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The Date of the Book of Jubilees

The book of Jubilees purports to be a divine revelation to Moses. Its contents run parallel to Genesis and the first twelve chapters of Exodus, occasionally rearranging material and especially making additions to confirm the doctrines of the author's Jewish sect. It contains bitter polemics against the holders of opposing views. The author was at least a spiritual and perhaps also a physical ancestor of the Qumran sect.¹

His polemics give a vivid reflection of the live issues of his time as seen by him. If only one could be sure of the date of the book, one would have valuable insight into the sectarian movements among the Jews at that time, and one would have a clearer picture of the origins of the doctrines of the Qumran sect.

Some scholars have proposed that the book dates from shortly before Antiochus IV, in 167 B.C.E., forbade the Jews to observe their religion and imposed upon them the observance of another cult.² Others, however, have suggested later dates. The view of Robert H. Charles,³ that the book was written during the reign of John Hyrcanus I (134-104 B.C.E.), long dominated the field. Recently, James VanderKam

argued that Charles' date was much too late, but he himself put the writing of the book between ca. 163-161 and 140 B.C.E.\(^4\)

I propose here to give a detailed demonstration that the book dates from the years between 175 and 167 B.C.E. and probably from between 169 and 167 B.C.E. I shall also refute the arguments of Charles and VanderKam for a later date. I shall begin by presenting arguments to show that the book was written in the Hellenistic era.

I. The Book of Jubilees was Written After Alexander the Great Conquered Syria and Palestine and Before 100 B.C.E.

Though the author of Jubilees wrote in Hebrew,\(^5\) in 8.12-30 he draws on the geographic terminology and concepts of the Greeks.\(^6\) He preaches on issues which became pressing only when Greeks flooded into the neighborhood of Judaea, after the conquests of Alexander the Great. Only Greeks had the habit of exercising nude. The pagan non-Greek peoples regarded nudity with much the same horror as did the Jews.\(^7\) If the author of Jubilees insists that a law inscribed on tablets in heaven forbids "going naked as the gentiles uncover themselves" (3.31), his gentile targets could have been only Greeks. Moreover, circumcision was practiced by all the non-Greek pagan peoples bordering on Judaea, but not by the Greeks.\(^8\) The author of Jubilees "predicts" the time when Israelites will leave their sons uncircumcised, like the gentiles (15.33-34). The author could have had no occasion to forbid nudity and to speak of widespread failure to observe the commandment of circumcision unless he wrote when Greek influence had pervaded the Holy Land. That fact brings the date of his book down well into the third century B.C.E. On the other hand, a published fragment of a 170


\(^5\)On the Hebrew fragments from Qumran and on the surviving translations, see VanderKam, pp. 1-18. On the clues in the versions pointing to Hebrew as the language of the original, see Charles, Book of Jubilees, pp. xxx-xxxiii.

\(^6\)The use of Gādār (Gades, modern Cadiz), the Sea of 'Atel (the Atlantic), the Sea of Mēʾāt (Lake Maeotis, the modern Sea of Azov), and the Trīnā River (the Tanais, the modern Don) as extremes, or boundary points, is found in Herodotus, and the three regions of Noah's sons come close to fitting the Greeks' three continents. See Henry F. Tozer, A History of Ancient Geography (2d ed., New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1964), pp. 67-69, 72, 80-85. The division of the inhabited earth into zones (vs. 30) is also Greek; the Greeks held that their zone was the moderate one (Aristotle, Politics, 7.7.2; Tozer, History, pp. 66, 179-80, 205-6).

\(^7\)See Herodotus 1.10, Thucydides 1.6.

\(^8\)See Herodotus 1.104.3.
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Hebrew manuscript of Jubilees, found at Qumran, has been dated palaeographically a bit before 100 B.C.E.  

II. The Stress in Jubilees on Shunning All Gentiles Indicates the Book was Written After Late 175 B.C.E.

The main thrust of the book of Jubilees is to prove that the Jewish laws followed by the author and his sect are not a matter of fairly recent interpretation and legislation. Those Jewish laws included the use of a calendar with a 364-day solar year and the strict observance of peculiar regulations on the celebration of festivals and on the conduct of life, as well as a requirement to shun all gentiles. According to the book, these principles were revealed already before Moses to the patriarchs of the stories in Genesis.  

Abraham's insistence, at Jub. 22.16-22, that the Chosen Stock must shun all gentiles is peculiar and datable. One might have thought that the principle, that the Jews of Judaea should shun gentiles, was beyond question after the times of Ezra and Nehemiah, and that it was based on texts from the books of the Torah from Exodus through Deuteronomy. The authority of the Persian king stood behind Ezra and Nehemiah and gave their interpretations of the Torah the force of royal law. Alexander the Great seems to have ratified the existing situation when he conquered the area from the Persian empire, and so did his successors; for King Antiochus III of the Seleucid empire we have documentary evidence that he did so. The self-separation of

---

11In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews in Judaea are required to separate (Hebrew root: bdl) themselves from all gentiles (Ezra 9.1-2, 10.11, 16-17; Neh 9.2, 10.29, 13.1-3; I Esdr 8.69-70; cf. Ezra 6.21, I Esdr 7.13). Despite Deut 23.8-9, Jews are required also to separate themselves from Egyptians and Edomites. The use of the root bdl suggests that the source for the requirement is Lev 20.24-26, where God is said to have separated (Hebrew root: bdl) Israel from the gentiles, not merely from "the nation which I am casting out before you" (Lev 20.23). Neh 13.1-3, in which separation only from Ammonites and Moabites is mentioned, is based on Deut 23.3-7.
12Ezra 7.11-12, 25.
13Neh 5.14, 13.6-7.
14See Josephus Ant. 11.8.5 §§338; on the legends at Josephus Ant. 11.8.2-5 §§ 306-45, see Abraham Schalit, "Alexander the Great," Enc. Jud. 2 (1972), 577-79.
15Josephus Ant. 12.3.3 §§138-44; II Macc 4.11
the Jews of Judaea from gentiles impressed Hecataeus of Abdera, who wrote in the reign of Ptolemy I, around the end of the fourth century B.C.E.\(^\text{16}\) Few if any gentiles resided in Judaea between the time of Nehemiah and the 170's B.C.E.\(^\text{17}\)

Ben Sira, writing ca. 180 B.C.E., finds it unnecessary to preach against association with gentiles. Though he regards Nehemiah as a hero, he says nothing about Nehemiah's efforts to separate Jews from gentiles. In Ben Sira's time, the point, that the Jews of Judaea should shun gentiles, still could be taken for granted.\(^\text{18}\)

The interpretations by Ezra and Nehemiah, which required rigorous separation of Jews from gentiles, were not the only way to construe the texts. A case could have been made for a more lenient view, that the words of the Torah required Jews to keep separate only from the seven "Canaanite" nations (all of whom could have been regarded as extinct in the Hellenistic age) and from the Ammonites and Moabites.\(^\text{19}\) There is, however, no trace that anyone in Judaea before the 170's B.C.E. acted against the rigorist interpretation of the requirement for separation, not even the notorious Tobiads.\(^\text{20}\)

Indeed, the accounts in First and Second Maccabees imply that the rigorist interpretation prevailed until the beginning of the reign of

---

\(^\text{16}\) *Apud* Diodorus 40.3.4.

\(^\text{17}\) See my article, "Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism," in this volume, pp. 15-17.

\(^\text{18}\) See *ibid.* and Ben Sira 49:13.

\(^\text{19}\) See above, pp. 7-8.

\(^\text{20}\) The Toubias who is known from papyri resided, not in Judaea, but in Transjordan. We know nothing of his religious views. The "syncretism" displayed in his surviving letters may be only the perfunctory mannerisms of his Greek scribe. See Victor A. Tcherikover and Alexander Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, Vol. I (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5.

Joseph the Tobiad, in entertaining the ambassador of Ptolemy at Jerusalem (Josephus *Ant.* 12.4.3 §165), was only doing what was proper, as is shown by the examples of the pious Onias III (II Macc. 3.9) and Simon the Hasmonaean (I Macc. 15.32). Joseph was tempted to have an affair with a gentile dancing-girl in Alexandria but recognized from the first that to do so would be a sin, and he was saved from committing that sin by his brother. On the behavior of Joseph's son Hyrcanus at Ptolemy's banquet in Alexandria, see my article, "The Tales of the Tobiads," above, pp. 118-19, n. 12.

Josephus asserts that Joseph's sons, other than Hyrcanus, were instigators of the "Hellenistic Reform" at Jerusalem (*Ant.* 12.5.1 §240). The charge may well be false; see my article above, pp. 150-51. Even if it were true, the same Tobiads had earlier received the support of the pious high priest Simon II the Just and that of the majority of the Jews of Judaea (*Ant.* 12.5.1 §239; on Simon II, see my article above, pp. 120, 145).
Antiochus IV. Only the successful petition then to Antiocoichus IV, of Jason the Oniad, brother of the high priest Onias III, late in 175 or early in 174 B.C.E., brought a change. Down to that point, Onias III is reported to have enforced Jewish law with rigor (II Macc 3.1). Thereafter, however, Antiocoichus IV deposed Onias III and made Jason high priest in his place and repealed the royal decrees enforcing the rigorist interpretation of the Jewish laws on separation.22 Preserved at I Macc 1.11 is a summary of some of the arguments used by those who sought to relax the rules of separation: "Come, let us make a covenant with the gentiles around us, because ever since we have kept ourselves separated from them we have suffered many evils."

What is the meaning of the clause which begins "ever since?" Both the author of First Maccabees and the speakers he quotes knew the historical books of the Bible, from Genesis through Nehemiah. They knew that the patriarchs in Genesis associated freely with gentiles. They also knew that Moses and Joshua and Solomon (I Kgs 9.20-21) had kept the Chosen People separate from the gentiles, and that surely the righteous kings Hezekiah (I Kgs 18.6) and Josiah (I Kgs 23.25) did so, too. It is thus unlikely that the clause beginning "ever since" refers to the enactments of Ezra and Nehemiah. Rather, it alludes to the revelations through Moses which separated the Chosen People from the gentiles. The "lawless men" quoted by the author of First Maccabees held that those revelations had brought only trouble upon the Jews.

The argument of the "lawless men" at I Macc 1.11 had much in common with the views of Greek intellectuals who admired Jewish "philosophy" but deplored Jewish aversion toward gentiles. Hecataeus of Abdera blamed the aversion on Moses' own reaction to Egyptian mistreatment of Jews.23 Others ascribed it to the superstition and "tyranny" of later Jewish leaders.24 The account in Jub. 22.7-18 seems directly to counter reasoning like that of Hecataeus of Abdera: Abraham gives thanks for having lived his entire life in peace and then turns to instruct Jacob to shun all gentiles. Clearly, Abraham's instruction to Jacob was not in reaction to mistreatment by gentiles!

For an author writing to influence Jews who believed in the validity of the books of the Torah from Exodus through Deuteronomy, there was no need to insist, contrary to the implications of the stories in Genesis, that the patriarchs already observed the regulations later

---

21 I Macc 1.11-14, II Macc 4.7-11.
22 II Macc 4.7-11.
23 Apud Diodorus 40.3.4.
24 Strabo 16.2.37, C761.
revealed to Moses. The insistence, that the patriarchs observed the full rigor of the laws, including those requiring separation from the gentiles, is explainable only on the supposition that the rigourist author faced a situation in which it was easy for Jews to violate the laws of separation and in which it was argued that those laws were a detrimental addition to the pristine religion of the patriarchs. Hence, the author of Jubilees must have written after late 175 B.C.E.

III. The Book Knows of the Sack of Jerusalem in 169, but Not of the Royal Decrees Against the Religion of the Jews in 167 B.C.E.

We can further narrow the limits between which the book must have been written. In at least two instances, the book of Jubilees should have reflected the changes which King Antiochus IV tried to impose upon the religion of the Jews in 167 B.C.E., yet the book fails to do so and hence must have been written before the king's attempt to impose the changes.

Where the language of Genesis lent itself to interpretations which ran counter to his own beliefs, the author of Jubilees rewrote the passage to exclude those interpretations. For example, the author at Jubilees 2.8-10 rewrote Gen 1.16-18 to exclude the possibility of a lunar calendar. Antiochus IV, in his decrees of 167 B.C.E. claimed he was restoring the original patterns of Jewish religion, not least in requiring the worship of the "Abomination of Desolation," a framework containing massēbōt (pillars"), erect cult-stones which represented the deity or contained his presence. The king's agents are known to have cited texts from the Torah to prove the point. Among those texts surely stood Gen 28.16-22, 31.13, and 35.7, passages in which Jacob shows reverence to a stone massēbah which is said to contain God's presence.

Even before the decrees of Antiochus IV, these passages were embarrassing to Jews who followed the Torah: explicit commandments forbade them to use such cult-stones. Accordingly, the author of Jubilees (at 27.26-27) adjusted the content of Gen 28.18-22 to make it conform to the prohibitions of the Torah against massēbōt: he specified that Jacob's massēbah was "for a sign," implying that it was not itself a

---

27Goldstein, I Maccabees, pp. 142-52.
28Ibid., pp. 261-62.
29See ibid., p. 148.
30Lev 26.1; Deut 12.3, 16.21-22; see also Exod 23.24, 34.13-14, and Deut 7.5.
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god. But the author of Jubilees says nothing to exclude the use of Jacob's *massēlāh* as a precedent for Jewish worship of the stone in the Abomination of Desolation which was supposed to contain God's presence. Indeed, he allows Jacob to set the extremely dangerous precedent of anointing the stone and of regarding it as a container of God's presence. Surely, then, the author wrote before Antiochus' decrees of 167 B.C.E.!

Another passage of Jubilees must have been written before the decrees of 167 but after late summer, 169 B.C.E. The author of Jub. 23.11-31 was a typical example of a person in the age of the cessation of prophecy who nevertheless believed he had prophetic inspiration. Like the authors of Daniel 7-12, I Enoch 85-90, and the Testament of Moses, he wrote a piece surveying Jewish history from the death of Abraham down to his own time of troubles and predicting an imminent miraculous transforming intervention by God. In Jubilees, the miracle is a lengthening of the human life span (derived from Isa 65.20). Before the great miracle, which never happened, the author first speaks of vain efforts by pious young Israelites to use the sword to turn sinning Jews back into the path of righteousness; then he says some wicked Jews will "escape" from these bloody clashes and will go on to "exalt themselves to deceit and wealth, that they may each take all that is his fellow-Jew's" and will defile the holy of holies; then he speaks of cruel punishment of Israel by the gentiles; never does he say that gentiles will force Israel to violate the Torah; unlike the author of Dan 11.36, he makes no reference to a king who would "speak things past belief concerning the God of gods."

A pious Jew writing between 299 and 100 B.C.E. could have expressed himself thus only within the narrow period between autumn 169 and spring 167 B.C.E. Jews are not reported to have taken arms against one another on religious issues during the third century or in the first three decades of the second century B.C.E. The first such religious civil strife of the Hellenistic period was the riot against Lysimachus, brother of the high priest Menelaus, in autumn 170 B.C.E. No more than a year later came the armed resistance of the pious both to the coup of the deposed high priest Jason and to his rival, the incumbent

---

32II Macc 4.39-42; Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, p. 162. At Dan 11.14 there probably is an allusion to an uprising in which Jewish interpreters of old prophecies sought to end Ptolemaic rule over the Chosen People; but the uprising is not portrayed as a civil conflict or as one in which the issue was righteousness versus wickedness. On the family strife among the Tobiads, see my article above, pp. 118-20, 129-31.
The pious drove Jason out of the holy city, and Menelaus escaped to the citadel of Jerusalem. Upon hearing of the disorders, King Antiochus IV marched to Jerusalem and cruelly punished the Jews there. The king's intervention enabled Menelaus to retain power as high priest. Menelaus went on to defile the holy of holies, at least by conducting Antiochus into it, and he also exalted himself oppressively over his fellow Jews. Thus, the author of Jub 23.11-31 knows of the riot against Lysimachus, the resistance of the pious to Jason and Menelaus, the punishment of the Jews by Antiochus IV, and the behavior immediately thereafter the Menelaus. He knows of the events of 170 and 169 B.C.E., but he knows nothing of Antiochus' decrees forbidding obedience to the Torah, which came in spring 167 B.C.E. He must therefore have written between 169 and 167 B.C.E.

---

33II Macc 5.5-7; Goldstein, 1 Maccabees, p. 163. According to II Macc. 4.39, the riot against Lysimachus grew out of mass indignation against Lysimachus' robbery of temple property. At Jub 23.17-19 nothing is said of temple robbery. But the sect of the author of Jubilees may have had its own motives for participating in acts of protest, different from those of the sect favored by the historian in Second Maccabees. The author of Jubilees may not have been thinking primarily of the riot against Lysimachus. Foremost in his mind may have been the armed resistance of the pious in 169 B.C.E., where the pious may have risen against the Hellenizing high priests from a broad array of religious motives.

34II Macc 5.11-16, I Macc 1.20-24; Goldstein, 1 Maccabees, p. 163.

35II Macc 5.15, Diodorus 34-35.1.3; cf. II Macc 13.8, I Macc 1.21, 4.42-43 (the priests appointed by Judas are in contrast to Menelaus).

36II Macc 5.23.


38As a whole, the book of Jubilees is a straightforward narrative sequence. The events of 170-169 B.C.E. in their order fit the account of Jub 23.19-24. Jub 23.25 should be viewed as rhetorical hyperbole, describing Israel under the oppressive acts of Antiochus IV between 169 and 167 B.C.E. Jub 23.26 would reflect a great movement of repentance carried out by the author's sect in response to the thought, "If God in his wrath has sent against us the sinners, the gentiles, we must try to appease Him by doing His will." Verses 26-31 then predict the miraculous divine intervention which will follow. Accordingly, the burden of proof is on anyone who would assert that the verses of our passage do not narrate a sequence of events in chronological order. Contrast Gene L. Davenport, The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 32-46, esp. 41, n. 1, and 43, n. 2.

The stress at Jub 15.11-13, 23-24, on circumcision, and the severe condemnation of failure to circumcise, can be used to show that the book was written at the latest in 152 B.C.E. Even as guerrilla warriors, the Hasmonaeanes succeeded in enforcing adherence to circumcision (I Macc 2.46), and as princes of the nation they must have seen to it that every new-born male was
IV. The Date of Jubilees 23.11-31 Is Probably the Date of the Entire Book

Can we then say that the entire book of Jubilees was written between 169 and 167 B.C.E.? Surely, it is possible that the author of Jubilees 23.11-31 is different from the author of the rest of the book and that the passage was later added to it.\(^{39}\) On the other hand, our passage, written between 169 and 167 B.C.E., now stands embedded in a book written between 175 and 167 B.C.E. There are two problems which could well have perplexed the author of the entire book:

1. How is it that Abraham, most righteous of the men who lived down to his time, had the shortest life?\(^{40}\)
2. What of truly saintly members of the author’s own sect in his own time? Would they, too, be limited to a short span of life?

In its setting Jub 23.11-31 with verses 9-10 serves to solve both problems. The wickedness of the wicked shortened the human life span, but God will soon restore it to full length. Thus, I think there is good reason to assume that the passage is not a later addition to the book. Even if it is an interpolation, it was written, at most, some six years later than the rest of Jubilees.

V. Refutation of the Arguments of Charles and VanderKam

Although VanderKam disposed of many of the arguments for a later date for the book of Jubilees, especially those of Charles, VanderKam himself would date the writing of the book later than we, placing it between ca. 163-161 and 140 B.C.E.\(^{41}\) We proceed now not only

---

\(^{39}\) Cf. Davenport, *Eschatology*, pp. 10-19, 32-46, though the arguments presented there are not convincing.

\(^{40}\) According to the Masoretic text of Gen 11.24-25, Abraham’s grandfather Nahor had a shorter life of 148 years, but the Septuagint gives Nahor 204 or even 304 years. On the closeness of the text of the Torah used by the author of Jubilees to that represented by the Septuagint, see VanderKam, *Studies*, p. 103-38.

to present considerations even stronger than those brought by VanderKam against Charles' arguments, but also to show that VanderKam's own evidence for the date between ca. 163-161 and 140 B.C.E. does not prove his point.

1. Charles wrongly assumed that the author was a Pharisee who could approve of Hasmonaeans.42 We can now show that the author was a spiritual ancestor of the Qumran sect, members of which called even early Hasmonaeans "the Wicked Priest," "the Cursed Man of Belial," and "the False Preacher."43 Hence, passages in Jubilees cannot be interpreted as approving allusions to acts of the Hasmonaeans Jonathan, Simon, and John Hyrcanus.

2. Jub 31.15, with its reference to the preeminence of the tribe of Levi, alludes, not to Simon the Hasmonaean and his successors, but to the great pre-Hasmonaean Zadokite high priests and their anticipated heirs.44 Indeed, only by emending the text of Jub 31.15 could Charles make it conform to the pattern of the "Hasmonaean propaganda" at Testament of Levi 8.11-17.45 My colleague, George Nickelsburg, has studied the Ethiopic text of the passage for me. It has "et principes et judices erunt omni semini Jacob." Ethiopian "mal'ak" normally translates Greek "angel," or "messenger." The Latin translator probably was at a loss to see how a high priest could be an angel, especially since the priests are only compared to angels at Jub 31.14; therefore, he omitted the word. Hence, the astonishing statement present in the Ethiopic text probably represents the original author's intentions: "They shall be princes and judges and angels [i.e., messengers of God] to all the seed of the sons of Jacob."

The author of Jubilees did not invent his list of the glories of Levi's high priestly descendants. In part they are derived from Mal 2.4, including the office of "angel." Ethiopian makwanen (literally "judge") frequently translates words for "ruler," including Greek archōn and hēgoumenos, the equivalents of Hebrew sār, rōš, nāśī', and nāgīd ("prince," "head," "chief"), and at Jub 31.18 the Ethiopic word refers to

---

45 Book of Jubilees, p. 187.
the prince descended from Judah (David or the Messiah). Nowhere in the Hebrew Bible is the high priest said to be such a prince or head of the nation. But the high priests of the Hellenistic period down into the second century B.C.E. certainly had the triple prerogatives predicted at Jub 31.15. Writing in the late fourth century B.C.E., Hecataeus of Abdera describes the priestly office as follows:\textsuperscript{46}

Moses took the men of greatest accomplishment and ability to be heads (proistasthai) of the nation and made them priests....He also made them judges of the most important cases and entrusted to them the guardianship of the laws and customs. Therefore, the Jews never have a king. Rather, the office of head (prostasian) of the people is given to that priest who is regarded as preeminent in wisdom and virtue. Him they call the high priest, and they look upon him as the messenger (angelos) to them of God's commandments...; as regards this last prerogative, the Jews are so ready to obey that they immediately prostrate themselves upon the ground when he expounds the commandments to them.

In the early second century B.C.E., the same picture of the high priestly office is drawn under the high priest Simon II by Ben Sira.\textsuperscript{47} Though Ben Sira does not call the high priest a "messenger" or "angel," he still may have the Jews prostrating themselves before him.\textsuperscript{48}

At Mal 2.7 the ideal priest is described in a context reproving sinful priests. The period of the great Zadokite-Oniad high priests, including Simon II the Just, could evoke the enthusiasm of the author of Jub 31.15 for the high priestly office and its legitimate occupant. But in the reign of Antiochus IV, the line held to be legitimate by the author of Jubilees was deposed forever, and the high priesthood fell first to wicked usurpers and then to the Hasmonaeans. To the author of Jubilees, those were sinful priests worthy of reproof. Since that author could only have hated the Hasmonaeans, it does not matter that John Hyrcanus I was high priest (134-104 B.C.E.) and had claims to be a prophet\textsuperscript{49} and thus might have been described as a messenger.\textsuperscript{50}

3. "Priest of the Most High God" at Jub 32.1 cannot be shown to have been derived from an official title of John Hyrcanus I.\textsuperscript{51} As an official title it is attested among Hasmonaeans only for John Hyrcanus

\textsuperscript{46}Apud Diodorus 40.3.4-6.
\textsuperscript{47}Greek Sir 45.24-26.
\textsuperscript{48}Hebrew Sir 50.21. See also Josephus \textit{Ant.} 11.4.8 §§111-12, 12.4.2 §161; 20.10.3 §238, 4 §244, 5 §251, and Ag. \textit{Ap.} 2.23 §§193-94.
\textsuperscript{49}Josephus \textit{J.W.} 1.2.7 §§68-69; \textit{Ant.} 13.10.3 §282, 7 §§299-300; t. \textit{Sota} 13.5 and parallels; cf. T. \textit{Levi} 8.15, 18.6.
\textsuperscript{50}See Hag. 1.13, II Chr 36.15-16.
\textsuperscript{51}Contrast Charles, \textit{Book of Jubilees}, p. lix.
II, not for John Hyrcanus I, and Charles admitted that the time of John Hyrcanus II was too late for the composition of Jubilees. "Most High God" as a name for the Lord is well attested in the first half of the second century B.C.E. and earlier, in Ben Sira and in Daniel. How else would one refer to His high priest?

4. Charles held that the victory of Jacob and his sons over Esau and his sons (Jubilees 38) reflects John Hyrcanus' conquest of Idumæa. On the contrary, the story reflects no historical event whatever. Rather, it is a demonstration that the fulfillment of the promises in Amos 9.12, Isa 11.14, and Obadiah will merely reestablish the conquests of Jacob. Jacob's descendants have a right, not only from Isaac's blessing, but also through conquest in war, to rule over Edom. According to Jub 38.13-14, from the time that Israel went down to Egypt, Edom has not been made to pay annual tribute, but Israel in the time of Moses still has the right to demand it. The passage does not reflect John Hyrcanus' conquest of Idumæa because Edom in Jubilees 38 is not only Idumæa (west of the Jordan rift, which in fact was conquered by John Hyrcanus) but also Mount Seir (in Transjordan, which no Hasmonaean ever conquered).

VanderKam holds that the victory over Esau and his sons and their allies in Jubilees 38 reflects the victories of Judas Maccabaeus and his brothers over the Idumæans and other neighboring peoples. VanderKam was so intent on enumerating the similarities between the struggle in Jubilees and the campaigns reported in the books of Maccabees, that he neglected the profound and significant differences. We may note, first, that Judas and his brothers fought "Edom" only west of the Jordan. Charles' case in one point is stronger than VanderKam's: John Hyrcanus as well as Jacob and his sons conquered Edom, but Judas and his brothers only passed through Idumæa on a punitive campaign, without conquering it. In the books of Maccabees, the hostile neighbors of the Jews are not said to have conspired

---

53Book of Jubilees, p. lix, lxiv.
54Greek Sir 7.9, 24.23, 41.8; Hebrew Sir 46.5; Dan 3.26, 32, and 5.18, 21.
56Ibid., pp. 230-38.
58Josephus Ant. 13.9.1 §257, J.W. 1.2.6. §63; Jub 38.8-14.
together, and with one exception, they do not attack the Jews' home territory. In Jubilees, Edom takes the lead in building up a great alliance which together marches upon Jacob and his sons, who have their home at the tower near Hebron. The picture of Edom as the ringleader of Israel's enemies was a view prevalent among Jews for centuries after the role played by the Edomites in approving and profiting from the destruction of the kingdom of Judah by the Babylonians in 586 B.C.E. This picture, however, does not reflect the Edomites in the time of Maccabaeus, for then the Idumaeans were but one enemy among may and neither incited others to attack the Jews nor profited from such attacks.

Let us examine the similarities which VanderKam considers "striking."61

(a) In the books of Maccabees, Judas leads his brothers and the Jewish forces against Edom and the other nations; and, at Jub 38.5, Judah goes into battle in front of his brothers. The parallelism is much less striking than VanderKam thinks. It is not clear that Judah in Jubilees is analogous to Judas Maccabaeus in serving as commander. True, the expression "in front" occurs in Jub 38.5, but Judah there leads only Naphthali and Gad in fighting the enemies on the south side of the tower of Hebron. After writing "in front" in Jub 38.5 to explain Judah's role at the south wall, the author could leave the words unexpressed in Jub 38.6-8, for the reader would infer that Levi, Reuben, and Simeon, the sons of Jacob named first in the author's description of the eastern, northern, and western sectors, led the fighting in each of the other directions. In fact, Judah has no preeminent role in Jubilees 38. The great victors are first Jacob, who slays Esau and Adoran the Aramaean (Jub 38.2), and then Simeon and Benjamin and Reuben's son, Enoch, who slaughter and rout the Edomites and Horites (ibid., 38.8).

(b) Almost the same nations appear in the lists of enemies confronting Jacob and his sons in Jubilees 38 and confronting Judas and his brothers in the books of Maccabees in the period after the purification of the temple. Indeed, one can make an even stronger case than VanderKam did, that the parallelism is too striking to be accidental. At Jub 37.6, 9-10, Esau's sons seek and get forces from Aram, Philistia,

59II Macc 10.24-31. The historian in Second Maccabees was mistaken. The campaign is the same as the one narrated at I Macc 5.6-8; see the Note on II Macc 10.24-38 in my II Maccabees (AB 41A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983).
60Cf. VanderKam, Studies, p. 233.
61Ibid., pp. 234-48.
62See n. 57.
Moab, Ammon, Edom, the Horites and the "Kittim," yet in the narrative of the battle at Jub 38.6-8 only the men of Moab, Ammon, the Philistines, Edom, and the Horites are mentioned. "Aram" is the equivalent of the Greek word "Syria" and thus could mean "the Seleucid empire." "Kittim" might mean Greek or Macedonian soldiers. In I Maccabees 5, the campaigns of Judas and his brothers are indeed presented as wars against neighboring peoples, not as conflicts with the Seleucid empire and its armies. Furthermore, the Horites are not mentioned in the Hebrew Bible as enemies of the Israelites, but Seir is said to have been a Horite, and the Baianites (or Sabaanites) defeated by Judas Maccabaeus were said to be descendants of Seir. Can all this be coincidence? Should we not conclude that the passages in Jubilees 37-38 reflect the campaigns described in I Maccabees 5?

We should not. The "Horites" for the author of Jubilees are probably the inhabitants of Mount Seir, the original homeland of the Edomites. By the author's time, the bulk of the Edomites lived in Idumaea, west of the Jordan rift, in territory which had been the southern part of Judah. For him there were two names to designate the ethnic groups most closely related to Esau: Edomites (i.e., Idumaeans) and Horites; he never mentions Horites separately from Edomites. Hence, his allusions to Horites need only reflect the migration of the bulk of the Edomites to Idumaea; it need have no connection with Judas Maccabaeus' victory over the Baianites.

As for the "Kittim," the author's Hebrew may well have had "Hittites." The word in the preserved Ethiopic version is used to render in Ethiopic the Greek equivalents of both "Kittim" and "Hittites." Hittites would, indeed, have been suitable allies for Esau and his sons, and enemies for Jacob and his. Even if the author wrote "Kittim" and meant Greeks or Macedonians, we would still have no proof that the passage reflects the campaigns of Judas Maccabaeus. "Kittim" had been harassing "Hebrews' for centuries before Maccabaean times and could long have been viewed as potential allies of Edomite haters of Israel.

63Very frequently in Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible.
64See Élie Bikerman, Institutions des Séleucides (Paris: Geuthner, 1938), pp. 4-5.
66Gen 36.20; cf. Deut 2.12.
67See Goldstein, I Maccabees, pp. 294-95.
68See Deut 2.12.
70Charles, Book of Jubilees, p. 216.
Far from being a significant reflection of Judas Maccabaeus' campaigns, the absence of the names of Aram and the "Kittim" from the description of the battle at Jub 38.5-10 is probably an accident. The first contingent of allies to come to join the sons of Esau was from Aram, with Adurām the Aramaean (Jub 37.9). At the beginning of hostilities, Jacob slew Esau and Adōrān (= Adurām); and Jacob's sons – Judah, Naphtali, and Gad – went forth against unnamed enemies in the south. But by subtracting from the list in Jub 37.9-10 the enemies named in Jub 38.6-8 as fighting on the east, north, and west, we are left with Aram and the "Kittim" for the south.

The enemies of Jacob listed in Jubilees 37-38 are simply the neighbors of the Promised Land and would fit any period in which an army of the patriarchs of Genesis, or an army of Israel or Judah or Judaea, fought all neighbors. Moreover, nothing in Jubilees 37-38 reflects the Nabataeans (I Macc 5.25, II Macc 12.10-12) or the other Arabs (I Macc 5.31). The author of Jubilees could have represented the peoples of heathen "Gilead" (I Macc 5.9, 25-45) by Amorites, but Amorites are not mentioned in Jubilees 37-38. Moreover, nothing there reflects Simon's victories over the heathens in Galilee (I Macc 5.21-23).

(c) At I Mac 5.65, Hebron is the site of the victory of Judas Maccabaeus and his brothers over the Idumeans to the south of Judaea; at Jub 36.20 and 37.15-17, the tower near Hebron is Jacob's home and the site of the victory of Jacob and his sons over Esau and his. Again, however, the contrasts between the two narratives are more significant than the parallels. Judas Maccabaeus does not capture the Idumæan city of Hebron but attacks its fortifications and destroys its towers. Jacob in Jubilees 37-38 has the tower near Hebron as his own throughout. As a punitive expedition, Maccabaeus' campaign asserted no Israelite rights over Idumean Hebron. The story in Jubilees probably is meant to assert that the territory of Hebron is rightfully Israelite, a claim which Jews made from the time that the Edomites encroached on southern Judah in the sixth century B.C.E.

(d) According to I Macc 5.17-18, Judas Maccabaeus divided his men into three forces to fight the many-sided peril which threatened his people, and the chapter tells of campaigns to the north, south, east, and west of Jerusalem; according to Jub 38.4-8, Judah and his brothers, divided into four groups, went out from the tower near Hebron in four

---

72David fought the Philistines, Moab, Aram, Edom, Amalek, and Ammon (II Sam 8.1-14, 10.1-14). Jehoshaphat fought Philistines (II Chr 18.11), Aram (II Chr 18.10, 30), Moab and Ammon (II Chr 20.1), Edom and Aram (II Chr 20.2), and Seir (II Chr 20.10, 22-23; identical with Edom?).

73See Num 32.29-40.
directions to fight against the several gentile nations. Here, too, the contrasts are more significant than the parallels. Twelve is divisible by three. If the author of Jubilees had wished to reflect Maccabaeus' three forces, he would have divided Jacob's sons into three groups of four, not into four groups of three. Furthermore, unlike the battle in Jubilees 38, the campaigns of Maccabaeus' forces are fought on widely separated fronts, and his third detachment fights without authorization and is defeated. Had the author of Jubilees 38 wished to reflect the great campaigns which Judas Maccabaeus and his brother Simon fought simultaneously in two widely separated sectors, he would have told of their namesakes' actions in an altogether different manner from what we have: he would have put Judah on the east, not on the south, and Simeon on the north, not on the west.

Thus, there is no reason to assume that the victory of Jacob and his sons over Esau and his in Jubilees 37-38 reflects Hasmonaean victories.

5. Similarly, the victory of Jacob and his sons over the Amorites in Jub 34.1-9 need not reflect Hasmonaean victories. VanderKam admits that the parallels are weak, and Charles himself recognized that the passage is an expansion of a much older legend about Jacob's conquest of Shechem, based on Gen 48.22. Most of the names in the narrative have no significance in Hasmonaean history. The names were probably added to "Shechem" by an author familiar with the book of Joshua.

6. The curse upon the Philistines at Jub 24.28-32 shows the author knew that the Greco-Macedonian empires (Kittim) ruled over Philistia (verse 28), but verses 29-32 need not reflect Hasmonaean conquests, but only the anti-Philistine prophecies at Isa 11.14, Obad 19, Zeph 2.4-7, and Zech 9.5-7, as well as the hatred felt by Jews of the second century B.C.E. toward the inhabitants of Philistia.

We may thus conclude that the author of Jubilees wrote between autumn 169, and spring 167 B.C.E.
Appendix: The Place-Names in Jubilees 34.4, 7-8

In their present form, as they stand in the Ethiopic text of Jub 34.4, 7-8, only Bēthōrōn (Beth-Horon) and Tāphū (Tephō, Tappūah) are mentioned at all in the books of Maccabees. Beth-Horon is an important site in the career of Maccabaeus (I Macc 3.16-24, 7.39) and appears also in the list of points fortified by Bacchides in 160 or 159 B.C.E. (I Macc 9.50). Tappuah in the books of Maccabees occurs only in the list of points fortified by Bacchides. One should add that Tamnātārēs, mentioned at Jub 34.8 as having been fortified by Jacob, is surely Timnath-heres (Judg 2.9) and is probably identical to Thammatha in the list at I Macc 9.50. One must concede that a Jewish patriot, after Bacchides fortified the sites, could have been interested in asserting that Jews had a prior claim to them, based upon earlier conquest or fortification of them by Jacob. But, if so, why do we not find the whole list from I Macc 9.50 reproduced in Jubilees 34? When we get probable identification of the places mentioned in Jubilees 34, we shall find that all but Beth-Horon lay outside the borders of Judaea in the Hellenistic period down to the middle of the reign of John Hyrcanus (Avi-Yonah, Holy Land, pp. 11-67). Beth-Horon was at least not securely held by the Jews during the Hellenistic period down through the career of Judas Maccabaeus and the early career of his brother Jonathan (ibid., p. 17). Thus, a Jewish patriot could have written our passage at any time during the Hellenistic period down to the middle of the reign of John Hyrcanus.

The presence of at most one name, important in the victories of the Hasmonaeans, is hardly impressive. One should, rather, note that of the names as they stand, four are important in the book of Joshua (Tappuah: Josh 15.34, 53, 16.8 17.8; Sēlō = Shiloh: Josh 18.1, 8-10, 31, 19.51, 21.1-2, 12, 22.9; Beth-Horon: Josh 10.10-11, 16.3, 5, 18.13-14, 21.22; and Timnath-heres [= Timnath-serah]: Josh 19.50 [cf. Judg 2.9]), and one, Gā'as (= Gaash) is mentioned there (Josh 24.30). Scholars have been quick to assume that names in the list have been corrupted, and by emendation they have added to the list names supposedly important in Hasmonaean history. Should we not assume, rather, that names from the book of Joshua have been corrupted? (On the wish of the author of I Maccabees 9 to echo the book of Joshua, see Goldstein, I Maccabees, pp. 381, 385-86.)

Let us examine the remaining names from Jub 34.4, 7-8.

1. Charles read the third name in the list as Sērāḡān or Sarēgān. VanderKam cites also the reading of ms. C (Sārāḡān), and of the Latin Jubilees (Saragon). The parallel at T. Judah 5.1 has Aretan, and
Midrash Wayyissā‘ū has SḤn, and Sēper Hayyāšār has Sṛtown. VanderKam himself noted (p. 222) that the g could well have come from the misreading of a Greek tau as gamma. He wanted to read the word as “Pirathon.” Pirathon (Pharathon) does appear in the list at I Macc 9.50. But, by following VanderKam’s own method and by merely reading t for g (as is suggested by the parallel texts), we get Sarēṭān and an original Hebrew Sarēṭān or Sarēṭān (= Zarethan), the place mentioned at Josh 3.16 (cf. I Kgs 7.46) as being by the Jordan, near Adam, upstream from Jericho. On the difficulties of locating Zarethan, see Bustanay Oded, “Ṣērēdā, Ṣērērā, Ṣārētan,” Encyclopaedia Biblica 6 (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1971), 765-68 (in Hebrew).

2. The second name in the list of Jubilees is Arēsa. The various Greek witnesses at T. Judah 3.1 have Asour, Sour, Assyrion, and Zour. Midrash Wayyissā‘ū has ḥṣr, and Sēper Hayyāšār has ḥṣr. To judge by the parallels, the Hebrew original had Ḥāṣḍr = Hazor, the site of a great victory of Joshua (Josh 11.1, 10, 11, 13; 12.19). Admittedly, Hazor was also the site of a great victory by Jonathan the Hasmonean (I Macc 11.67-74), but that victory came between September 145, and summer 143 B.C.E. (Goldstein, I Maccabees, p. 170), far too late to be known to the writer of Jubilees (see n. 168-69). VanderKam (p. 221) would see in Arēsa a corruption of "Adasa" (Ḥādāšā), the site of Maccabaeus’ victory over Nicanor (I Macc 4.40-45). Even if VanderKam’s emendation is correct, Hadashah is mentioned at Josh 15.37.

3. The last name in the list of enemy cities was read by Charles as Ma’anīṣākir. According to VanderKam, ms. A reads Mā’anisakēr, and mss. C and D, Mā’anisākir. The Latin Jubilees was Manesacer. T. Judah 6.3 has Machēr or Machir. Midrash Wayyissā‘ū has mṭnh šbyr and šbyr mlk ṣbnnym, and Sēper Hayyāšār has šbyr mlk ṣbnnym. The other kings in Jub 34.4 and 7 are designated only by their cities and not by their own names, so that it is not likely that Mā’anisākir is a corrupt combination of the name of a king with the name of his city (contrast Charles, Book of Jubilees, pp. 202-3). Later writers tried to bring the personal names of the kings into the story, as we find in Midrash Wayyissā‘ū and Sēper Hayyāšār. A writer like the author of Jubilees is unlikely to have invented place-names: he either took them from scripture or from events of his own times. We can only guess what he wrote here. The parallel texts suggest that he wrote at least one word beginning with the phonetic equivalent of Ma’ani- and another word ending in -ir. No such pair of place names occurs in Hasmonaean history. But Ma’ani- immediately suggests Hebrew Maḥanayim, and Mahanayim at Josh 13.26 in the Hebrew and in the Greek is associated with Debir. Perhaps the Hebrew original of Jub 34.4 had ṣmlk ṣbnnym
4. In Jub 34.8, Rōbêl is mentioned as a city "built" (i.e., fortified) by Jacob. Here, too, the author surely is asserting that the Jews have rights to a strategic site which go back to the time of Jacob. One would assume that the site was a strong point in his own day. VanderKam, following the 'rb'l of Midrash Wayyisâ'î and 'rbln of Sêper Hayyaâšîr, would identify Rōbêl with Arbelâ in Galilee, the site of a massacre of Jews in 160 B.C.E. by a Seleucid army at a time when the Hasmonean force was far away (I Macc 9.2). Though the area has steep cliffs and caves, we do not hear of its being regarded as a strong point in the second century B.C.E. (but cf. Josephus Ant. 14.15.4 §§415-17). Though Arbelâ in Galilee is not mentioned in the book of Joshua, VanderKam's identification at present seems to be the best available. One might still think of the fountain of Rōgêl near Jerusalem (Josh 15.7, 18.16), of Har Habba'âl or Har Habba'âlâ (Josh 15.11) and Hârabbâ (Josh 15.60) in the territory of the tribe of Judah, and of Har 'Èbal (Mount Ebal; Josh 8.30, 33), but not one of them is known to have been a fortified point. The author of Jubilees may have taken all the other names from Joshua and still have brought in Arbelâ. Knowing that Hazor lay in the far north and that Jews had claims to Arbelâ, which lay on the road between Hazor and the territory around Shechem used by Jacob, the author may have liked the idea that Jacob fortified Arbelâ against future menaces from the north.