreted by the reference to the earth bringing accusations against the giants is probably not that the earth itself brought accusations, but that the suffering people prayed to God, which is formulated more clearly in 8:4 “(And) as men were perishing; the cry went up to heaven.”

This is one of the major differences from the Mosaic tradition, and from the narrative found in Jub, where sin is a part of the human nature from Garden of Eden. The angels bring

---

<sup>84</sup> Profanus (lat) – (eng) *in front of, or, outside the temple.*

with them secret knowledge that makes it possible for man to sin, and later when the angels are removed from earth their evil spirits linger on earth until the archangel Michael is sent to renovate the earth (Jub 10:16-22). The part that mentions the evil spirits in the narrative is interesting not only because there are differences between the Enochian and Mosaic traditions, but because Jub presents a third version of the same story, which I examine closer at when I explore the content of Jub later in this section.

Scholars agree that the narrative seems to be an elaboration of Gen 6:1-8, but disagree when it comes to the implications of the changes from the Mosaic version.<sup>85</sup> While the Mosaic version recounts that there happened a mixing of angels and earthly women, it does not judge them good or evil. They are only referred to as heroes, half-breeds between man and angel. The Enochic version on the other hand deems them evil and changes the origin of sin. A second change that goes against the whole traditional Judaic idea of death and afterlife is the possibility for a universal redemption, which can imply that even non-Jews might be saved. Veronica Bachmann lists three facts that might reveal a universal message found in BW: Enoch is not a part of the Israelite tradition, as he is an antediluvian and precedes the idea of a chosen people, the troubles described within the texts are universal, and the laws presented within BW seems to refer to all humans.<sup>86</sup> It is possible the original text was meant to be read by adherents of the Judaic community, and that the message was not necessarily supposed to be universal, and that it was just taken for granted that the audience was Judaic and knew of the exclusivity of redemption. However there is an interesting second possibility that the narrative is the work of a religious group with a universal message that wanted to reach a larger audience. Bachman believes it is done to draw attention to the text, a deliberately tactical move in an attempt to break new ground.<sup>87</sup> Could there have been different factions within the religious elite in Jerusalem, one group for religious exclusivity, building on the idea of the Jews as a chosen people, and another for a universal message? The Greek and Roman presence in Palestine brought major changes to their culture, and through a historical perspective it would seem reasonable that there would be reforms within the Judaic religion as well as in the rest of the culture as a response to this. We know that a lot of Jews partook in Greek and Roman culture, and that part of the clergy was sceptical to the Jews that mixed with the non-Jews and showed an interest for these non-Jewish customs.<sup>88</sup> A wish for a

---

<sup>85</sup> VanderKam. 1995B:31

<sup>86</sup> Bachmann. 2011:7

<sup>87</sup> Bachmann. 2011:23

<sup>88</sup> Goodman. 2007:113

broadening of the Jewish religion in such a case is a possibility, as we have seen it happen in more modern times under similar conditions.<sup>89</sup>

*Differences between BW and AW – Inconsistencies within the Enochic tradition*

If one compares the universal message found in BW with AW there seem to be certain contradictions that might indicate that the existing categories commonly used when it comes to the different Jewish traditions are problematic. AW refers to a chosen people in the seventh week, and this could be used as an argument for religious exclusivity, 93:10 “And at its conclusion, the chosen will be chosen, as witnesses of righteousness from the everlasting plant of righteousness, to whom will be given sevenfold wisdom and knowledge.” But while BW and AW are both viewed as Enochic texts they are still two different texts, and it is likely they were written for different reasons. So before we claim the AW proves that the Enochic ideology was exclusive we need to compare the two texts and try to discern the nature of the texts.

Earlier I have noticed differences between the two Enochic texts, in their representations of the Mosaic tradition. BW is by many considered anti-Mosaic, since they interpret the silence surrounding Mosaic key elements as polemics against Jerusalem and the temple.<sup>90</sup> However there is no explicit polemics against the Mosaic tradition in BW, only silence when it comes to the Torah, Jerusalem, and the idea of a chosen people. This could be interpreted as an attempt to ignore the part one disagrees on, by not mentioning the Torah and Jerusalem they do not acknowledge the Mosaic message. In the very beginning of BW (1:4) there is a reference to Mount Sinai, but that is basically the only reference that could allude to Moses in BW. Andreas Bedenbender claims chapters 1-5 of BW were added at a later stage to an original non-Mosaic text, and that this was done to make it fit within the Mosaic tradition, this implies that changes were done to the original Enochic text either by the group

---

<sup>89</sup> I speak of Reform and Liberal Judaism, as they are known from England and U.S.A. Both groups that could be called progressive traditions and have an aim to be more compatible with surrounding cultures.

<sup>90</sup> Names that could be mentioned are: Andreas Bedenbender, James, C. VanderKam, and Gabriele Boccaccino. These scholars see the silence surrounding the Torah and Jerusalem in BW to be a sign of non-mosaic or anti-Mosaic tendencies. George W.E. Nickelsburg, and to a certain degree Bedenbender, remains somewhat ambivalent to the relation between the two groups; Nickelsburg see elements of mosaic law and at the same time recognises that Enoch plays on Moses, while Bedenbender explains the ambivalence of the texts by assuming changes have been done to the text. For a good summary of the views; Bachmann. 2011:10

themselves or a competing group.<sup>91</sup> Helge S. Kvanvig also identifies a difference between BW 1-5 and 6-16, as in the first part man is depicted as sinful, while in the second part man is presented as the victim of the angels' transgression.<sup>92</sup> At first it seems reasonable to argue that a reference to Mount Sinai is a reference to the law as well, taking Exod 19 and 20 into consideration, in which the Israelites reach Mount Sinai and Moses receives the Torah. It is important to remember that a place like Mount Sinai could be a quite general reference to a sacred mountain. Being mentioned in the Mosaic tradition does not automatically mean that it is a restricted area for other Jewish religious interests. Rather the place would probably get an even higher reputation as a sacred area as a result of the Mosaic narrative. Jub elaborates on the existing tradition as it claims Moses received the Jub as well as the commandments while on Mount Sinai. This builds on an existing idea of the mountain as a special mountain in the Mosaic tradition. The reference to Sinai without an explicit reference to the Torah should not be interpreted as polemics against the Mosaic tradition.

On the other hand in part one of BW there seems to be an attack on Jerusalem and at least some of the priests there, but in this case, even if more visible, the attack is given in an indirect manner. In 15:2-4, God instructs Enoch what he should say to the imprisoned angels that were removed from the human world;

15:2-4, 2/Go and say to the watchers of heaven, who sent you to petition in their behalf, 'You should petition in behalf of humans and not humans in behalf of you. 3/Why have you forsaken the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary; and lain with women, and defiled yourselves with the daughters of men; and taken for yourselves wives, and done as sons of earth; and begotten for yourselves sons. 4/ You were holy ones and spirits, living forever. With the blood of women you have defiled yourselves, and with the blood of flesh you have begotten, and with the blood of men you have lusted, and you have done as they do- flesh and blood, who die and perish.

The accusations against the angels are very similar to accusations against the priestly order in Jerusalem that we know from the other Jewish sources (*Cairo Damascus Document*, and the *Psalms of Solomon*, and, at some points, the last chapters of Ezra).<sup>93</sup> The author or authors in

---

<sup>91</sup> Bedenbender. 2007:66

<sup>92</sup> Kvanvig. 2009:170

<sup>93</sup> In *Psalms of Solomon* he refers to (8:12[13].) Online version can be found at:

<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/31-pssal-nets.pdf> Oxford University Press. The Cairo Damascus Document CD 5:6-7 online version can be found at:

these texts accuse the priests of marrying foreign women, who supposedly defiled the blood of the chosen ones.<sup>94</sup> God refers to the fallen watchers as beings that had been holy and living forever, in preterit, which seem to imply that they are no longer considered holy. Given that this is not just a coincidental similarity, it could be interpreted as a reference to the priestly order in Jerusalem, branding them as fallen priests. If BW should be interpreted in such a way then certain questions show up again, as such a reference might bring the idea of a chosen people into the ontological view found in BW. But we are still left without any explicit polemics. Jub presents a very similar narrative, but the universal message is removed as the rest of the texts make it clear that the Jews are a chosen people (1:7,1:27, 50:5).

Comparing AW to BW is hard as they use different literary models when it comes to the structure of the text. BW is a narrative which focuses on the fall of the angels and Enoch's discourses with God and the angels, while AW is more of a chronological pseudo-historical work. AW is a chronological text that divides time until the final judgement into ten weeks, which makes it easier to compare it to Mosaic religious ideas, as well as those in Jub, as they all refer to happenings within the same time span. For while the silence surrounding central Mosaic traditions as the Torah and the temple in BW might be considered as polemics against the Mosaic tradition, the silence is absolute in most of the book, except for the reference to Mount Sinai mentioned earlier (that doesn't seem to tell us much.) AW on the other hand refers to first the temple in Jerusalem, but not to the second temple. The temple was built in the fifth week according to AW (93:7.) This temple is destroyed by fire in the seventh week (93: 8) making life hard for the chosen people. No second temple is mentioned before the temple is rebuilt in the eighth week (91.12) when the temple of the great one will be built, which is close to the eschaton. There is also a reference to a covenant in the fourth week (93:6) which according to VanderKam should be understood as a reference to the Torah.<sup>95</sup>

In my opinion, this silence that surrounds key elements of the Mosaic tradition in AW is unlike the silence of BW. While the silence in BW was total, AW mentions the Torah and the first temple, but fails to mention it being rebuilt, thus it does not seem to recognize the authority of the second temple. That the second temple was just forgotten by the author would be very unlikely indeed. It seems as if the two texts have different goals. Given the different nature of the two texts I thus use the term master or alternative narrative for BW, while I

---

[http://www.sas.upenn.edu/religious\\_studies/rak/courses/225/CD1910.html](http://www.sas.upenn.edu/religious_studies/rak/courses/225/CD1910.html) by S. Schecther and updated by Robert Kraft.

<sup>94</sup> Nickelsburg. 1981:585

<sup>95</sup> VanderKam. 1997



believe counter-narrative would fit better with AW. The terms are as used and presented by Hilde L. Nelson in *Damaged Identities, Narrative repair*.<sup>96</sup>

The reason for labelling BW a master or alternative narrative is the ontological view presented. It is a whole package that tells a different story than the Mosaic tradition, and which seems to be capable of standing alone. I do not claim that the people behind BW did not know of the Mosaic tradition, or that they did, as it is possible they knew of it, parts of it, or had never heard of it (while the last seems unlikely). But it points towards BW being one of the first texts of the Enochic literature, as it appears to be a base narrative. The fact that BW is among the oldest texts is also supported by palaeographic dating, as mentioned earlier. If BW is an elaboration of Genesis it is an alternative narrative, as it does not openly contest the version in Genesis but adds certain features.

AW does not present an ontological view in the same way as BW, on the other hand it seems to present the same story as found in the Mosaic tradition, just with some changes as if it wants to alter the view already presented, much like Jub as we will see later. Since there is no mention of the Maccabean revolt, the text is believed to precede the event, thus placing it in at least as early as the middle of the second century BCE. If we compare this with the probable authority of the Torah at the time there are certain factors that should be mentioned. Even if we did not identify a clear dating for the Hebrew Bible in the first part of this thesis it is probable that the reputation and the authority of the Torah, or of certain texts within the Torah grew in the years following its creation. Thus is it possible that the authority of the Torah changed from the time of composition of BW to that of the composition of AW. This makes the silence in BW more understandable, as it is possible BW knew of fewer of the texts that would make up the Hebrew Bible than AW, which probably was composed at a later date. However even if we identify AW as a counter narrative as opposed to BW as a master narrative, we still need to figure out if AW is meant as a counter narrative to the Mosaic tradition, the earlier Enochian tradition, or both if we are to understand the filiations between these texts. Later I will examine Jub in the same way.

AW does not directly mention the fall of the watchers or give Enoch the major role that he has in BW, it only mentions a time of deceit and violence, which could be just as much inspired by the Mosaic tradition as the Enochian. Hence there is not much that connects AW to BW, except a possible shared hostility towards the Mosaic tradition, which as we have seen is an uncertain factor. Might there be a possibility that BW and AW are not related at all?

---

<sup>96</sup> Nelson. 2001:6-20, 150-158

That would change our understanding of the Enochic literature quite a bit. It is possible that the texts are unrelated, and given that we know little or nothing about the authors behind what is considered Enochic literature we should not ignore the possibility. However, there are three arguments speaking for AW being a part of the Enochian literature as I see it. The first is the fact that AW was found in the same text corpus as BW, the second is the use of Enoch as an important person, a protagonist in BW and a narrator in AW, and the third is the identification of a possible connection between AW and AB, which also is considered an Enochic text. The last is a problematic argument, but I will try to explain it. At the end of AB Uriel commands Enoch to read the heavenly tablets so that he can teach them to his children:

81:1-2, 5; He said to me: "Enoch look at the heavenly tablets, read what is written on them, and understand each and every item." 2/ I looked at all the heavenly tablets, read everything that was written, and understood everything. I read the book of all the actions of people and of all humans who will be on this earth for the generations of the world. ... 5/ Those seven holy ones brought me and set on the earth in front of the gate of my house. They said to me: "Tell everything to your son Methuselah and show all your children that no human is righteous before the Lord, for he created them."

Moreover at the beginning of AW Enoch explains how what he is about to say comes from the tablets:

93:2; Considering the sons of righteousness, and concerning the chosen of eternity, and concerning the plant of truth, these things I say to you, my sons, I myself, Enoch. The vision of heaven was shown to me and from the words of the watchers and holy ones I have learned everything and in the heavenly tablets I read everything and I understood.

It could seem like the author or authors try to make AW a continuation of AB. Enoch learning the future, prophesied in AW, is the same as referred to in the end of AB, which makes this argument problematic. It is almost just as likely that the argument distances both AW and AB from the other Enochian literature as it connects it. This might be problematic for the idea of a continuing Enochic corpus. For while there is no doubt that people have seen a connection between the texts as they have been translated and collected into the same text corpuses, which found its way to Ethiopia through stages of translation, I do not find it unlikely that BW started as a Mosaic text. That it is in fact an elaboration on Gen 6:1-8. This would place BW among the literature commenting on the Torah. This could be true even if the text was

used within another tradition at a later stage, for example what is identified as the Enochian tradition. A text can be used and interpreted by different groups and in different ways.

While it is possible that AW is a counter narrative to BW it would not change much, as AW spans over a much larger timeframe than BW and does not explicitly disagree with BW. It only briefly mentions some tribulations in the second week, which would be what is described in BW. The silence that surrounds the angels could be seen as an attempt to counter parts of BW's narrative, although I find this unlikely. In any case it would probably not be the main goals for the text as it covers most of Jewish history and the focus seems to be more on the eschaton and the rewards for the righteous. I believe it is more likely that AW is a counter narrative to the master narratives that is found in the Hebrew Bible, for example the Torah (Gen and Exod) and the summarizing prayer in Nehemiah (9:1-31).<sup>97</sup> It tells us that AW was probably written later than BW, and that it seems more likely to be negative towards the Mosaic tradition than BW. This again could point towards increased hostility against the Mosaic tradition, and/or a wish to not only present an alternative story, like BW, but change the existing Mosaic one.

To explore the Enochian texts such as I have attempted in this part is difficult, as it is not so much a question of adding clues together, but rather trying to solve a puzzle that is missing a lot of pieces. Still the inconsistencies within BW and AW, the difference between the first five chapters of BW and the rest of the text, the possible universal message within BW, as well as no evident polemics within BW against the Mosaic tradition, gives some information to build upon as I explore possibilities in part three. However the aim for this thesis is the origin of the Jub, which I will now explore, and which is a very different text.

### **The Book of Jubilees – the bastard of Enoch and Moses**

Jub is a long text, which can at first glance easily be mistaken for a copy of Genesis. While it tells much of the same narrative there are some major differences that have puzzled scholars for a long time. As I hint at with my heading there can be found elements that are considered Enochian as well as obvious Mosaic ones in the text, which makes it probable that the author knew of both traditions. At the same time it seems like the author or authors of the text refuse to choose side, so as I start to explore the text I find myself between the two traditions, the Mosaic and the Enochian, which as I showed above is uncertain ground as the relation

---

<sup>97</sup> The identification of Nehemiah as a master narrative is done by Kvanvig. 2009:165

between these traditions are unclear. Jub presents content of unknown origin as well, as it often adds more details to the stories which are very similar, and at times almost identical with the one we know from the Pentateuch or Enochian literature. The parts we do not know from the Mosaic and Enochian traditions are enigmas, but as Jub in general they are very similar to the Genesis, and BW to a certain extent. The differences might clarify the reason for writing the Book, and while there are many differences I focus on the points that help clarify the relations between Jub and the aforementioned traditions. These are Jub's account of the Watchers and their role on earth, the origin of sin, the role of Enoch in Jub (which diverges from the Mosaic tradition), as well as the calendar and chronology in Jub, which might reveal connections to the Enochic tradition.

The text starts with Moses on Mount Sinai as he is given the commandments, but adds that he also was told the entire story of the Jews. This was dictated to him by an angel, called the angel of presence (1:27).

### *Enoch in Jubilees*

The role given to Enoch in Jub is not as prominent as the one he holds in the Enochian literature or as Moses's role as protagonist in Jub, but it is still bigger than his role in the Mosaic tradition. In Jub (4:17-18) Enoch is said to be the first man who learnt the art of writing. He wrote the first calendar, separated the year into seasons and months, recounted the weeks of jubilees and set the Sabbaths in order, so there is no doubt that he is given a very important position. This is found neither in the Enochian nor the Mosaic tradition, for while AB is about astronomy and covers the basics needed to understand the calendar, the role of Enoch as an inventor of the calendar is not as explicit in the Enochic tradition as in Jub. In Jub (4:19) Enoch is said to have had a vision in his sleep in which he saw the fate of man, from the beginning until the judgement, and he understood everything. He also wrote a testimony and left it on earth for later generations to read. This could be a reference to the Enoch literature, and it fits well with DV. This similarity is being used as an argument by Boccaccini as he claims that Jub came from the same tradition as the Enoch literature.<sup>98</sup> Later I will present other theories that claim it is a reference to AW. Jub also mentions Enoch's dealing with the angels, as it recounts that he was with the angels for six jubilees (294 years), learned everything, and wrote everything down (4:21). This fits very well with AW (93:2) and AB

---

<sup>98</sup> Boccaccini. 1998:86

(81:1), where he explains that he studied the tablets of heaven and learned everything from the angels. After a short mention of his dealings with the Watchers similar to the BW narrative, which I explore later in the paper, he is taken from the earth, as in Gen (5:24). Whereas Genesis moves on to the next generation, Jub elaborates on Enoch's ascent and gives him a place in the Garden of Eden, where he is given the task of writing down man's evil deeds (Jub 4:23).

It seems that the text is influenced both by Enochic and Mosaic traditions but we might try to turn that around and ask whether Jub could not be the inspiration for the other traditions. When it comes to the Mosaic tradition, this seems unlikely, as it is probable that Genesis is older than Jub. The text of the Hebrew Bible seems to have a much more authoritative status than Jub in Jerusalem, the religious centre, as well as it seems Jub is copying Genesis, not the other way around. That BW is based on Jub is more likely, as it elaborates on just a small part of Jub and scholars are unsure of its authoritative status. However, BW also seems to be older than Jub according to palaeographical dating. The difference in the date of the texts and the at times almost identical narratives could, and I believe it does, imply that the author of Jub knew of the other works and thus bases much of Jub on them. According to Annette Yoshiko Reed, the author of Jub even defends the Enochic tradition, by affirming that Enoch indeed did write down what he saw in his vision. Furthermore Enoch's authority is strengthened as Jub claims that his writings were used by men like Abraham and Noah. It also gives the Enoch literature a place among the books of other important men, like Moses, as all were inspired by revelations from angels or the heavenly tablets.<sup>99</sup> This way the Enochic tradition is given authority by being placed with the Mosaic tradition, which reminds the reader that both narratives are results from divine inspiration (Jub 1:1-5.) It could be that the Enochic tradition and the Mosaic tradition are two sides of the same coin and that the separation of the two among scholars is an exaggeration of the real differences. There's little doubt that many read Jub and thus probably revered Enoch, because of his role in Jub. There is also the possibility that there were multiple opinions concerning what was the authoritative works, and that the context in which the discussed texts originated, being pre-canonical, makes it impossible to separate the different traditions, as none of the choices had a clear majority. I will come back to this in part three.

---

<sup>99</sup> Reed. 2009:364-365

## *The Watchers in the Book of Jubilees*

As I mentioned earlier there is a big difference between the Mosaic and Enochic accounts of the Watchers and their mixing with the earthly women. While the story in BW is of angels who sin when they invade earth and create evil offspring, teach them secret divine secrets and wreak havoc, the Genesis narrative is more neutral about the actual interbreeding and presents the children as renown men of old times. God's decision to destroy the beings he had created, as narrated in Gen (6:5-7), and the actual flood as recounted in Gen (11-24), show that God did kill the angels' offspring in the flood, but he did also kill everyone else except Noah's family, which gives us no clue when it comes to the evilness of the angels' offspring. There are big differences in the accounts of the angels' transgression within the Mosaic and Enochic traditions, but they do not necessarily disagree with each other. The differences can be explained by the fact that BW elaborates much more on the subject, and in that case it is bound to add information. I have not found any evidence against BW being an elaboration of the Gen 6:1-7, and as I mentioned earlier, there are no obvious differences between BW and the Mosaic narrative.

The version in Jub is very similar to BW narrative, but with some major changes. It presents a devil-like character unknown in the other narratives. The angels were originally sent to the earth to teach men righteousness, while in BW they were only supposed to observe mankind. Jub also adds a continuation of some of the problems from the pre-flood era into the post flood era.

The first reference to the watchers in Jub is through Enoch, as the angel dictates to Moses that Enoch testified against the angels (4:22). This can be compared to BW (12-16), where Enoch works as middle man between the angels and God and brings them the judgement of God and then brings their plea of forgiveness to God. Chapter four explains why the angels were on earth, as God had sent them to judge and teach righteousness, which is contrary to the BW version in which the angels started to sin already before they entered earth. In Jub they were to teach man, and that's when they started sinning, because they taught man the wrong things and trespassed the border between the divine and the mortal. Then in chapter five the complete story of the Watchers is told from the angel of presence's perspective, as he was one of the angels who was sent to remove the fallen watchers from the earth. The story is like a shortened version of BW's narrative, in which the watchers create offspring much like giants, and the evil that followed results in God's decision to renovate the earth. The narrative does not say anything about revealing secret knowledge to man in these verses, but later, in

Jub 8:3-4, it recounts that they had secret knowledge that concerned the reading of omens according to the sun, moon and stars (astrology) which was considered forbidden knowledge.<sup>100</sup> The fallen angels are trapped within the depths of the earth:

Jub 5:6; Against his angels whom he had sent to the earth he was angry enough to uproot them from all their (positions) of authority. He told us to tie them up in the depths of the earth; now they are tied within them and are alone.

The sanction of being trapped within the earth mirrors those of BW where it is depicted that they were imprisoned in the Abyss:

BW 21:7-10; 7/ From there I travelled to another place, more terrible than this one. And I saw terrible things- a great fire burning and flaming there. And the place had a narrow cleft (extending) to the abyss, full of great pillars of fire, borne downward. Neither the measure nor the size was I able to see or estimate. 8/ Then I said, "How terrible is this place and fearful to look at!" 9/ Then Uriel answered me, one of the holy angels who was with me, and said to me, "Enoch, why are you frightened and shaken?" And I replied, "Because of this terrible place and because of the fearful sight." 10/ And he said, "This place is a prison for the angels. Here they will be confined forever."

In Jub the giants kill each other in what could be understood as a civil war, and the Watchers had to witness the destruction of their offspring before being trapped in the earth until the judgement. This is different from the version in BW where God commissions the archangel Michael to kill the offspring. However, the similarity between the narratives when it comes to the watchers witnessing the destruction of their children and their subsequent imprisonment within the earth on the other hand is striking, as we see from these quotes:

BW 10:12; And when their sons perish and they see the destruction of their beloved ones, bind them for seventy generations in the valleys of the earth, until the day of their judgement and consummation, until the everlasting judgement is consummated.

Jub 5:9-10; 9/He sent his sword among them so that they would kill one another. They began to kill each other until all of them fell by the sword and were obliterated from the earth. 10/ Now their fathers were watching, but afterwards they were tied up in the depths of the earth until the great day of

---

<sup>100</sup> Several books in the Hebrew bible condemn astronomy, but it is clearest in Isaiah 47:13-15.

judgement when there will be condemnation on all who have corrupted their ways and their actions before the Lord.

It seems that in both narratives it is emphasized that the angels are forced, or at least given the opportunity, to watch the demise of their offspring. Such similarities to BW are striking and could be used as an argument for the texts being influenced by each other at some level. However, a significant change in the narrative between Jub and the narratives found in the Mosaic and Enochian corpuses is found after the depiction of the flood. When Noah and his family reach land and Noah teaches his sons the commandments and laws he voices a concern about the demons that remain after the giants, the watchers' offspring. He explains that the main reason for the flood was the watchers' lust for women and the repercussions of their actions, and now remnants of the pre-flood era have obviously entered the post-flood era (Jub 7:20-27). In chapter eight the great grandson of Noah named Kainam is said to find the teachings of the watchers written on a stone and to have copied them:

Jub 8:3-4; 3/ He found an inscription which the ancients had incised in a rock. He read what was in it, copied it, and sinned on the basis of what was in it, since it was the Watchers' teaching by which they used to observe the omens of the sun, moon, and stars and every heavenly sign. 4/ He wrote (it) down but told no one about it because he was afraid to tell Noah about it lest he become angry at him about it.

The teachings of the angels, as well as the demons of their offspring, are now in the new world, or the renovated world. It is easy to think of the demons as a synonym for sin that appeared again in the new world, but in chapter ten it becomes clear Jub is about actual demons. Noah prays for the imprisonment of the demons, as they lead men astray. God then commands all the demons to be bound, but before this is executed a character named *Mastêmâ* asks that some remain under his control;

Jub 10:8-9; 8/ When Mastema, the leader of the spirits, came, he said: 'Lord creator, leave some of them [*the spirits*] before me; let them listen to me and do everything that I tell them, because if none of them is left to me I shall not be able to exercise the authority of my will among mankind.<sup>101</sup> For they are meant for (the purposes of) destroying and misleading before my punishment because the evil of mankind is great.' 9/ Then he [*God*] said that a tenth of them should be left before him, while we would make nine parts descend to the place of judgement.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> My italics

<sup>102</sup> My italics



According to Jub, God does remove most of the threat, but the evil spirits clearly have a role to play and one out of ten is left to torment mankind. This is completely new material compared to BW or Genesis. While it is possible that BW was an elaboration of Gen 5:24, the addition of Mastêmâ and his role after the flood is something completely new that has no obvious base in neither of the two traditions. We know of the remaining spirits from BW, called demons in Jub, but their role as minions for Mastêmâ, and their presence as a tool for testing are additions.<sup>103</sup>

Mastêmâ seems to exist to test mankind, as God lets him have a share of the demons, and since it is said in the text that he needs demons to do his will, which is to corrupt mankind and to lead them astray. In this he is similar to Satan as portrayed in Job, a comparison that is strengthened later in Jub when Mastêmâ asks God to test Abraham in the manner we know from Gen 22:1-15 (Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac). Mastema is also mentioned as a factor in the exodus from Egypt. He wanted to kill Moses, he urged the Egyptians to attack, and he helped the Egyptian Sorcerers and the Pharaoh (Jub 48:1-12). The roles given to Mastêmâ are interesting, as the roles seem to try and explain several features when it comes to the actions of God in the Torah. The question of why God did test Job has been asked countless times, and Mastêmâ is presented as the answer. The same counts for Abraham when he nearly sacrifices his own son. Furthermore when it comes to Mastêmâ's role in Egypt his presence there changes Exod 4:24, in which God says he will kill Moses. God is left out, and Mastêmâ now is the one who plans the killing. By adding Mastêmâ the idea of sin and punishment changes drastically from what we know from BW.

### *Sin and punishment in the Book of Jubilees*

So far we have three different perspectives on sin and the origin of evil. In Genesis sin started with Adam and Eve, and the Watchers' action seem to have changed little. Within BW the Watchers seem to be the origin of sin in a world that might not have known of evil. Especially if the five first chapters were later additions as I discussed earlier. Jub on the other hand, seem to mix these ideas.

For while Jub include the narratives of Adam and Eve in Paradise, God's subsequent anger and banishment from the Paradise, Cain killing Abel, Noah's nakedness and the famous

---

<sup>103</sup> Reed. 2009:357-358

tower of Babel it is the actions of the Watchers that are given most space in the narrative. At the same time Jub presents mankind as sinful by nature. The existence of Mastêmâ and his demons are a result of this, as they are to test mankind, which according to Jub, is easily corrupted (11:4-5). It is difficult to decide if Jub agrees more with the Mosaic or the Enochic tradition when it comes to the origin of sin. Simplified one could conclude that in both Jub and Genesis man is sinful by nature, while this is not the case in BW. Then again Jub does focus on the evil that follows the Watchers. As mentioned earlier, it is said explicitly by Noah in Jub that the reason for the flood was mainly the fall of the Watchers (7:21). In his conclusion, after exploring the five points of sin mention at the beginning of this paragraph, Loren T. Stuckenbruck claims it is difficult to find an origin of evil in Jub. None of the mentioned contexts explains evil's origin. According to Stuckenbruck the closest is the narrative about the Watchers, as they influence the world in a bad way that led to continuing suffering.<sup>104</sup>

The punishment in Jub is similar to the Mosaic and Enochic traditions in that all mankind will be judged in the final judgement. There are two points in which there are differences between the traditions relevant to this thesis. The first is that according to Jub and BW the angels will receive their punishment alongside man in the final judgement (as they only have been locked away earlier), which is not mentioned in the Mosaic tradition. The second is the idea of exclusivity, which we find in the Mosaic tradition, but, as discussed earlier, is more problematic in the Enochic tradition.

### *Calendar and chronology*

So far the focus has been on Jub compared to Genesis and BW, since the actions of the Watchers are often considered the core of the Enochic tradition. When I turn to look at the calendar, AW and to some degree AB become important. The religious calendar is essential in all the traditions, as is shown with the existence of AB in the Enochian tradition, and the role given to Enoch as the creator of the calendar in the first generations of man in Jub, and the references to the sun and the moon as signs to mark sacred times in the very first chapter of Genesis.

First of all, Jub counts time in groups of seven. A week is seven days, a year is defined as 52 weeks, but a week can also be seven years and seven times seven years would make a

---

<sup>104</sup> Stuckenbruck. 2009:307-308

jubilee (49 years.) The usage of the number seven as a basis for understanding time is not limited to Jub. It can be seen in the title of AW, Apocalypse of Weeks. According to Annie Jaubert, Jub uses a solar calendar that counts 364 days to a year and whose form is based on the Enochic AB.<sup>105</sup> If this is the case it could indicate a very close connection between the Enochic tradition and Jub, as the calendar and thus the days of religious importance would more or less follow the same system. While this has been the governing view for several decades scholarly objections should be mentioned. In a recent re-examination of Jaubert's claim Liora Ravid argues that the calendar of Jub is not solar, as a solar calendar can't explain the remaining 1 and ¼ day of the year. As this flaw have been known for thousands of years it is improbable that Jub would be based on the solar cycle and still count 364 days in a year.<sup>106</sup> Ravid agrees that there are similarities between the calendar in Jub and certain parts of AB when it comes to the seasons of the year, but that much of AB seems to be influenced by the Babylonian calendar while Jub is more influenced by the Egyptian calendar.<sup>107</sup> If Ravid's arguments are valid, the connection between AB and Jub might not be so close after all. Another fact is that AB only uses the count of weeks once, and then in correspondence with the lunar year, which makes it more likely that Jub reflect the terminology of AW. Additionally, Jub does not mention the days of the week, which leaves it the odd text out within second temple literature.<sup>108</sup> One might see a similarity between Jub and certain date formulae in the Hebrew Bible, as they do not focus much on the single days either. This could imply a connection or an intention to use the same model. Jonathan Ben-Dev thinks this might have been done deliberately to imitate the biblical norm.<sup>109</sup> This could be an argument against Jub originating at Qumran as they are known for use of days in their date formulas, even if they also used a 364 day calendar.<sup>110</sup> Some scholars argue that it would be wrong to speak of the Enochian calendars as solar, lunar, or as consistent with any real cosmic phenomena at all, as the 364 day calendar is fitted to the schematic model of sevens and thus keeps a consistent view of the Sabbaths.<sup>111</sup> This could be the same for Jub if it builds on BW and/or AW. Any

---

<sup>105</sup> Ravid. 2003:371-373

<sup>106</sup> Ravid. 2003.374-375

<sup>107</sup> Ravid. 2003.374-375

<sup>108</sup> Ben-Dev. 2009:280

<sup>109</sup> Ben-Dev. 2009:280-281

<sup>110</sup> Ben-Dev. 2009:280

<sup>111</sup> Glessmer. 1999:231

inconsistencies between reality and the narrative could be explained by the default cosmic model which changed because of with the watchers' deeds.<sup>112</sup>

Both the structure and parts of the content of Jub and AW are somewhat similar, and this has led certain scholars to claim that AW had a substantial influence on Jub. James M. Scott claims that this is the case and that the reference to the writings of Enoch in Jub (4:18-19) actually is a specific reference to the text of AW:

Jub 4:18; He [*Enoch*] was the first to write a testimony. He testified to mankind in the generations of the earth: The weeks of the jubilees he related, and made known the days of the years; the months he arranged, and related the Sabbaths of the years, as we had told him.<sup>113</sup>

That AW could be the texts that Jub refers to has also been suggested by VanderKam and Nickelsburg.<sup>114</sup> If this is the case it could be concluded that Jub has fitted the Mosaic narrative into an Enochian understanding of time, which makes Jub as a whole seem more Enochian in nature. Scott also argues that AW could be used to fill in unclear parts in the chronology of Jub.<sup>115</sup> This doesn't mean that Scott argues for Jub being an Enochian text, rather it is influenced by the Enochian tradition, and as Jub changes the Mosaic narrative to fit its calendar the Enochic model is also fitted into the ideology of Jub as it reinterprets the apocalyptic ideas of AW.

To get an understanding of Jub's relation to the Enochic tradition as it is presented in Jub, one should consider the nature of the knowledge given to Enoch and that which is given to Moses. According to Jub it is the same revelation. Enoch studied the heavenly tablets, and both Enoch and Moses were told the revelation by angels. So according to Jub their messages are the same.

#### *The Jubilees as an apocalyptic counter narrative or an alternate alternative?*

In deciding if Jub is a master, counter or alternative narrative we have more data to build on than when we looked at the Enochian texts. Furthermore Jub as a textual unity is much larger than AW or BW. At the same time it is placed within a Mosaic tradition, as it claims to have

---

<sup>112</sup> Jackson. 2009:423

<sup>113</sup> My italics

<sup>114</sup> Scott. 2009:67

<sup>115</sup> Scott. 2009.68

been revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai. The first thing we can exclude is Jub as a master narrative, since it seems to build on the Mosaic master narrative of Genesis and Exodus. Further, it seems to presuppose that the reader knew why Moses was on the mountain at that time. It could be argued that the text could work as a master narrative for another tradition in the area and that similarities are results from a shared cultural context. The problem then would be the nature of the similarities, as it seems the Mosaic tradition is worked into the core of the text, indicating that a Mosaic influence would not be a strong enough term. Rather it is a copy with some changes.

It is either a counter or an alternative narrative to the Mosaic tradition, or to the Enochic tradition, or both. As it seems to build heavily on the Mosaic tradition throughout much of the texts, as well as on BW for its material about the watchers, and possibly on AW for its chronology, an analysis that examines if it could be an alternative narrative of one tradition and a counter narrative to the other, or if it is the same for both, is needed. Compared to the Mosaic tradition the focal points in Jub are somewhat different, for example, the calendar seems to have more importance in Jub than in Genesis and Exodus, and likewise the story of the watchers mixing with women receives much more focus in Jub than in Genesis. The introduction of a new advocate of evil, Mastêmâ, and changes done to certain verses seem like major changes, but the major part of the narrative remains and it seems more like the result of a process of adding and tidying up material than removing it. I would say that Jub seems to be an alternative version of the Mosaic tradition, and the only obvious counter element between the two is Jub's changes done to the Mosaic calendar to fit the Jub calendar. It is the same for BW as its main message is found in Jub, even if found in a summarized form. Enoch keeps an important role, and it is the same role given to him as in the Enochian texts. Of course Moses is given a vital role in Jub, which never happens in the Enochic tradition. However, Jub does not go against the narrative in BW.

All in all Jub seems to have very diplomatic characteristics, which manages to mix the Enochian and Mosaic traditions together within its own calendar, and at the same time come up with explanations for problematic parts in the aforementioned traditions. It is an alternative version of the two other traditions. If one understand BW as an alternative narrative to the Mosaic tradition, and Jub as an alternative narrative to BW the result would be an alternate alternative.

When we discuss the nature of the text there is also the apocalyptic nature of the text to consider, which when compared to other apocalyptic texts might help find the origin of Jub. Both Jub and AW are apocalyptic given that an 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.”<sup>116</sup>

According to Scott AW is clearly an apocalypse, and while he believes Jub to be one too, he feels that more needs to be said about Jub.<sup>117</sup> He points out that Jub is a more covenantal book than AW and thus harder to place within a category. While this is true the text is still an apocalypse according to the definition used, and Scott ends up viewing Jub as an “apocalypse within a covenantal setting that inherently lends it authority.”<sup>118</sup> The question is how relevant this is for finding the origin of Jub. Could Jub be influenced by the Mosaic tradition of apocalyptic literature? The best known Mosaic apocalypse, is the *Book of Daniel* which is believed to be a late text (somewhere between 167 BCE and 164 BCE.) Matthias Henze believes that Jub and Daniel could be written within the same decade.<sup>119</sup> The Enochian candidate would of course be AW. A major comparison between these works would demand a work of its own and thus I only take a superficial look at the elements that belongs in the apocalyptic genre in the two texts.

When it comes to the apocalyptic elements in the texts there is of course the similarity that both include divine revelation, as they are apocalypses. However the ways they are received are different. Jub presents itself as a revelation, the text is the words of the divine, either dictated to Enoch or written for Enoch by the angel of presence. Daniel on the other hand contains several dreams that are interpreted by Daniel and the angel Gabriel. The apocalyptic ideas are much clearer in Daniel as it is a relatively short narrative and believed to have been written with the purpose of explaining the context in which it was written and console those affected by the situation at the time.<sup>120</sup> Jub on the other hand contain few apocalyptic elements compared to Daniel, and there are actually only two chapters (Jub 1 and 13) that are of an apocalyptic character, but then those chapters are strongly apocalyptic. AW is like Jub in that all the text is a revelation, as it is Enoch’s narrative of what he learned from

---

<sup>116</sup> Collins 1979:1-20. Cited by Scott 2009:69

<sup>117</sup> Scott 2009:69

<sup>118</sup> Scott. 2009:70

<sup>119</sup> Henze. 2009:52

<sup>120</sup> The situation would be Antiochean persecution and the desecration of the temple.

Henze. 2009:52,55

the heavenly tablets that concerns the pre-judgment and post-judgment happenings. It is different in being a much more summarized narrative than Jub. The purpose of the texts is another interesting factor. While Daniel can be argued to be an attempt at explaining and comforting the people at a certain time, the author or authors of Jub seems more interested in retelling the narrative of Genesis, Exodus, and BW with a focus on halakic law and the historical chronology.<sup>121</sup> The general theme of dream interpretation is somewhat different from Jub and AW, as the information in those cases is gathered directly from the angel of presence and the heavenly tablets. Altogether it does not seem like Jub is influenced by Daniel. Reading them is somewhat like reading books within the same genre, and similar language but with very different narratives. This is explained by Henze by the texts being from the same context but with different functions.<sup>122</sup> This covers the apocalyptic nature of the text, and while it is possible that Daniel and Jub were written in the same context, which might help date Jub, there are no obvious connections between the two books except the genre.

---

<sup>121</sup> Henze. 2009:63

<sup>122</sup> Henze. 2009:63





## **Part Three**

**Evaluating theories and categories, and placing the Book of  
Jubilees in a religious context.**



## *New perspectives, old theories*

In the two previous parts of this thesis the obscure origins of Judaic texts have been reviewed closely, and while the second part did not give an answer to my inquiry it did give an indication of the relations between the texts as well as revealing the interesting diplomatic nature of Jub. There are without a doubt several differences between the texts, from the calendars used and the origin of sin, to the protagonists and goals of the texts. Before continuing I summarize the most important findings from part two.

Most revealing among the differences between the texts, and among the traditions which have served as my focal texts in part one and two, would be the origin of sin, as it has consequences for the idea of free will, and it is the point where the texts diverge most from each other. This is also one of the places where Jub seems to attempt to merge the Enochian ideas as presented in BW, and possibly AW, with that of Genesis and Exodus. We saw that according to the Mosaic view man is to blame for sinning, although Satan had a role to play, while in the Enochian tradition man is a victim and the fallen angels are to blame. Jub is somewhere between these views and has often been interpreted as an attempt to reconcile the two opposing ideas or groups while implementing ideas of its own to those traditions. How the origin of sin is depicted in Jub reveals that it used both the narratives from BW and from the Mosaic tradition.

The use of the calendar in Jub gives us another interesting clue, as it reveals how Jub seems to build on the chronology of AW, and makes it more plausible that the books referred to in the beginning of Jub include AW.

We see that both the BW and the AW are likely to have influenced Jub, in addition to the obvious Mosaic relation as seen in the similarity of major parts of the narrative of Jub with that of Genesis and Exodus. With only the narratives focused on in this thesis it would probably be impossible to identify the origin, as both traditions have a strong presence in the narratives. I tried to identify a universal message in the Enochic texts, as opposed to the

exclusive message of a chosen people in the Mosaic tradition, but while it seems that BW presents a more open idea of salvation, there is too little evidence to support the claim. AW seems to favor the idea of a chosen people. The deciding factor will be what we know of the scribal traditions and the historical context of the time.

One could ask if Jub should be placed within either of the traditions, or in another category (the Qumran community?). To answer this question we need to review the relationship between the Mosaic and the Enochian literary corpuses and traditions, which may not be as opposing as is often thought.

After reading 1.Enoch and Jub as well as collecting data for this thesis, I found the lack of polemics between the assumed different religious groups striking. Parts of the narratives have been interpreted as anti-Mosaic, as I discussed in part two, and have been identified as literary attacks aimed at the other traditions. In my opinion there are no such attacks. The silence that surrounds certain central religious ideas does not give enough information about the relations between these different traditions to conclude that there is any animosity between any of the traditions explored in this thesis. What we do see in this thesis is that there are no open polemics between the traditions, but that they share a very similar narrative base. I believe some of the reason for this speculative identification of polemics has to do with the categories used within this academic field today. By focusing on the differences between the Judaic groups rather than on the fact that they all are Judaic and seem to follow a similar narrative base scholars creates a representation, a map in which polemics seem much more likely to occur, but which may not give an accurate understanding of the actual terrain. There are several reasons why this might be the case. Chief among these are the scribal practices at the time, the idea of a canon, religious filiations, continuous Mosaic reshaping or discourse, and an alienation of Jub and parts of the Enochic corpus from the Mosaic tradition as a result of categorization. These topics will be explored alongside the search for Jub's origin, as the two are connected. I start by examining the theories that try to explain the relations between the religious traditions and the possible scribal tradition behind Jub.

### *Examining theories*

The Groningen hypothesis is not directly linked to Jub unless the text was written by the Qumran community or the Essene movement, a possibility I will explore below. However, the Qumran caves and the texts found there are some of the few landmarks, in a metaphorical sense, that we can use to get clues on the early Judaic context, and I also believe this is a key

in understanding the relation between the texts and their authors. Given that Tov is right, and a specific scribal style was used at Qumran it should be possible to separate the Qumran scrolls from the scrolls which were written elsewhere. This would not prove that Jub originated there as it is a possibility that the versions at Qumran were only copies of an older unknown version, but it could give an indication as to the authority of the text at Qumran. Tov claims there is circumstantial evidence for Jub being an accepted text at Qumran, but maintains that there is no sure knowledge of it being an authority in any known religious groups.<sup>123</sup> If the Groningen hypothesis is right, it is probable that much of the literary corpus found at Qumran represents the texts used in either a contemporary or earlier Essene movement of which Qumran was a splinter group. As the knowledge of Essene traditions outside Qumran is very limited it would be difficult to identify the status of Jub in the Essene tradition. If Philo and Josephus were correct in their claims that there existed Essene movements within villages at the time, the texts of these movements, and possibly the ruins, are most likely lost to us. With that possible information denied to us at this time, there is no actual choice, as we have to work with the information we got.

It seems the settlement at Qumran was one of a kind, and I base this on several reasons. There is the archeological evidence discussed earlier, which limits the possible size of the community living at Qumran as well as rendering the theory of Qumran being some kind of headquarter for the Essene movement unlikely. We have sources like Dio of Prusa and Pliny that seem to place Essenes near the Dead Sea, and which fit well with Qumran. And there is little evidence at Qumran that points towards it being part of a larger organization. If so, then Josephus and Philo's references to several thousand Essenes could be interpreted as referring to the original movement of which Qumran came from, or a possible contemporary Jewish group. The evidence does point towards Qumran being an autonomous group. The copies of texts found in the Hebrew Bible and Enochic literature indicate that they were a splinter group from the Mosaic tradition, or another tradition building on the Mosaic one. It could be that they just stored books from the other traditions, but given the cost of books, and the time it took to copy one at the time, that seems unlikely.

The next question would be if the group that the Qumran community originated from indeed was an Essene tradition or the Enochic-Essene tradition, as claimed by Boccaccini, the

---

<sup>123</sup> What is meant by accepted text is unclear, but I interpret it as a larger category than canonical. To compare with other traditions I would say that if the Quran was canonical, some of the Hadith are recognized as accepted texts, as they are used but cannot claim such a status as the Quran.

Enochic tradition, or even the Mosaic tradition. The information when it comes to the Essene tradition is very limited, there are mostly ancient references as by Josephus, Philo, Dio and Pliny, as mentioned in part one. If the information from texts that were found at Qumran does not represent the entire Essene movement, which is unlikely, especially if they were a splinter group, there is indeed very little knowledge about the Essene culture and what their relationship were to the other traditions. We are stuck with several missing links in the research. The Essene-Enochic thesis by Boccaccini might explain some of these missing links, and I believe it has its uses, if not in the way Boccaccini sees it.

By presenting the Enochic and Mosaic (Boccaccini refers to it as Zadokite) traditions as two opposing parties Boccaccini has established an early (pre-Maccabean) dichotomy within the Judaic tradition. When the Enochic tradition split into two, forming the Essene tradition, another division of the Judaic tradition took place, which was the Qumran-Essene split. The Qumran community is then a splinter group of the Essene group, which makes it possible for the theory to explain all the literature found at Qumran. It is a simple map, and seemingly logical. The only problem is the lack of evidence. What is important for my thesis is the fact that both theories seem to conclude that the Qumran community came from the other Judaic traditions. It is then probable that they brought with them certain parts of those traditions, which can explain the multitude of texts at Qumran. Now there is the possibility of Jub originating either at Qumran, or from an earlier Mosaic, Enochic or Essene tradition. I agree with Boccaccini's reason for the Hebrew and Enochic texts being at Qumran at all. I agree that at least some of them were remnants of the tradition from which Qumran split. Where I disagree is the nature of the dichotomy between the Mosaic and Enochic, later Enochic-Essene, groups. We should acknowledge the possibility that they might have been two opposing groups, but given the information we got today there is just too little evidence to support such a claim.

In the first part of this thesis there was one thing common to the hypotheses concerning the origin of the Torah, and that is the editing and adding of information to existing material, a process which I believe it is likely many of the texts mentioned in this thesis have been through. Be it the Documentary Hypothesis, Supplementary Hypothesis or the Fragment Hypothesis, texts are collected and edited to make them relevant to the historical context of the time, or it could be a rewriting of several texts into one text. It is not a static process and I believe the texts examined in this thesis might have gone through similar changes. While good categories make information more accessible to the scholars, at times these categories seem to alienate groups from one another, and while categories are there to

map differences, they are not supposed to create further differences. At this point I argue that it seems Jub has a Mosaic-Enochic base. This is not the same as to say that Jub originated in a specific Mosaic-Enochic group, it is just a statement concerning its base, but as I will show later I believe the separation between the given traditions is a bit uncertain.

### *Scribal traditions*

When we attempt to place Jub within a certain context and religious group there is the scribal culture at the time to consider. Creating a text such as Jub would demand a lot of time and knowledge, which limits our choices as its author or authors would have needed substantial literary training. We should also consider that religious groups currently unknown to us could be the authors of Jub. Josephus mentions what is identified as three religious groups (Sadducees, Essenes, and Pharisees), and while this thesis explores the possibility of an earlier Mosaic base than the Pharisees, as well as the Enochic tradition, this does not exclude the possibility of other groups of lesser status being the author of Jub. In other words, other groups than the ones mentioned in this thesis could be the authors of Jub. This will not be a problem for this thesis as I can only work with the knowledge available. Calculating in every possibility will not lead this thesis closer to an answer, but I can at least deem it unlikely that other groups wrote Jub as the literary skills were limited at the time. This does not exclude possible unknown author groups. However, it makes the known traditions better candidates.

There was without a doubt a scribal culture in Jerusalem, which was connected to the temple and the palace. The relationship between the temple and the palace is another question visited earlier, that might be important for understanding the religio – political context of the time. As I search for the origin of Jub I continue working with the Mosaic category, which includes both the Temple and the Palace as I find it problematic as well as unnecessary for this thesis to separate the two. It is sufficient to say that Van Der Toorn believes the authors of the Torah were trained at the Temple while others claim the language points towards court training and the palace.

There is also the scribal practice at Qumran, forgotten by Van Der Toorn, and advocated by Tov as discussed in part one. We know of a scribal culture in Jerusalem and there probably was one at Qumran as well. This makes it likely that Jub was written in one of these places, given that the text seems to be from the same geographical area, which is probable as it builds on other existing traditions known in the area, as well as fragments from several copies found at Qumran.

There are still major differences between Jub and the other traditions' text corpuses and the one author theory is one such difference that makes it even harder to place Jub. In part one I examined the arguments for there being several authors behind Jub, as advocated by Segal, but I agree more with VanderKam's identification of inconsistencies in the text as errors of translation, as Segal's arguments were built on little evidence. There is a possibility of there being multiple authors, and of course later attempts to edit the text, but as it stands now the evidence is not strong enough. With the Torah there are differences within the texts that indicate the presence of several authors and changes being made to the existing texts. This means one could assume a certain consistency in thought and practice throughout the text corpuses because of the editing. However there would still be some differences in the writings of the various authors and editors, as well as various comments on the context of the time of the different authors. Such differences can be used to place the text or parts of the text in a given historical context. Regarding the one author theory of Jub the information available is more limited. We search for the one author and the timeframe within which the text was created, which is much more precise than searching for a group of people and a larger timeframe, and might be impossible to find, as the text displays no information of the contemporary time in which it was written, as for example the Mosaic Daniel does. While at least parts of the Mosaic and Enochic text corpuses were written by several authors, it is much more likely that they were created within the scribal traditions mentioned above. That need not be the case for Jub, for while it is still probable that it was written within one of these places it also has a greater chance of being written elsewhere as it only takes one person with literary skill and knowledge about the religious texts and traditions to write it.

These are the premises on which I move towards my conclusion. While there is a possibility that the text was created outside the known scribal traditions I will assume they were written within these traditions given the evidence found for there being scribal practices in both Qumran and Jerusalem, and because of lack of evidence pointing towards other scribal traditions in which one could assume to find both the literary skills and knowledge it would take to compose such a text as Jub.

### *The Idea of a Canon*

In part one of this thesis it became evident how important the origin of the Torah is to scholars as there has been a focus on origin for a very long time, and still is. The idea of a set of texts that represent the ideology within religions, or at least the mainstream tradition within



a religion, is almost expected when approaching a religion. Within several of the largest religions we find such sets of texts or books, and that literature is often recognized as sacred. One does not add to the Quran or the Bible, they are recognized as ancient books which should not be tampered with. Therefore it is perfectly understandable that scholars search for the texts that started the traditions and which were regarded as authoritative. But it is important to remember the pre-canon time, in which there might have been a multitude of texts, many dedicated to certain parts of the Jewish culture. The author of Jub might have considered it Mosaic. Ben-Dev believed it to imitate the biblical norm. It could be that most literate Jews knew little of the differences between the texts. Given the similar base narrative within the different traditions they could have recognized several texts that are now considered to belong to different groups, as belonging to the same.

I see no reason for this not being the case with several of the earliest works, such as AB and BW. It is true that they are commonly thought of as a part of 1.Enoch but because of the large timeframe within which the different Enochian texts are believed to have been composed, as dated by paleographical and carbon dating, the first Enochian texts are likely to be additions to the already existing traditions, rather than opposing texts. In other words alternative narratives and not necessarily counter narratives. That we later know of a corpus based on texts with Enoch as a main character could imply that the first texts were considered popular and that it was safe to build upon. Certain of the Enochian texts could actually be part of an early Mosaic ongoing canonization process, which makes them in a way Mosaic, which would again make it much more probable that Jub is to be considered Mosaic as well. There are no or little evidence for there being opposing views between the texts, as shown in part two, and groups seem to have been adapted to the texts corpuses rather than the other way around. It is very likely things changed the closer to the Common Era that one comes, as the process of canonization moved on.

Both 1.Enoch and Jub were found in Ethiopia, and it is used by the Ethiopian Orthodox Church today as well as having previously been a part of the canon for the Ethiopian Jews. I find this relevant as it could point towards the texts being part of an earlier version of a canon, or at least given a certain status within some religious group. I do not claim that the Ethiopian Jews are a direct continuation of Israeli or Egyptian Judaism as much research shows that it is likely that the texts reached them through the Ethiopian Church, but that the texts of Enoch and Jub could have been part of the Jewish texts which formed the

Ethiopian Church's Old Testament.<sup>124</sup> The question is how Jub and *1Enoch* became canonized in both the Ethiopian Church and Ethiopian Judaism if they were not part of the authoritative literary corpus earlier. Given that there was a council of Jamnia, the answer could be that Jub and 1.Enoch were removed from most earlier Jewish canonical collections but remained in the Ethiopian Church, from which the Ethiopian Jews got a hold of it. There might be other reasons, that the text was introduced much later, but the role of 1.Enoch and Jub in the Ethiopian Church indicate that they were known and used as parts of the Jewish tradition, council of Jamnia or not. There is still the problem of identifying which Jewish traditions, as it could have been the Mosaic, Qumranic, Essene, Essene-Qumranic or Enochian.

As the Ethiopian Church recognizes several texts known from the Tanakh alongside Jub and 1.Enoch it is possible that these texts reached Ethiopia at the same time, probably through a Greek translation as there are traces of a Greek base in the Ge'ez version as mentioned in part one. This could indicate that the canon, or the set of authoritative texts the Ethiopian Church received their texts from, was a tradition with a Mosaic base.

The religious context of early Judaism is complex, and which tradition's canon Jub belongs to remains a difficult question. Scholars are not even sure if there is a specific group behind the Enoch category, or who the Essene was. If we remove some traditions or at least use another perspective it is possible to simplify the equation of traditions and corpuses.

Given the obscurity surrounding the Essenes, their relevance for this thesis can be clarified. If the Essenes lived at Qumran, or if Qumran was a splinter group of the Essenes, can be recognized as the Qumran community or a part of the Qumran community. Possible Essene movements outside of Qumran are removed from the equation as the evidence for their existence outside Qumran is limited. In a similar way I remove the Enochians, given that they are not part of the Mosaic or Qumranic traditions. There exists very little information about an Enochian tradition outside the information found within the texts themselves, and the information found is obscure. It is possible that there were differences within Jerusalem and the temple, but I see no strong reasons to assume the differences discussed in this thesis came from opposing Enochian group located outside Jerusalem. The category Enochian is still viable, but as a perspective and as a sub-group within the Mosaic tradition.

We are then left with the Mosaic, and the Qumranic traditions. Building on what we know from Jub and 1.Enoch, both as found in Ethiopia and as texts found at Qumran, we are

---

<sup>124</sup> Kaplan. 1988:52-53

left with two possible places of origin, namely in the Qumran scribal culture and the Jerusalem scribal culture.

### *Jerusalem versus Qumran*

The scribes in Jerusalem as well as those from Qumran are the most likely origins for Jub as we have seen in the discussion above. Most copies are found at Qumran, alongside several texts from the Mosaic tradition. I have tried to clarify the matter by categorizing the often confusing multitude of traditions and texts, and to remove the most unlikely of the origins.

It is still possible that there is an Essene or Enochian, or Enochian-Essene (according to Boccaccini) origin of Jub, I cannot disprove the possibility entirely. However by ending up with Jerusalem versus Qumran I have covered what I find the most likely candidates.

The scribal culture in Jerusalem is known both from history and the Hebrew Bible, and there were doubtlessly a considerable number of scribes connected to the temple and the palace, as the religious and political center of Judea. According to Ezekiel and Van Der Toorn, the Levites were the original scribes of the temple, and tensions between them and the temple Priesthood resulted in a split within the religious tradition of Jerusalem. The Levites formed their own group in opposition to the temple priesthood. This could be the origin of the Enochic tradition, or even the Qumran tradition. It could explain why there was a scribal culture at Qumran. It could explain much, and it is a possibility, but a possibility that has almost nothing to support it, except that it could explain how there came to be a scribal culture at Qumran. While it is an interesting theory the lack of evidence is problematic.

The scribal culture at Qumran is difficult to get a grip on as many of the texts found there are the same as the ones believed to originate in Jerusalem. Certain texts on the other hand are believed to be Qumranic (for example, *Rule of the Community* and *Miscellaneous Rule*) and thus Essene-Qumranic by those who follow the Groningen Hypothesis.<sup>125</sup> I mentioned earlier that Tov did not find it unlikely that Jub held an authoritative status at Qumran. Aahron Shemesh goes so far as to argue that it held a canonical status at Qumran, given the amount of copies found at Qumran together with a possibility of it being referred to

---

<sup>125</sup> 1QS and 4Q265

in the Damascus Document.<sup>126</sup> However, I am skeptical of speaking of canonical texts at such a stage in Jewish history, so I rather speak of it as Tov does, as a possible authoritative text.

I see one strong argument for both sides, one building on the amount of copies found of Jub at Qumran along with the possibility that Jub was an authoritative text at Qumran. The other is more content based, as I believe Jub to build on Mosaic and Enochic, or Mosaic-Enochic traditions while I find little that refers to Qumran, or the Essene to cover that possibility. Shemesh mentions several similarities between *Rule of the Community* and Jub, but this similarity seems to indicate that *Rule of the Community* based some of its legislation on Jub, not the other way around.<sup>127</sup> Given these arguments for both sides I find it most likely that Jub was written in Jerusalem. The amount of copies and the status of Jub at Qumran is not necessarily because it was originally written there. Further, we have little or no evidence that points towards Jub being influenced by texts which are believed to originate at Qumran, or within a possible Essene community, as mentioned above it goes the other way around. So the same argument for Jub being a Qumran text could also be used as an argument for it being a Mosaic, Enochic, or Mosaic-Enochic text.

I do not claim that Jub was written in Jerusalem, such a claim would undermine the whole thesis. I argue that according to the information known, and used by me in this thesis, it is more likely that Jub originated in Jerusalem. There are several other possibilities, which I have mentioned above, the scribal culture at Jerusalem just has the highest probability when we consider the information we have.

It is probable that Jub held a certain authoritative status at Qumran. It builds on Enochic and Mosaic traditions. It is recognized as a canonical text by both Jews and orthodox Christians in Ethiopia. In a study of VanderKam's work on Jub, Enoch and Qumran Anette Yoshiko Reed voices a similar perspective:

Our evidence suggests that the boundaries of scriptural authority remained fluid at the second century B.C.E., and that a variety of texts continued to vie for elevated status, functioning as Scripture for some Jews but not for others. This is evident in the range of authoritative texts used by different groups, no less than the dominant modes of literary production in second temple Judaism.

When seen from this perspective, it does not seem paradoxical that Enochic books like the Book of the Watchers can root their claims to record heavenly secrets in the "biblical" statements about

---

<sup>126</sup> The Damascus Document, or DD, was found among the texts at DSL. Given that there were already known copies before the discovery of DSL it is very interesting in understanding the spread of Qumranic ideas, as the texts is secretarian and believed by many originate at the Qumran, or an Essene community.

<sup>127</sup> Shemesh. 2009:258

Enoch, even as their expansions of Genesis are no less grounded in the “extrabiblical” claim of Enoch’s status as revealer. Nor does it seem so odd that the author of Jubilees might seek to expand upon the books of the torah by using Moses’ own voice, even if he wishes to supplement rather than supplant those cherished books (Reed 2002, 80-86).<sup>128</sup>

Reed explains that it might not be strange that the authors of BW and Jub built their narrative on earlier “biblical” knowledge, as the “boundaries of scriptural authority remained fluid”, and it is this fluidness, or ongoing Mosaic discourse that I believe scholars should focus on in an attempt to unravel the relations between the Jewish traditions. When mapping these boundaries one have to be careful when using categories, as categories used without caution often leads to oversimplification.

There is still the question of who wrote Jub. The answer, according to the premises this thesis is based upon, would probably be a scribe connected to the temple in Jerusalem. Several texts considered Enochian may have been written in Jerusalem, and there is a certain chance that no one ever considered them anti-Mosaic. As mentioned it could have been an elaboration on the known Genesis, an alternative version, or it could have been a counter-story with hidden polemics. Given the narrative base of Jub the Mosaic and Enochic traditions are the obvious candidates and according to my discussion on the narratives what is referred to as Enochian could just as likely be a part of an earlier Mosaic tradition. The copies found at Qumran worked as a key in the research and might have played a vital role in spreading Jub, but the evidence goes towards Jerusalem being the point of origin.

### *Dating the Book of Jubilees*

In searching for the origin of a text, part of the task is to find the date of composition. To find an exact date for Jub is probably impossible. According to paleographical dating, as mentioned in part one, the oldest copy found at Qumran was from the first century BCE while the youngest was from the first century CE. According to my examination of Jub’s narrative it builds on earlier Enochic-Mosaic traditions and is therefore written after these, which would only tell us that it was written after AW. AW is assumed to be from the second century and more precisely according to Vanderkam a few years before 165 BCE because of references to troubled times in the text which Vanderkam identifies as the Maccabean revolt. This leaves us

---

<sup>128</sup> Reed. 2009:97-98

with a timeframe of about 70 years in which Jub probably was created, from 170BCE up until 100BCE.

### *Conclusion*

According to the information used in this thesis, I find it most probable that the *Book of Jubilees* was written in Jerusalem. I present several arguments for this being the case.

1) *It presents itself as a Mosaic text.* The author seems to recognize the text as a part of the Mosaic tradition. When one considers that the narrative presented in Jub is very similar to Genesis and Exodus and given the fact that there are no strong arguments against it being Mosaic, it most likely is Mosaic.

2) *The narrative is that of a Mosaic-Enochic mixture with modifications.* At times Jub looks like a copy of the narratives we know from Genesis and Exodus. When it recounts a different version of what is known from the Mosaic tradition, the differences can either be identified as Enochian, or as lesser modifications to the original Mosaic narrative. These modifications are either additions or changes to the original, but the changes do not seem to break with the original narrative, but to integrate the additions. When adding parts from the Enochian BW into the original narrative known from the Torah, Jub had to change certain parts of the original narrative to fit with the additions from BW, and certain parts were probably edited to fit with the context in which Jub was written. Although Jub adds and changes the original I argue that it is not a counter narrative, but rather an alternative version, as Jub recounts both the original narrative and the Enochian at the same time by integrating the Enochian tradition into the original Mosaic tradition. This tells us that the narratives known from Genesis and Exodus were the most likely base for Jub, while elements known from 1.Enoch were added.

3) *There is little reason to suspect that the authors behind the Enochic corpus operated outside Jerusalem, as there are no references to Enochians as a separate group in early Judaism.* I argue that there was not an Enochian group outside Jerusalem, and that the authors behind the texts in 1.Enoch were most likely connected to the temple. There are no references to a group of Enochians outside Jerusalem. Considering the advanced literary abilities and considerable knowledge concerning the Mosaic tradition, in a time when Hebrew understanding and scribal training was limited, I argue that the authors behind the Enochian corpus probably came from the number of scribes in Jerusalem. When I place the authors of

the Enochian corpus in Jerusalem it seems likely that Jub originated there, given the Mosaic and Enochian base of Jub.

4) *There are no explicit polemics between the Mosaic and the early Enochian narratives.* Although there are certain differences between the narratives in the texts, there are no explicit polemics. As we have seen in this thesis there are certain parts of the Enochian corpus that ignore Moses, the Torah and the second temple, but this alone should not be interpreted as hostility. As there are no explicit polemics between the Enochian and the Mosaic traditions it seems more likely that Jub, as a Mosaic-Enochian mix, has been considered as an authoritative text in Jerusalem, explaining why copies of the text have been found in several languages, and at several different places.

6) *It is possible that Jub originated at Qumran, as they probably had their own scribes as well as several copies were found in the area.* Many of the texts found near Qumran were known Mosaic texts that are believed to originate in Jerusalem, but of which there have been found several copies at Qumran. Certain of these texts were probably recognized as authoritative at Qumran, and it is likely that Jub was one of these, as fragments of several copies have been found there. It is possible that Jub originates from Qumran, but given the Enochic-Mosaic nature of the text and the fact that it is has been found outside Qumran, which according to archeological evidence only could hold a small group of people, makes Jerusalem seem the more likely of the two.

7) *The role of Jub and 1Enoch in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and among the Ethiopian Jews.* The possibility of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church receiving Jub and 1. Enoch at the same time, and along with several other texts from the Mosaic canon, could point towards Jub being an authoritative text in earlier versions of the Mosaic tradition. Although if this should be the case, it would probably be through a Greek translation as the Ge'ez version is believed to come from a Greek base.

8) *The date of composition of Jub is likely between 170BCE and 100BCE.* According to paleographical datings as well as the identification of a reference to the Maccabean revolt done by Vanderkam the date of origin seems to be within the timeframe 170BCE and 100BCE.

I believe there existed a multitude of texts and different traditions at the time of the creation of Jub, and an ongoing discourse surrounding the authenticity of texts and how to interpret them. I believe the same was the case for the early Enochian corpus, which I propose could be viewed as Mosaic, for the reasons mentioned above. I see no explicit polemics in the texts and do not see any need or reason to assume them.

As traces of several copies of Jub as well as Enochian texts were found in Qumran alongside the scriptures from the Hebrew Bible, this could indicate that they were part of an early base of texts, a pre-canon corpus. Then later in the formative period, Jub was excluded from the developing canon and somewhat forgotten, but with the traces of it found in communities that originate from an earlier stage of the formative period, such as the Ethiopian church and the library of Qumran. When it comes to why Jub was written, as I believe it was written as an attempt to unify the Mosaic and the Enochic traditions by fitting the Enochian texts into the Mosaic narrative.



## *Bibliography*

- Abakuks, Andris. 2006. "A statistical study of the triple-link model in the synoptic problem" in *The Journal of Royal Statistical Society*. Vol. 169. No.1. 49-60.
- Adler, William. 2005. "Enoch, Moses, and the Essenes" in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Bachmann, Veronika. 2011. "The Book of Watcher (1 Enoch 1-36): An anti-Mosaic, non-Mosaic, or even pro-Mosaic writing?" in *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*. Vol. Article 4.
- Baigent, Michael and Leigh, Richard. 1993. *The Dead Sea Deception – Why a handful of Religious Scholars Conspired To Suppress the Revolutionary of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Simon & Schuster.
- Barstad, M. H. 2010. *A Brief Guide to the Hebrew Bible*. Westminster John Knox Press.
- Baumgarten, I. A. 2005. "Reflections on the Groningen Hypothesis" in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company
- Bedenbender, Andreas. 2007. "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature" in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Brill.
- Ben-Dev Jonathan. 2009. "Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of Jubilees" in G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Boadt, Lawrence. 1984. *Reading the Old Testament: An Introduction*. Paulist Press.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. 1998. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis – The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. 2005. "Introduction: From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism" in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co.

- Boccaccini, Gabriele. 2005. "Qumran: The Headquarters of the Essenes or a Marginal Splinter Group?" in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmanns Publishing Co.
- Bonani, Georges., Ivy, Susan., Wöfli, Willy., Broshi, Magen., Carmi, Israel., and Strugnell, John. 1992. "Radiocarbon dating of fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls" in *Radiocarbon – An International Journal of Cosmogenic Isotope Research*. Vol. 34. No 3. 843-849
- Collins, J. John. 1979. "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre" in *Semeia*, no. 14. 1-20.
- Davila, R. James. 2005. "Enochian, Essenes, and Qumran Essenes" in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmanns Publishing Co.
- Davis, Phillip. 2000. "What separates a Minimalist from a Maximalist? Not Much" in *Biblical Archaeology Review* Vol. 26. 24-27.
- Diamant Devorah. 1993. "The Seventy Weeks Chronology (Dan 9.24-27) in the Light of New Qumranic Texts" in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Peeters Publishers.
- Elgvin, Torleif. 2004. "Introduksjon" in *Verdens Hellige Skrifter – Dødehavsrullene*. De Norske Bokklubbene.
- Elgvin, Torleif. 2009. "Proessen med å publisere og fortolke skriftene" in *Dødehavsrullene – Deres innhold, historie og betydning*. Høyskoleforlaget.
- Elgvin, Torleif. 2005. "The Yahad Is More Than Qumran" in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmanns Publishing Co.
- Glessmer, Uwe. 1999. "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Brill
- Golb, Nordmann. 1980. "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 124, No.1. 1-24.
- Goodman, Martin and Vermès, Géza. 1989. *The essenes – According to classical sources*. Continuum International Publishing Group
- Goodman, Martin. 2007. *Rome & Jerusalem: The clash of Ancient Civilizations*. Knopf
- Hempel, Charlotte. 2005. "The Groeningen Hypothesis: Strengths and Weaknesses" in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmanns Publishing Co.
- Henze, Matthias. 2009. "Daniel and Jubilees" in G. Boccacinni and G. Ibbá (ed.), *Enoch and*

- the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Jackson, R. David. 2009. "Jubilees and Enochic Judaism" in G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Jackson, R. de. J. J. 1989. *Historical Criticism and the meaning of texts*. Routledge
- The HarperCollins Study Bible – New Revised Standard Version* (2006) (Original editor Meeks, A. W. Revised Edition editor Attridge, W.H). HarperOne.
- Kaplan, Steven. 1988. "'Falasha' Religion: Ancient Judaism or Evolving Ethiopian Tradition?" In *The Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series* vol.79. No.1. 49-65.
- Kvandal, S. Helge. 2009. "The Concept of covenant in Jubilees" in G. Boccacinni and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Murphy, J. Frederick. 2002. *Early Judaism: The Exile to the time of Jesus*. Hendrickson Publishers.
- Nelson, Lindemann. 2001. *Hilde Damaged Identities, Narrative repair*. Cornell University Press
- Newmann, C. Roberts. 1976. "The Council of Jamnia and the gold Testament Canon" in *Westminister Theological Journal*. Vol. 38. 319-348.
- Nickelsburg, W.E. George and VanderKam, C. James. 2004. *1 Enoch. A New Translation*. Fortress Press.
- Nickelsburg W. E. George. 1981. "Enoch, Levi and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in upper Galilee" in *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Vol. 100. No.4. 575-600.
- Nicholson, Ernest. 1998. *The Pentateuch in the twentieth century, the Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. Clarendon Press
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi. 2005. "Some Archaeological, Sociological, and Cross-Cultural Afterthoughts on the "Groeningen" and the "Enochic/Essene" Hypotheses" in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmanns Publishing Co.
- Ravid, Liora. 2003. "The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar: A Reexamination" in *Dead Sea Discoveries*, Vol 10. No 3. 371-394
- Reed Y. Annette. 2009. "Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in Jubilees" in G. Boccacinni and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Reed Yoshiko Reed. 2005. "Reaveled literature" in the Second Century B.C.E. in *Enoch and*

- Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Schiffman, Lawrence. 1990. "The New Halakhic letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect" in *Biblical Archaeologist* Vol. 53. 64-73.
- Scott, M. James. 2009. "The Chronologies between the Book of the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Book of Jubilees" in G. Boccacinni and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Shemesh Aharon. 2009. « 4Q265 and the Authoritative Status of Jubilees at Qumran» in G. Boccacinni and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Segal, Michael. 2009. "The Composition of Jubilees" in G. Boccacinni and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Seters, Van. John. 1975. *Abraham in History and Tradition*. Yale University Press.
- Stuckenbruck. T, Loren. 2009. "The Book of Jubilees and Origin of Evil" in G. Boccacinni and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah – The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Toorn, Van. Der. Karel. 2007. *Scribal Culture and the making of the Hebrew Bible*. Harvard University Press.
- Tov, Emmanuel. 2009. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Judean Desert*. Society of Biblical Literature
- Tov, Emmanuel. 2009. "The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture- Reflections in the light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch" in *From Qumran to Aleppo*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co KG
- VanderKam, C. James. 1995A. *Dødehavsrullerne - Teorier og Kendsgerninger*. Translated by Jordt, L. Ellen. ANIS.
- VanderKam, C. James. 1995B. *Enoch: A Man for all Generations*. University of South Carolina Press
- VanderKam, C. James. 1989. *The Book of Jubilees*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Vol. 511, Scriptores Aethiopici, Tomus 88. Peeters Publishers.
- VanderKam, C. James. 2009. "The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees" in G. Boccacinni and G. Ibba (ed.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah - The Evidence of Jubilees*. Wm.B.Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- VanderKam. C. James. 1981. "The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees" in *Journal of*

*Semitic Studies* 26 No.2. 209-207.

VanderKam, C. James. 2005. "Too far beyond the Essene Hypothesis?" in *Enoch and Qumran Origins – New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Wm.B.Eerdmanns Publishing Co.

Wellhausen, Julius. 1985. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Adam & Charles Black

Whybray, N. Roger. 1987. *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*. Sheffield Academic Press.

URL:

"Jabneh" at *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online Academic Edition*. Encyclopedia Britannica Inc.

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/298633/Jabneh> (Last checked: 6/2/2012)

VanderKam, C. James. 1997. "The Enoch Literature."

<http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/divinity/rt/otp/guestlectures/vanderkam/> (Last checked: 7/2/2012)

Weis, Richard. 2010. Review of *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*.

Published by RBL/Society of Biblical Literature

[http://bookreviews.org/pdf/6755\\_7661.pdf](http://bookreviews.org/pdf/6755_7661.pdf) (Last checked: 01/6/2012)

*Psalms of Solomon*. Oxford University Press.

<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/31-pssal-nets.pdf> (Last checked 28/05/2012)

Schechter. Solomon. *Cairo Damascus Document*. CD 5:6-7. Updated by Robert, Kraft.

[http://www.sas.upenn.edu/religious\\_studies/rak/courses/225/CD1910.html](http://www.sas.upenn.edu/religious_studies/rak/courses/225/CD1910.html)

(Last Checked 28/06/12 16:49).

## ***Thesis abstract***

*Norwegian*

I denne avhandlinga forsøker eg å plassera den jødiske jubileerteksten i ei historisk kontekst gjennom å studera ulike jødiske grupperingar som me kjenner frå andre tempelperiode (530BCE - 70CE). Jubileerteksten har gjennom tidene fått mykje oppmerksomhet ettersom den kan verka som ein tekst som prøver å knytta saman det mosaiske og den enoiske verdsbiletet. Det er gjort mykje forskning på denne perioden tildligere men ettersom jubileerteksten ikkje har fått ein fast plass blant dei ulike grupperingane gjer eg eit forsøk. Tradisjonane eg fokuserar på er den tradisjonelle mosaiske retninga, den såkalle enoiske retninga samt samfunnet som hold til i nærleiken av Qumran. Andre grupperingar som essenerane blir nemnt og diskutert i avhandlinga men ikkje i like stor grad som grupperingane nemnt over.

Oppgåva er delt i tre delar som tar føre seg [1] historisk kontekst og forskingshistorie, [2] ei komparativ del som tek føre seg det faktiske innhaldet i dei religiøse narrative, og, [3] ein siste del der eg bruker dei føre delane til å lage eit oversiktlig bilete av relasjonane mellom grupperingane samt plassera jubileerteksten i ein sansynleg historisk kontekst. Eg viser etter kvart i avhandlinga at dei antatte ulikehetane mellom grupperingane burde revurderast.

Utfallet av avhandlinga blir at eg problematiserar bruken av kategoriar som dominerer innan det gjeldande akademiske feltet før eg plasserar jubileerteksten i den mosaiske grupperinga, som eg meiner det er fult mogeleg overlappar med visse delar av den enoiske tradisjonen.