

The reception of Jubilees in Greek *catena* manuscripts of Genesis

Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha

2022, Vol. 31 (4) 264–286

© The Author(s) 2022



Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/09518207211059474

journals.sagepub.com/home/jsp

Jeremiah Coogan 
University of Oxford, UK

Abstract

Several Greek *catena* manuscripts preserve material from Jubilees, offering valuable witness to the largely lost Greek version of the book. Yet how did material from this Second Temple composition become part of a late ancient Christian anthology? This article interrogates the transmission of Jubilees material in *catena* manuscripts of Genesis. Rather than offering direct witness to Greek manuscripts of Jubilees, this material had already been appropriated and restructured before the compilers of *catena* manuscripts collected and reorganized it around the textual frame of Greek Genesis. Two conduits account for the availability of this material: the use of Jubilees among late ancient chronographers and a widespread genealogical tradition, derived from Jubilees, that names the wives of biblical patriarchs. In late antiquity, the Book of Jubilees often circulated not as a unified composition but as individual units which were assimilated into other structuring frameworks, whether the schemata of chronographers or the (margins of) the Greek Bible itself. The late ancient reception of Jubilees thus foreshadows the atomism of modern text-critical appropriations. The conclusions of this article invite similar exploration for other Second Temple texts.

Keywords

catena, chronography, Epiphanius, Genesis, Jubilees, Second Temple

Introduction

Late ancient and medieval exegetes often engaged in biblical scholarship by creating *catena* commentaries (*catenae*), “chains” of extracts structured around a continuous biblical text.¹ A *catena* weaves together material from diverse sources to offer a new commentary, both reflecting the insights of its creators and invoking the authority of

1. While the Latin term *catena* corresponds to the *σειρά* of later Byzantine usage, the more typical expression in late antiquity is the expression *ἐκλογαὶ διαφόρων ἐρμηνευτῶν* (cf. William R. S. Lamb, “Conservation and Conversation: New Testament Catenae in Byzantium,” in *The New Testament in Byzantium*, ed. Derek Krueger and Robert S. Nelson [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016], 277–300 at 277).

Corresponding author:

Jeremiah Coogan, University of Oxford, Faculty of Theology and Religion, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK.

Email: jeremiah.coogan@theology.ox.ac.uk

previous interpreters.² *Catena* were reference texts of choice for many readers from late antiquity onward. As anthologies, they preserve a wealth of earlier material, much of it otherwise unattested.³ The study of *catena* is still beginning, and the composition and use of many *catenae* remain insufficiently understood. Although scholars quarry *catena* manuscripts for lost extracts of earlier works, they often fail to consider how material entered these *catenae* or how it might have been changed by those who transmitted it.⁴ Recent scholarship has likewise neglected *catenae* as evidence of the ongoing use and reconfiguration of both the varied texts which they contain and the biblical texts which they surround.⁵

As a case study for the composition of *catenae* and their reception of earlier texts, this article analyzes the use and reuse of material from the Second Temple work Jubilees in Greek *catena* manuscripts of Genesis. Citations of Jubilees attest a largely lost Greek version of the book. Yet how did material from this Second Temple work become part of late ancient Christian anthologies? The reception of Jubilees in *catena* manuscripts illuminates both the construction of *catenae* and the interwoven reading of Genesis and Jubilees in late antiquity.⁶

2. Despite the anthological technique, one should not underestimate the artistry involved. On the artistry of *catena* manuscripts, see Lamb, "Conservation and Conversation," 294–99 (which summarizes the often-negative view of *catena* in the secondary literature of the twentieth century), as well as the discussion of Procopius of Gaza in Marc Hirshman, "The Greek Fathers and the Aggada on Ecclesiastes: Formats of Exegesis in Late Antiquity," *HUCA* 59 (1988): 137–65.
3. On *catena* as a way of organizing knowledge, see Robert Devreesse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," *DB* 1 (1928): 1084–1233; Gilles Dorival, *Les chaînes exégétiques grecques sur les Psaumes: Contribution à l'étude d'une forme littéraire* (DB 43–46; 4 vols.; Leuven: Peeters, 1986–95), esp. 1: 1–98; Hirshman, "Greek Fathers"; Robert Bas ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress: The Use of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 19–25; William R. S. Lamb, *The Catena in Marcum: A Byzantine Anthology of Early Commentary on Mark* (TENTS 6; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 3–110; Ekkehard Mühlenberg, "Catena. II. Christianity," *EBR* 4 (2012): 1061–64; Gilles Dorival, "Biblical Catenae: Between Philology and History," in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton (TS 13; Piscataway: Gorgias, 2016), 65–81; William R. S. Lamb, "Catenae and the Art of Memory," in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton (TS 13; Piscataway: Gorgias, 2016), 83–98; Lamb, "Conservation and Conversation."
4. As Lamb notes, this approach "has led scholars to expend an enormous amount of energy identifying the catenist's sources and reconstructing a number of 'lost' commentaries without paying too much attention to the catenae themselves" ("Conservation and Conversation," 278, cf. 294–99). On the parallel problem in classical scholia, see René Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 4; Fausto Montana, "The Making of Greek Scholiastic Corpora," in *From Scholars to Scholia: Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, ed. Franco Montanari and Lara Pagani (Trends in Classics Supplements 9; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 105–61 at 106.
5. *Catena* manuscripts are thus one facet of what Hindy Najman describes as the "vitality" of scriptural texts; cf. Najman, "The Vitality of Scripture Within and Beyond the 'Canon,'" *JSJ* 43 (2012): 497–518.
6. For early Christian uses of Jubilees, the most comprehensive collection of sources is Hermann Rösner, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Reisenland],

Greek *Catena* manuscripts of Genesis and the Book of Jubilees

As “open” texts, Greek *catenae* continued to evolve throughout late antiquity and the Middle Ages.⁷ While names may be attached to individual editions and recensions, *catenae* vary at every stage of transmission.⁸ Differences between the manuscripts disrupt simplistic claims about a single *catena*, even for individual biblical books. Every *catena* manuscript is a unique work.⁹

In this article, I analyze material from *catena* manuscripts of Genesis as collected by Françoise Petit.¹⁰ Petit’s edition represents a corpus of exegetical material that might have

1874), esp. 251–382, “Neunter Abschnitt: Ältere Bezeugungen des Jubiläenbuchs und seines Inhaltes.” See further A.-M. Denis, “Liber Jubilaeorum” in *Fragmenta pseudigraphorum graeca* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 70–102 and the critical review of J. T. Milik, “Recherches sur la version grecque du Livre des Jubilés,” *RB* 78 (1971): 545–57, as well as the citations collected in R. H. Charles, ed., *Maṣḥafa Kufāsē, or, the Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees, Otherwise Known Among the Greeks as Hē Leptē Genesis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895); James C. VanderKam, ed., *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (CSCO 510–11; ScrAeth 87–88; 2 vols.; Peeters: Louvain, 1989), and now in James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; 2 vols.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2018).

7. For this concept, see Bernard Cerquiglini, *Éloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris: Seuil, 1989). On *catena* as an ‘open’ form, see Lamb, “Conservation and Conversation,” esp. 279–80.
8. As stated by Lamb, “the manuscript tradition is often varied and unpredictable” (“Conservation and Conversation,” 277).
9. For similar arguments about the scholia of classical Greek authors, see Montana, “The Making of Greek Scholiastic Corpora”; with respect to rabbinic literature, see Peter Schäfer, “Research into Rabbinic Literature: An Attempt to Define the *Status Quaestionis*,” *JJS* 37 (1986): 139–52 and Israel Ta-Shma, “The ‘Open’ Book in Medieval Hebrew Literature: The Problem of Authorized Editions,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 75 (1993): 17–24.
10. Françoise Petit, ed., *La Chaîne sur la Genèse: Édition intégrale. 1: Chapitres 1 à 3* (Leuven: Peeters, 1991); *La Chaîne sur la Genèse: Édition intégrale. 2: Chapitres 4 à 11* (Leuven: Peeters, 1993); *La Chaîne sur la Genèse: Édition intégrale. 3: Chapitres 12 à 28* (Leuven: Peeters, 1995); *La Chaîne sur la Genèse: Édition intégrale. 4: Chapitres 29 à 50* (Leuven: Peeters, 1996); Françoise Petit and Lucas Van Rompay, *La Chaîne sur l’Exode. 1: Fragments de Sévère d’Antioche* (Leuven: Peeters, 1999); Françoise Petit, *La Chaîne sur l’Exode: Édition intégrale. 2: Collectio Coisliniana. 3, Fonds caténique ancien. (Exode 1, 1-15, 21)* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000); *La Chaîne sur l’Exode: Édition intégrale. 4: Fonds caténique ancien. (Exode 15, 22-40, 32)* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001). Cf. her methodological essays: Françoise Petit, “Les ‘chaînes’ exégétiques grecques sur la Genèse et l’Exode: programme d’exploration et d’édition,” *TU* 115 (1975): 46–50; “L’édition des chaînes exégétiques grecques sur la Genèse et l’Exode,” *Mus* 91 (1978): 189–94; Françoise Petit, “La chaîne grecque sur la Genèse, miroir de l’exégèse ancienne,” in *Stimuli: Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, ed. Georg Schöllgen and Clemens Scholten (Munich: Aschendorff, 1996), 243–53, and especially the introduction to the first volume (*Chaîne sur la Genèse* 1: 13–37). Petit’s project “is an ‘édition intégrale’ of the ‘primitive *catena*’ underlying the tradition” found in several extant manuscripts and recensions. It thus “represents a movement away from manuscript to text, from artefact to construct” (so Paul Parvis in his review of Petit’s first volume, *JTS* 48 [1997]: 284–86 at 284).

been accessible to a Christian reader in the mid-fifth century CE, likely in Palestine.¹¹ This editorial approach omits a significant amount of material that appears in later *catena* manuscripts of Genesis and Exodus. Although these inclusions and omissions are contestable, Petit's edition contains most of the Second Temple material occurring in *catenae* manuscripts of Genesis and Exodus.¹² These two features—an approximate (although reconstructed) context and a wealth of Second Temple material—render Petit's edition suitable for this project.

Greek *catena* manuscripts included material not only from Christian exegetes, but also from various Second Temple Jewish compositions. One of these Second Temple texts is the Book of Jubilees, an anonymous work composed in Hebrew in the second century BCE. Jubilees corresponds in scope to much of Genesis and part of Exodus (chapters 1–12), filling gaps and adding details. The author reframes material from these familiar narratives as a second-person address to Moses, spoken by the Angel of the Presence on Mount Sinai. A distinctive feature of Jubilees is its rigorous and theologized chronological framework, which organizes the narrated events in years from the creation of the world (*anno mundi*), counted in seven-year weeks and forty-nine-year jubilees (hence the commonly used name of the book). This chronological structure made Jubilees particularly interesting for later chronographers.¹³

While Jubilees was written in Hebrew, a largely lost translation into Greek underlies later Armenian, Latin, Syriac, and Ethiopic (Ge'ez) sources as well as the Greek *catena* materials that are the focus of this article.¹⁴ Orienting discussion toward the receptions of this Greek text invites fruitful comparison with other texts transmitted in Greek, regardless of the language in which they were first composed.

All identifiable Jubilees material in Petit's edition is attached to passages from Genesis. The absence of material for Exodus may result from the greater narrative

11. Petit, *Chaîne sur la Genèse*, 1: xv.

12. On *catena* reception of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (with occasional reference to Jubilees), see Marinus de Jonge, "Sidelights on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs from the Greek Catena on Genesis," in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*, ed. Esther Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 303–15.

13. For recent surveys of scholarship on Jubilees, see James C. VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees," *CBR* 6 (2008): 405–31; Hindy Najman and Eibert Tigchelaar, "Unity After Fragmentation," *RevQ* 26 (2014): 495–500; VanderKam, *Commentary*.

14. On the Latin version of Jubilees, see James C. VanderKam, "The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 3–21; Benjamin Gleede, *Parabiblica Latina: Studien zu den griechisch-lateinischen Übersetzungen parabiblicher Literatur unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der apostolischen Väter* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 36–38. On Syriac citations of Jubilees, see VanderKam, "Manuscript Tradition," 10–12, who argues that the Syriac citations reflect a Greek translation; *pace* Eugène Tisserant, "Fragments syriaques du Livre des Jubilés," *RB* 30 [1921]: 55–86; 206–32, who suggests that the Syriac citations reflect direct translation from Hebrew. Cf. William Lowndes Lipscomb, "A Tradition from the Book of Jubilees in Armenian," *JNES* 29 (1978): 149–63 at 153, who argues that the Syriac depends on Greek.

pace in that portion of Jubilees (only chapters 1 and 46–50 of Jubilees re-tell events that correspond to the Book of Exodus) and from its tendency to avoid recounting to Moses additional details about his own life. In short, the creators of *catena* manuscripts had less Jubilees material to work with for Exodus. The Jubilees material in Genesis is attached to a relatively small number of passages, and vanishes entirely for roughly the middle half of the book (Gen 11:28–37:29). These observations suggest that this Jubilees material may have been already fragmentary or only available indirectly, a point to which we will return.

Petit identifies thirteen units (nos. 551, 585, 590, 833, 839, 857, 861, 867, 1804, 1829, 1850, 2268, 2270) as potential examples of Jubilees material in the *catenae*. Two (nos. 839, 1829) are attributed to a work called ἡ διαθήκη, only one of which (no. 839) exhibits any identifiable relationship with Jubilees.¹⁵ For two other units (nos. 857, 1850), any connection with Jubilees is so tenuous as to exclude them from further discussion. This article focuses on the remaining ten instances (nos. 551, 585, 590, 833, 861, 839, 867, 1804, 2268, 2270), which reflect material known from other versions of Jubilees.

Complex receptions

In this article, I focus on a methodological problem: the evidence that *catena* manuscripts can and cannot offer for earlier works, including Second Temple compositions like Jubilees. Numerous scholars have quarried *catena* manuscripts for fragments of Jubilees, hoping that these manuscripts might offer older readings than those preserved in the extant Latin or Ethiopic versions.¹⁶ Yet such text-critical appropriation underestimates the extent to which Jubilees material in *catena* manuscripts has been reworked. Other questions must come first. How did material from Jubilees arrive in *catena* manuscripts of Genesis? And what is this material doing there? This investigation must precede attempts to quarry *catena* manuscripts for the study of Jubilees, text-critical or otherwise. Such questions are relevant not only for Jubilees, but also for the many other Second Temple and early Christian texts which are excerpted and anthologized in *catena* manuscripts.

In the first section of this article, I discuss chronography as one significant avenue of transmission for material derived from Jubilees. Both thematically and in the shared use of individual traditions, most Jubilees material in *catena* manuscripts parallels the long afterlife of Jubilees in Christian chronography. In the second section, I discuss a

-
15. Both VanderKam, “Manuscript Tradition,” 17, and ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian in Greek Dress*, 241 n. 180, argue that the work titled ἡ διαθήκη and known primarily from Didymus the Blind, should not be equated with the Ethiopic Jubilees. Interpretations attributed to this work by Didymus differ from known versions of Jubilees. For example, Didymus’s source identifies the victims of Lamech’s murder (Gen 4:23) as Cain and a son of Cain (*Comm. in Gen.* 142.27–143.4 [Pierre Nautin and Louis Doutreleau, eds., *Didyme: Sur la Genèse* (SC 233–34; 2 vols.; Paris: Cerf, 1976), 233: 328]).
 16. VanderKam, “Manuscript Tradition”; VanderKam, “Another Citation of Greek Jubilees,” in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense*, ed. A. Piquer Otero and P. Torrijano Morales (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 377–92. Further Jubilees material may exist in other *catena* manuscripts that have not been edited.

widespread tradition which lists the wives of biblical patriarchs. Here, genealogical lists provide a more elegant solution for what appears in *catena* manuscripts. In the third section, I consider a brief excerpt about Enoch which could fit in either category. This example demonstrates the uncertainty that remains given the flexible nature of *catenae*.

I am not the first to discuss chronographic and genealogical receptions of Jubilees. Nonetheless, scholars reconstructing the text of Jubilees using *catena* material have not yet grappled with the full implications of these complex receptions. Each of these examples disrupts the idea that the creators of Genesis *catenae* simply copied from manuscripts of Jubilees and that, as a result, *catena* manuscripts provide straightforward textual witness to a Greek Jubilees. Instead, Jubilees material arrived in *catena* manuscripts by more circuitous routes. This evidence demands methodological caution when using material from *catena* manuscripts to reconstruct lost texts from earlier periods, including an “original” Greek text of Jubilees.

These examples not only reveal the methodological problems with quarrying *catena* manuscripts for earlier texts but also demonstrate how “Jubilees” was used creatively by later scholars. They compel us to consider what one could do with material from “Jubilees” and how this material might function for readers even when it had a form and content that were quite different from the Ethiopic text that present-day scholars often use to study a Second Temple Book of Jubilees.

Chronography

I begin with the chronographic use of Jubilees material. Given Jubilees’ calendrical obsessions, it is not surprising that the work proved useful for Christian authors engaged in projects of universal history. Indeed, as William Adler has observed, most late ancient and Byzantine authors using Jubilees do so via this intellectual milieu.¹⁷ Chronographic

17. For surveys of late ancient and Byzantine Christian chronography, see Heinrich Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898), 249–97; William Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (DOS 26; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989); William Adler and Paul Tuffin, eds., *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), xxx–xxxv; William Adler, “Sextus Julius Africanus and the Roman Near East in the Third Century,” *JTS* 55 (2004): 520–50; Martin Wallraff, ed., *Julius Africanus und die Christliche Weltchronistik* (TUGAL 157; Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 2006); Richard W. Burgess, “Apologetic and Chronography: The Antecedents of Julius Africanus,” in *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, ed. Martin Wallraff (TU 157; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 17–42; Martin Wallraff et al., eds., *Iulius Africanus: Chronographiae. The Extant Fragments* (GCS N.S. 15; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007); William Adler, “The *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus and Its Jewish Antecedents,” *ZAC* 14 (2010): 496–524; Elizabeth Jeffreys, “Old Testament ‘History’ and the Byzantine Chronicle,” in *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, ed. Paul Magdalino and Robert S. Nelson (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2010), 153–74; Umberto Roberto, “From Hellenistic to Christian Universal History: Julius Africanus and the Atthidographers on the Origins of Athens,” *ZAC* 14 (2010): 525–39; Martin Wallraff, “The Beginnings of Christian Universal History: From Tatian to Julius Africanus,” *ZAC* 14 (2010): 540–55. Recent authors focused on ancient chronography

sources preserving parallel Jubilees material include the ninth-century Byzantine chronographer Georgios Synkellos,¹⁸ the eleventh-century historian Georgios Kedrenos,¹⁹ and the anonymous *Syriac Chronicle to 1234*.²⁰ Further sources employing Jubilees have been noted by Gelzer, Denis, Milik, VanderKam, and Adler.²¹ None of the three main chronographic sources depends directly on *catena* manuscripts of Genesis. They cite numerous passages from Jubilees which are not found in *catena* manuscripts and, on occasion, parallel citations differ significantly. For their part, the *catena* manuscripts contain material absent in extant chronographic sources. While Synkellos and his intellectual heirs sometimes confuse Josephus and Jubilees, this is not the case in *catena* manuscripts.²² Nonetheless, all of them employ some of the same material. What are the implications of this circumstance for our understanding of the *catena* material?

Common sources may underlie the use of Jubilees material in *catena* manuscripts and in chronographic sources. But those sources are not available to us, and I do not venture into the hazardous terrain of reconstruction.²³ Instead, I demonstrate the

devote little attention to Jubilees, perhaps because its peculiar chronological framework and its indifference to Greek chronography are at odds with the Christian chronographic tradition more broadly; as exceptions note Sebastian P. Brock, "Abraham and the Ravens: A Syriac Counterpart to *Jubilees* 11–12 and Its Implications," *JSJ* 9 (1978): 135–52; William Adler, "Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols: Jubilees' Traditions in Christian Chronography," *JQR* 77 (1986): 95–117; "*Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus," 508–14.

18. Synkellos began his work in 808 CE; it ended with his death *circa* 810 CE (Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, xxix–xxx). I have cited Synkellos from Alden A. Mosshammer, *Georgii Syncelli: Ecloga chronographica* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1984). Citations of Synkellos in Rönsch, *Jubiläen*; Charles, *Jubilees*; Denis, "Liber Jubilaeorum"; and VanderKam, *Jubilees* were based on Karl Wilhelm Dindorf, ed., *Syncelli Chronographiae* (Bonn: 1829) (*non vide*). Compare the list of Jubilees citations at Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, 578.
19. The sole edition remains that of Immanuel Bekker, *Georgius Cedrenus opera* (Bonn: Weber, 1838) (*non vide*), whose page and section numbers are used in the present article. The texts from Kedrenos (as edited by Bekker) are assembled in Rönsch, *Jubiläen*; Charles, *Jubilees*; Denis, "Liber Jubilaeorum"; and VanderKam, *Jubilees*. Milik, "Recherches sur la version grecque," 547, cf. 555, proposes using instead Paris, BNF ms. 1712, fols 18v and following (thirteenth century).
20. See I. B. Chabot, ed., *Anonymi auctoris. Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* (CSCO 81; Scriptores Syri 36; Louvain: Imprimerie orientaliste, 1920) (Syriac) and I. B. Chabot, ed., *Anonymi auctoris. Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* (CSCO 109; Scriptores Syri 56; Louvain: Imprimerie orientaliste, 1937). VanderKam, ed., *Book of Jubilees*, edits (vol. 1) and translates (vol. 2) the Syriac text. On this source, see Sebastian P. Brock, "Syriac Historical Writing: A Survey of the Main Sources," *ByzZ* 5 (1979): 1–30 at 17–18; VanderKam, "Manuscript Tradition," 11–12.
21. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus*, 2: 273–276; Denis, "Liber Jubilaeorum"; Milik, "Recherches sur la version grecque"; VanderKam, *Jubilees*; VanderKam, "Manuscript Tradition"; Adler, "*Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus," 508–14.
22. See Milik, "Recherches sur la version grecque," 55; Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, lii–lv.
23. Gelzer attributed Synkellos' use of Second Temple sources, including Jubilees, to the Alexandrian chronographic tradition associated with the fifth-century CE scholars Annianos and Panodoros; more recently Adler and Tuffin have demonstrated problems with this claim (Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus*, 2: 189; Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, xxxi and lxi–lxix).

significance of chronographic sources for the presence of Jubilees material in *catena* manuscripts of Genesis and for the evident changes that some of this material has undergone.²⁴ Jubilees had already been digested into Christian chronography before it was incorporated by the compilers of *catena* manuscripts. The two case studies to which I now turn are among the most widely discussed questions of first-millennium chronography.²⁵

Abraham and the Idols

A citation attached to Genesis 11:23 in several *catena* manuscripts illuminates how late ancient scholars could use “Jubilees.” As with several other units derived from Jubilees, the passage is anonymous in the manuscripts. Chronographic concerns dominate in the section, which describes Abraham’s burning of the idols in Ur:

(a) Ἀρράν ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῷ ἐμπυρισμῷ ᾧ ἐνεπύρισεν Ἀβραμ τὰ εἰδῶλα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν τοῦ ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτά.

(b) Ἦν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τότε ἑτῶν ξ' ὅτε τὰ εἰδῶλα ἐνεπύρισεν, ἅτινα οὐδὲ ἀριθμοῦνται εἰς ἔτη ζωῆς αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ μέχρι τότε ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ αὐτὸν εἶναι, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἰωβηλαίῳ.²⁶

(a) Arran died in the fire by which Abram burned the idols of his father, when he went in to rescue them.

(b) And Abraham was at that time, when he burned the idols, sixty years old; and these years are not counted in the years of his life because until that time he was in unbelief, just as it is written in Jubilees.²⁷

This material corresponds to Ethiopic Jubilees 12:12–15:

(12:12) ወበዓመት፡ ዘሰሳ፡ ዘሕይወተ፡ ኦብራም፡ ውኣቱ፡ ሰብዓ፡ ራብዕ፡ በዓመት፡ ራብዕ፡ ሎቱ፡ ተንገሥኦ፡ ኦብራም፡ በሌሊት፡ ወአውወ፡ ቤተ፡ ጣዖታት፡ ወአውወ፡ ኰሎ፡ በውስተ፡ ቤት፡ ወሰብኦ፡ አልቦ፡ ዘአሰመረ።

(12:13) ወተንገሥኦ፡ ሌሊተ፡ ወፈቀዱ፡ ያድጎኑ፡ አማልክቲሆሙ፡ አማክክለ፡ አሳት፡

(12:14) ወሰረረ፡ አራን፡ ከመ፡ ያድጎኖሙ፡ ወነደደ፡ አሳት፡ ላዕሌሁ፡ ወውዕ፡ በአሳት፡ ወሞተ፡ በኤኑር፡ ዘከላዴዎን፡ በቅድመ፡ ታራ፡ አቡሁ፡ ወቀበርዎ፡ በኤኑር፡ ዘከላዳዊያን።

(12:15) ወወፅኦ፡ ታራ፡ አምነ፡ ኡር፡ ዘከላዳቂያን፡ ውኣቱ፡ ወወሉዱ፡ ከመ፡ ይምጽኦ፡ ውስተ፡ ምድረ፡ ሊባኖስ፡ ወውስተ፡ ምድረ፡ ከናኦን፡ ወጎደረ፡ ውስተ፡ ካራን፡ ወጎደረ፡ ኦብራም፡ ምስለ፡ አቡሁ፡ ውስተ፡ ካራን፡ ክልኤ፡ ሰብዓ፡ ዓመታት።²⁸

24. Petit, Metzler, and Adler each note that chronographic sources (including occasional Jubilees material) are used by *catena* manuscripts of Genesis, but the present article is the first to develop the implications of this transmission for how scholars use *catenae* to reconstruct Jubilees. Cf. Karin Metzler, ed., *Prokop von Gaza. Der Genesiskommentar: Aus den "Eclogarum in libros historicos veteris testamenti epitome" übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015).

25. Adler, “Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols”; “*Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus,” 514–19. In the second essay, Adler focuses on the dating of the Exodus, discussed below in reference to a scholion at the end of Genesis (Petit no. 2270).

26. Petit edits the citation as no. 867 (*Chaîne sur la Genèse*, 2: 218). Both parts of the passage are preserved in manuscript M; only the part that I have labeled “(a)” appears in manuscript B.

27. All translations of Greek and Syriac texts are the work of the author, although I have consulted previous translations when available.

28. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 1: 73–74.

(12:15) And Terah went out with Abraham to go to the land of Canaan. But he changed his mind and settled in Haran, enthralled by idolatry until his death.³⁴

Unlike the other chronographic sources, the *catena* material uses Jubilees 12:12 to respond to a particular exegetical difficulty: Two narratives in Genesis seem to contradict one another. The problem is as follows.³⁵ If, as Gen 11:26 states, Abraham's father Terah was seventy years old when Abraham was born, and Terah died at the age of 205 years (as we find in Gen 11:32), then Abraham must have been 135 years old when his father died. But Gen 12:4 states that Abraham departed Haran at the age of seventy-five and that this was *after* the death of his father Terah. We thus have a sixty-year discrepancy.

The problem vexed Christian interpreters.³⁶ Perhaps this was especially because the chronology of Genesis contradicts Stephen's statement in Acts 7:4 that "after the death of his father, [God] had [Abraham] migrate from there [Haran] to this land."³⁷ The discrepancy was significant enough that it offered material for Jerome's *Hebrew Questions in the Book of Genesis*.³⁸ Chronographers also dealt with the problem. If Synkellos is correct, chronographers had grappled with the discrepancy as early as Sextus Julius Africanus (ca. 160–post 240 CE).³⁹ Synkellos and his successors in both Greek and Syriac proposed their own varied solutions.⁴⁰

-
34. Compare VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 2: 336; Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, 138–39. Just above, Synkellos (111.13–15, ed. Mosshammer) preserves a different version of the material, which he attributes to Josephus: Τῷ ἰδ' ἔτει αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀβραάμ ἐπιγινούς τὸν τῶν ὄλων θεὸν προσεκύνει, τὰ δὲ εἰδῶλα τοῦ πατρὸς συντρίψας κατέκαυσε σὺν τῷ οἴκῳ. συγκατεκαύθη δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ Ἀρρὰν ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἀβραάμ σβέσαι τὸ πῦρ σπουδάζων. "In his fourteenth year, Abraham recognized and worshiped the God of all. After he had destroyed his father's idols, he burned them along with their house. But Haran, Abraham's brother, was burned up with them as he sought to extinguish the fire" (cf. Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, 138).
35. See Petit, *Chaîne sur la Genèse*, 2: 218–19; ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian in Greek Dress*, 289–92. VanderKam observes the chronological difficulty, but suggests that "the passage may imply that the Greek Jubilees had a more expanded text at this point" ("Manuscript Tradition," 16).
36. See Adler, "Chronographiae of Julius Africanus," 504. In his earlier work on the subject, Adler was unaware of the *catena* material since Petit's edition had not yet been published (Adler, "Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols"; Adler, *Time Immemorial*, 188–93, 198–206, 217–23).
37. Acts 7:4 (NA28): κάκειθεν [Χαρρὰν] μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ [θεὸς] μετώκισεν αὐτὸν [Ἀβραάμ] εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην.
38. *Ad Gen 12:4. S. Hieronymi Presbyteri opera. Pars I: Opera exegetica. 1. Hebraicae quaestiones in libro Geneseos, Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum, Commentarioli in Psalmos, Commentarius in Ecclesiastes* (CCSL 72.1.1; Turnhout: Brepols, 1959), 15–16. Cf. Brock, "Abraham and the Ravens," 143–45; Adler, *Time Immemorial*, 188 n. 103. This chronological difficulty also occupied rabbinic readers (*Berešit Rabbah* 39.7–8, ed. Albeck; cf. Adler, *Time Immemorial*, 190 n. 110).
39. Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, 130–31, esp. 130 n. 4.
40. Synkellos (105.6–108.11, ed. Mosshammer); cf. Adler, "Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols"; Adler, *Time Immemorial*, 188–93, 198–206, 217–23; Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, 130–35, 139 n. 4. Adler argues that the solution of the Logothete chronographers can be traced to Julius Africanus. This is possible for *catena* material as well.

The appeal to Jubilees in the second part of no. 867 is another attempt to resolve this problem. A sixty-year period in Abraham's life must have seemed the obvious solution to a sixty-year discrepancy. By inserting just a few words—*ἄτινα οὐδὲ ἀριθμοῦνται εἰς ἔτη ζωῆς αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ μέχρι τότε ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ αὐτὸν εἶναι*—the exegetical problem was resolved. Conveniently, this comment was placed between the attribution to Jubilees and the material actually derived from Jubilees.⁴¹ Never mind that Jubilees itself is not aware of this chronographic difficulty—oddly, given its obsessive chronographic interests. Furthermore, Jubilees 11 asserts that from the age of fourteen onward, Abraham was not in unbelief. The *catena* material not only attributes to Jubilees a claim that the work does not make but, in so doing, even contradicts Jubilees' broader narrative.

While this form of the *catena* explicitly claims Jubilees (*γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἰωβηλαίῳ*) as support for the exegetical claim, other known forms of Jubilees support only one rather minor detail. This example shows the need for caution in quarrying material from *catena* manuscripts. Here we can compare the *catena* material with a more extensive Ethiopic text of Jubilees, a luxury often not available for other texts reconstructed from *catena* manuscripts. Nonetheless, the divergence warns us against assuming that *catena* manuscripts offer straightforward textual evidence.⁴²

This example also demonstrates how late ancient readers re-used material from Jubilees. The Genesis *catena* seems to derive from a source that had already repurposed Jubilees material. An exegetical addition, responding to a specific and vexing chronological problem, supplements and reinterprets the material from Jubilees. Although Jubilees has been filtered through a source with chronographic concerns, this need not have been a chronicle; it could have been an exegetical or antiquarian work with an interest in chronographic questions, like Jerome's *Hebrew Questions*. In any case, material from Jubilees was transmitted through an intermediate source. This leads to a broader point: These late ancient scholars supported historical and exegetical claims by appealing to "the Book of Jubilees." Yet this did not require textual accuracy or even, necessarily, a text of Jubilees at all. "Jubilees" in late antiquity could say something quite different from "Jubilees" as we are used to studying it.

Between Genesis and Exodus

On occasion, *catena* manuscripts of Genesis not only use Jubilees to advance specific claims but also reproduce extensive passages out of historical interest—in this, hewing closely to a standard paradigm of Christian chronography.⁴³ A noteworthy example is an extensive scholion placed (without an explicit attribution) at the conclusion of Genesis.⁴⁴ I cite the first part of this scholion—that is, the material from Jubilees—at length:⁴⁵

41. Since manuscript B includes only the first half, this creative misattribution is attested only in manuscript M.

42. Another example of this sort of misattribution might be found in the frequent conflation of Josephus and Jubilees in late ancient and Byzantine chronographic sources.

43. This practice of extensive citation goes back at least as far as Africanus and Eusebius, and is characteristic of the work of Synkellos, Kedrenos, and other Byzantine chronographers.

44. This is Petit's no. 2270, preserved only in what she terms manuscript L.

45. Most work on Jubilees in *catena* manuscripts has focused on this passage. See VanderKam, "Manuscript Tradition"; VanderKam, "Jubilees 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram," *DSD*

Ἐξώρπισεν Ἰωσήφ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ περὶ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐγίνωσκεν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἐπιτρέψωσιν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς γῆν Χαναάν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ, διότι Μαχμαρὸν βασιλεὺς Χαναάν ἐποίησε πόλεμον μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι. Καὶ ἐπεδίωξεν ὀπίσω τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἕως τῶν ὁρίων Αἰγύπτου, καὶ οὐκ ἤδυνήθη Μαχμαρὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, διότι ἀνέστη βασιλεὺς ἕτερος νέος ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν ὑπὲρ αὐτόν. καὶ ἐκλείσθησαν αἱ πύλαι Αἰγύπτου καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος καὶ ἐκπορευόμενος εἰς Αἴγυπτον. Καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ σορῶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ· καὶ ἐτελεύτησαν πάντες οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐξήνεγκαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰακώβ τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ πάντα, παρεκτὸς τῶν ὀστέων Ἰωσήφ, καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῶ τοῦ σπηλαίου τοῦ διπλοῦ ἐν Χεβρών ἐν τῷ ὄρει. Καὶ ἀπέστρεψαν πολλοὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ὀλίγοι περιελείφθησαν ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει Χεβρών. Καὶ περιελείφθη Ἄμβραμ ὁ πατὴρ Μωϋσέως μετ’ αὐτῶν. Καὶ ἐτροπώσατο βασιλεὺς Χαναάν βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἀπέκλεισε τὰς πύλας Αἰγύπτου ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου. Καὶ ἐλογίσατο λογιμοὺς πονηροὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ κακῶσαι αὐτούς. Ἐπανελθὼν δὲ Ἄμβραμ ἀπὸ γῆς Χαναάν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, γεννᾷ τὸν Μωϋσέα. Οὗτος ἦν ὁ καιρὸς θλίψεως ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ.⁴⁶

Joseph placed his brothers under oath concerning his bones, because he knew that the Egyptians would not permit [them] to carry him away into the land of Canaan in the day of his death, because Machmaron the king of Canaan made war with the king of Egypt and killed him there in the valley. And he pursued after the Egyptians as far as the borders of Egypt, but Machmaron was not able to enter Egypt, because another, new king arose over Egypt and he prevailed over him [Machmaron]. And the gates of Egypt were closed and there was no one who entered or exited Egypt. And Joseph died and they buried him in a coffin in Egypt. And all his brothers died after him. And the sons of Jacob carried all the bones of the sons of Israel out, except the bones of Joseph, and buried them in the field of the double cave [*sic*, cf. OG-Gen 50:13] in Hebron in the mountain. And many returned to Egypt, and a few remained with them in the mountain of Hebron. And Amram, the father of Moses, was left with them. And the king of Canaan put to flight the king of Egypt, and the king of Egypt shut the gates of Egypt. And he planned evil plans concerning the sons of Israel, to treat them badly. But when Amram returned from the land of Canaan to Egypt, he fathered Moses. This was the time of tribulation for the sons of Israel.⁴⁷

Here a text resembling Ethiopic Jubilees 46:6–12; 47:1 (cf. Gen 50:25–26) describes a war between Egypt and Canaan, occurring in the unwieldy gap between the end of Genesis and the beginning of Exodus.⁴⁸ The core problem for both Jubilees and the *catena* manuscript is the same. The texts of Genesis and Exodus read as if only a

17 (2010): 141–58. De Jonge, “Sidelights on the Testaments,” 312 n. 30, parenthetically notes the link to Tatian.

46. Petit, *Chaîne sur la Genèse*, 4: 453–55.

47. Compare the phrase-by-phrase comparative translations in VanderKam, “Another Citation.” VanderKam considers how the Greek text of no. 2270 contributes to an edition that depends on Ethiopic manuscripts. VanderKam does not discuss the Greek *catena* tradition at length or ask how the citation from Jubilees came to be combined with chronographic material resembling Tatian’s *Oratio ad Graecos*. VanderKam finds no major differences between the Greek and Ethiopic texts except the consistent omission of Jubilees’ characteristic dating formulae and the second-person address to Moses, both of which he suggests were changed because they would have confused the intended readers of a *catena* manuscript.

48. For this incident, see VanderKam, “Jubilees 46:6–47:1.”

generation or so has passed between Gen 50:26 and Ex 1:1. Other texts, however, assert that the period was 400 or 430 years (Gen 15:13; Ex 12:40–41). This Jubilees-derived bit of narrative gap-filling provided continuity, simultaneously explaining how the situation of Jacob's descendants could be so significantly altered and how the generational gap fit with this biblical chronology.

Yet this material from Jubilees occurs in a composite citation with another block of material, derived from the *Oratio ad Graecos* of the second-century intellectual Tatian (fl. ca. 170–180 CE).⁴⁹ This juxtaposition has gone undiscussed in literature on both Jubilees and the *Oratio ad Graecos*, and recent editions of Tatian overlook this passage.⁵⁰ Like Jubilees, Tatian discusses the relationship between the events of Genesis and Exodus. Unlike Jubilees, however, Tatian focuses on the chronological relationship between the events of the Exodus and other events of Greek antiquity, a widespread concern among ancient Christian chronographers.⁵¹ The two blocks of material may have entered the *catena* separately, since both naturally fit at the end of Genesis. But the manuscript does not offer textual or paratextual cues to distinguish between the two blocks of material.⁵² From the adapted citation of Jubilees, the *catena* manuscript simply proceeds into an extended and (likewise) adapted citation of *Oratio ad Graecos* 38–39. The lack of attribution or transition suggests that they may have entered the *catena* together. A chronographic source would account for all the data. Here the material that we recognize as “Jubilees” breaks free from that attribution, taking on a life of its own, unconstrained by either the title or the text of our familiar (Ethiopic) Jubilees, in order to shape ongoing encounters with biblical texts.

The two examples we have considered thus far both suggest that Jubilees material was filtered through sources with chronographic concerns, leading to various transformations.⁵³ Other units exhibiting prominent chronographic concerns include nos. 839 (the Tower of Babel), 1804 (Reuben and Bilhah),⁵⁴ and 2268 (Joseph's age for signifi-

49. On the Greek text in MS L, see Petit, *Chaîne sur la Genèse*, 4: 455–56.

50. Molly Whittaker, ed., *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1982]; Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Tatiani: Oratio ad Graecos* [PTS 43; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995]; Jörg Trelenberg, ed., *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos = Rede an die Griechen* [PTS 165; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012].

51. See especially the introduction to the Christian chronographic tradition in Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, xxx–xxxv; Adler, “*Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus,” 514–19.

52. This claim is based upon consultation of images for Russian National Library, MS Bibl. publ., gr. 124 (fol. 125r), which the library's staff generously provided. This thirteenth-century manuscript is also known as Rahlfs 628.

53. Compare Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Retelling Biblical Retellings: Epiphanius, the Pseudo-Clementines, and the Reception-History of *Jubilees*,” in *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, ed. Menahem Kister et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 304–21 at 313, who suggests that the details that Epiphanius knows from Jubilees might have been “already preselected for their value in enhancing the utilization of Scripture as scaffolding for universal history.”

54. No. 1804 (*ad* Gen 37:29–30) contains two parts. No. 1804a ascribes Reuben's intention to rescue Joseph as an attempt to redeem himself after his rape of Bilhah (cf. Gen 35:22).

cant events). In the light of this chronographic reception, the concentration of Jubilees material attached to the patriarchal narratives of Genesis makes sense: these offered the longest periods requiring chronological data and narrative material. Yet even more significant than this particular conduit of transmission is the broader observation that the Jubilees material from these *catena* manuscripts reflects diffuse patterns of reception and reconfiguration.

Genealogy

Chronography is not the only way in which material from Jubilees circulated in late antiquity.⁵⁵ Epiphanius of Salamis cites extended portions of Jubilees' creation narrative in his *Weights and Measures*, as well as briefer sections in his *Panarion*.⁵⁶ In Syriac, some material was absorbed into the *Cave of Treasures*.⁵⁷ A handful of midrashim also contain material resembling that in Jubilees.⁵⁸ Most significantly for the present discussion, lists of matriarchs were popular in late antiquity and appear in several *catena* manuscripts, although this Jubilees material is not attributed to an author or work by those manuscripts.⁵⁹

No. 1804b cites Jubilees 34:15–16, 18 to link the death of Dinah, the sale (and assumed death) of Joseph, and the death of Bilhah. Cf. de Jonge, "Sidelights on the Testaments," 310–11; VanderKam, "Manuscript Tradition," 16. The citation differs from Ethiopic Jubilees but is recognizably similar. This passage is not attested elsewhere in extant Hebrew, Latin, Greek, or Syriac sources. Both units are adjacent to the same set of two verses, although the Jubilees material (no. 1804b) relates to Gen 37:34–35 (see Petit, *Chaîne sur la Genèse*, 4: 182–83). Yet placing no. 1804b there would have separated it from no. 1804a with several intervening units (at least nos. 1805–06, perhaps also nos. 1807, 1808, or 1809). Since nos. 1804a and 1804b circulate together, it is likely that they entered the Genesis *catena* tradition together. It is possible, however, that this is a result of transmission and that an earlier *catena* manuscript linked the two because there was no intervening material.

55. Cf. Reed, "Retelling." Reed notes that Jubilees' reception was diffuse, and was sometimes received "as if simply the self-evident or traditional meaning of Genesis itself" (312).
56. On Epiphanius, see VanderKam, "Manuscript Tradition," 13–14; Reed, "Retelling"; Gleede, *Parabiblica Latina*, 37.
57. On the *Cave of Treasures*, see Albrecht Götze, *Die Schatzhöhle: Überlieferung und Quellen* (CSCO 4; Heidelberg: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1922); Alexander Toepel, *Die Adam- und Seth-Legenden im syrischen Buch der Schatzhöhle* (CSCO 681; Subsidia 119; Louvain: Peeters, 2006). The *Cave of Treasures* is structured around the chronographic framework known to us from Africanus in which Jesus' first coming occurs in *anno mundi* 5500 and the second coming will occur in *anno mundi* 6000, before a millennium-long period of peace (cf. Witold Witakowski, "The Idea of *Septimana Mundi* and the Millenarian Typology of Creation Week in Syriac Tradition," in *V Symposium Syriacum 1988*, ed. René Lavenant [Rome: Pontificum Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990], 93–109).
58. Abraham Epstein, "Le livre des Jubilés, Philon et le Midrash Tadsché," *REJ* 21 (1890): 80–97 and *REJ* 22 (1891): 1–25; Lowndes Lipscomb, "Jubilees in Armenian"; VanderKam, "Manuscript Tradition," 8–10.
59. VanderKam, "Manuscript Tradition," 10–11; Lowndes Lipscomb, "Jubilees in Armenian"; cf. Milik, "Recherches sur la version grecque," 551–53. For a comparison of the names in these sources, see Lowndes Lipscomb, "Jubilees in Armenian," 152 *et passim*.

This genealogical material is distributed across Genesis to provide information about the matriarch wherever the patriarch appears (Gen 4:17; 6:6–32; 10:24–25; 11:20–25). For clarity, I present them together. Further reasons motivating my act of editorial collecting will become clear shortly:

- (no. 551⁶⁰) Ἡ γυνὴ Κάϊν, Ἀσαούλ, ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.
- (no. 585⁶¹) Γυνὴ Σήθ, Ἀζούρα, ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Ἐνώς, Νωα, ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Καϊνᾶν, Μαωλιθ, ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ
 Γυνὴ Μαλεεήλ, Δινα, θυγάτηρ Βαραχιήλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Ἰάρεδ, Βαραχα, θυγάτηρ Ἄρουήλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Ἐνώχ, Ἐανί, θυγάτηρ Δανιήλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Μαθουσάλα, Ἐδνα, θυγάτηρ Ἐζριήλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Λάμεχ, Βεθενώς, θυγάτηρ Βαραχιήλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Νῶε, Ἐμμαζάρα, θυγάτηρ Βαραχιήλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
- (no. 833⁶²) Γυνὴ Καϊνᾶν, Μελχά, θυγάτηρ Μαδαΐ υἱοῦ Ἰάφεθ.
 Γυνὴ Σαλά, Μωχά, θυγάτηρ Χεεδέμ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Ἐβερ, Ἀζοδρά, θυγάτηρ Νεβρώδ.
 Γυνὴ Φαλέγ, Δόμρα, θυγάτηρ Σενναάρ.
- (no. 861⁶³) Γυνὴ Πραγῦ, Ὅρα, θυγάτηρ Οὔρ υἱοῦ Χέζα.
 Γυνὴ Σερούχ, Μελχά, θυγάτηρ Χαβέρ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
 Γυνὴ Ναχώρ, Ἰεσθά, θυγάτηρ Νεσθά, τοῦ Χαλδαίου.

Each note follows a similar pattern, for example, “the wife of Cain was Asaoul, his sister.” The content derives from Jubilees, although the formulaic pattern simplifies the corresponding passages. Despite changes in the names, the similarity is unarguable when compared with the Ethiopic texts or the similar lists of matriarchs discussed below.⁶⁴ This material may seem unrelated to chronography. It includes no dates and offers no solutions to exegetical problems. Yet, the chronographers employ an expansive definition of relevance.⁶⁵ For example, Synkellos records the name of Cain’s wife and Kedrenos mentions the wife of Terah.⁶⁶ Nonetheless, this is uncommon; almost all such material from the *catena* has no analogue in preserved chronographic sources.

60. Compare Jubilees 4:9.

61. Compare Jubilees 4:11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 27, 28, 33.

62. Compare Jubilees 8:5–7; 10:18.

63. Compare Jubilees 11:1, 7, 9.

64. While Petit notes similarities among the genealogical *catena* units (*Chaîne sur la Genèse*, 2: 57), no one has explored the connections between the *catena* and the Syriac and Armenian material.

65. Compare Adler, “*Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus,” 502.

66. Compare Jubilees 11:15 with Kedrenos 47.15–19 (VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 1: 267; 2: 335). A similar treatment of Terah occurs in the Syriac list cited below (cf. VanderKam, “Manuscript Tradition,” 11). Epiphanius (*Panarion* 39.6.1–4; cf. Jubilees 4:9, 11; cf. Petit nos. 551, 585) also names matriarchs and explicitly attributes the information to Jubilees (Karl Holl et al., eds., *Epiphanius* [Leipzig; Berlin: J.C. Hinrichs; de Gruyter, 1915–2006]; T. R. Williams, ed., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis* [NHS 35; NHMS 36; 2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1987]; VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 1: 262). On Epiphanius’ use of Jubilees, see Reed, “Retelling,” 314–15.

When we compare *catena* material with chronographic sources, we also observe a key distinction. For example, the ninth-century chronographer Synkellos reflects Jubilees 4:9 as follows:⁶⁷

Τῷ πε' ἔτει ἐγεννήθη αὐτοῖς θυγάτηρ, καὶ ὠνόμασαν αὐτὴν Ἀσουάμ. [...] τῷ ρλε' ἔτει ἔλαβεν ὁ Κάιν τὴν ἰδίαν ἀδελφὴν Ἀσαυνᾶν, οὐσαν ἐτῶν ν'. αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ἐτῶν ξε'.⁶⁸

In the eighty-fifth year, a daughter was born to them [Adam and Eve], and they named her Asouam. [...] In the one hundred thirty-fifth year, Cain married his own sister Asaunan (*sic*), who was fifty years old. He himself was sixty-five years old.⁶⁹

This roughly corresponds to Ethiopic Jubilees 4:9.

ወነሥሐ: ቃዮን: ለአዋን: እኅቱ: ሎቱ: ብእሲተ: ወወለደት: ሎቱ: ኤዮሃሃ: በፍጻሜ: ራብዕ: ኢዮቤልወ:: ወበአሐዱ: ሳመት: ዘሱባዔ: ቀዳሚ: ዘኃምስ: ኢዮቤልወ: ተሐንጸ: አብዖት: ውስተ: ምድር: ወሐነጸ: ቃዮን: ሀገረ: ወስመዖ: ስሣ: በስመ: ወልዱ: ኤዮሃ::⁷⁰

Cain married his sister Awan, and at the end of the fourth jubilee [AM 148–96] she gave birth to Enoch for him. In the first year of the first week of the fifth jubilee [AM 197] houses were built on the earth. Then Cain built a city and named it after his son Enoch.⁷¹

Now contrast again the abbreviated format of no. 551 in *catena* manuscripts:

Ἡ γυνὴ Καῖν, Ἀσαούλ, ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.

The other genealogical notes follow this same pattern. As I have noted, the material is dispersed in *catena* manuscripts so that each matriarch is named at the appropriate point.

67. Synkellos also includes the following (10.25–29, ed. Mosshammer): Τῷ χκε' ἔτει Καῖνᾶν ἐγεννήθη τῷ Ἐνώσ. οὗτος γενόμενος ἐτῶν ρο' ἐγέννησε τὸν Μαλελεήλ. Τῷ ψς' ἔτει ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Καῖνᾶν ἔλαβεν εἰς γυναῖκα τὴν Μαλέθ. Τῷ ψςε' ἔτει ἐγέννησε Καῖνᾶν τὸν Μαλελεήλ ὦν ἐτῶν ρο'. Μαλελεήλ γενόμενος ἐτῶν ρξε' ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰάρεδ. τῷ λξ' ἔτει τοῦ κόσμου. “In the six hundred twenty-fifth year, Kaïnan was born to Enosh. When Kaïnan was one hundred seventy years old, he fathered Maleleël. In the seven hundred ninetieth year after Adam, Kaïnan married Maleth. [Cf. Jubilees 4:15.] In the seven hundred ninety-fifth year, when he was one hundred seventy years old, Kaïnan fathered Maleleël. When he was one hundred sixty-five years old, Maleleël fathered Jared, in *anno mundi* nine hundred sixty” (cf. Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, 11).

68. Synkellos 8.14, 23–24 (ed. Mosshammer); VanderKam (*Jubilees*, 1: 262) resolves the numbers into words (ἐκατοστῶ τριακοστῶ πέμπτῳ; ἐξήκοντα πέντε), but otherwise prints the same text. For a different text, see MS Paris 854, fol. 72r, 14–18 as cited by Milik, “Recherches sur la version grecque,” 551. For the wife of Seth, see also Synkellos 9.20; 10.3–4 (ed. Mosshammer; cf. Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, 13–14). The ages in Synkellos do not depend on Jubilees.

69. Compare VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 2: 331; Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography*, 12.

70. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 1: 21.

71. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 2: 22–23, with notes. The numbers in brackets are years of the world (*anno mundi*), as calculated by VanderKam.

This genealogical list does not occur alongside other material from Jubilees or even accompanying other material related to the Book of Genesis. Rather, it appears in a quite miscellaneous eighth-century manuscript, in a section titled “Words and Riddles for Students for Fun.” A rubricated heading identifies the list as “the names of the wives of the patriarchs according to the book which is called Jubilees among the Hebrews” (ܠܫܡܘܬ ܩܝܘܡܘܬ ܗܘܢܢ ܕܡܪܝܩܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܩܘܒܘܠܐ ܕܩܘܒܘܠܐ ܕܩܘܒܘܠܐ ܕܩܘܒܘܠܐ ܕܩܘܒܘܠܐ ܕܩܘܒܘܠܐ). This Syriac list is not the conduit by which this genealogical material entered Greek *catena* manuscripts of Genesis. It does, however, illuminate the contexts in which such material from Jubilees might circulate. A similar Armenian list, preserved in a fifteenth-century manuscript, names the patriarchs from Adam to Jacob with their wives.⁷⁹

Given the organizing principle of *catena* manuscripts, in which exegetical supplement is organized around the frame of the biblical text, these genealogical data are redistributed according to the sequence of Genesis. If one collects the material as above, however, the *catena* list closely corresponds to the format of the Syriac and Armenian lists. Such a list also offers a plausible source for a second major block of Jubilees material in the Genesis *catena*. Even so, it remains uncertain whether a Greek list of matriarchs circulated independently or as part of a chronographic work.⁸⁰ For the first possibility, we have comparative evidence in Syriac and Armenian manuscripts. Given the penchant for lists evident in so many chronographic sources, the second possibility is equally plausible. In either case, the evidence suggests that the Jubilees material reached the *catena* tradition through an intermediate step.

Just as in the case of Abraham and the idols, so also here in these lists we find that the “Jubilees” available to late ancient scholars could be rather different from what we might expect based on either the Ethiopic Jubilees or the fragmentary manuscripts from the Judean Desert. This again impels us to caution in using such later receptions to reconstruct an “original” Greek text of Jubilees. Moreover, we observe that material which once circulated as part of something called “Jubilees” could break free of that bibliographic attribution, as in the case of the genealogical material in *catena* manuscripts. Here again, *catena* manuscripts offer the reader something that is not-quite-Jubilees.

Blurring the categories: Enoch

A brief note about the antediluvian patriarch Enoch (no. 590, *ad* Gen 5:21–24) initially appears incongruous with either chronography or lists of matriarchs. The *catena* reads,

79. See Lowndes Lipscomb, “*Jubilees* in Armenian.” Lowndes Lipscomb did not have Petit’s edition, although he consulted one of Petit’s manuscripts (B = Basel, Bibliothèque universitaire, MS A.N. III.13 = Rahlfs 135), which contains much of the material. The *Cave of Treasures* reflects a number of these name traditions, as Lowndes Lipscomb notes. The list also mentions the four women who appear in the genealogy of Matthew 1 (Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba).

80. This is also the conclusion of Lowndes Lipscomb, “*Jubilees* in Armenian,” 153–55.

elegant solution for its presence.⁸⁶ If so, it might have been inserted in that list as follows, within the material now attached to Gen 5:6–32 as no. 585:

[...] Γυνή Ἐνώχ, Ἐανί, θυγάτηρ Δανιήλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ. <Ἐνώχ πρῶτος ἔμαθε γράμματα, καὶ ἔγραψε τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὰς τροπὰς καὶ τοὺς μῆνας.> Γυνή Μαθουσάλα, Ἐδνα, θυγάτηρ Ἐζριήλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ. [...]

[...] The wife of Enoch [was] Eani, the daughter of his uncle Daniel. <Enoch was the first person who learned letters, and he wrote the signs of the heaven and the seasons and the months.> The wife of Methuselah [was] Edna, the daughter of his uncle Ezriel. [...]

Just as the Syriac list attaches an additional description of Peleg (derived from Jubilees 10:21) between genealogical data derived from Jubilees 10:18 and 11:1, so also a description of Enoch from Jubilees 4:17 could have been placed in a list between genealogical data from Jubilees 4:20 (about Enoch's marriage to Edna) and Jubilees 4:27 (about Methuselah's marriage to Edna).⁸⁷ A subsequent scholar distributed the genealogical material across Genesis. As a result, the brief biographical note about Enoch is now attached to Gen 5:21–24, even though it might once have appeared with no. 585. Genealogical traditions derived from Jubilees thus provide a plausible explanation for the inclusion of this puzzling unit about Enoch. This observation lends further weight to the idea that the genealogical material in *catena* manuscripts derives from a formulaic list containing Jubilees material, and not just an exegetical source that repeats individual names and narrative elements.

Yet, this is not the only possibility. A conventional chronographic source also offers a plausible intermediate source for the material about Enoch. Parallel traditions appear in both Kedrenos and the anonymous *Syriac Chronicle*.⁸⁸ Compare Ethiopic Jubilees 4:17 with the two chronographers and the *catena*:

Ethiopic Jubilees:

ውእቱ፡ ቀዳሚ፡ ተምህረ፡ መጽሐፈ፡ ወትምህርተ፡ ወጥበበ፡ እምእጳለ፡ እወሕያው፡ እመሕያው፡ እምእለ፡ ተወልዱ፡ ዲበ፡ምድር፡ ወዘጸሐፈ፡ ተአምረ፡ ሰማይ፡ በከመ፡ ሥርዓተ፡ አውራጊሆሙ፡ ውስተ፡ መጽሐፍ፡ ከመ፡ ያለምዳ፡ እጳለ፡ እመሕያው፡ ጊዜ፡ ዓመታት፡ በከመ፡ ሥርዓተ-ጊሆሙ፡ ለለ፡ ወር-ኖሙ።⁸⁹

He was the first of humans who were born on the earth who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky in accord with the

86. This possibility is noted by Petit, who suggests that nos. 551, 585, and 590 originate from the same source (*Chaîne sur la Genèse*, 2: 60).

87. Petit's numbers can be misleading. The material she groups as no. 585 is spread either in the margins or the main *catena* text from Gen 5:6–32. Other material is interwoven with it at whatever point is appropriate for their relationship to the biblical text. While the material on matriarchs forms a recognizable unit in its content, its physical arrangement on the manuscript page does not preserve this unity. This is part of the challenge of reconstructing earlier texts from *catenae* manuscripts. As we saw above, interwoven material can make "Jubilees" say the opposite of what we might expect.

88. Nothing relevant is preserved in Synkellos.

89. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 1: 24–25.

of this material (1) the use of (material from) Jubilees by late ancient chronographers and (2) a widespread genealogical list tradition that names matriarchs. These two conduits may have intersected; a brief comment on Enoch demonstrates that some material could be explained by either. All Jubilees material in the *catena* fits with at least one possibility or the other.

These intermediate receptions shape the Jubilees material in *catena* manuscripts and have wider implications for the receptions of Jubilees and other Second Temple texts in late antiquity.⁹⁵ Citations of “Jubilees” do not necessarily reflect the familiar (that is, medieval Ethiopic) shape of the text. They can even be used to justify statements that disagree with that “Book of Jubilees.” Furthermore, familiar “Jubilees” material sometimes circulated without attribution. Considering this complex history of transmission and reappropriation is a prerequisite for using *catena* material for larger arguments or textual reconstructions.

The atomistic text-critical “quarrying” of Jubilees material does not adequately account for these varied contexts of reception. Material in *catena* manuscripts passed through intermediate stages of transmission and was shaped at every stage to serve particular ends. Various smaller blocks of material were reconfigured and assimilated into other governing frameworks, whether the schemata of chronographers (such as Synkellos and Kedrenos) or the (margins of) the Greek Bible itself.⁹⁶ In paradoxical similarity to the atomism of modern quarrying, we discover that, even in late antiquity, Jubilees—or perhaps better, material *from* Jubilees—often functioned less as a unified composition than as a plethora of discrete units. In this sense, late ancient scholarly receptions of Jubilees foreshadow the modern text-critical project, in which scholars reconfigure and assimilate textual “witnesses” of various dates and origins into the controlling framework of the critical edition. Projects of scholarly *recyclage* are inescapable. Strategies for organizing knowledge not only transformed “the Book of Jubilees” in late antiquity, but they continue to do so even still.

Further research on the composition of *catenae* remains a *desideratum*. The processes by which late ancient scholars created and adapted *catenae* could be explored further even from the data discussed in the present article. Yet nothing guarantees that the same conclusions would hold true for the reception of another text. Other *catenae* might likewise exhibit their own tendencies. Scholars must continue to examine the varied ways in which material was collected, adapted, and interwoven to form *catenae*—and attend to the larger cultures of reading and scholarship that these practices reflect.⁹⁷

95. Recent studies have traced, at greater length, complex histories of reception for Enochic texts (Reed and Reeves, *Enoch*) and for the text known as 2 Baruch (Liv Ingeborg Lied, *Invisible Manuscripts: Textual Scholarship and the Survival of 2 Baruch* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021]).

96. For other examples, see Adler, “Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols”; Adler, “*Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus”; Reed, “Retelling,” 313.

97. While Dorival, *Chânes exégétiques*, explores these questions richly for the Psalms, different *catenae* may reflect different approaches.

Author's note

Earlier versions of this article were presented at the 2017 Midwest Regional Meeting of SBL and in the Pseudepigrapha Program Unit at the 2017 SBL Annual Meeting.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Warren Campbell, John Fitzgerald, Matthias Henze, Liv Ingeborg Lied, David Lincicum, Matthew Monger, Hindy Najman, Tzvi Novick, James VanderKam, and several anonymous peer reviewers for generous feedback on earlier stages of this project. I thank Logan Williams for his expert assistance in correcting the manuscript.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This project has received funding from the European Commission's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement no. 891569, "Expanding the Gospel according to Matthew: Continuity and Change in Early Gospel Literature."

ORCID iD

Jeremiah Coogan  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6426-1478>

Author biography

Jeremiah Coogan is a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellow in Theology and Religion at the University of Oxford.