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

Jeremiah Coogan
*The Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University, jcoogan@scu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/jst](https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/jst)

Part of the Religion Commons

**Recommended Citation**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) which permits any use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access page (https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/open-access-at-sage).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jesuit School of Theology by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact rscroggin@scu.edu.
The reception of Jubilees in Greek catena manuscripts of Genesis

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.
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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

previous interpreters.\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Catena}e 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.\textsuperscript{3} The study of \textit{catena} is still beginning, and the composition and use of many \textit{catena}e remain insufficiently understood. Although scholars quarry \textit{catena} manuscripts for lost extracts of earlier works, they often fail to consider how material entered these \textit{catena}e or how it might have been changed by those who transmitted it.\textsuperscript{4} Recent scholarship has likewise neglected \textit{catena}e as evidence of the ongoing use and reconfiguration of both the varied texts which they contain and the biblical texts which they surround.\textsuperscript{5}

As a case study for the composition of \textit{catena}e and their reception of earlier texts, this article analyzes the use and reuse of material from the Second Temple work Jubilees in Greek \textit{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 \textit{catena} manuscripts illuminates both the construction of \textit{catena}e and the interwoven reading of Genesis and Jubilees in late antiquity.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{2} Despite the anthological technique, one should not underestimate the artistry involved. On the artistry of \textit{catena} manuscripts, see Lamb, “Conservation and Conversation,” 294–99 (which summarizes the often-negative view of \textit{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,” \textit{HUCA} 59 (1988): 137–65.


\textsuperscript{5} \textit{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 ‘Canons,’” \textit{JSJ} 43 (2012): 497–518.

\textsuperscript{6} For early Christian uses of Jubilees, the most comprehensive collection of sources is Hermann Rönsch, \textit{Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis} (Leipzig: Fue’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. While names may be attached to individual editions and recensions, catenae vary at every stage of transmission. Differences between the manuscripts disrupt simplistic claims about a single catena, even for individual biblical books. Every catena manuscript is a unique work.

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


8. As stated by Lamb, “the manuscript tradition is often varied and unpredictable” (“Conservation and Conversation,” 277).


been accessible to a Christian reader in the mid-fifth century CE, likely in Palestine.\(^\text{11}\) 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 *catena* manuscripts of Genesis and Exodus.\(^\text{12}\) 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.\(^\text{13}\)

While Jubilees was written in Hebrew, a largely lost translation into Greek underlies later Armenian, Latin, Syriac, and Ethiopian (Ge’ez) sources as well as the Greek *catena* materials that are the focus of this article.\(^\text{14}\) 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.


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. 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. 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]).

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.  

sources preserving parallel Jubilees material include the ninth-century Byzantine chronographer Georgios Synkellos, the eleventh-century historian Georgios Kedrenos, and the anonymous *Syriac Chronicle to 1234*. Further sources employing Jubilees have been noted by Gelzer, Denis, Milik, VanderKam, and Adler. 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. 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. Instead, I demonstrate the

---


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 lxiii–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. 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.

**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) Ἀρρὰν ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῷ ἐμπυρισμῷ ὧν ἐνεπύρισεν Ἅβραμ τὰ εἴδωλα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν τὸ ἔξοδον αὐτῶν.

(b) Ἦν δὲ Ἅβραμ τότε ἐτῶν ξʹ ὅτε τὰ εἴδωλα ἐνεπύρισεν, ἅτινα οὐδὲ ἀριθμοῦνται εἰς ἔτη ζωῆς αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ μέχρι τότε ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ αὐτὸν εἶναι, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἰωβηλαίῳ.

(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.

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

(12:12) ዋበዓመት፡ ዘሰሳ፡ ዘሕይወተ፡ አብራም፡ ውእቱ፡ ሱባዔ፡ ራብዕ። በዓመት፡ ራብዑ፡ ሎቱ፡ ተንሥአ፡ አብራም፡ በሌሊት፡ ወአውዐየ፡ ቤተ፡ ጣዖታት፡ ወአውዐየ፡ ኵሎ፡ በውስተ፡ ቤት፡ ወሰብእ፡ አልቦ፡ ዘአእመረ።

(12:13) ዋወተንሥኡ፡ ሌሊተ፡ ወፈቀዱ፡ ያድኅኑ፡ እማልክቲሆሙ፡ እማእከለ፡ እሳት፡ ላዕሌሁ፡ ወውዕየ፡ በእሳት፡ ወሞተ፡ በኤኑር፡ ዘከላዴዎን፡ በቅድመ፡ ታራ፡ አቡሁ፡ ወቀበርዎ፡ በኤኑር፡ ዘከለዳዊያን።

(12:15) ዋወወፅኣ፡ ታራ፡ እምነ፡ ኡር፡ ዘከለዳቂያን፡ ውእቱ፡ ወወሉዱ፡ ከመ፡ ይምጽኡ፡ ውስተ፡ ምድረ፡ ሊባኖስ፡ ወውስተ፡ ምድረ፡ ከናአን፡ ወኀደረ፡ ውስተ፡ ካራን፡ ወኀደረ፡ አብራም፡ ምስለ፡ አбуሁ፡ ውስተ፡ ካራን፡ ክልኤ፡ ሱባዔ፡ ዓመታት።

---

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).


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.

(12:12) In the sixtieth year of Abram’s life (which was the fourth week, in its fourth year [AM 1936]), Abram got up at night and burned the temple of the idols. He burned everything in the temple, but no one knew (about it).

(12:13) They got up at night and wanted to save their gods from the fire.

(12:14) Haran dashed in to save them, but the fire raged over him. He was burned in the fire and died in Ur of the Chaldeans before his father Terah. They buried him in Ur of the Chaldeans.

(12:15) Then Terah left Ur of the Chaldeans, he and his sons, to go to the land of Lebanon and the land of Canaan. He settled in Haran, and Abram lived with his father in Haran for two weeks of years.29

The first half of the catena unit (what I have here labeled “a”) relates to the death of Haran in Gen 11:28, and parallels Ethiopic Jubilees 12:14. We will focus on the second half (what I have here labeled “b”). This comment, paralleling Ethiopic Jubilees 12:12, does not mention Haran’s death, but claims that Abraham was sixty years of age when he started the fire. Other chronographers also cite the tradition of Abraham’s burning of the idols:30

Syriac Chronicle:

When Abraham was fifty-six years old, he burned the temple of Kainan. But Abraham’s brother Haran went in to save the temple and was burned up with them at night. When he was sixty years old, Abraham, his father Terah, his brother Nahor, and Haran’s son Lot, left Ur of the Chaldeans and went and stayed in Haran for fourteen years.32

Synkellos:

(12:12) Τῷ γεγονός ἔτει τοῦ κόσμου, Ἀβραὰμ δὲ ξαʹ ἐνεπύρισεν Ἀβραὰμ τὰ εἴδωλα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,
(12:14) καὶ συγκατεκαύθη αὐτοῖς Ἀρρὰν θέλων σβέσαι τὸ πῦρ ἐν νυκτί.
(12:15) καὶ ἐξῆλθε Θαρὰ σὺν Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν εἰς γῆν Χαναάν, καὶ μεταγνως ἤκησεν ἐν Χαρρὰν εἰδωλομανῶν ἕως θανάτου αὐτοῦ.33

(12:12) In anno mundi 3373, when he was 61 years old, Abraham burned the idols of his father.
(12:14) Desiring to extinguish the fire, Arran was burned up with them at night.

29. VanderKam, Jubilees, 2: 70–71 with notes.
30. Recent discussions of Jubilees and chronography focus on this passage, e.g., Milik, “Recherches sur la version grecque”; Brock, “Abraham and the Ravens”; Adler, “Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols.” Adler and Tuffin, Chronography, 138 n. 8, observe further examples in Byzantine sources. Both Synkellos and the Syriac Chronicle diverge from the catena, making direct dependence in either direction unlikely.
31. Chabot, Chronicon (Text), 52, II. 7–9; VanderKam, Jubilees, 1: 268. Brock explains the number “56” as a textual corruption for “60” (“Abraham and the Ravens,” 149–50).
32. Compare Chabot, Chronicon (Translation), 39; VanderKam, Jubilees, 2: 336.
33. Synkellos (112.7–10, ed. Mosshammer); cf. VanderKam, Jubilees, 1: 268–69.
(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 ιδʹ ἔτει αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιγνοὺς τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν προσεκύνει, τὰ δὲ εἴδωλα τοῦ πατρὸς συντρίψας κατέκαυσε σὺν τῷ οἴκῳ. συγκατεκαύθη δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ Ἀρρὰν ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἀβραὰμ 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).
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. 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.

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. A noteworthy example is an extensive scholion placed (without an explicit attribution) at the conclusion of Genesis. I cite the first part of this scholion—that is, the material from Jubilees—at length:

---

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
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 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

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). This juxtaposition has gone undiscussed in literature on both Jubilees and the *Oratio ad Graecos*, and recent editions of Tatian overlook this passage. 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. 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. 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) Jubilee, 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. Other units exhibiting prominent chronographic concerns include nos. 839 (the Tower of Babel), 1804 (Reuben and Bilhah), and 2268 (Joseph’s age for signifi-

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

---

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).


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. 551) Ἡ γυνὴ Κάιν, Ἀσαούλ, ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.

(no. 585) Γυνὴ Σῆθ, Αξούρα, ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.
Γυνὴ Ἐνώς, Νωα, ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.
Γυνὴ Καϊνᾶν, Μαωλιθ, ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.
Γυνὴ Μαλελεήλ, Δινα, θυγάτηρ Βαραχιὴλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
Γυνὴ Ἰάρεδ, Βαραχα, θυγάτηρ Αρουὴλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
Γυνὴ Ἐνώχ, Εανι, θυγάτηρ Δανιὴλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
Γυνὴ Μαθουσάλα, Ἐδνα, θυγάτηρ Βαραχιὴλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.

(no. 833) Γυνὴ Καϊνᾶν, Μελχά, θυγάτηρ Μαδαῖ υἱοῦ Ἰάφεθ.
Γυνὴ Σαλά, Μωχά, θυγάτηρ Χεεδὲμ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ.
Γυνὴ Ἐβερ, Ἀζοδρά, θυγάτηρ Νεβρώδ.
Γυνὴ Φαλέγ, Δόμρα, θυγάτηρ Σενναάρ.

(no. 861) Γυνὴ Παγαύ, Ὅρα, θυγάτηρ Οὖρ 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.

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.
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 πεʹ ἔτει ἐγεννήθη αὐτοῖς δυγάτηρ, καὶ ὀνόμασαν αὐτὴν Ἀσουάμ. […] τῷ ρεʹ ἔτει ἔλαβεν ὁ Κάιν τὴν ἰδίαν ἀδελφήν Ἀσαυνᾶν, οὕτων ἔτων νʹ. αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ἔτων ἥζʹ.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.

ὢ ἡ γυνὴ Κάϊν, Ἀσαούλ, ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ.

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 Καίνα, 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 χχεʹ ἔτει Καϊνᾶν ἐγεννήθη τῷ Ἐνώς. οὗτος γενόμενος ἐτῶν ῥοʹ ἐγέννησε τὸν Μαλελεὴλ. Τῷ ψϛʹ ἔτει ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Καϊνᾶν ἔλαβεν εἰς γυναῖκα τὴν Μαλέθ. Τῷ ψϛεʹ ἔτει ἐγέννησε Καϊνᾶν τὸν Μαλελεὴλ ὤν ἐτῶν ροʹ. Μαλελεὴλ γενόμενος ἐτῶν χξεʹ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰάρεδ. τῷ ςξʹ ἔτει τοῦ κόσμου ἦν ἀπό τὸ χίλιον ἐτῶν ῥοʹ. Ἰάρεδ γενόμενος ἐτῶν χξεʹ ἐγέννησε τὸν Λέυθ. τῷ χξζʹ ἔτει τῆς ἡλικίας ἦν ἀπό τὸ χίλιον ἐτῶν. “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 (ἐκατοστῷ τριακοστῷ πέμπτῳ; ἑξήκοντα 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.


71. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 2: 22–23, with notes. The numbers in brackets are years of the world (*anno mundi*), as calculated by VanderKam.
Nonetheless, the formulaic pattern suggests that the *catena* material derives from a list, and not from a text of the “Book of Jubilees.” We find confirmation in lists of matriarchs that circulated independently in Syriac and Armenian. Even when chronographic sources contain genealogical data, the *catena* manuscripts find a closer parallel in these lists of matriarchs. Consider a Syriac list from the eighth-century British Library Add MS 12,154, fol. 180r–v:72

The name of Adam’s wife was Eve; of Cain’s wife was ‘SW’. And the name of Seth’s wife was ‘ZWR’, his sister; and of Enosh’s wife was N’WM, his sister; of Mahalala’el Dina, the daughter of his uncle; of Enoch, ‘DNY’, the daughter of his uncle; of Methuselah ‘DN’, the daughter of his uncle; of Lamech ‘NWŠY’, the daughter of his uncle. The name of Noah’s wife was ‘MYZR’, the daughter of his uncle; of Shem’s wife ZDQTNBB; of Ham NḤLMḤWQ; of Japheth ‘DNTNŠ’. The name of Arpachshad’s wife was RWSʾ, the daughter of ŠWŠN; of his son C ainan MLKʾ, the daughter of MDY; of his son Shelah, MʾKʾ, the daughter of his uncle; of Eber’s wife ‘ZWR’, the daughter of NBRWD; of Peleg MNʾ, the daughter of SNʾR. In the days of Peleg, the tower was built; its height was 5433 cubits, <13> stadia. The name of ‘RʾW’s wife was ‘RW’, the daughter of ‘WR’; of Serug MLKʾ, the daughter of KBR his uncle; of Nahor his son ‘SQ’, the daughter of NSTG the Chaldean; of Terah ‘DN’, the daughter of his uncle Abram. She bore a son and named him Abram after her father.78

72. This is my own transcription, based on digital images provided by the British Library. I preserve the punctuation of the manuscript. I am grateful to Liv Ingeborg Lied Matthew Monger, and James VanderKam for discussing the manuscript with me. The list is discussed in VanderKam, “Manuscript Tradition,” although VanderKam does not relate this Syriac list to the *catena*.


75. This correction appears in the right margin of fol. 180r, visible in the images provided by the British Library. It is not noted in published transcriptions or translations.

76. Note the parallel to Kedrenos 47.15–19.

77. This is most of the list; the remainder names the wives of Jacob’s sons and Pharaoh’s daughter.

78. I have only vocalized names found in the Bible. Compare VanderKam, “Manuscript Tradition,” 10–11.
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” ( интересующихся. Этот сирийский список не является трансляцией этого геронимического материала в греческие catena рукописи Genesis. Это, однако, проливает свет на контекст, в котором такой материал мог циркулировать. Аналогичный армянский список, сохраненный в рукописи XV века, называет патриархов от Адама до Иакова с их женами.

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. 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.
Ἐνὼχ πρῶτος ἔμαθε γράμματα, καὶ ἔγραψε τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὰς τροπὰς καὶ τοὺς μῆνας.81

Enoch was the first person who learned letters, and he wrote the signs of the heaven and the seasons and the months.

Derived from Jubilees 4:17, the unit exhibits no compelling interest for chronographic projects. It contains no dates and affords no clever solutions to chronological problems. Nor does the unit seem to belong in a genealogical list. Yet, on closer examination, we discover that this unit could fit into either of our two categories; it thus illustrates the uncertainties that remain.82

On occasion, the Syriac list cited above breaks from its formulaic structure. For instance, it provides an extra detail about Peleg:

artial text

of Peleg MN’, the daughter of SN’R. In the days of Peleg, the tower was built; its height was 5433 cubits, <13> stadia.83

Despite a format which condenses unnecessary detail, the Syriac list still made room for an exegetical note that cited part of Jubilees 10:21. Compare Ethiopic Jubilees:

artial text

They built it; they spent 43 years building it (with) complete bricks whose width was 13 (units) and whose height was a third of one (unit). Its height rose to 5433 cubits, two spans, and thirteen stadia.85

If the brief note about Enoch had appeared in the formulaic genealogical list that lies behind numerous catena units (nos. 551, 585, 833, and 861), this would provide an

81. Petit, Chaîne sur la Genèse, 2: 60.
82. This material from Jubilees and its reception in the Syriac Chronicle are discussed by Annette Y. Reed and John C. Reeves (Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Vol. 1: Sources from Judaism, Christianity, and Islam [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018], 53–57), but they do not discuss the catena material.
83. See the notes on text and translation above. While not discussed further in the present article, the same unit appears in catena manuscripts as Petit’s no. 839 (ad Gen 11:4, attributed to ἡ διαθήκη; cf. Petit, Chaîne sur la Genèse, 2: 202, with notes), where it also reveals chronographic interests. Preserved in the early modern catena of Nicephorus (1.175) and in the Patrologia Graeca, this was the only catena material from Jubilees that was known to modern scholars (e.g., Rönsch, Jubiläen; Charles, Jubilees; Denis, “Liber Jubilaeorum”; VanderKam, Jubilees) prior to the publication of Petit’s edition.
84. VanderKam, Jubilees, 1: 63–64.
85. VanderKam, Jubilees, 2: 61–62, with notes. The numbers are garbled in at least one version.
elegant solution for its presence.\textsuperscript{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:

[...\] Γυνὴ Ἐνώχ, Ἐανί, θυγάτηρ Δανιὴλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ. \(<\text{Ἐνώχ πρῶτος ἐμαθεὶς γράμματα, καὶ ἔγραψε τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὰς τροπὰς καὶ τοὺς μῆνας.}>\) Γυνὴ Μαθουσάλα, Ἐδνα, θυγάτηρ Ἐζριὴλ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ. [...] 

[...\] The wife of Enoch [was] Eani, the daughter of his uncle Daniel. \(<\text{Enoch was the first person who learned letters, and he wrote the signs of the heaven and the seasons and the months.}>\) 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 Edni) and Jubilees 4:27 (about Methuselah’s marriage to Edna).\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{Syriac Chronicle}.\textsuperscript{88} Compare Ethiopic Jubilees 4:17 with the two chronographers and the \textit{catena}:

\begin{quote}
Ethiopic Jubilees:

\textit{አርታ፡ ቁተር፡ ተምህረ፡ መጽሐፈ Enlightened one, instructed, and wise, who wrote in a book the signs of the sky according with the

\end{quote}

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

\begin{quote}
86. This possibility is noted by Petit, who suggests that nos. 551, 585, and 590 originate from the same source (\textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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.

fixed patterns of their months so that humans would know the seasons of the years according to the fixed patterns of each of their months.  

*Syriac Chronicle:*

This Enoch was the first to learn writing, instruction, and wisdom. And he wrote in a book the signs of heaven to inform humanity concerning the alternations of times and of years, according to their fixed patterns and according to their months.

*Kedrenos:*

This was the first person who learned and taught letters, and was worthy of the uncovering of divine mysteries.

*Petit no. 590:*

Enoch was the first person who learned letters, and he wrote the signs of the heaven and the seasons and the months.

Ethiopic Jubilees and the *Syriac Chronicle* correspond closely, while the two Greek witnesses are condensations. The latter half of Kedrenos’ version diverges especially from these other texts (and, unlike the material in the *Syriac Chronicle*, consists only of the short segment cited above). Despite the presence of this tradition in chronographic sources, variations in content and phrasing make a direct relationship unlikely. Nonetheless, repeated use of the same Jubilees material in chronographic sources suggests that the *catena* material might derive from a similar source. If it derives from a chronographic tradition, then the textual differences might reflect variation either before or after the creation of the *catena*. An intermediate chronographic source thus offers a second plausible conduit for transmitting this Jubilees material.

**Conclusion**

In this article, I have traced some of the ways that readers encountered “Jubilees” in late antiquity. I have demonstrated that the creators of Genesis *catenae* probably did not draw directly from a text of “Jubilees” as we are familiar with it. Rather, this material had already been appropriated and restructured before it was organized around the textual frame of Greek Genesis. I have focused on the two clearest conduits for the transmission

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. 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. 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.

---

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, *Chaînes 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.