JUBILEES AND HEBREW TEXTS OF GENESIS-EXODUS

James C. VanderKam

Scholars have long been aware that the Book of Jubilees (= Jub), which was composed in Hebrew at some point near the middle of the second century B.C.E., is a valuable witness to the text of the Pentateuch. The author quotes from and alludes to major portions of Genesis and Exodus and in so doing reflects the wording of the Hebrew biblical text which he knew. Although he abbreviates at times and occasionally rearranges passages, he often provides extended quotations of the text. His readings frequently disagree with those of the MT, but the fact that these disagreements are regularly supported by other ancient versions strongly suggests that he drew them from a biblical text.

The state in which the text of Jub has been preserved, however, naturally makes one wonder whether the details of the original have been rendered precisely enough to justify use of it for text-critical purposes. The Hebrew original, apart from a few Qumran fragments, is lost, and no copy of the Greek translation of the Hebrew has yet been identified. From the putative Greek version the book was translated into Ethiopic and Latin. The entire text of the book is available only in Ethiopic, while significant parts of it are extant also in Latin. In addition to these relatively late witnesses, there are Greek excerpts from Jub in several patristic and Byzantine sources and a series of Syriac quotations in the Chronicon Paschasium ad Annum Christi 1234 Pertinens. It is reasonable to suppose that mistakes of copying and translating were made at various stages in the book's textual journey and that other forces — such as the influence of readings in the

1See J. VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees (HSM 14; Missoula 1977) 214-85 (= THS), where a date between 161 and 140 and more specifically between 161 and 152 is defended. Recently, G.W.E. Nickelsburg (Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah [Philadelphia 1981] 78-79) and J. Goldstein ("The Date of the Book of Jubilees", PAAJR 50 [1983] 63-86) have argued for a date just before 167 B.C.E.

2For details about the available texts, see VanderKam, THS, pp. 1-15.
Greek, Ethiopic, Latin, and Syriac versions of the Bible — caused changes in the original text.

Though one is compelled now to use granddaughter versions of Jub for most of the book, there is every reason to believe that the text, despite its distance in time from the original, has been transmitted and translated with remarkable accuracy. This verdict follows from a comparison of the published Hebrew fragments of the book with the critical text of the Ethiopic version (and the Latin where extant). The Ethiopic rarely deviates from the Hebrew texts, and in some cases it may even preserve readings that are superior to those of the Hebrew fragments.

Once it has been established that the Ethiopic (and Latin) text of Jub is, insofar as it can be checked, a very precise reproduction of the original, one is justified in using the existing text as a witness to a Hebrew text of Genesis and Exodus in the second pre-Christian century. Ten years ago I published a detailed treatment of the textual affiliations among the biblical citations in Jub. The biblical quotations of Jub were compared with the wording of the same passages in six ancient versions: the Massoretic Text (= MT), Samaritan Pentateuch (= Sam), Peshitta (= Syr), Septuagint (= LXX), Old Latin (= La), and the Ethiopic (= E). These versions were chosen not only for their text-critical importance but also because at least parts of Jub are available in each of their languages and the text of the last four could have influenced the readings in Jub as it was translated into those tongues. The targums and other works such as the Genesis Apocryphon and Josephus’ Antiquities were also compared wherever this was possible. All of the cases in which Jub offered a reading that varied from at least one of the first six versions named above and in which at least one of these witnesses supported that variant were then recorded in 33 different lists. These included 896 variant readings, all of which were retroverted into Hebrew and accompanied by an indica-

---

3Word-by-word comparisons are found in *ibid.*, pp. 18-95. For a case in which the Ethiopic manuscripts are demonstrably superior to the Hebrew, see 4Q221 Jub 1.6-7 (J.T. Milik, "Fragment d’une source du Psautier (4QPs 89) et fragments des Jubilés, du Document de Damas, d’un phylactère dans la grotte 4 de Qumran", *RB* 73 [1966] 104 and plate II) where the Hebrew fragment has a dittography which is lacking in Ethiopic Jub (= Jub 21:23). Another possibility is 1Q18.4 (*DJD* I, 83-84 = Jub 35:9-10); cf. the discussion in *THS*, pp. 85-87.

4*ibid.*, pp. 103-205.
tion of which ancient witnesses supported them. Many of the readings recorded there may be debatable, but it was thought that a full recording of all variants rather than a smaller enumeration of those which appeared important or absolutely certain would reduce the element of subjectivity involved. These numerous readings were then evaluated within the framework of F.M. Cross’ theory of local texts (on which see below). The conclusion was that the author of Jub used a Hebrew Bible which belonged to the Palestinian family of texts.

The present seems a suitable time for a re-examination of the issue of Jub’s biblical citations for two reasons: I have just completed a critical edition of Jub (it is not yet published) which is based on a far larger and superior manuscriptal foundation than was possible for the last editor, R.H. Charles; and textual critics have continued to debate aspects of Cross’ theory of local texts. The present essay consists of three parts: a statement about the biblical citations in the new edition of Jub compared with those in Textual and Historical Studies which were taken largely from Charles’ edition; a survey of the ways in which scholars have evaluated the biblical readings in Jub; and a new suggestion about the implications of its biblical quotations.

I. The variant readings that appear in Textual and Historical Studies were almost always based on Charles’ edition of Ethiopian Jub. When he was preparing his text, he had direct access to two manuscripts of the book and derived the readings of two others from A. Dillmann’s edition of 1859. I have had access to 27 manuscripts and have fully collated 15 for the new edition. Naturally the fuller picture of the Ethiopian text which the additional manuscripts offered has produced many new and improved readings — a fact which could entail that the lists of variant readings as given in Textual and Historical Studies are no longer accurate. A partial comparison was therefore made between the variants in these

---

5There are also two additional lists which detail the readings for which Jub agrees with a/the Targum(s) against the six versions (25 cases) and for which Jub agrees with a (some) Septuagintal copy (copies) against the versions (95 examples). Those 250 instances in which the pattern Jub = MT Sam Syr LXX La versus E prevails were not listed because of the space they would have required (see ibid., pp. 112-13).

6Maṣḥaṣa Kufaṭē or the Ethiopian Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees (Anecdota Oxoniensia; Oxford 1895).

7See ibid., pp. xiii-xiv. Dillmann’s edition was published as Maṣḥaṣa Kufaṭē sive Liber Jubilaeorum (Kiel/London 1859).
lists and the readings of the new edition. It soon became evident that though there are many changes in the new edition from Charles’ text the wording of the biblical citations has not been affected to any significant degree. For instance, in List A, which contains the 54 readings for which Jub agrees with Sam LXX against MT, the new text agrees in 53 cases (no. 11, which involves a conjunction at Jub 6:4 = Gen 8:22, is the exception). There are also some readings which should probably be added to the list; examples are:

Jub 1:1 = Exod 24:12 ‘ehubaka (imperfect [with suffix], not subjunctive) = Sam (יִנָּק) and LXX (δόσω), not MT (דַּקֵּנָא [cohortative]).

Jub 21:1 = Gen 25:8 mawdele(bya) = Sam (םיָּמִים) Syr LXX OL Eth; MT omits.

For List B (Jub = Sam vs. MT LXX) the new text supports the old in all 17 instances, and to this one as well more readings could be added, such as:

Jub 18:15 = Gen 22:16 ‘emennēya = Sam (אַמְסָּנָה) Syr Eth; MT omits.

Jub 27:11 = Gen 28:4 ‘ezqi‘abēr = Sam (תַּנְוָי) Targums; MT has שְׁוַתִּים (= Latin Jub [deus]).

For the readings in Lists C (Jub = MT vs. Sam LXX [11 readings]) and D (Jub = MT LXX vs. Sam [9 variants]) the agreement between the older and newer editions is also complete. Similar percentages prevail in the larger and important Lists E (Jub = MT Sam Syr vs. LXX La E [110; agreement in 19 of 20 checked]) and F (Jub = LXX La E vs. MT Sam Syr [131; agreement in all 25 checked]). These comparisons demonstrate that a new study of the textual affiliations of the biblical citations in Jub may rest on the data as given in Textual and Historical Studies with only minor adjustments in numbers.

---

8 This reading can be found in Charles, Maṣḥafa Kufale (cf. p. 1, n. 12), although he did not cite the biblical versions which agreed with it. It was omitted from THS. Several manuscripts of Ethiopic Jub use the subjunctive at this point.

9 Charles (see Maṣḥafa Kufale, p. 72, n. 13) also included this reading which was omitted from THS (although see p. 143 where the same reading in Jub 23:8 is recorded; it is supported by 2Q19:5 [DJD III, 77-78]).

10 Charles read this word but did not note which versions backed it.

11 Charles read this divine name, which usually corresponds with the tetragrammaton, but he did not adduce the readings of the versions. There are, naturally, some cases in which the biblical readings in my edition differ from those in Charles’ text (e.g., at 5:32 = Gen 8:19 Charles and Dillmann read wa-‘ensēstā; these words should now be omitted with Syr LXX La E).
II. Students of Jub, have, of course, been aware of the nature of its biblical citations, and they have explained their origins in a variety of ways. In particular, the many cases in which the wording of Jub agrees with that of the LXX have proved the most intriguing for them. The several approaches for explaining these "Septuagintal" readings are instructive to review now for at least two reasons: in some cases, they show erroneous paths that were taken, and in others they confirm that long before the manuscripts of the Judean desert were found perceptive scholars had arrived at rather modern-sounding solutions. The explanations can be subsumed under three headings: the agreements in Jub with the LXX are due to A) the Greek translator; B) the postulated Greek author; or C) the author who used a Hebrew Pentateuch that diverged noticeably from the MT.

A. The agreements with the LXX are due to the Greek translator: Dillmann proposed this explanation in the first modern publication on Jub.\footnote{"Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis", Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft 3 (1851) 88-90.} He noted the presence of some of these agreements but also the existence of other readings in which Jub sided with the Hebrew text (= MT). Moreover, he observed that Hebrew or Aramaic etymologies of names were found in the book. These data suggested two possibilities to him: if the author was Greek and wrote in Greek, he must at least have been familiar with Hebrew and Aramaic; or, if he wrote in Aramaic (!), the agreements with the LXX would derive from the person who was responsible for translating Jub into Greek. He favored the latter option because Jerome, in one of his letters, had indicated that Jub was written in Hebrew and had circulated in Jewish circles. "Und bei dem bekannten hasse der hebräischen Juden gegen die griechische übersetzung werden wir jene übereinstimmung mit den LXX allerdings eher vom übersetzer ableiten, als eine benutzung der LXX durch den verfasser selbst annehmen dürfen".\footnote{Ibid., p. 90.}

Dillmann's thesis, which credited the translator with great freedom in handling his Vorlage, soon elicited learned objections. B. Beer noted that his explanation was unsatisfactory "...da die heraus entstehende divergirende Auffassung auf gesetzliche Bestimmung Einfluss übt"\footnote{Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim (Leipzig 1856) 57. He thought that the author had Sam and the LXX before him as he wrote (p. 58).}, but Z. Frankel penned a more de-
tailed rebuttal. He observed that one could not simply dismiss some of the "Septuagintal" readings as the work of the translator because they were not merely incidental but affected the structure of larger sections of the book. The most telling example figures in Jub 8:1 which, like LXX Gen 11:13 and Luke 3:36, includes Kainam in the post-diluvian genealogy — a name that is lacking in the MT. A. Büchler later phrased the same objection in these words: "As this additional Kainam forms an integral part of the author's system of counting in 2, 23 the twenty-two generations from Adam to Jacob, not including the latter, not the assumed Greek translator but the author of the book was responsible for the inclusion of Kainam". One could also object that Dillmann's translator must have been rather arbitrary in altering biblical readings toward the LXX, since there are hundreds of cases in which Jub opposes the LXX and agrees with the MT or opposes both the MT and the LXX.

Frankel and Büchler may well have been correct about the additional generation in the genealogy of Genesis 11 and its relation to other parts of the text, but there are not very many readings which would fall into this category. It remains possible that some readings of the LXX influenced the translator, perhaps unconsciously. A case in point would be those names in Jub which are given in their Greek forms (e.g., Heliopolis in 40:10; Mesopotamia in 44:18, 24). Yet, it should be added that evidence which was not available to these scholars has demonstrated that, if the person who rendered Jub into Greek tampered with the biblical citations, he did so rarely. And, there are now examples in which a reading that agrees with the LXX is present in a Hebrew fragment of the book (e.g., in 11QJub M 3 [Jub 4:12 = Gen 4:26], מ, not כ is read with LXX ὁ πρώτος).

B. The agreements with the LXX are due to the postulated Greek author: Frankel and Büchler, though they may have isolated a flaw in Dillmann's hy-

---

15 "Das Buch der Jubiläen", MGWJ 5 (1856) 314-15; 380-84.
17 "Studies in the Book of Jubilees", REJ 82 (1926) 258. Actually, one could debate this issue, since Jub 2:23 ("There were 22 leaders of humanity from Adam until him" [my translation]) is ambiguous. Does this mean "up to and including him"? If it does, then the extra Kainam is incidental and ruins the series of 22. If it means "up to but not including", then the name is integral to the text.
18 See *THS*, pp. 113-16.
19 This small fragment was published by Milik, "A propos de 11QJub", *Bib* 54 (1973) 78.
pothesis, posited a far less likely origin for the agreements with the LXX: they came from the author who wrote in Greek and naturally quoted from the Bible with which he was familiar. Their explanation is supported in each case by pages of examples and analyses of the pertinent readings, but their obvious learning founders on a too narrow vision of the possibilities and, in Frankel's case, on his "Massoretic fundamentalism". That is, his conviction that the MT was the Hebrew text of the Bible prevented him from accepting the possibility that the variant readings in Jub could have come from a different kind of Hebrew biblical text. Frankel maintained that the writer of Jubilees could hardly have been a Palestinian Jew because in the land of Israel the scriptures were known more precisely. Jub's readings which disagree with the MT are signs of the author's ignorance of the original. "Das Buch der Jubil. zeigt offenbar von ungemeiner Unkenntnis des h. Originaltextes, und ist überreich an den grobsten Verstossen gegen denselben. Bei den jüd. Hagadisten taucht von der frühesten bis auf die späteste Zeit nirgend eine solche Erscheinung auf...". As this statement demonstrates, he confused two issues: the question is not so much "does Jub preserve original biblical readings" as "do its readings reflect a non-massoretic form of the Hebrew text of Genesis-Exodus".

The view of Frankel and Büchler is now only a historical oddity — one that was possible only because the field of possibilities was unduly limited. They seem not to have asked themselves: if the author wrote in Greek and used the LXX, why did he depart from its readings in a vast number of cases?

C. The agreements with the LXX are due to the author who used a Hebrew Pentateuch that diverged noticeably from the MT. The scholars who have made the most substantial contributions to the study of the text of Jub have posited that a divergent Hebrew Pentateuch stands behind at least some of Jub's biblical citations. Dillmann returned to the subject of the biblical readings in Jub in an essay that was published more than 30 years after his translation of the book. By that time he had a far better Ethiopic text with which to work and was able to enunciate a more detailed and nuanced hypothesis about the "Septuagintal" read-

---

21 Ibid., p. 384.
ings. His expressed purpose was to determine whether and to what extent the text of the Pentateuch that is presupposed in Jub agreed with the MT. He offered a list of some 89 readings in which Jub sided with the Hebrew against the LXX; these confirmed, in his opinion, that the author had before him "den hebräischen Grundtext". There was also, however, a smaller category of readings for which Jub agreed with the LXX. Dillmann accounted for these in three ways: "Und sieht man die betreffenden Stellen näher an, so findet man, dass die Übereinstimmungen mit den LXX grossentheils von dem griechischen (oder auch erst vom lateinischen) Übersetzer des Jubiläenbuchs herrühren, einige andere, obgleich weniger, auf Anschliessung des Autors an die in den LXX verkörperte exegetische Tradition (zumal bei Erklärung seltener Ausdrücke) beruhen, noch andere endlich auf wirkliche Varianten in dem von ihm benutzten hebräischen Texte zurückzuführen sind". He explained that in some cases the Greek translator could hardly have avoided the "unwillkürlichen Einfluss" of the LXX which was so commonly used in his world (he gives about 40 examples). In other cases the translator adopted explanations that also appear in the LXX for rare or difficult expressions in Genesis, though one could not always determine whether "...der Verfasser des Jubiläenbuchs oder erst der griechische Übersetzer desselben die LXX zu Rathe gezogen hat" (he offered ca. 10 examples). But he adduced some 28 more variants from the MT which, he believed, were found in the author’s Hebrew Pentateuch. About them he wrote: "...so wird man auch seine oben verzeichneten Lesarten nur auf einen hebräischen Pentateuch zurückzuführen dürfen, und wird darin einen Beweis finden müssen, dass die hebräischen Abschriften des Pentateuch damals noch keineswegs ganz mit dem späteren

---

23"Beiträge aus dem Buch der Jubiläen zur Critik des Pentateuch-Textes", Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1 (Berlin 1883) 323-40. On p. 324, n. 1 he mentions that he had collated the British Museum’s manuscript of Jub which, even today, remains the best copy of the book.

24Ibid., pp. 324-27. The quoted words are on p. 327.

25Ibid., p. 327.

26Ibid.

27Ibid., pp. 327-28. The quoted expression is found on p. 327.

28Ibid., pp. 328-29. The quotation is from p. 328.

29Ibid., pp. 329-30.
amtlichen Text zusammenstimmten. Die Abweichungen von diesem sind zwar weit nicht mehr so zahlreich, wie die der LXX, und betreffen auch in der Regel nur unwichtige Dinge, aber gehen doch oft genug noch mit den LXX oder auch dem Sam. zusammen".\footnote{Ibid., pp. 333-34.} Despite its agreements with Sam and the LXX against the MT, the Pentateuchal text behind Jub was identical with neither of them.\footnote{Ibid., p. 335.}

From these statements one learns that as late as 1883 Dillmann credited the translator with a large number of revisions toward the LXX; but by then he had also recognized, and this should be stressed, that a substantial number of the agreements with the LXX originated in the Hebrew text of Jub. R.H. Charles, who edited the text anew in 1895, seems at first to have done little more than echo much of Dillmann's position.\footnote{See Mašḥāṭa Kufālē, especially pp. xx-xxiv; cf. pp. v-vi.} However, in his commentary of 1902 he expressed a more independent view about the biblical text that is mirrored in Jub.\footnote{The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis (London 1902 [reprinted: Jerusalem 1972]) xxxiii-xxxix.}

After providing several lists of biblical readings in the book and the ancient authorities which support them, he concluded: "...our book attests an independent form of the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch. Thus it agrees at times with the Sam. or LXX or Syr. or Vulg. or even with Onk. against all the rest". In the same place he characterized that Hebrew Pentateuch as falling "...midway between the forms presupposed by the LXX and the Syriac".\footnote{Both quotations are from ibid., p. xxxviii, where the second one is italicized.}

Charles' later view was largely confirmed by my more detailed treatment of the biblical readings in Jub. There are several reasons why one should not think that the text of Jub, though it is available in toto only in Ethiopic (a translation of a translation), has been altered to any appreciable extent by translators or copyists: in the relatively small amount of text where the Ethiopic can be compared with the published Hebrew fragments from caves 1, 2, 3, 4, and 11 at Qumran, the two texts agree very closely;\footnote{THS, pp. 18-95; for the conclusions, see p. 94.} and, there is a massive amount of disagreement in the text with both the LXX and the Ethiopic versions of Genesis and
Exodus.\textsuperscript{36} Interestingly enough, a high percentage of the 80 readings in Ethiopian Jub which agree with the Ethiopic Pentateuch alone among ancient versions is also supported by the Latin manuscript of Jub — and the Latin translation of Jub was hardly influenced by the Ethiopic Bible.\textsuperscript{37} In Textual and Historical Studies I concluded that the patterns of agreement in Jub showed that the author's Hebrew Genesis-Exodus belonged in what F. M. Cross has called the Palestinian family in his theory of local texts. That is, it agreed with the LXX more frequently in its variants than with the MT, and, where the MT and Sam diverged, Jub sided with the latter in the great majority of cases. Moreover, as Charles had noted, Jub evidences a high number of agreements with the Syriac Pentateuch.\textsuperscript{38}

III. A third issue which merits consideration is whether the theory of local texts as described by Cross provides the best explanatory framework within which to understand the place of the biblical copy reflected in Jub in the evolution of the pentateuchal text. As noted above, I had accepted this theory and concluded that the author quoted from an early exemplar of the Palestinian family of texts. The primary support for that conclusion came from the statistics for several crucial patterns of agreement: where the MT and Sam diverged, Jub agreed with the latter far more often than with the former (71-20); where Sam and the LXX agreed against the MT, Jub supported them in 54 of 65 cases; and Jub sided with the LXX more frequently than with the MT (492-398). But does the verdict that the text was an early copy of the Palestinian family do justice to the diverse patterns of agreement and disagreement and to the unique readings that one finds in the author's biblical material?

Cross' theory of local texts, which he developed from an earlier sketch by W.F. Albright\textsuperscript{39} and which he has elaborated in several essays, is so well known that

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., pp. 107-16.

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., pp. 112-13; see also list I (pp. 163-66). For three of the examples in this list a Qumran Hebrew fragment of Jub also supports the reading (nos. 6, 13, 48). There are no instances of disagreement between the Ethiopic and Hebrew texts for the readings in the list. This is additional evidence that such readings are not due to influence from the Ethiopic Pentateuch but are native to Jub.

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., pp. 136-38; see Charles, The Book of Jubilees, p. xxxviii.

a short review will suffice here. He maintains that from the fifth to the second century B.C.E. the Hebrew biblical texts evolved scribally (not recensionally) in geographically separated centers of Jewish settlement. There appears to have been an Urtext in Judea, and a copy (or copies) of it was (were) brought to Babylon where, during the fifth to the second century, it (they) gradually took the form that is known as proto-massoretic. In the fourth century another (or other) exemplar(s) of the growing Palestinian family of texts was (were) brought to Egypt where it (they) became a family of texts which eventually served as the Vorlage of the LXX. It is important to add that Cross thinks copies of the Babylonian textual family were brought to Judea in the aftermath of the Maccabean triumphs. Once there, the readings of these copies became mixed with those from Palestinian texts with the result that the two families were merged to some extent.

Other text-critical experts have not allowed the theory of local texts to go unchallenged. S. Talmon, for example, has written that by this theory "... we are transported into the realm of purely hypothetical statements, arrived at by deductions and reconstructions which lack any material, i.e. manuscript, basis". He believes that the MT, Sam, and LXX are survivors of more numerous types of texts which had existed at an earlier time but which disappeared or were suppressed. E. Tov, too, has raised a number of questions regarding the theory of local texts. He has written, for instance, that "... the LXX does not reflect any Hebrew text that was characteristic of Egypt". He has charged that scholars who have the advantage of knowing the Qumran biblical manuscripts have

40 His principal statements on this subject are the following (the pages in parentheses are to Cross-Talmon, Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text, where the first three essays have been reprinted): "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran", JBL 74 (1955) 147-72 (147-76); "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert", HTR 57 (1964) 281-99 (177-95); "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text", IEJ 16 (1966) 81-95 (278-92); and "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts", Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text, pp. 306-20. See also his The Ancient Library of Qumran & Modern Biblical Studies (Grand Rapids 1980) 163-94.


42 Ibid., pp. 198-99 (40-41).

retained the old, pre-1947 framework of a tripartite division of Pentateuchal witnesses and have thus elevated three texts (MT, Sam, LXX) to the status of central witnesses of entire families or textual types. He cites as a counter-example 11QpaleoLev, which does not fit any of the three types or families, and concludes: "... a scroll does not have to be grouped with one of the so-called major sources; it can also be independent of them, that is, individualistic. Each scroll reflects the idiosyncrasies of its own scribe". He prefers that one use neutral terms such as source, textual witness, or just text rather than more suggestive words such as text-types or recensions. Though he posits a greater amount of diversity than the theory of local texts envisions, he does not think there was an indefinite number of individual texts. There are a few groups that can be identified.

The theory of local texts does indeed have hypothetical features, as Cross himself recognizes, and it does allow for only a very limited number of textual families; but the real test of it is whether it provides an economical and logical explanation for the data at hand. Does it, for instance, account adequately for the biblical readings in Jub? As I have reflected further on this problem I have come to the conclusion that Jub's biblical citations point toward a more complicated picture of the evolution of the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch in Palestine. That is, I now doubt that Jub's patterns of agreements and disagreements with the ancient versions and its unique readings indicate that the author cited from an older exemplar of the one Palestinian family of texts of which Sam is a later, central representative.

44-45 ibid., pp. 19-21 (the quotation is from p. 20).

46 ibid., pp. 23-26; cf. The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, pp. 272-75. He rejects, with few exceptions, the thesis that the three famous texts "reflect typologically different texts" (p. 274). Note E. Ulrich's statement ("Horizons of Old Testament Textual Research at the Thirtieth Anniversary of Qumran Cave 4", CBQ 46 [1984] 624): "We may also note that Tov does call our attention to a probable overstatement by Cross on the basis of early sampling concerning the clarity of text-types, but Tov may turn out to be too reductionist in denying discernible text-types".

47 See, for example, his comments about Babylon as one of the three localities in "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text", pp. 90-91 (287-288).
Tov has stressed that in assessing the relationships between two texts such as a scroll from Qumran and one of the ancient versions one must consider not only the agreements between them but also their disagreements and the unique readings of each.48 If one applies this principle to the gross figures in the lists of variants recorded in Textual and Historical Studies, the following totals result:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jub = LXX</td>
<td>492 (742)</td>
<td>Jub ≠LXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jub = Sam</td>
<td>449 (699)</td>
<td>Jub ≠ Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jub = MT</td>
<td>398 (648)</td>
<td>Jub ≠ MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no doubt that a number of qualifying statements could be made about many of the readings that are included in each total, but one conclusion which should be drawn from these numbers — even if they are only general guides — is that Jub manifestly does not agree with any of these versions consistently but charts its own course through the text of Genesis-Exodus. It does indeed side more often with the LXX and Sam than with the MT; and in those relatively few cases where Sam and MT differ it decidedly follows Sam (71-20). Moreover, where Sam and LXX combine to disagree with MT, Jub supports them at a rate of 54-11. These numbers can in fact be explained by the theory of local texts. But when one adds to the high numbers of disagreements with each of these three versions the fact that Jub opposes all three of them in 198 readings (= lists I [80]; J [24]; L [31]; O [21]; Q [24]; T [14]; and b [4]), it appears more likely that Jub’s biblical citations were drawn from a text that was rather more independent of the Palestinian family of which Sam and the LXX are, at different stages, supposed to be witnesses. The Jub material suggests that there was in Palestine a biblical text that fell somewhere between (and slightly outside) the fixed points embodied in the MT, Sam, and LXX. Its readings show that at some time after 200 B.C.E. (its biblical Vorlage would have to antedate Jub itself) there was in Judea at least one copy of Genesis-Exodus that agreed more often with the LXX and Sam than with the MT but that was an independent witness — not part of any of the "families" that may be represented by the famous versions. Or, to put the same

49 The numbers in parentheses represent the figures to the left of the parentheses plus 250 for the 250 readings for which Jub agrees with MT Sam Syr LXX La versus E (see n. 5 above). These were not included in THS.
point differently, if there was a Palestinian family of texts of which the LXX and Sam are two representatives and Jubilees a third, then it must have been a very loose conglomeration of divergent texts. And, if it were such a loose assortment of copies, it would be doubtful whether the term *family* should be applied to it, especially if Tov is correct in maintaining that few typological traits separate it from the others.

In addition to this rather major difficulty, there are other more general questions that arise in connection with the theory of local texts.

1. If one accepts the idea that families of texts develop in geographically separated areas (there are other possibilities), just how distant must they be from one another? Why should there not have been different texts associated with different centers in Judea, Samaria, and Galilee? Or were they not sufficiently separated to occasion the development of textual families?

2. If one granted that there were different textual families associated with Palestine, Egypt, and Babylon (and the evidence for these latter two is slim), would they have evolved in isolation from one another? We have few sources for the Persian and early Hellenistic periods, but the available evidence does indicate some contact between the great centers. It is conceivable that copies of biblical books were transported between them and that mixed texts were created in different localities. Perhaps Ezra was not the only traveler who came with the Law of the Lord in his hand.

3. Is geographical separation the only important factor in the development of textual families or would party affiliation in any place also be significant? Talmon has raised the point about social groups and the transmission of biblical texts, and it is worth exploring in more detail. It is undeniable that in later times discrete religious groups — Jews, Samaritans, and Christians — preserved the MT, Sam, and LXX respectively. Did this happen at earlier times as well?

The present essay is not the place in which to attempt a thorough reassessment of Cross’ theory of local texts which is, of course, much more complicated than is

50 *The Old Testament Text*, pp. 198-99 (40-41). The three parties described by Josephus cannot be traced beyond the second century B.C.E., but there certainly were other sorts of groupings in Judaism during the Persian and early Hellenistic periods. See, for example, Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (New York/London 1971); and M. Stone, "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.", *CBQ* 40 (1978) 479-92.
intimated here and which also relates to the various recensions of the Greek Bible. But enough has been said to show that the biblical Vorlage of Jub was too widely divergent from the LXX and Sam to justify including the three witnesses in a single, evolving family of biblical texts. The scriptural readings in Jub indicate that a more complicated textual situation prevailed in Palestine that the theory of local texts suggests.