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Since the preliminary publication of all legible portions of the *Genesis Apocryphon* in the mid 1990s, attention again has turned to the relationship this scroll shares with another, roughly contemporaneous, rewriting of Genesis and the early parts of Exodus—the book of *Jubilees.*¹ In the spirit and wake of historical biblical criticism, scholars have been especially keen to answer questions about the literary priority and potential sources of these two works. The answers to such questions, when viewed collectively, aid greatly in reconstructing the history and development of religious thought in Second Temple period
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¹ That there is some sort of relationship seems assured by the many details shared by these two compositions alone at this early period (third to first centuries B.C.E.). These include: Lamech’s wife is named Batenosh (1QapGen 2:20–21, *Jub.* 4:28); Noah’s wife is named Emzara (1QapGen 6:7, *Jub.* 4:33); a clear knowledge of Enochic traditions is displayed (1QapGen 0–5, *Jub.* 4:16–5:12, 10:8–11); Mount Lubar is specified as the place where the ark came to rest (1QapGen 12:13, *Jub.* 7:1); Noah’s sacrifice is specifically linked to atonement for sin (1QapGen 10:13, *Jub.* 6:2); the general structure of Noah’s division of the earth among his sons and grandsons is remarkably similar (1QapGen 16–17, *Jub.* 8:11–9:15); and Abram and Sarai are said to have dwelled in Egypt for five years before Sarai was taken by the Pharaoh (1QapGen 19:23, *Jub.* 13:11). One could add to this list, but the examples in it should suffice to demonstrate the striking overlap in parabiblical traditions shared by these two rewritings of Genesis. Still, any stress placed on these connections must be counterbalanced by the many, significant ways in which these two texts differ, such as the ways in which pseudopigraphraphy is employed, the preferred forms of divine revelation, and the specific events treated. After reading *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* it is easy to see why scholars are curious about their specific relationship and its ramifications for understanding each writing more thoroughly. For overviews of the relationship, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1* (1Q20: A Commentary) (3d rev. ed.; BibOr 18/B; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004), 20–23; D. A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 13–17; and J. L. Kugel, “Which is Older, Jubilees or the Genesis Apocryphon? An Exegetical Approach,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)* (ed. A. Roitman, L. H. Schiffman, and S. L. [Berrin] Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).
Judaism; this, in turn, provides us with a better understanding of an era so formative for Judaism and Christianity in the opening centuries of the Common Era. Although the payoffs for answering questions about literary relationships are primarily historical and sociological, it should be added that this sort of work tends to produce numerous tangential insights regarding the language, exegetical techniques, theological outlook, and literary character of individual works. To every one of these areas, and many more, James VanderKam has made lasting, significant contributions; moreover, he has worked on both the Genesis Apocryphon and, especially, Jubilees. It is with the greatest pleasure and appreciation that I dedicate this essay to my esteemed teacher and friend.

Three types of relationship have been defended by those working on the Genesis Apocryphon and/or Jubilees. The first posits that Jubilees depends directly on, and is therefore later than, the Genesis Apocryphon. This view was espoused early on by the original editors of the Apocryphon, N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, and followed by P. Kahle, G. Vermes, B. Z. Wacholder, and P. Grelot. In more recent times it has again been defended by C. Werman and E. Eshel. In skeptical reaction and opposition to this position, a second group found the opposite arrangement to be more plausible: the author of the Genesis Apocryphon borrowed directly from Jubilees. Included in this camp are H. del Medico, G. Lambert, J. Fitzmyer, L. Hartman, K. Beyer, G. Nickelsburg, C. Evans, D. Falk, S. White Crawford, and most recently J. Kugel. A third contingent—including F. García Martínez,
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