In this essay the fragmentary remains of two Qumran Hebrew manuscripts of the Book of Jubilees are published. They were first deciphered and identified by J. T. Milik, who also has proposed restorations for the missing sections. J. VanderKam has been responsible for the final form of the restorations made on the basis of the later versions of Jubilees and biblical parallels, translations of the texts, and commentary on them. Milik has seen an earlier draft of the editions and has had opportunity to offer comments on it.

The Book of Jubilees was, as scholars have long maintained, composed in the Hebrew language at some point in the second century BCE. It is a particularly intriguing document because of its varied relations with the text of Genesis-Exodus. While it often closely follows the biblical storyline and even the scriptural wording, it frequently omits sections or adds new material. That new material may derive from unknown sources or from biblical (or extra-biblical) passages that are related in some way to the context in Genesis-Exodus. The two fragments which are being published here belong to legal pericopes in Jubilees (which is one of the earliest sources for the use and interpretation of pentateuchal laws) and illustrate the writer's practice of drawing upon legislation found elsewhere in the Torah to clarify and/or expand sections in Genesis-Exodus. The words of 4QJub⁵ (Jub. 2:26-27) are part of the lengthy section on the sabbath (Jub. 2:17-33) which concludes the creation account. Here the author borrows especially from the language of Exod 31:14-16 in order to formulate his thoughts about the seventh day. The preserved words and lines of 4QJub⁶ (Jub. 21:5-10) allow one to witness his work regarding a different topic. According to the setting, Abraham, at 175 years of age, is giving final instructions

¹For the evidence and differing views, see VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press 1977) 1-6, 207-285.
to Isaac. They center on service to the one God and prescriptions for proper sacrificial procedure. The wording of the commands shows that the writer drew heavily from language that is characteristic of the sacrificial laws in Leviticus (chap. 3, for example).

4QJub\(^2\) (4Q218): The Third Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4

Just one fragment from this manuscript has survived, and on it parts of four lines of text can be read. Though the fragment is small and consequently has one or no examples of most letters, enough information remains to permit a conclusion about the approximate date of the script. The hand belongs in the formal sequence. The letters are, with the exception of final mem, of a uniform size and straight stance. Those letters which are fully preserved and significant for purposes of dating suggest that the fragment was copied in the Herodian period, probably the earlier part of it (ca. 30 BCE-20 CE). For example, the waw has a slight hook at the top, while the downstroke is straight. F. M. Cross has noted that the hooked top is a development which begins in the late Hasmonean period.\(^2\) The yod strongly resembles waw and has a fairly long and straight downstroke with a hook at the top. It is a longer letter than it is in either earlier or later hands.\(^3\) Lamed has the more prominent hook that is characteristic of the Herodian formal scripts.\(^4\) The largest number of close parallels to the letter shapes of the fragment are found in Cross’ figure 2, lines 4-7, that is, scripts dating from ca. 30 BCE to ca. 50 CE.

The leather has shrunk to some extent with the result that the lines are slightly bowed. At several points there are spots where letters should appear but no ink is visible; these are whiter than the remaining parts of the surface. The fragment can be read on PAM 42.327 and 43.189 (bottom). Here it should be noted that in Stephen A. Reed’s Dead Sea Scroll Inventory Project: Lists of Documents, Photographs and Museum Plates, fascicle 10, several other photographs for the fragment are listed.\(^5\) All of them are, however, of ms. e of Jubilees, not ms. c.

---


\(^3\)For similar yods, see Cross, ibid., figure 2.2, 5, 7.

\(^4\)Ibid., 219; see also figure 2.4, 6, 7, 9.

On the four lines of Hebrew text, several words from Jub. 2:26-27 are preserved. For these verses only the Ethiopic version of Jubilees is available for comparison. At this point in the text Moses is being instructed by an angel to give the people commands about the sabbath.

2:26 ... to sanctify it, not to do any work on it, and not to defile it, for it is holier [than] all the (other) days. 2:27 Anyone [who profanes it is to die,] [and any] one who does work on it will be cut off [forever] [so] [t] at the [Israelites may observe] this[s] day [throughout] their [generations] and not be cut off from the earth.

Line 1: At the top right edge of the fragment there is some ink whose shape is consistent with lamed. The letter qoph then is very clear, while only the lower part of the vertical stroke from the next remains. The lower traces of resh should be visible on the leather after lamed, but this is one of several spots where the surface is whiter and no ink can be seen. The Ethiopic version expresses the meaning of the Hebrew infinitival construction לָבֵל by means of a subjunctive verb (preceded by kama in several mss.). Retroversion of the remainder of the line from Ethiopic to Hebrew yields a text with 36 Hebrew letters.

Line 2: shin are clear at the right edge of the fragment, while the horizontal stroke of dalet can be seen. It is preceded by a dot that should be from the upper left corner of mem. See Exod 31:14: יָדֶךָ וּדָבַּרְךָ. After the pronoun את there is a gap in the writing where mem or nun (the remaining surface is probably too narrow to accommodate both letters and the space needed before the next word) should appear according to the Ethiopic text. There is a similar blank area at the end of this line where there is space for another word but no trace of ink. The last clear letter (ב) is followed by a small piece of the next letter which is visible at the left of the kaph’s upper horizontal bar. Since the Ethiopic reads kaph “ellu (without the conjunction, just as in the Hebrew),


7Typically, a number of mss. add וַאֲשֶׁר, but the fragment shows it is an addition.
ב_cipher is almost certain. Retroversion of the Ethiopic text leaves one with a relatively short line of 32 letters (or 33 if מ is read), whereas the other three have 36 or 38. Two Ethiopic mss. (9 38) read la-żāt ‘elat before mota = rather than alone. If one restored these extra words, the line would acquire an extra six letters which would make it only slightly longer than the others. Nevertheless, support for the longer reading is slender, and it is thus unlikely to be original. For the end of the line, Exod 31:14 (see also Lev 18:25; Num 35:34 [these two passages use forms of רכיב, not בֵּית]; and Mal 2:11) supplies nearly the same wording: מִטָּלִים, כַּעֲדָה, מַעַמְּאָה, מִזְמָה, מִיָּמוֹת.

Line 3: There is enough space at the beginning of the line to restore the letters ב (Ethiopic: wa-k“ellu); a small part of lamed’s upper extension can be seen at the right edge. The clear letter ayin is preceded by a dot of ink and followed by a letter with two clear angling vertical strokes and by he. Ethiopic za-yegabbër assists in clinching the reading as הֵעָשָׁה. The next two letters are not as obvious as one might prefer, but especially on PAM 43.189 the bet can be seen, after which comes a small letter. Ethiopic here has bātî which corresponds (allowing for the gender difference of the word for day in the two languages) with בַּתִּי. The last two letters of הנררתה are only partially preserved but are recognizable. At the left extension of the fragment, the bottoms of a few letters are still visible. There is a small dot of ink where the left edge meets the leftward extension and about one letter space removed from it is the bottom of ב. Since at this point the Ethiopic has la-‘ālam, it is likely that the fragment read לְעֵיתֶן. There are bits of three other letters that are visible farther to the left: the first and third are merely dots, while the second is recognizable as the tail of ת. The text has been restored to correspond with kama ye’qabu in the Ethiopic version. Between the words מִלְאָה and מַעַמְּאָה Ethiopic presupposes כל—an addition that may have been influenced by the formulation of the fourth commandment (Exod 20:9-10; Deut 5:13-14; see Gen 2:2-3 where phrases with and without כל are found). The word הנררתה is surprising in light of the Ethiopic reading mota yemut which reflects (or מות ימות [חיים]. The same Hebrew verb is employed in the next line as well (see also v 25). On the photograph it appears that the letter after ת, which is almost certainly ת (compare the preserved top parts of ת in line 4), is attached directly to the verb. Milik separates it and suggests restoring הו, but there is no warrant for this in the Ethiopic tradition. If one read נְכֵרַת it would

8Ms. 9 is, however, the earliest surviving copy of Ethiopic Jubilees.
seem to require a feminine subject — something that is lacking in the context; but there are other possibilities. The text is modeled on Exod 31:14: כי כל האשה הצהו מתחברת המידות הממיד המקרא נמכת והושך. Perhaps the feminine form in line 3 was the result of this passage, which underlies the entire context here; in addition, the words מתחברת המידות הצהו may have misled the scribe to write ר at the end of the verb. Perhaps it is also relevant to add that in a very few cases in Biblical Hebrew the cohortative ending is added to third-person forms. The wording at the end of line 3 further confirms that Exodus 31 provides the scriptural inspiration for the passage. Exod 31:15 includes phrases that were also used in v 14 (כי כל האשה מתחברת בים השבת מות וידות), while v 16 furnishes the expressions at the end of line 3 and the beginning of line 4: רפסמרו בכר יראל אתי השבת לעשהו אתי השבת לדורות אחד עולם.

Line 4: The first part of the line is lost, but there would be sufficient space for restoring בניגי יראל, as the Ethiopic text and Exod 31:16 require. The first traces of ink at the right bottom of the fragment correspond with the tops of דא, with the ד being especially clear. Following a slight gap, one can see the top parts of ד and the tops of two other letters which are narrow. The ד is largely preserved. After ר, one would expect some traces of ink; none is visible but the context makes the restoration certain (Ethiopic: ḫata ῆlata). No letters can then be read for several spaces until one comes to a clear ר preceded by the left vertical stroke of another letter. The Ethiopic reading bα-tewoleddomu helps in identifying the letter as ר. The final two letters in the verb ירחקו are more difficult, with the last being almost completely lost (it is slightly clearer on PAM 42.327). The top of ד is quite distinct, and the next letter is consistent with י (Ethiopic: ḡem-). The last letters that have left a trace are consistent with the tops of ד. In this line where the Hebrew uses ירחק, the Ethiopic agrees in meaning (yeḥṣarráwu). In fact, the two versions agree verbatim for the entire line.

4QJub⁴ (4Q220): The Fifth Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4

Just one composite fragment from the fifth copy of Jubilees in Cave 4 has survived, but it is a relatively large and well preserved one. On it one can read letters from eleven lines. There are several photographs on which parts or all of the composite

⁹GKC 48d (p. 130).
fragment can be studied: PAM 40.615, 41.438 (the bottom right fragment on the photograph), 41.693, 42.222, and 43.189. On the first and third of the photos only the large piece is present; the second shows the piece which was added later; and the fourth and fifth have the composite. At its best preserved point, it is possible to read 36 consecutive letters (line 5). As they are here restored, the letter count for the lines ranges from 41 (line 6) to 49 (lines 8 and 9). The scribal hand has some traits of the formal and cursive series and dates the manuscript to the early Herodian period (ca. 30-1 BCE). In the formal sequence it shows the largest number of similarities with the script traced in F. M. Cross’s figure 2, line 4 (a manuscript of 1QM that he dates to ca. 30-1 BCE.); among the semicursive hands it often resembles the letter forms in figure 4, line 4 (a late Hasmonean semicursive from an unknown Hebrew text, ca. 50-25 BCE.).

The letters, which tend to be straight and angular, are not always uniform in size (note the long tail of the p), and the upper stroke of b extends into the line above. There are cases of ligaturing, and there is also some inconsistency regarding intervals between words and spaces between lines.

The fragment preserves letters and words from Jub 21:5-10. By a happy coincidence, another of the 4QJub manuscripts — 4QJub4 — supplies significant parts of Jub 21:7-10. Thus, it is possible to supplement the evidence of one from that of the other. Where both are extant, they agree word-for-word in almost every instance (apart from mistakes), although in some cases they exhibit differing orthographies. The Ethiopic and Latin versions are also extant for the passage: the former preserves the entire section, and the latter breaks off in 21:10, just before the end of the Hebrew fragment.

The orthography, like the spacing in the manuscript, is not entirely consistent: in some instances one finds the customary plene style of Qumran, but in others the scribe employs defective spellings (the list excludes restored examples and the traditional full spelling of plural endings and pronouns):

---

10See Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” figure 2 (formal scripts, pp. 176-77 [there are also resemblances in some cases with the scripts in lines 3, 5-7]); figure 4 (semicursive scripts, p. 190 [cf. also line 5]).


1. Full orthography: גַּלְיָלָה (line 1); שַׁעַר (line 2); מֶלֶל וְלָרְצִינוֹ (line 3); הָלָה (line 4); מִשְׁפַּר (line 5); כֹּלָה, וְלָרְצִינוֹ (line 6); נִיחֹת, רִיחָ, כּוֹלָה (line 7); מְמַטְּרָה וְלָרְצִינוֹ (line 8).

2. Defective orthography: מֹמַת (line 1); עֲלָה (line 2); מַמְּרֵה (line 4); אוֹלָה (line 5); נְעָר (line 9)⁴ and מְמַטְּרָה (line 10).

Another inconsistency concerns the writing of the final letter of the preposition ב: in lines 4 and 8 a medial form of mem is used, while in line 9 the expected final form appears.

Jub 21:5-10

[21:5 ... his ordinances, his] commandments, [and his statutes, and do not go a]fter idols and after [images and after]
[molten images.] 21:6 And do not [eat any blo]od of an animal, cattle, or any bird which [flies in the sky.]
[21:7] If you sacri[fice]ce as a burnt offering a peace offer[ing] you are to [sa]cristfe it in a pleasing way, and you are to sprinkle their blood on the alt[ar.]
[All] the meat of the burnt offering you are to off[e]r on the alt[ar] with the flour of its cereal offering mixed with [o]il[L,]
[5] with its libation. You] are to offer the whole on the altar as a fire offering, a pleasing fragrance before God. [21:8 The fat]

⁴The plene spelling of יְהוֹה אָבָא is rare in the scrolls. A Preliminary Concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Caves II-X... (Privately printed in Göttingen 1988), lists only three occurrences. Conversely, the anarthrous יְהוֹה אָבָא is very common.
[of the peace offering] you are to offer on the fire which is on the altar, and the fat [which is on]
[the intestine,] the [fat which is on the inner parts, the kidneys, [and] the [fat which is on them,]
[and that which is on the loins,] and the lobe (of?) the liver with the kidneys you are to remove. [21:9 You are to offer]
[the whole as a pleasing fragrance before Go[d] with its cereal offering and its libation as a plea[sing] fragrance, [the bread of the fire offering]

10 [for Go[d. 21:10 Eat its meat on] that [day] and (on) the next day; and [the sun] is n[ot] to s[et on it]
[on the next day until it is eaten. None is to be left to the th]i[rd day....]

Line 1: The first visible letters are not from the beginning of the line, as a comparison with line 2 shows. A distinct part of the curved right stroke of ה can be seen above the ה in the word בְּאָרֶץ in line 2 (the ה extends above the base of line 1). Almost all of the following ע is visible (cf. the same letter in לְבָנָן in line 3), and two marks that are consistent with the shapes of ו and נ can be seen after it. In the space between these last letters and the next visible traces some 14-16 letters could fit (judging by the letters in line 2); this would leave sufficient room for the next noun and for the negative and verb which the versions presuppose before רָעָא. For the sequence of legal nouns the Ethiopic reads: te'zāzo wa-šer āto wa-k'en nanēhu; and Latin gives praeepta eius et mandata eius et iudicia eius. One would think that מָצָאֵתי would correspond with te'zāzo, but that would imply that two nouns followed in the lacuna in the manuscript and for this there is inadequate space. Latin, however, has mandaeta eius as the second member in the sequence, and its order may more nearly represent the Hebrew. However, A. Dillmann does list for te'zāz the meanings praeeptum, mandatum, etc. Hence, the Ethiopic, too, may reflect a Hebrew original which read מָצָאֵתי as the middle item. The three nouns read and restored above are associated with one another in several biblical passages (Deut 5:28; 6:1; 8:11; 11:1; 26:17; 30:16; 1 Kgs 8:58 [cf. 2 Kgs 17:37]; 2 Chr 19:10; Neh 9:13; 10:30); and different pairings of them also occur (Deut 4:1, 8, 40; 27:10; Mal 3:22; Neh 9:14). Before the clearly legible letters דָּלָל there are lower tips of what appear to be others. They are consistent with דָּלָל, as the context and the versions (dextrē/post) require. It is strange that the final kaph of the verb דָּלָל cannot be seen at the top of the fragment.

14 Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae (reprinted, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag 1970) 244.
if this word is correctly restored (for לולימ with ולולימ, see 1 Kgs 21:26; Ezek 20:16 ולארי ולולימ בלב הלוחם in line 2. Just possibly its tail may have merged with the top of ל in לולימ in line 2. At the left edge of the fragment, תואם and תואם are certain, and a trace of the vertical stroke of ת is visible. The different terms read and restored here for idols (of the three, only ולולימ is preserved) are found in varying combinations in the Bible. For the latter two, see Deut 27:15; Judg 17:3, 4; 18:14; Nah 1:14; 2 Chr 34:3, 4.

Line 2: There may be a slight trace of the waw that precedes על in the line 3 extends into line 2 just after על, but beyond it some of the following letter can be glimpsed. It should be the first letter of האכל. The space between ה and the next legible letter is large enough to accommodate the remainder of the verb and the word לולימ (Ethiopic menta-ni and Latin omnem) which could be spelled defectively as it is later in this line. For the prohibition against consuming blood, see Lev 7:26 where it is phrased in a way similar to the present text: כל דם לא האכל男孩 משבחתם לועה ואכלוהו (cf. 17:13). At the end of the line at least two words should be restored to fill the space which must have remained as indicated by line 3. The last preserved words in the line show that the Ethiopic version has retained a purer form of the text than the Latin has. It reads: za-‘arve wa-‘enses a wa-zaz (omit 9 20 25)-kællu ‘of za-yesarrer westa samay; Latin has a nicely balanced but more periphrastic statement: omnis carnis sive de his quae in terris sunt sive quae volant in aere. The wording here is reminiscent of Gen 1:20 (עועז) (באל עועז השמיים); 2:19 (באל עועז השמיים); etc. (see Gen 6:7; 7:23; 9:2).

Line 3: The base stroke of ב is clear at the right edge of the fragment, and the next letter is certainly ה. The versions presuppose a verb for sacrificing or slaughtering at this point (xarada/occidas). In 2 Chr 18:2 the Ethiopic Bible uses a form of x/ harada where the MT has על in יよりも is spelled without a mater lectionis for the long vowel and stands where Ethiopic employs a noun that is cognate with the verb (xerd) and Latin gives (hostiam). Almost all of the next word is lost, except part of the vertical line that belongs to the first letter and a dot that is part of the second. The best reading of the first is ת, and in the context this should be the first letter of תוב — part of the familiar biblical phrase תוב שבליים. However, the base line of ב should be visible on the fragment, as should the lower part of the vertical stroke. No trace of either can be seen. It is possible that some ink has been lost, but the Latin version suggests another possibility: In some cases (e.g., line 5) fructum, which is
modeled on LXX’s κάρπωμα, stands where Hebrew has אשה.\textsuperscript{15} Reading this word here would alleviate the problem of the second letter but would make the first more difficult (ink would have to be lost from it too); also, in the Hebrew Bible אשה never stands in construct with another term for sacrifice and certainly not with שלמים. The Ethiopic word ሰንحال hasa is a rather general one for a sacrifice (it corresponds with הולא in line 4). It seems best to read בְּהַ and to maintain that the lower right parts of ב have disappeared (at the broken edge of the fragment), just as parts of other letters have in the context. If so, the wording is strongly reminiscent of several biblical passages in which the same verb and the two sacrificial terms figure (Lev 17:5; 1 Sam 10:8; 1 Kgs 8:63; 2 Chr 33:16), but Lev 19:5 supplies both these words and some of the sequel: ויכח נכה שלמים לה להולא ההולא. For the verb נוהג with הולא, see, for example, Exod 20:24. There are traces of ink on the edge of the fragment after קדש, and they are found where נ should appear, according to the versions. Thus, only one letter needs to be restored in the lacuna to complete the verbal form with objective suffix (as in Lev 19:5). The next clause employs words that are identical to a phrase in Num 18:17: והם הוריק על הוהה. The letters of the verb after ה have had their tops shaved off, but the remaining lines of ink and the context require that הוריק be read (for כ compare the same letter in אשת [line 2], and for the long tail of כ, see the one in לְכָּרָב [line 7]). Following כ an ל is legible as is the slanting bottom stroke of ל. The Vulgate uses fundes for הוריק in Num 18:17, while Latin Jubilees here has effundetis. Ethiopic teke ‘ewwo (from ka’awwa) also corresponds with הוריק (e.g., in Lev 1:5, 11).\textsuperscript{16}

**Line 4:** The letters ר are clear at the right edge, and the remains of a letter before them look like the top stroke of ב (which in this script turns upward quite sharply). The next letter is נ, and it seems to be separated from the preceding ר, thus beginning a new word. The versions at this juncture read senhah/holocausti — terms which are fitting renderings of הולא. However, the resulting combination ובש הולא is unattested in the Bible, though does appear in construct relation with both נכה and השלמים (Lev 7:15, 17, 18, 21). Where Hebrew has ובש the versions read sebha (= חלב) and sanguinum (= דם, a word which appeared shortly before this). The words in the remainder of the line are similar to frequent expressions in the sacrificial parts of the Hebrew Bible. For הקסיד (Latin omits the verb) with הולא

\textsuperscript{15}See VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees, 2.121.

\textsuperscript{16}Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae, 868.
one can find parallels in 2 Kgs 16:13, 15; 2 Chr 13:11; for נבוכ (in line 5) ... see Num 28:9, 12. Ethiopic lacks a suffix on its equivalent of מנהה (Latin omits) and joins it to the preceding noun with a conjunction, whereas the Hebrew uses a construct phrase. The word which precedes סכל is noteworthy: it should be the preposition ט, but the mem is written in medial, not final form (which is clearly distinguished in this script — e.g., דם in line 3). See also line 8. At the end of the line one can make out the vertical stroke and part of the baseline of ב and possibly part of the top stroke as well. Somewhat to the left, about one letter removed, there is a dot from the tip of a letter. Since the expression בבלויה הבשorum is so frequent, there can really be no doubt about the correct reading here.

With the word המב in line 4, 4QJud 5 and 4QJud 6 begin to overlap (this is the only word of the line preserved in ms. d) and provide complementary evidence for reading and restoring the remainder of the passage (Jub 21:7-10).

Line 5: The letter ג is recognizable at the edge of the fragment, and a vertical stroke is visible before it. A י follows ג but most of what should be י is lost. Only the left upper tick can be seen. The remaining letters in the line can be read easily. On ms. d just one of the letters in this line (the definite article on המב) has survived. The Hebrew agrees fairly closely with the text which the versions suggest: Ethiopic tâ‘arrogo k‘ello xebura presupposes קַסְפִּיר הָכֹל וְהוֶיָּה and Latin, too, may reflect a suffix on the verb offeres omnia ea, though it does not support reading וְהוֶיָּה. The type of sacrifice — אַשָּׁה — the versions express as senhahasfructum, with the latter rendering קַסְפִּיוֹן with which LXX translates אַשָּׁה. The words אַשָּׁה וְהוֶיָּה are often associated with one another in the Bible, but the most common way for making reference to the deity after them is לֹא לַאֲלֹהִים; אַשָּׁה וְהוֶיָּה does not figure in such phrases (see, e.g., Lev 3:5; 11QT 14:7; in 15:13 the analogous אַשָּׁה וְהוֶיָּה לַפְּנֵי ה is used [cf. 22:8]). Compare also 11QT 23:16-17: וַיֶּקֶם וְהוֶיָּּה עֲלֵי הָמָmother יְהוֹוָה, and מִמְּנָה אַשָּׁה וְהוֶיָּה לֹא

Line 6: Beginning with line 6 more and more of the right side of the fragment is lost. There are a few traces of letters at the beginning of the line. The upper stroke of ה can be seen extending into the word הָמָmother in line 5. It comes at a point where the versions presuppose הָמָmother, parts of the last two letters of which are just

17 Citations of the Temple Scroll are from Y. Yadin, The Temple Scroll (3 vols. with a supplement; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Archaeological Institute of the Hebrew University, Shrine of the Book 1983).
barely visible on the fragment. Ms. d (I.33) preserves the last three letters of the verb יִשְׁמַר, and these happen to be the three letters which are clearest in the present line. The remaining letters in the line offer no problems of decipherment. The last visible evidence of a letter is a dot of ink after בַּרְאֶשֶׁת, but the context and the surviving letters leave no doubt that it is part of ב. Ms. d also confirms the reading (I.34). אֶת stands where Ethiopic likewise has a relative pronoun (za), whereas Latin omits it. The conjunction in the compound תַּאֹרֶץ indicates that Ethiopic bakama serves to correlate the following type of fat with the fat mentioned in the restored section at the end of line 5, which Ethiopic also introduces with bakama. In both places Latin reads only et (see Lev 3:3, etc.). With this line compare the wording in 11QT 23:14: אָמַר הָלוֹם יִשְׁמַר הַמַּעֲרָבָּה. Line 7: At the bottom edge on the right side of the fragment one can see a small amount of ink which belongs to the top of a letter. It could be from the upper horizontal stroke of ב. Following a missing part of the leather a ב is then clearly visible. From the ב of בַּרְאֶשֶׁת through בַּרְאֶשֶׁת הַמַּעֲרָבָּה, the letters offer no problems, but there is a small gap before ב, in which, according to the versions, a conjunction should be restored. Ms. d offers another, slightly different copy of this passage (I.34-35): אָמַר בַּרְאֶשֶׁת הַמַּעֲרָבָּה אָמַר עַל הָּכַּרְבִים וַאֲחַיָּהָה הַמַּעֲרָבָּה אָמַר עַל הָּכַּרְבִים הַמַּעֲרָבָּה אָמַר עַל הָּכַּרְבִים וַאֲחַיָּהָה הַמַּעֲרָבָּה. Note that ms. e seems not to have כּל before the beginning of line 7, and it also lacks the word before the reference to fat at the end of the line. Ethiopic and Latin read “all” in both places. For the relatively rare use of the plural דְּרִיבִים, and for the entire context, see the parallel text in 11QT 23.15: אָמַר עַל הָּכַּרְבִים וַאֲחַיָּהָה אָמַר עַל הָּכַּרְבִים וַאֲחַיָּהָה. The versions also insert a word for “two” before their equivalents of דְּרִיבִים. In so doing they mirror the biblical practice in numerous passages which this section of Jubilees closely resembles (Exod 29:13, 22; Lev 3:4, 10, 15; 4:9; 7:4; 8:16, 25).

Line 8: Nothing can be read before אָמַר, but beginning with it and continuing to the last word preserved the readings are certain. Note that, as in line 4, the final letter of the preposition עַל is a medial form. At the end of the line the letters of the verb are fairly clear except that ד is broken where the leather is torn and ב has been partially shaved away. Some of the words in line 8 can be restored with the assistance of ms. d I.35-36:

18Dillmann, Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae, 826.
Ms. e has a strange reading at the two nouns, both of which are definite, or the article on the first is a mistake. In the versions there is a conjunction before “liver,” but Ethiopic has nothing corresponding with מַאֲרָה (mārāh) and Latin reads *sicur quod est super pulmonem*. The verb at the end of the line, the full form of which is extant in ms. d (see above), proves, if proof were needed, that Ethiopic יבּלְלוּ (yiblul) (or יבּלוּ) is corrupt. Latin has retained the correct verb *separa*, which has the support of biblical parallels (Lev 3:4, 10, 15, etc.) and of 11QT 23:16.19

Line 9: The first part of the line, except for the tops of three letters, has broken off. The first fragmentary letter is unmistakably א, while the vertical stroke which follows it matches the right top of י and the thicker, more slanted stroke fits ג (compare the shapes of these two letters at the beginning of מַאֲרָה just above this point in line 8). Ethiopic and Latin read a divine name here — *'egzi'abhēr/domini* — both of which suggest the tetragrammaton (as in Lev 3:5, 11, 16, etc.). However, the tips of letters indicate that אֲדָלָהִים was used, and ms. d, on which only the final letter א can be read, confirms this. The preposition י in this case has the expected, final form of *mem*. The suffix on מַאֲרָה is partly visible before the hole in the leather (cf. מַאֲרָה in ms. d, I.37, where, however, the preserved letters are somewhat uncertain). At the end of the surviving portion of the line the tops of three letters can be seen; as they are part of a stock phrase they can be read with confidence. There are some difficulties in restoring the beginning of the line (ms. d must also be reconstructed in this passage). Where Ethiopic has מָנָת *k'ello* (all this/these) Latin uses *universa* only. However, in line 5, where the Hebrew expression is מַאֲרָה, Ethiopic renders with מָנָת alone and Latin has *omnia ea*. Under the circumstances and with the amount of space available, it seems wiser to follow line 5 and read מַאֲרָה or מַאֲרָה מִלָּה. The next words in the versions also pose a difficulty: both presuppose מַאֲרָה נָתַתָה לֶבֶן לִפְנֵי מַאֲרָה before the divine name. These expressions would require more space than is available (the same is true for ms. d in I.37). Either these two Hebrew copies have suffered parablepsis or the versions have added a familiar biblical phrase (see Lev 1:3: יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַрְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ יַרְבּוּ Y. 71) for similar wording). In the text above, מַאֲרָה has not been restored, and the remaining words fill the space adequately.

19For a discussion, see VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.122.
Ethiopic and Latin repeat the preposition “with” before their renderings of מְנַחֵת (for which Latin presupposes a plural suffix) and מְנַחָה; Hebrew, though, reads it before the first alone (ms. d, I.37, agrees). The Temple Scroll once again offers a parallel text for the words that appear in this line: רֵיסָר הַכֹּל עַל המוֹדָע עַם מְנַחֵת (23:16-17; cf. Lev 3:5, 11, 16). For לַחֲמָּם (ms. d, I.37 may preserve part of the first letter) in a context of this kind, see Lev 3:11; Num 28:24.

Line 10: There is a dot of ink to the right of the first clear letter; in the context it must come from ש. Before the letters מְנַחֵת there is a wrinkle in the leather and some of it is lost. The top of a ש can be read just before it, but it is unlikely that there is space for a letter — especially a wide one such as the expected מ — between the conjunction and the noun (4QJud 6 1.38 has מְנַחֵת). The ink between them at the bottom of the fragment, which could perhaps be interpreted as the twisted end of the lower horizontal stroke in מ, seems to be from a ש in the next line. The versions employ equivalents of “in” (ba/in) before “the morrow/second day.” For the expression at the end of the line, compare Deut 24:15: ולא נבוא עליה השם.

Line 11: Only a part of a single letter remains for the line: the top of ל that is visible between מ in the word מְנַחֵת of line 10 (in line 1 the ל from line 2 extends above the base line of מ in מְנַחֵת). For legislation regarding leaving the meat of the sacrifice until the second or third day, see Lev 7:16-17 where there is no prohibition against leaving meat until the third day; rather, what is left on the third day is to be burned (cf. Lev 7:15; 21:6, 8). 20

20 For the legal issue, see Ch. Albeck, Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha (Siebenundvierzigster Bericht der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin; Berlin-Schönberg: Siegfried Scholem 1930) 22-23.