JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA
Vol 24.3 (2015): 182-212
© The Author(s), 2015. Reprints and Permissions:
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/JournalsPermissions.nav
10.1177/0951820715578381
http://JSP.sagepub.com

The Alphabet of Creation: Traces of *Jubilees* Cosmogony in Slavonic Tradition*

FLORENTINA BADALANOVA GELLER

Topoi Excellence Cluster, Freie Universität Berlin, Kaiserswerther Straße 16-18, 14195 Berlin, Germany

Abstract

So far the reception history of *Jubilees* within the intellectual environment of the Byzantine Commonwealth, from the perspective of the last *lingua sacra* of Europe, Old Church Slavonic, has been overlooked. One of the goals of this article is to present hitherto neglected evidence concerning the attestations of the *Jubilees* cosmogonic template in medieval Slavonic tradition, thus aiming at introducing new material into the study of the transmission and domestication of Jewish parabiblical writings in their successive Christian environments. Intentionally excluded from the scope of the current investigation are literary sources attested in languages other than Church Slavonic (since they are analyzed by others). The focal point of the analysis in the present work is thus Slavonic material, as represented by translations (from Greek) of some parabiblical writings (e.g. fragments from Epiphanius of Salamis' treatise *On Measures and Weights*) and related historiographical compositions (e.g. the *Chronicles* of John Malalas and George Hamartolos); also included is complementary data from *The Palaea* compendia. Of particular importance for this discussion are narratives

* Earlier versions of this paper were read in the spring and autumn of 2014 at the Research Seminar 'Unacknowledged Offspring of Byzantium' at TOPOI Excellence Cluster (Freie Universität Berlin). I am indebted to my colleagues for their comments made on these occasions.

concerned with the origins of the Universe and Mankind; each of these is treated as a surviving piece of evidence concerning Judaeo-Christian encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

Keywords: Cosmogony, alphabet, reception of Jubilees, Epiphanius, Syncellus, Slavia Orthodoxa.

1. Point of Departure: Empirical and Epistemological Linchpins

1.1. Examining the Evidence

It is generally assumed that there is scant evidence suggesting the survival of text-witnesses to the *Jubilees*[1] tradition in the last *lingua sacra* of Europe, Old Church Slavonic.[2] The goal of the present article

1. For critical editions of the text, see R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, *or The Little Genesis* (London: A. & C. Black, 1902); *idem*, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), II, pp. 1-82; R.H. Charles and G.H. Box, *The Book of Jubilees; or The Little Genesis* (London: SPCK, 1917); C. Rabin (trans.), *Jubilees*, in H.F.D. Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), pp. 1-141; O.S. Wintermute (trans.), '*Jubilees*', in *OTP*, II, pp. 35-142; James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87-88; Louvain: Peeters, 1989); see also nn. 4 and 13 below.

2. See, however, the earlier discussion in Ivan Porfir'ev's [Иван Порфирьев], *Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoi Biblioteki* [*Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям Соловецкой библиотеки*], *Sbornik Otdeleniia Russkogo Iazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk* [*Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук*] (a monographic issue), Sankt Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk [Санктпетербург: Типография Императорской Академии Наук] 17.1 (1877), pp. 1-276 (esp. pp. 3, 22-24, 35); V. Istrin [В. Истрин], 'Redaktsii Tolkovoi Palei (II): Vzaimootnoshenie polnoi i kratkoi Palei v predelakh teksta Palei Kolomenskoi' ['Редакции Толковой Палеи (II): Взаимоотношение полной и краткой Палей в пределах текста Палеи Коломенской], *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk* [*Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук*], 11.1 (1906), pp. 1-43 (esp. pp. 17-27; see also nn. 49-52 below); Simon Franklin, 'Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan Russian Historiography', *Oxford Slavonic Papers* NS 15 (1982), pp. 1-27 (esp. 12-25); A. Totomanova [А. Тотоманова], *Slavianskata Versiia na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel* [*Славянската версия на Хрониката на Георги Синкел*] (Sofia: Universitetsko

is to challenge this assumption. This article explores the hitherto neglected data demonstrating the 'recycling'[3] of certain fragments from this most important composition of late Second Temple Judaism[4]

Izdatelstvo Sv. Kliment Okhridski [София: Университетско издателство Св. Климент Охридски], 2008), pp. 408-409.

3. On the phenomenon of 'recycling' and 'reuse' of earlier parabiblical writings in later compilations (with special emphasis on Christian apocryphal hermeneutics), see Pierluigi Piovanelli, 'The Reception of Early Christian Texts and Traditions in Late Antiquity Apocryphal Literature', in Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu (eds.), *The Perception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity. Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11–13 October 2006* (Bible in Ancient Christianity, 6; Leiden: Brill, 2008), p. 429-39 (esp. 438-39).

4. A common view is that *Jubilees* dates from c. 150 BCE and is considered to be later than *Enoch*, but probably predating the *Genesis Apocryphon*, although all these arguments are far from certain and subject to debate; see the discussion in James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM, 14; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 207-85; *idem*, 'Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources', *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 13.1 (1978), pp. 229-51; *idem*, 'Biblical Interpretation in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*', in James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup, 14; SSEJC, 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 96-125; James H. Charlesworth, 'The Date of Jubilees and of the Temple Scroll', *SBLSP* 24 (1985), pp. 193-204; Philip S. Alexander, 'Retelling the Old Testament', in D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 99-121 (esp. 99-107); Michael A. Knibb, 'Which Parts of *1 Enoch* Were Known to *Jubilees*? A Note on the Interpretation of *Jubilees* 4.16-25', in J. Cheryl Exum and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), pp. 254-62; J.S. Bergsma, 'The Relationship between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and the Book of the Watchers)', in G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), pp. 36-51; and, in the same volume, E. Eshel, 'The Aramaic Levi Document, the Genesis Apocryphon, and Jubilees: A Study of Shared Traditions', pp. 82-98; B. Halpern-Amaru, 'The Festivals of *Pesah* and *Massot* in the Book of Jubilees', pp. 309-22; D.R. Jackson, 'Jubilees and Enochic Judaism', pp. 411-25; J.M. Scott, 'The Chronologies of the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Book of Jubilees', pp. 67-81; E. Larson, 'Worship in *Jubilees* and *Enoch*', pp. 369-83; L.T. Stuckenbruck, '*The Book of Jubilees* and the Origin of Evil', pp. 294-308; A. Yoshiko Reed, 'Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in *Jubilees*: The Evidence of Angelology and Demonology', pp. 353-68 (esp. 353-54); James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 305-42, 345-51. For a comprehensive survey of the textual witnesses, see James C. VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', in

in parabiblical (re)writings, transmitted and interpreted within the intellectual landscape of the Byzantine Commonwealth;[5] thus it aims to rehabilitate the cultural memory of *Jubilees* (conventionally designated as one of the oldest 'rewritten Bible'[6] texts) in the intellectual history of *Slavia Orthodoxa.*[7] The matter gets even more complicated if one considers that no complete copy has been identified of a Greek translation of the *Jubilees* corpus,[8] which was the most probable source for the Slavonic offshoots, as for the Latin[9] and Ethiopic (Ge'ez)[10] versions. Actually, the complete text of the book was

Boccaccini and Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, pp. 3-21. For a thorough overview of different methodological approaches and epistemological shifts occurring in the history of the research on *Jubilees*, see the recently produced annotated bibliography which summaries of most influential scholarly works (from 1850 to 2006) in Veronika Bachmann and Isaac W. Oliver, 'The Book of Jubilees: A Bibliography (1850–Present)', in Boccaccini and Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, pp. 441-68.

5. Cf. D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971).

6. The term was coined by Geza Vermes; see his *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (SPB, 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961; repr. 1973, 1983). See also the discussion below (§1.2).

7. The term *Slavia Orthodoxa* and its counterpart *Slavia Romana* (or *Slavia Catholica*) reflect the 'division of historical Slavdom into two main areas belonging to the jurisdiction of the Eastern Orthodox Churches (*Slavia Orthodoxa*) and to that of the Roman Church (*Slavia Romana*)'; see R. Picchio, 'Guidelines for a Comparative Study of the Language Question among the Slavs', in R. Picchio and H. Goldblatt (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*. I. *Church Slavonic—South Slavic—West Slavic* (New Haven, 1984), pp. 1–42 (esp. p. 1).

8. See VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*', p. 12; Wintermute, *Jubilees*, p. 42.

9. VanderKam maintains that the Latin redaction of *Jubilees* was based on a Greek protograph; see VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*', pp. 4, 17-18. Consult also Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, pp. 5, 336-37.

10. VanderKam is equally arguing that the Ethiopic redaction of *Jubilees* originated from a (no longer extant) Greek translation of a Hebrew protograph; see VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*', pp. 4, 18-21. See also the discussion in Rabin's *Introduction* to his revised version of R.H. Charles' translation of *Jubilees* in H.F.D. Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), pp. 6-7, and J. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, pp. 5, 336-37; for a contrasting view, see C.C. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945), maintaining that *Jubilees* was originally written in Aramaic.

preserved only in the Ethiopic redaction (as is also the case with *1 Enoch*), on the basis of which the narrative structure of the original Hebrew version—which likewise survived only fragmentarily—can be traced back. On the other hand, it has been maintained that both the Greek[11] and the Syriac[12] fragments are most probably based on a Hebrew protograph, the features of which can be further reconstructed on the basis of the passages found in manuscripts from Qumran.[13] As for the no longer extant Greek version of the book, there is strong circumstantial evidence indicating 'that a translation of *Jubilees* into

11. See VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', pp. 12-17.

12. See Wintermute, *Jubilees*, p. 42; VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', pp. 10-12; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, pp. 4-5.

13. See James C. VanderKam, 'The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4', in Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (Leiden: Brill; Madrid: Universidad Complutence, 1992), II, pp. 635-48; *idem*, 'The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees', in Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds.), *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 241-61; *idem*, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', in Boccaccini and Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, pp. 4-8; J.C. VanderKam and J.T. Milik, 'The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication', *JBL* 110 (1991), pp. 243-70; Peter W. Flint, 'Noncanonical Writings in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Apocrypha, Other Previously Known Writings, Pseudepigrapha', in Peter W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), pp. 80-128 (esp. 100-103). Also consult in this connection 1Q17 (1QJubilees[a]), 1Q18 (1QJubilees[b]), 2Q19 (2QJubilees[a]), 2Q20 (2QJubilees[b]), 3Q5 (3QJubilees), 4Q216 (4QJubilees[a]), 4Q217 (4QpapJubilees[b]), 4Q218 (4QJubilees[c]), 4Q219 (4QJubilees[d]), 4Q220 (4QJubilees[e]), 4Q221 (4QJubilees[f]), 4Q222 (4QJubilees[g]), 4Q223-224 (4QpapJubilees[h]), 11Q12 (11QJubilees) in F. García Martínez and E. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. I. *1Q1–4Q273* (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–98), pp. 22-25, 214-15, 226-27, 459-76; and II. *4Q274–11Q31* (1998), pp. 1204-1207. See also the discussion in J.M. Baumgarten, 'The Laws of Orlah and First Fruits in Light of *Jubilees*, The Qumran Writings, and the Targum Ps-Jonathan', *JJS* 38 (1987), pp. 195-202; George J. Brooke, 'Exegetical Strategies in *Jubilees* 1–2: New Light from 4QJubilees[a]', in Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), pp. 39-57; E. Regev, 'Jubilees, Qumran, and the Essenes', in Boccaccini and Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, pp. 426-40, and, in the same volume, L.H. Schiffman, 'The Book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll', pp. 99-115; A. Shemesh, '4Q265 and the Authoritative Status of Jubilees at Qumran', pp. 247-60.

Greek (or at least a Greek rendering of parts of it)',[14] must have been in circulation already in the fourth century, when the Alexandrian scholar Didymus the Blind (313–398)[15] designated it as *The Little Genesis* (*Leptogenesis*, ἡ Λεπτογένεσις).[16] It was certainly known to the early Church Fathers, since Epiphanius of Salamis (ca. 315–403) inserted fragments from it in his treatise *On Measures and Weights* (Περί μέτρων καί στάθμων; *De mensuris et ponderibus*),[17] in the

14. VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', p. 12.

15. A brief survey of Didymus' writings (and related bibliography) is provided by James C. VanderKam, 'The Book of the Covenant: A New Translation and Introduction', in R. Bauckham *et al.* (eds.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), pp. 28-32 (esp. 28-29); see also Emmanouela Grypeou and Hellen Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity: Encounters between Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 122-23.

16. Cf. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*, pp. xv-xvi, lxxvii]. Furthermore, identified in Didymus' *Commentary on Genesis* and *Commentary on Job* were references to a number of extra-canonical writings. Apart from *Jubilees* these include *The Book of the Covenant*, *The Ascension of Elijah*, *The Apocalypse of Elijah*, etc.; see VanderKam, 'The Book of the Covenant: A New Translation and Introduction', pp. 28-32. On Didymus' dependence on *Jubilees* in his *Commentary on Genesis* [4.1-2], see Grypeou and Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity*, p. 122 n. 73.

17. The treatise *On Measures and Weights* was produced in Constantinople in 392; the full text did not survive in the original Greek, but exists only in Syriac; for English translation of the Syriac redaction of the text, see James Elmer Dean (ed.), *Epiphanius*' *Treatise on Weights and Measures: The Syriac Version* (with a Foreword by Martin Sprengling; The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 11; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935). Among the extant Greek fragments of the composition are those containing the section from *Jubilees*; see *ibid.*, p. 5; see also VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', p. 14. *Epiphanius*' *Treatise on Weights and Measures* survived, also fragmentarily, in Armenian; see Michael Stone, 'Concerning the Seventy-Two Translators: Armenian Fragments of Epiphanius *On Weights and Measures*', *HTR* 73 (1980), pp. 331-36; Michael Stone, Roberta Ervine, *The Armenian Text of Epiphanius of Salamis 'De mensuris et ponderibus'* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 583, Subsidia, 105; Leuven: Peeters, 2000). There are also Georgian translations (and/or adaptations) of the text; see the survey of text witnesses in Renan Baker, 'Epiphanius, *On Weights and Measures* §14: Hadrian's Journey to the East and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 182 (2012), pp. 157–167 (esp. p. 157). For the Slavonic fragments and their utilization in chronographic narratives see Simon Franklin, 'Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan

section devoted to the scriptural *modius* as a sacred measure containing twenty-two *xestai*. The following is an extract of the Syriac recension of the text:

> [t]he name of the *modius* was invented by the Hebrews with great exactness. For it consists of 22 *xestai*, not in simple fashion or by chance, but from great exactness. Now I speak of the 'just' *modius*, as the Law is accustomed to say, according to the sacred measure. For, O lover of the good, God did twenty-two works between the beginning and the seventh day, which are these: On the first day, (1) the upper heavens, (2) the earth, (3) the waters—of which consist snow, ice, hail, frost, and dew—and (4) the spirits that minister before him. They are the angels before his face, the angels of glory, the angels of the winds that blow, the angels of the clouds and of the cloud-darkness, of snow and hail and frost, the angels of sounds, of the thunders and the lightning, the angels of the cold and of the heat, of winter, fall, spring, and summer, and of all the spirits of his creatures in heaven and on earth. (5) The abysses, both that which is beneath the earth and that of the gulf of darkness that was above the abyss of the waters which were at one time upon the earth, whence (6) the darkness—the evening and the night; (7) the light—of the day and of the morning. These seven great works God did the first day. On the second day, (8) the firmament that is between the waters. On this day the waters were divided; half of them ascended above the firmament, and half of them remained below the firmament in the midst upon the face of the whole earth. This is the only work that God did on the second day. On the third day, (9) the seas, the rivers, and the fountains and lakes, (10) seed grains and plants, (11) fruit trees and those without fruit, and (12) forests. These four great works God did on the third day. On the fourth day, (13) the sun, (14) the moon, (15) the stars. These three great works God did on the fourth day. On the fifth day, (16) the great whales, (17) the fishes and the other creeping things in the waters, (18) the winged birds. These three great works God did on the fifth day. And on the sixth day, (19) wild beasts, (20) cattle, (21) the creeping things of the earth, (22) man. These four great works God did on the sixth day. And everything was twenty-two kinds in the six days. And he completed all his works on the sixth day, everything that is in heaven and on earth, in the seas and in the abysses, in the light and in the darkness, and in everything. And God rested from all his works on the seventh day, and he blessed it and hallowed it. And he showed Moses through an angel that there would also be twenty-two heads from Adam to Jacob, otherwise Israel, when he said: 'And I will choose for myself from his seed a people more numerous than any other people'. And the heads, which are the generations, concerning whom the Lord spoke,

Russian Historiography', *Oxford Slavonic Papers* NS 15 (1982), pp. 5-6, 11-12; see also the discussion below (§2.2).

> are as follows: Adam, Seth, Enosh, Kenan, Mahalalel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah, Shem, Arpachshad, Shelah, Eber, Peleg, Reu—for the Scripture omits Cainan from the number—Serug, Nahor, Terah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, otherwise Israel—altogether, twenty-two generations.[18] Therefore there are twenty-two letters among the Hebrews, which are these: *alef*, *beth*, *gimel*, *deleth*, *he*, *waw*, *zej*, *heth*, *teth*, *joth*, *kaf*, *lamedh*, *mem*, *nun*, *samekh*, *ʿajin*, *pe*, *sadhen*, *qof*, *resh*, *shin*, *taw*. Therefore also there are twenty-two books of the Old Testament;[19] but they are said among the Hebrews to be counted as twenty-two though they are (really) twenty-seven, because five of their letters also are double—*kaf* has a duplicate form, also *mem*, *nun*, *pe*, and *saddhe*—for the books also are counted in this manner.[20]

Without explicitly naming his source, Epiphanius simply borrowed segments from *Jubilees*, tacitly referring to the cosmogonical template of *twenty-two* primordial divine deeds as a discrete 'alphabet' of Creation.[21] Furthermore he expanded the *Jubilees* [2.23-24] original account and provided a symmetrical index of the first twenty-two

18. On the canonical lineages of the first twenty-two biblical patriarchs, see also *Genesis* [5.3-32; 11.10-26; 21.5; 25.26]; see also the discussion below.

19. As pointed out by Evans, this particular detail presents a problem of its own: '[i]n some manuscripts *Jubilees* refers to "twenty-two books" [*Jub*. 2.23-24], but in the earliest copies we have (from Qumran), the reference is not to be found. Yet this number is also attested by Josephus, who perhaps is depending on *Jubilees*'; see Craig A. Evans, 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Canon of Scripture in the Time of Jesus', in Peter W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), pp. 67-79 (esp. 73). Further on Epiphanius' 'restructuring of the twenty-two Scriptures', see Eugen J. Pentiuc, *The Old Testament in Eastern Orthodox Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 118.

20. Cf. chs. 21–22 of the Syriac redaction of Epiphanius' treatise (based on *Jubilees* [2.1-26]); see Dean, *Epiphanius' Treatise on Weights and Measures*, pp. 41-42.

21. The earliest attestation of this cosmogonic template appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q216, col. v, vi, vii); see the suggested readings of the fragments concerned (i.e. *Jub.* 2.1-4, 7-12, 12-24) by VanderKam and Milik, 'The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication', pp. 246, 257-70; see also García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, I, pp. 464-65. See also the discussion in VanderKam, 'Biblical Interpretation in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*', in Charlesworth and Evans (eds.), *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 96-125 (esp. 118-19); Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, pp. 29-37. See also the discussion below (§2.2).

biblical Patriarchs (from Adam to Jacob).[22] In fact, Epiphanius had reproduced (yet in an inverted order) the list of the patriarchs from Jacob to Adam, as presented in the genealogy of Jesus according to the Gospel of Luke [3.34-38]:

> …Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham, the son of Terah, the son of Nahor, the son of Serug, the son of Reu, the son of Peleg, the son of Eber, the son of Shelah, the son of Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem, the son of Noah, the son of Lamech, the son of Methuselah, the son of Enoch, the son of Jared, the son of Mahalalel, the son of Kenan, the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.

Naturally, no quotation of such a list may be found in the surviving Ethiopic version of *Jubilees* [2.23-24]:

> There were twenty-two patriarchs from Adam to Jacob, and twenty-two kinds of created things were made before the seventh day: this day is blessed and holy; and Jacob also is blessed and holy; and so the two together are hallowed and blessed.[23]

Obviously, the implicit reference to Luke [3.34-38] in the treatise *On Measures and Weights* is an effective rhetorical device. While rephrasing the important ideological claim initiated by *Jubilees* [2.23-24]—namely, that the inauguration of the sacred genealogy of Israel was symbolically imbedded in the divine economy of Creation itself—Epihanius virtually converts 'the Jewish' narrative into a

22. For the genealogical table of the antediluvian patriarchs in parabiblical sources, consult Flavius Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* [1.82-87]; see in this connection the discussion in Steve Mason (ed.), *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. III. *Judean Antiquities 1–4. Translation and Commentary by Louis Feldman* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 31-32. On the lists of antediluvian and postdiluvian patriarchs in Greek (Byzantine) Chronographic tradition as adaptations (via Josephus and Africanus) of *Jubilees*, see William Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 26; Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, 1989), pp. 182-93, 196-206.

23. Quoted afters Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, p. 16. In fact, the enumerating of the names of the patriarchs is likewise missing from the earliest copy of *Jubilees* from the Qumran library (i.e. 4Q216, col. v, vi, vii). Consult in this connection the discussion in VanderKam and Milik, 'The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication', esp. pp. 246, 257-70; see also García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, I, pp. 464-65; see also n. 21 above.

'Christian' one, thus allegorically proclaiming the divine economy of Salvation.

In fact, Epiphanius was also the first among the Church Fathers to employ the title 'Jubilees', and to use it synonymously with that of 'The Little Genesis' (ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις). This parallel designation occurred for the first time in his *Panarion* (also known as *The Medicine Chest*, or *Against Heresies*).[24] It is again in *Panarion* where Epiphanius mentions that, according to *The Little Genesis*, Adam and Eve had altogether twelve sons and two daughters; the older daughter, Saue [Σαυὴ] (whose name in the Ethiopic version of *Jubilees* is rendered as Awan) became the wife of Cain [*Jub*. 4.8-9], while the younger, Azura [Ἀζουρᾶ], married Seth [*Jub*. 4.11]:

> (1) But as we find in *Jubilees* which is also called *The Little Genesis*, the book even contains the names of both Cain's and Seth's wives, so that the persons who recite myths to the world may be put to shame in every way. (2) For after Adam had sired sons and daughters it became necessary at that time that the boys marry their own sisters. Such a thing was not unlawful, as there was no other human stock. (3) Indeed, in a manner of speaking Adam himself practically married his own daughter who was fashioned from his body and bones and had been formed by God in

24. The text was published (with introduction and commentaries) by Frank Williams (trans. and ed.), *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Book 1 (Sects 1–46)* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 63; Leiden: Brill, 2nd edn, 2009 [1st edn: *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Book 1 (Sects 1–46)* (Nag Hammadi Studies, 35; Leiden: Brill, 1987)]). For further discussion, see Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*, pp. xv, lxxvii-lxxvii; VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', pp. 13-14. On *The Panarion* as a plausible intermediary between *Jubilees* and the Byzantine chronographic tradition, see Adler, *Time Immemorial*, pp. 180 (n. 78), 217 (n. 174), 222, 224 (n. 186), 230. On *The Panarion* in Christian exegetical writings, see Grypeou and Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity*, pp. 122 (n. 74), 123, 124 (n. 82), 135 (n. 117), 136, 274, 407 (n. 118), 409]; for the utilization of *The Panarion* in Slavonic chronographic production (based on Greek/Byzantine tradition), see S. Franklin, 'Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan Russian Historiography', pp. 17-18. For the implementation of *The Panarion* excerpts in the interpretative discourse on the New Testamental commentaries accompanying narratives incorporated in the Chronographic Palaea and some homiletic compositions (e.g. *Zlatoust*), see further E. Vodolazkin [Евгений Водолазкин], *Vsemirnaia istoriia v literature Drevnei Rusi* (*na materiale khronograficheskogo i paleinogo povest-vovaniia XI-XV vekov*) [Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования 11-15 веков] (Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2000), pp. 81, 88, 185-88, 192.

> conjunction with him, and it was not unlawful. (4) And his sons were married, Cain to the older sister, whose name was Saue; and a third son, Seth, who was born after Abel, to his sister named Azura. (5) And Adam had other sons too as *The Little Genesis* says, nine after these three, so that he had two daughters but twelve sons, one of whom was killed but eleven survived. (6) You have the reflection of them too in the Genesis of the World, the first Book of Moses, which says, 'And Adam lived 930 years, and begat sons and daughters, and died'.[25]

This particular matrilineal genealogical record[26] continued to be perpetually supplied in the Byzantine chronographic corpus, and was

25. Quoted after Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*; see *Book 1*, section III (*Anacephalaeosis*), Chapter 39 (*Against Sethians*) [6.1-5], p. 280.

26. On the portrayals of the two daughters of Adam and Eve, the progenitress Azura and Asuama (Saue/Awan), in *Jubilees'* genealogical scheme, see John Rook, 'The Names of the Wives from Adam to Abraham in *The Book of Jubilees*', *JSP* 7 (1990), pp. 105-17 (esp. pp. 107-109); Betsy Halpern-Amaru, 'The First Woman, Wives, and Mothers in *Jubilees*', *JBL* 113.4 (1994), pp. 609-26 (esp. 614-18); K. Coblentz Bautch, 'Amplified Roles, Idealized Depictions: Women in the Book of Jubilees', in Boccaccini and Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, pp. 338-52 (esp. 342-43); see also the discussion in Jacques van Ruiten, 'Eve's Pain in Childbearing? Interpretations of Gen 3:16a in Biblical and Early Jewish Texts', in Gerard P. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *Eve's Children: The Biblical Stories Retold and Interpreted in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions, 5; Leiden: Brill), pp. 3-26 (esp. 14-15). For alternative parabiblical traditions presenting parallel models of matrilineal kinship (e.g. Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* [1.1], Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* [1.54], *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* [Gen. 4.2], *Genesis Rabbah* [22.3-7], *Testament of Adam* [3.5], *The Cave of Treasures* [5.20-22], etc.), see Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, pp. 148-49; Norman A. Stillman, 'The Story of Cain and Abel in the Qur'ān and the Muslim Commentators: Some Observations', *JSS* 19.2 (1974), pp. 231-39 (esp. 234); Jürgen Tubach, 'Seth and the Sethites in Early Syriac Literature', in Luttikhuizen (ed.), *Eve's Children*, pp. 187-202 (esp. 195); Lowndes Lipscomb, 'A Tradition from the *Book of Jubilees* in Armenian', *JJS* 29 (1978), pp. 149-63 (esp. 156-57); Grypeou and Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity*, pp. 138-41. It should be noted, however, that in *Jubilees* the account about Cain's desire for his beautiful sister (identified in different traditions either as his own twin, or as a twin of Abel, see above) is missing. In some parabiblical narratives this 'fatal attraction' is recognized as the principal reason behind the deadly rivalry between the two brothers, and, hence, as the ultimate murder motif. For traditions concerning the daughters of Adam and Eve in the Palestinian Targumim, see F. García Martínez, 'Eve's Children in the Targumim', in Luttikhuizen (ed.), *Eve's Children*, pp. 27-45 (esp. 36-39, 41-45); on the hermeneutic and the homiletic aspects of rabbinic midrashic interpretations of 'the twin-sisters' subject, see Lieve M. Teugels, 'The Twin Sisters of Cain and Abel: A Survey of the Rabbinic

subsequently transmitted to the later Slavonic redactions. Incidentally, in some historiographic compositions the original matrimonial pattern of *Jubilees* may be occasionally inverted, with the older sister Saue / Asuam [Σαυὴ/Ἀζουάμ] wedding the younger brother Seth and the younger sister Azura [Ἀζούρα] the older brother Cain. As for the pristine *Jubilees* scheme according to which Cain married the older sister while Seth married the younger, it is found in Epiphanius' *Panarion* (see above) and in Syncellus' *Chronography*,[27] whereas Michael Glycas (*Annales*), John Malalas (*Anonymi Chronologica*) and others 'invert the tradition in *Jubilees* and claim Azoura was the wife of Cain while Seth married Asouam'.[28] In a similar manner, other

Sources', in Luttikhuizen (ed.), *Eve's Children*, pp. 47-56 (esp. pp. 48-49, 51-56). Some of these alternative matrimonial prototypes were likewise identified in Islamic exegetical writings concerned with prehistory of mankind; see F. Rosenthal (ed. and trans.), *The History of Prophets and Kings* (Tarīkh al-rusul wa'l-mulūk) *by Al-Tabarī: From the Creation to the Flood*, I (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989), p. 317]; F. Badalanova Geller, *Qur'ān in Vernacular: Folk Islam in the Balkans* (Max Planck Institute for the History of Science. PREPRINT, 357; Berlin: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2008), pp. 106-11; see also the discussion below, n. 29.

27. See the following short statements: 'In the 135th year, Cain took as a wife his own sister Asaunan, who was 50 years of age. He was 65 years old' (quoted after William Adler and Paul Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 12); 'In the 425th year, Seth married Azoura, his own sister. Seth was 195 years of age, Azoura was 191 years old' (p. 14). A similar model is followed in *The Chronicle of George Hamartolos.*

28. See W. Lowndes Lipscomb, 'A Tradition from the *Book of Jubilees* in Armenian', *JJS* 29 (1978), pp. 149-63 (esp. p. 156). As for the Slavonic tradition, it may follow either the genealogical model attested in *Jubilees* and subsequently in Malalas (according to which the older sister weds the older brother, and the younger sister—the younger brother), or the inverted model according to which the younger sister Асоуам/Асѫам [Ἀζουάμ] weds Cain, while the older one Азара/Иазара [Ἀζούρα]—Seth; for further information (concerning the utilization of Malala's account into the *Interpretative Palaea*) see Tatiana Slavova [Т. Славова], *Tŭlkovnata Paleia v Konteksta na Starobŭlgarskata Knizhnina* [*Тълковната Палея в контекста на старобългарската книжнина* (Sofia: Universitetsko Izdatelstvo Sv. Kliment Okhridski [София: Университетско издателство Св. Климент Охридски], 2002), pp. 251-52; for genealogical schemes attested in Slavonic chronographic compositions (with the first daughters of Adam and Eve shaping the original pattern of matrilineal kinship in the Slavonic redaction of the *Chronography of* Syncellus), see Totomanova, *Slavianskata Versiia na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel*, pp. 408-409. A

embellished renditions of some parabiblical legends (e.g. about Cain's death by stone,[29] about 'Abram the iconoclast' putting the idols of his father Terah on fire,[30] etc.), the earliest redactions of which are attested in *Jubilees*, were further conveyed, through various Byzantine

model similar to that of Syncellus is attested in the opening paragraph of the thirteenth- to fourteenth-century Bulgarian redaction of *The Chronicle of George Hamartolos, from the Palaeographic Collection of The Ecclesiastical Academy in Moscow, MS No 100* (Временьникъ въпростѣ ѡ различны^{x}же хронографъ же и сказатель събранъ же и сложенъ гєwргиємь грwшьникомь мнихомь). Concerning the life of the offspring of Adam and Eve, it is stated that 'Cain took the first sister Azura as his wife while Seth took the second sister Asuama' [Каинъ поятъ женѣ свою сестроу .а҃ю Азоуроу, Сифъ же .в҃ю Асоуамоу]; see V. Istrin, *Knigy Vremennyia I obraznyia Georgiia Mnikha. Khronika Georgiia Amartola v drevnem slavianorusskom perevode. Tekst, issledovanie I slovar'*. I. *Tekst* [*Книгы временьныа и образныа Георгиа Мниха. Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе. Текст, исследование и словарь.* Том 1. *Текст*] (Petrograd, Rossiiskaia Gosudarstvennaia Akademicheskaia Tipografiia [Петроград, Российская Государственная Академическая Типография], 1920), pp. 31-32.

29. Cf. *Jubilees* [4.31]; on Cain's death as an illustration of 'the principle of *lex talionis* engraved in the heavenly tablets', see L.T. Stuckenbruck, 'The Book of *Jubilees* and the Origin of Evil', pp. 294-308 (esp. 297-98); see also F. Badalanova Geller, 'Clandestine Transparencies: Retrieving *The Book of Jubilees* in *Slavia Orthodoxa* (Iconographic, Apocryphal and Folklore Witnesses to the Fratricide)' (forthcoming).

30. Cf. *Jubilees* [12.1-8, 12-15]; for comparison between the *Jubilees* version of the story and its renditions in some other traditions (e.g. Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* [6.3-18], *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* [Gen. 11.28], *Genesis Rabbah* [38.13]), see Craig A. Evans, 'Abraham in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Man of Faith and Failure', in Peter W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), pp. 149-58 (esp. 152-55); for a thorough examination of the renditions of the legend about Abraham burning the temple of idols in the Byzantine chronographic sources, consult William Adler, 'Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols: *Jubilees*' Tradition in Christian Chronography', *JQR* NS 77.2/3 (Oct., 1986–Jan., 1987), pp. 95-117. For the Slavonic versions of the narrative, see V. Istrin [В. Истрин], 'Zamechaniia o sostave Tolkovoi Palei' [Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи], *Izvestiia Otdeleniia Russkogo Iazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk* [*Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии Наук*] 2.1 (1897), pp. 189–200; Andrei A. Orlov, '*The Gods of My Father Terah*: Abraham the Iconoclast and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*', in *Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, 23; Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 55-73. See also the discussion below.

channels, to Slavonic parabiblical literature, iconography and oral tradition.[31] Then again, the reception history of *Jubilees* within the intellectual landscape of Byzantium was neither straightforward nor simple. Thus Adler observes that 'of all the extra-biblical sources that Syncellus and the other Byzantine chronographers consulted in their treatment of primordial history, *Jubilees* is the most extensively used, and, at the same time, subject to some of the most thoroughgoing reworking'.[32] In fact, 'Syncellus never quotes verbatim from it'—a practice which stands in sharp contrast to his 'fairly faithful Greek citations from *1 Enoch*'.[33] Furthermore in Syncellus' *Chronography* (unlike in Epiphanius' *Panarion*) the enumeration of the individual acts of Creation (with the twenty-two primordial works corresponding to the twenty-two Hebrew letters and twenty-two books of the Hebrew Bible) significantly deviates from that in *Jubilees* [2]. For the clarity of the current discussion, it is necessary to quote here the cosmogonic catalogue of 'the twenty-two acts of Creation', as listed in Syncellus' *Chronography*:

> The first day Africanus calls 'intelligible', because the first created light was yet unformed and diffuse. On the first created full day the first day of the first Hebrew month of Nisan, as has been shown above, the 25th of the Roman month of March, and the 29th of the Egyptian month of Phamenoth, on the Lord's day, that is on the first of the week, God created the heaven and the earth, the darkness and the waters, spirit and light and a full day: altogether seven works. On the second full day, the firmament came into being: one work. On the third full day, there were four works: the manifestation and drying of the land, Paradise, all kinds of trees, and plants and seeds. On the fourth day, God created the sun and the moon and the stars. On the fifth day, God created all reptiles and swimming things (sea monsters and fish and whatever is in the waters), as well as birds: altogether three works. On the sixth day, God created four-footed animals, land reptiles, wild beasts, and man: four works. Altogether there are twenty-two works, equal in number with the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and the twenty-two books of the Hebrew Bible, and the twenty-two generations of patriarchs from Adam up to Jacob, as it is reported in the Little Genesis [Λεπτὴ Γένεσις], which some say is also a

31. These narratives will be analyzed elsewhere.

32. Adler, *Time Immemorial*, p. 182. Adler thus promptly defines Syncellus' citations from *Jubilees* as 'epitomised forms' of the work; see, p. 183. See also the earlier discussion in Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, pp. xvi, lxxviii-lxxix.

33. Adler, *Time Immemorial*, p. 183.

> revelation of Moses. This work states that the heavenly powers were created on the first day.[34]

In contrast to Epiphanius, Syncellus excluded the engendering of angelic powers from the acts of the first day of Creation; by emending the template of *Jubilees*, he thus gave priority to the Greek, that is, Christian hexameral tradition (according to which the creation of the angels preceded the creation of the Universe).[35]

It has been noted that various pieces of *Jubilees* were cited not only by George Syncellus, but also by George Cedrenus,[36] Ioannes Zonaras,[37] George Hamartolos[38] and others;[39] excerpts were also quoted in a number of Christian exegetical texts on *Genesis*.[40] It is also worth mentioning that along with the aforementioned *Little Genesis* [Λεπτὴ Γένεσις] and *Details of Genesis* (τὰ λεπτὰ Γένεσεως)',[41] among

34. The fragment is quoted after Adler and Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, p. 4. In fact, Syncellus 'later refers to the book as the *Details of Genesis* (τὰ λεπτὰ Γένεσεως)'; see p. 4 (n. 3), p. 11 (n. 1).

35. For a thorough discussion on the adaptation of *Jubilees* in Syncellus' primordial chronology, see Adler, *Time Immemorial*, pp. 145-47, 182-94, 213. Significantly, in contrast to the *Jubilees*, where the list of the twenty-two generations from Adam to Jacob ('based on the Hebrew chronology, which excludes the second Kainan') is presented in symmetry with the twenty-two primordial works, twenty-two Hebrew letters and twenty-two books of the Hebrew Bible, in Syncellus' chronology, 'there are actually twenty-three generations from Adam up to and including Jacob'; see Adler and Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, pp. 4-5 (n. 4).

36. Cf. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*, pp. xvi, lxxix; Adler, *Time Immemorial*, pp. 206-31.

37. Cf. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*, pp. xvi, lxxix; Adler, *Time Immemorial*, p. 183.

38. As pointed out by Adler, 'George the Monk regularly cites from Josephus and *Jubilees* in tandem, habitually conflating material from both works and sometimes, like Syncellus, misattributing *Jubilees* citations to Josephus', thus producing 'not a continuous chronological narrative, but rather a collection of source material'. At the same time Adler warns that the confusion between *Jubilees* citations and Josephus, as observed in this type of historiographical compilations, was not always accidental, but was a result of deliberate editorial interventions, due to the fact that some of the Byzantine chronographers 'held Jubilees in low regard'; see Adler, *Time Immemorial*, p. 193. For more on the interpolations of the *Jubilees* narrative in *The Chronicle of Hamartolos*, see pp. 206-31 of Adler's discussion.

39. See VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', pp. 18-21; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, p. 5.

40. VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees', pp. 15-17.

41. See n. 34 above.

the titles[42] used in Byzantine sources to designate *Jubilees* (or fragments from the book), are *The Apocalypse of Moses* (e.g. Syncellus [1.5, 48]; Cedrenus [1.7]),[43] *The Testament of Moses* (in the Catena of Nicephorus [1.175], preceding a quotation from *Jubilees* [10.21]),[44] *The Life of Adam*[45] and *The Book of Adam's Daughters*;[46] the latter, as pointed out by Charles, is 'identified with *Jubilees* in the Decree of Gelasius: 'Liber de filiabus Adae, hoc est Leptogenesis, Apocryphus'. The designation…aims at giving the names of the wives of all the patriarchs from Adam onwards.'[47]

The Greek material, in turn, served as the intermediate template for the Slavonic tradition, which, despite its long history of translation and transmission (as attested occasionally in relatively late manuscripts), preserves a rather archaic phase in the reception history of the 'Jewish' *Jubilees* and, more importantly, quite an early stage of its domestication within a 'Christian' intellectual landscape. The crux of the matter is this: the Slavonic scribes, who were much more conservative than their Greek contemporaries, conventionally maintained a rather robust, somewhat old-fashioned tradition of fostering the transmission of text-witnesses which were much less corrupt/embellished than those produced in Byzantine scriptoria in the same period (as it is the case of *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, for instance);[48]

42. For a short survey of titles applied to *Jubilees*, see Charles, *The Book of Jubilees, or The Little Genesis*, pp. xiv-xx, as well as the *Introduction* to Rabin's revised translation of *Jubilees* in Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, p. 5, and Wintermute, *Jubilees*, p. 41; consult also Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, p. 2.

43. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*, p. xvii; Wintermute, *Jubilees*, p. 41; see also nn. 53 and 54 below.

44. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*, pp. xvii-xviii; Wintermute, *Jubilees*, p. 41; see also nn. 53 and 54 below.

45. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*, pp. xix-xx.

46. Wintermute, *Jubilees*, p. 41.

47. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*, pp. xviii-xix.

48. See for instance the discussion in S.P. Shestakov [С.П. Шестаков], 'O znachenii slavianskogo perevoda khroniki Ioanna Malaly dlia vozstanovleniia i ispravleniia ee grecheskogo teksta' [О значении славянского перевода хроники Иоанна Малалы для возстановления и исправления ее греческого текста], *Vizantiiskii Vremennik, Izdavaemyi pri Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, Sankt Petersburg* [*Византийский Временник, Издаваемый при Императорской Академии Наук*, Санкт-Петербург], 1 (1894), pp. 503-552; *idem*, 'Pribavlenie k stat'e «O

hence the argument that the Slavonic redactions of certain compositions can be used as a reliable basis for the hypothetical reconstruction of their no longer extant Greek *Vorlage*. However, the case of *Jubilees* is much more complicated, since, as briefly mentioned above, no complete copy has been identified of a Greek translation of the text. Although it is impossible to detect—at least on the bases of currently available, and occasionally hopelessly corrupt, sources—a specific Byzantine intermediary for the Slavonic (fragmentary) renditions of *Jubilees*, there is, nevertheless a dependable strategy for unearthing the intellectual settings of its penetration into the scribal production of *Slavia Orthodoxa*. The most straightforward (yet by no means undisputable) evidence comes from the survey of conventional taxonomy used by the Slavonic scribes to label compositions based on Byzantine protographs; of particular importance in this connection are the Slavonic designations *Дробное/ Дробъное Бытиѥ/Бытіе/Бытїѧ* (*The Little Genesis*),[49] *Дробное Писаніе* (*The Little Scripture/Writ*),[50] *Доброе Писаніе* (*The Good Scripture/Writ*),[51] and *Доброе Глаголаніе* (*The Good Discourse*), [52] along with their complementary forms *Дрѣбное Житие* (*The Little Vita* [*of Moses*]),[53] *Доброе Житие* (*The*

znachenii slavianskogo perevoda Malaly»‘ [Прибавление к статье «О значении славянского перевода Малалы»], *Vizantiiskii Vremennik, Izdavaemyi pri Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk* 2 (1895), pp. 372-77.

49. For the title *Дробное (var. Дробьное/Дробъное) Бытиѥ (var. Бытіе, Бытїѧ)* as one of the Slavonic designations of *The Little Genesis*, see Istrin, ‘Redaktsii Tolkovoi Palei (II)’, pp. 22, 25-26.

50. For the title *Дробное Писаніе* (= *The Little Scripture/Writ*), see Istrin, ‘Redaktsii Tolkovoi Palei (II)’, p. 26.

51. For the title *Доброе Писаніе* (= *The Good Scripture/Writ*), see Istrin, ‘Redaktsii Tolkovoi Palei (II)’, pp. 18, 25-26.

52. For the title Доброе Глаголаніе (= *The Good Discourse*), see Istrin, ‘Redaktsii Tolkovoi Palei (II)’, p. 26.

53. The title *Дрѣбное (var. Дробъное) Житїе* (= *The Little Vita* [*of Moses*]) is used to render one of the Greek designations of *Jubilees* as *The Apocalypse of Moses* (as in Syncellus [1.5, 48] and Cedrenus [1.7]) and/or *The Testament of Moses* (as in the Catena of Nicephorus [1.175]); see Istrin, ‘Redaktsii Tolkovoi Palei (II)’, pp. 17-18, 20-22, 24-27 and K. Istomin [К. Истомин], ‘K voprosu o redaktsiiakh Tolkovoi Palei’ [К вопросу о редакциях Толковои Палеи], *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk* [*Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук*], 18.1 (1913), pp. 87-172 (esp. p. 107).

Good Vita [*of Moses*]),[54] as attested in the *Interpretative Palaea*. Clearly, they were coined on the basis of the *verbatim* translation of the Greek *Leptogenesis* (ἡ Λεπτογένεσις), one of the titles applied to designate the book of *Jubilees*.[55]

One further point. So far the history of *Jubilees* cross-cultural transmission in the Byzantine Commonwealth, from the perspective of Old Church Slavonic sources, has been overlooked. One of the goals of the present work is to include this hitherto neglected evidence into a wider scholarly discussion, thus aiming at introducing new material in the study of reception history of Jewish parabiblical tradition in its successive Christian environment. At the same time, the present author intentionally excludes from the scope of the current investigation literary sources attested in languages other than Church Slavonic (since they are examined at length by other scholars). The focal point of the analysis in the present work is thus the Slavonic material (as represented by parabiblical writings); each of these components is treated as a surviving piece of evidence concerning Judaeo-Christian encounters in Late Antiquity and Middle ages.

1.2. *Jubilees* as a Witness to the 'Folk Bible' of the Ancients

There is, I believe, a problem with the label 'rewritten Bible',[56] as applied to *Jubilees* and other parabiblical texts (such as the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*, etc.). The term 'rewritten' (as coined by Vermes) excludes the oral features of this type of texts in recognizing only their written

54. For the title *Доброе Житїе* (*The Good Vita* [*of Moses*]), see Istrin, 'Redaktsii Tolkovoi Palei (II)', pp. 20-22, 25, 26; see also the previous footnote.

55. See also n. 16 above.

56. The literature on the subject of the 'rewritten Bible' is vast; for a brief overview of methodological strategies applied in studies on the topic, see the discussion in Alexander, 'Retelling the Old Testament', pp. 99-121; James C. VanderKam, 'Biblical Interpretation in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*', in Charlesworth and Evans (eds.), *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 96-125 (esp. 97-98 n. 6); Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007); Moshe J. Bernstein, '*Rewritten Bible*: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?', *Textus* 22 (2005), pp. 169-96; Hindy Najman, 'Reconsidering Jubilees: Prophecy and Exemplarity', in Boccaccini and Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, pp. 229-43 (esp. 229-31).

form. I would prefer a different epistemological discourse, whereby *Jubilees* (and other texts from the Second Temple period) are viewed as the earliest examples of oral counterparts to the Pentateuch, since all of these compositions represent in some way or another expansions of biblical narratives; *Jubilees*, moreover, also accentuates calendar reckoning and chronology, as well as some ritual regulations. Nevertheless, *Jubilees* identifies itself as revelation transmitted to Moses by an angel, and this precisely fits the pattern I am advocating. By the second century BCE, once rabbinic institutions were established, Moses was seen as the source of all *halachah*, in this case designated the 'Oral Torah', and the orality of the transmission of Jewish legal norms as well as parabiblical narratives were fully acknowledged by the Rabbis under this heading: oral law. In this connection, pre-rabbinic *Jubilees* causes a certain amount of difficulty, since the text probably predates Pharisaic institutions and the usual designation 'Oral Torah', but at the same time could well fit into the similar pattern of orally transmitted parabiblical texts (e.g. Midrash, Mishnah), which were eventually written down. In other words, just as rabbinic literature was ascribed to Moses as the ultimate source of traditions (i.e. 'Torah from Sinai'), deemed as oral but eventually committed to writing, these same attributes could be assigned to *Jubilees*, albeit at a much earlier period.

Hence, the underlying premise of this article is that *Jubilees*, along with some other Second Temple compositions (e.g. *The Life of Adam and Eve*, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, etc.), may be regarded as one of the written imprints of a much older orally transmitted hypertext, among the offshoots of which was the Pentateuch itself;[57] it can be argued that it was exactly the fabric of this *Ur-*

57. We agree with Charlesworth's suggestion that 'the Pseudepigrapha were often produced within the crucible of biblical interpretation. The biblical stories were memorized; they were taken seriously, as *bruta facta*, as revealed truths; but to speak to the curiosities and needs of a later time the stories needed to be retold and completed with details. All the evidence seems to suggest that what we call additional facts and details were considered by the early Jews who revered these Pseudepigrapha to be part of the true story. Now they were revealed to serve the curiosities and needs of later generations'; see James H. Charlesworth, 'In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation', in Charlesworth and Evans (eds.), *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 20-43 (esp. p. 39). Furthermore, he argues that 'many works in the Pseudepigrapha—especially the *Apocalypse of*

hypertext that served as *material prima* for the construction of the canonical scriptural corpus. Can we thus argue that *Jubilees* was part of the oral corpus of the 'Folk Bible' of the ancients? I think we can.

2. Searching for Evidence: Querying and Quarrying at the Periphery of Byzantium

2.1. Tracing the Agents of *Jubilees* in Slavonic Parabiblical Literature

Pursuing the Greek (Byzantine) model of discrete domestication and subsequent clandestine diffusion of *Jubilees*' fragmented corpus into Christian intellectual landscape, one can roughly predict 'the usual suspects' for its potential hosts in Slavonic tradition. Indeed, they include (sections from) *The Treatise on Measures and Weights* and *The Panarion* by Epiphanius of Salamis,[58] as well as redactions of the

Abraham, the *Testament of Job*, the *Lives of the Prophets* and *Pseudo-Philo*—attest to folk tales developing around the Tanach. They show how Torah permeated the far reaching corners of Early Judaism and helped produce the Pseudepigrapha' (p. 41).

58. There is firm evidence indicating that the scribes of Medieval Bulgaria were acquainted with some of the writings (or at least fragments thereof) of Epiphanius of Salamis (= Epiphanius of Cyprus). Thus the earliest references to some of his works (e.g. *The Ancoratus*, *The Panarion*, *De Gemmis*, etc.) occur in the very first encyclopaedic anthology of *Slavia Orthodoxa—Symeon's Florilegium*. Compiled in Bulgaria during the reign of King Symeon (893–927) according to the conventional template of the contemporary Byzantine compendia, the codex was designed as a 'databank' containing articles from various spheres of medieval knowledge, including theology, philosophy and ancient science; see P. Dinekov [Петър Динеков], 'Kulturno-istoricheskoto znachenie na Simeonoviia Sbornik' ['Културно-историческото значение на Симеоновия сборник'], in P. Dinekov *et al.* (eds.), *Simeonov Sbornik* (*Po Svetoslavoviia Prepis ot 1073*). I. *Izsledvaniia i Tekst* (Sofiia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1991) [*Симеонов Сборник (По Светославовия препис от 1073), Том 1: Изследвания и текст,* София: Издателство на Българската Академия на науките, 1991], pp. 9-17; Klimentina Ivanova [Климентина Иванова], 'Simeonoviia Sbornik kato Literaturen Pametnik' ['Симеоновият сборник като литературен паметник'], in Dinekov *et al.* (eds.), *Simeonov Sbornik*, I, pp. 18-33; Kuyo Kuev [Куйо Куев], 'Poiava i Razprostranenie na Simeonoviia Sbornik' ['Поява и разпространение на Симеоновия сборник'], in Dinekov *et al.* (eds.), *Simeonov Sbornik*, I, pp. 34-98; Francis J. Thomson, 'The Symeonic *Florilegium*: Problems of Its Origin, Content, Textology and Edition, Together with an English Translation of the Eulogy of Tzar Symeon', *Palaeobulgarica* 17.1 (1993), pp. 37-53. A survey of its earliest extant copy, *Sviatoslav's Miscellany* (made in 1073 in

classical representatives of the genre of the Byzantine universal chronographies.[59] Furthermore, some specific themes and motifs, bearing the hallmark of *Jubilees*' narrative etiology, penetrated the corpus of the *Palaea*, retaining at the same time its presence in a number of related parabiblical compositions, such as *The Apocalypse of*

Kiev for the Russian Prince Sviatoslav), shows that references to Epiphanius' *Panarion* occur on fols. 123б.11, 123в.17-18, 124г.14-15, 126в.12-13, 127а.23-24; 137а.14-15, 167б.22, 216в.24-25, 240г.21 under the following designations: *Стааго Ѥпифаниа отъ Панарии, Стааго Ѥпифаниа отъ Парии, Стааго Ѥпифана отъ Панарии, Стааго Ѥпифана отъ Понарии, Епифаниєво отъ Панарии, Епифаниєво отъ Понари*; see Dinekov *et al.* (eds.), *Simeonov Sbornik*, I, pp. 441, 442, 444, 448, 449, 467, 527, 626, 674. Furthermore, apart from the briefly glossed *Panarion* and *Ancoratus*, included in *Symeon's Florilegium* (fols. 152в-154а), was an epitome of Epiphanius' most celebrated (at least in *Slavia Orthodoxa*) treatise *De Gemmis*, with the Slavonic version of the title being rendered as *Стааго Ѥпифаниа о .вѣ. камыкоу иже бѣахоу на логии сѫнтителевѣ насаждана* (= *Saint Epiphanius' On the Twelve Gems Which Were Set in the High-Priest Breastplate*); see the discussion in Dinekov *et al.* (eds.), *Simeonov Sbornik*, I, pp. 498-501]; see also Tzvetana Raleva [Цветана Ралева], Petya Yaneva [Петя Янева], 'Sveti Epifanii: Za dvanadesette kamŭka, koito biakha vgradeni v nagrŭdnika na pŭrvosveshtenika' ['Свети Епифаний: За дванадесетте камъка, които бяха вградени в нагръдника на първосвещеника'], in Anisava Miltenova [Анисава Милтенова] (ed.), *Stara Bŭlgarska Literatura* [*Стара българска литература*], V. *Estestvoznanie* [*Естествознание*] (Sofiia: Bŭlgarski Pisatel [София: Български писател], 1992), pp. 100-101, 392-94. Discrete references to the treatise *De Gemmis* are attested in the writings of John Exarch, one of the most impressive men of letters in Medieval Bulgaria; consult, for instance, 'The Discourse on the Sixth Day of Creation' from the fifteenth-century Russian redaction of his *Hexameron* (fol. 268a in Ms 145 from the Ecclesiastical Academy in Moscow) edited by G.S. Barankova [Г.С. Баранкова] and V.V. Mil'kov [В.В. Мильков], *Shestodnev Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo* [*Шестоднев Иоанна Экзарха Болгарского*] (St. Petersburg: Aleteia [Санкт-Петербург: Алетейа], 2001), p. 641. For the relationship between *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *The Legend Concerning the Twelve Precious Stones on the Priestly Breastplate* [Сказание о 12-ти драгоценых камнях на наперснике первосвященника], see Porfir'ev, *Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoi Biblioteki*, pp. 68-70; for the incorporation of Epiphanius' *Legend Concerning the Twelve Precious Stones on the Priestly Breastplate*, see Slavova, *Tŭlkovnata Paleia*, pp. 277-87. Furthermore *De Gemmis* survives in a number of fragments (in Latin, Georgian, etc.).

59. See the discussion in S. Franklin, 'Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan Historiography', pp. 12-25.

Abraham,[60] some erotapocritic writings (e.g. *The Discussion between the Three Saints*), and other apocryphal texts (e.g. *The Discourse Concerning the Righteous Abraham*, *The Discourse Concerning Avram and Sarah*, *The Legend of the Sea of Tiberias*, etc.); these are analyzed elsewhere.

2.2. The Creation Template of *Jubilees* Recycled

Among the first to draw attention to the occurrence of a (brief) quotation from *Jubilees* in Slavonic tradition was the Russian philologist I. Porfir'ev, in his *Apocryphal Legends of Old Testament Figures and Events* [*Апокрифические сказания о Ветхозаветных лицах и событиях*] (published in 1877). He identified it in (a fragmentary) copy of the Slavonic translation/redaction of the treatise *On Measures and Weights by Epiphanius of Salamis* [Епифана Епс̑па Кипрьскаго еже w мирилѣхъ и стоанихъ]. While analyzing the Slavonic section, comparing it to its Greek counterpart, Porfir'ev pointed out that both reproduced an abridged rendition of the *Jubilees*' Creation account. The excerpt from the treatise *On Measures and Weights*, in turn, was included in the sixteenth-century Russian redaction of *The Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes*;[61] it was

60. For an English translation of the text (with commentaries) and bibliography, including a concise survey of sources, see A. Pennington, 'The Apocalypse of Abraham', in Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 363-92; R. Rubinkiewicz, 'The Apocalypse of Abraham', in *OTP*, I, pp. 681-705. For more on *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, see the discussion in Alexander Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004; Leiden: Brill, 2005); see also Andrei A. Orlov, *Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, pp. 12-18, 21-90; for the incorporation of *The Apocalypse of Abraham* into the *Interpretative Palaea*, see Slavova, *Tŭlkovnata Paleia*, pp. 292-94.

61. For the use of the Epiphanius' fragment (concerning the twenty-two major works of Creation) by Cosmas Indicopleustes in his *Christian Topography*, see Wanda Wolska-Conus (ed.), *Cosmas Indicopleustes: Topographie chrétienne* (Sources Chrétiennes, 197.3; Paris: Cerf, 1973), pp. 283-85; Michael Stone, Roberta Ervine, *The Armenian Text of Epiphanius of Salamis 'De mensuris et ponderibus'* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, V.583; Subsidia: T.105; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), p. 1 (n. 2). Obviously, Slavonic tradition followed the same pattern; for the incorporation of fragments from Cosmas Indicopleustes' *Christian Topography* (containing excerpts from *The Treatise on Measures and Weights*) into the corpus of the *Interpretative Palaea*, see Slavova, *Tŭlkovnata Paleia*, pp. 210-19 (esp. pp. 210, 213). For a general survey of the fragments from the *Christian Topography*

inserted as a special section devoted to cosmogony and angelology, in the incipit of which it is stated that during the first week the primordial *twenty-two* works were completed, after which the first seven great works are enumerated:

> Два десяте оубо и двѣ дѣлѣ. w добролюбче. Бг҃ъ сътвори изначала до ҃з днїй. яже суть сіи. въ҃а д҃нь. ҃нбо вышнее. землю. воды. отъ нихъ же есть снѣгъ голоть. градъ. ледъ. роса. д҃си служаще предъ нимъ. иже суть сїи. аг҃ли лицу. аг҃ги сл҃вѣ і аг҃ли wблаку и мраку. и снѣгомъ и граду и леду. аг҃ли гласомъ и млнїамъ. аг҃ли студени и зною. зимѣ і осѣни. веснѣ и жатвѣ и всѣхъ зданьи его. иже на нб҃сѣхь и на земли и глубины. тма иже верху бездны. водамъ иже когда врьху земля. отъ нихъ же тмы вечеръ и нощь. свѣтъ. д҃нь. изаоутрїа. сихъ҃з великыхъ дѣлъ сотвори Бг҃ъ въ҃а д҃нь.[62]
>
> O lover of the good, God did twenty-two works between the beginning and the seventh day, which are these: on the first day [He created] the upper heavens, the earth, [from] the waters of which [emanate] snow, ice, hail, frost, dew, [as well as] the spirits that minister before Him. They are the following: the angels of the presence [lit. of the face], the angels of glory, the angels of the clouds and of the darkness, of snow and hail and frost, the angels of sounds [of the thunders] and the lightning, the angels of the cold and of the heat, of winter and autumn, of spring, and summer [lit. harvestide], and of all the spirits of his creatures in heaven and on earth, along with the darkness above the abyss of the waters which were at one time upon the earth; from them originated the darkness of the evening and

incorporated into the Slavonic *Palaea* (with a special emphasis on the legend of the construction of the Tower of Babel and the confusion of languages), see Istrin, 'Zamechaniia o sostave Tolkovoi Palei', pp. 178–189. See also the following note.

62. Quoted after Porfir'ev's transcription in his *Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoi Biblioteki*, pp. 23-24; the fragment was found in a miscellany, about which details of the original location are somewhat scarce and vague. In his edition of the text Porfir'ev simply noted that at the time when he copied the fragment, the manuscript was kept in the *Archival Collection of the Ecclesiastical Academy* of the city of Kazan, and the paragraph about the twenty-two works of creation was on fols. 433-34; see pp. 23-24 (esp. n. 2). In a parallel column, next to the Slavonic segment, Porfir'ev provides a Greek version of Epiphanius' text corresponding to the first day of Creation. The whole Greek fragment (covering two days of creation), along with a Latin translation, appears in Jacques-Paul Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus* (vol. 88; Paris: Migne, 1864), pp. 427-30, and the Epiphanius passage is found within the rubric of Cosmas Indicopleustes' *Topographia Christiana.*

> of the night, and the [light of the] dawn and the morning. These seven great works God created on the first day.[63]

The comparison between the Slavonic and the Greek excerpts quoted by Porfir'ev shows that they are almost identical; in fact, the Slavonic witness represents a relatively faithful rendition of the Greek version. This, in turn, suggests, that the Slavonic scribe most probably copied the account from a source, the content of which did not differ drastically from the redactions attested in (the currently known) Greek witnesses. Yet most signficantly, the above-quoted sixteenth-century Slavonic witness to the *Jubilees* Creation template [64] provides a remarkable piece of evidence demonstrating the robustness of this cosmogonic tradition, the earliest attestation of which, as mentioned briefly above, comes from Qumran library (fragment 4Q216 2.2):[65]

> [For on the first day he created the] upper [heaven]s, the ear[th, the waters and all the spirits who serve before him: the angels of] the presence, the angels of ho[liness,] the an[gels of the spirits of fire the angels of the spirits of the current]s [and] the angels of the spirits of the [clouds], of dark[ness, ice, frost, dew, snow, hail and hoar]frost; and the angels of thunder[s] and the angels of the [storm-]winds [and the angels of the winds of cold and of] heat, of winter and of summer, [all] the spirits of his creatures [which he made in the heavens and which he made in the ear]th and in everything, the aby[sses,] darkness, dawn, [light, the dusk which he prepared with] his [know]ledge. Then we saw his deeds and [blessed him] on account of all his [d]eeds and [we praised him in his presence because] he ma[de seven] great works [on the first day]. And on the [second] da[y he made the vault in the midd]le of the [water]s, [and the waters were separated on that day. Half] went up on to[p of the vault and half went down below the vault which was in its midst, on top of the face of all] the earth…[66]

So far it has been maintained that 'for these lines there are two other textual witnesses in addition to the Ethiopic manuscripts: Epiphanius' Greek citation of the *Jubilees*' Creation story, and excerpts from the

63. Author's translation.

64. Consult also Dean (ed.), *Epiphanius*' *Treatise on Weights and Measures*, pp. 41-42; see also n. 17 above.

65. See also the discussion above, nn. 13 and 21.

66. Quoted after García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, I, p. 461; for an earlier edition of the text, see also VanderKam and Milik, 'The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication', p. 258.

same account in an anonymous Syriac Chronicle';[67] further comparison may be made with a 'shorter creation story in the Greek Chronicles'.[68] In any case, the standard text for analysis of the *Jubilees* cosmogonic scheme is considered to be the Ethiopic version [2.2-18]:

> For on the first day he created the heavens which are above, and the earth, and the waters, and every spirit that serves before him—the angels of the presence, and the angels of the holiness, and the angels of the spirit of fire, and the angels of the spirit of the winds, and the angels of the spirit of the clouds and of darkness and of snow and of hail and of hoar-frost, and the angels of the depths and of thunders and lightning, and the angels of the cold winds and of the hot winds and of winter and spring and autumn and summer, and the spirit of his creatures in the heaven and on the earth and in all abysses, and the deep darkness and the light and the dawn and the morning and the evening, which he had already prepared and planned. And then we saw his works, and we blessed him and sang praises before him because of all his works; for on the first day he created seven great works. And on the next day he created the vault between the waters, and the waters were divided on that day—half of them went up above and half of them went down below the vault that was between them over the earth; and this was the only work he did on the second day. And on the third day he commanded the waters to be gathered together from the surface of the earth into one place, and the dry land to appear. And the waters did so, just as he commanded them; and they receded from the surface of the earth into one place outside the vault, and the dry land appeared. And on that day he created all the seas and their separate gathering-places, and all the rivers, and the gatherings of the waters in the mountains and all over the earth, and all the lakes and all the dew of the earth, and the seed that is sown, and all plants that grow, and the trees that bear fruit, and the trees of the wood, and the Garden of Eden in Eden; and all these four great works God created on the third day. And on the fourth day he created the sun and moon and stars, and he set them in the vault of heaven to give light on earth, to have charge over day and night, and to separate light from darkness. And God appointed the sun as a great sign on earth to mark the days and weeks and months and festivals and years and weeks of years and jubilees and all the seasons of the years; and it separates light from darkness, and is the source of health, so that everything may be healthy that sprouts and grows on earth. These three kinds of lights he made on the fourth day. And on the fifth day he created great sea-monsters in the depths of the waters (these were the first living creatures that were created by his

67. See VanderKam and Milik, 'The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication', p. 257.

68. See VanderKam and Milik, 'The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication', p. 257 (n. 9).

> hands), and all the fish that swim in the waters and all kinds of birds that fly. And the sun rose over them all to give them health, over everything that was on the earth—all plants and trees and living creatures. These three kinds of living creatures he created on the fifth day. And on the sixth day he created all the wild animals of the earth, and all the cattle, and everything that moves on the earth. And after all this he created man: a man and a woman he created; and he made him master over everything that is on the earth and in the seas and over everything that flies, and over the wild animals and the cattle, and over everything that moves on the earth, and over the whole earth; over all this he made him master. And these four kinds of creatures he created on the sixth day. And there were all together twenty-two kinds. And he finished all his work on the sixth day—all that is in the heavens and on the earth, and in the seas and the abysses, and in the light and the darkness, and in everything. And he gave us a great sign, the Sabbath day.[69]

The assessment of the Slavonic renditions of the *Jubilees* cosmogonic scheme against the background of the Ethiopic version reveals a somewhat surprising picture. Let us examine the evidence.

In his Survey of the Russian Redactions of the Chronographic Compendia (1866), the Russian scholar Andrei Popov[70] detected that the incipit of the so-called First Recension of *The Chronographic Compendium from the Hellenistic and Roman Times* (also known as *Letopisets Ellinskii i Rimskii*, hereafter *LER*)[71] was based on a paraphrase of translated extracts from the Epiphanius's treatise *On*

69. Quoted after C. Rabin's translation of the text in Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 14-15.

70. See Andrei Popov [Андрей Попов], *Obzor Khronografov Russkoi Redaktsii* [Обзор Хронографов Русской Редакции] (Moscow: Tipografiia Lazarevskogo Instituta [Москва: Типография Лазаревского института], 1866), pp. 4-6.

71. The prevailing view in the Russian (and later the Soviet) academic tradition, which is likewise shared by some Western scholars, is that the text of *The Chronographic Compendium from the Hellenistic and Roman Times* [Лѣтописецъ Еллинский и римскы] was of East Slavonic (that is, Russian) provenance. Others maintain that the text was first translated/compiled in Bulgaria in the period of the King Simeon (that is, the tenth century), concurrently with some other historiographical compendia (e.g. the *Chronicles* of John Malalas, George Syncellus, George Hamartolos), as well as theological treatises, along with exegetical and homiletic writings (e.g. *The Hexameron*, etc.). For further information, see Franklin, 'Sources of Kievan Historiography', pp. 3-26; D. Peev [Д. Пеев], 'Arkhivskiiat khronograf i Letopisets elinski i rimski I redaktsiia', [Архивският хронограф и Летописец елински и римски, I редакция], *Starobŭlgarska Literatura* [*Старобългарска литература*] 39–40 (2008), pp. 104-31.

Measures and Weights, which, in turn, quoted the Jubilees' Creation account. Thus, the Slavonic scribe opens his composition with a paragraph entitled *The Narrative About How at the Beginning God Created Twenty-Two Deeds in Six Days by Saint Epiphanius* [Сказа$^{\text{ние}}$ сѧ̑го Епифа$^{\text{ни}}$ѧ яко изначала сътвори Бъ̑ дѣл кв̑ ѕ̑-ю де$^{\text{ни}}$]; presented in this fragment is the list of the divine deeds which took place on the first day.[72] The same pattern is attested in Second recension of *LER*, which likewise opens with a narrative about the initial stages of the Creation of the Universe, entitled *Concerning the First Day, according to Our Holy Father Epiphanius of Cyprus* [Иже во святыхъ отца нашего Епифанія Кипрьскаго о первомъ дни];[73] as pointed out by Popov, the text of Epiphanius is then followed by excerpts from *The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses*, along with quotations from the Sermons on Genesis of Severian of Gabala, as well as passages from the Palaea. In his recent edition of the *LER* corpus, the Russian scholar O. Tvorogov[74] drew attention to some exciting textual discoveries; thus he pointed out that in the so-called 'Arkhangel'sk redaction' of this chronographic compendium (dated to the fifteenth–sixteenth century),[75] there is a fragment interpolated from *The Discourse of Saint Epiphanius*, *How at the Beginning God Created Twenty-Two Deeds in Six Days* [Сказание святаго Епифания, яко изначала сътвори Бог дѣлъ 22 6-ю день].[76] To the best of my knowledge, this fragment from the 'Arkhangel'sk redaction' of *LER* represents the most elaborate (and perhaps the best preserved so far in Slavonic tradition) witness to the *Jubilees* cosmogonic account; following the Hexameral scheme, the compiler, however, inserts some additional details (e.g. the Fall of the Devil from the angelic host, with implicit

72. See Popov, *Obzor Khronografov*, pp. 3-5.

73. See Popov, *Obzor Khronografov*, pp. 100-101.

74. See O. Tvorogov [О. Творогов], *Letopisets Ellinskii I Rimskii* [Летописец Еллинский и Римский] (vols. 1–2; St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1999/2001).

75. The Ms was discovered in 1985; it is currently kept in the Library of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg (Архангельское собрание, С 18); see Tvorogov, *Letopisets Ellinskii I Rimskii*, I, p. iii.

76. Among the most fascinating pieces of the currently discussed intertextual puzzle of the *Jubilees* numerical scheme of the 'twenty-two primordial deeds' is the fact that the Slavonic text presents an independent parallel to chs. 21–22 of the Syriac redaction of Epiphanius' treatise; cf. Dean, *Epiphanius*' *Treatise on Weights and Measures*, pp. 41-42. See also nn. 17 and 20 above.

reference to the Fall of Lucifer in Isa. 14.12-19) which are usually attested in the Palaea and related chronographic compendia. It is important to note that the reference to the episode of the eviction of Satanael from Heaven is not found in the Greek and/or Syriac versions of *On Measures and Weights*, but is attested in the Slavonic redaction of Epiphanius' treatise. The account in *LER* runs as follows:

> Въ пръвыи день небеса и вышняя, и землю, и воды, из нихже есть снѣгъ, и голоть, и град, и мраз, и росы, и духи, иже служать пред нимъ, иже суть сии аггели пред лицем его: аггели славы, аггели духом дышущимъ, аггели облаком и мъгламъ, и снѣгу, и граду, и мразу, аггели гласомъ, и громомъ, аггели зимы, и зноеви, и зимнии, и осѣни, и весны, и лѣта, и всему твари его духу, и на земли водныя и бездныя, и сущая под землею пропасти и тъмѣ, и сущая врьху безныя, бывшая древле врьху земля, от неяже тъмы, и вечеръ и нощь, и свѣтъ дневныи и утрении. Сих же седмь дѣлъ створиль есть Богъ въ 1 день. Въ 2 день иже твердь, иже есть посреди воды. Сего же дни раздѣлишася воды и плъ их взыдоша на твердь, а полъ под твердию, посрѣди лица всея земля. Се едино дѣло створиль есть Богъ въ 2 день. И въ 3 море, и рекы, и езера, и источники, траву же, и древеса и семена вся, яже прозябе древод плодовитое и неплодовитое, и дубравы. Сии же 4 делеса великыя сътвори Богъ въ 3 день. Въ четвертыи день солнце, и луну, и звѣзды обѣсил. Си три великая же сотвори Богъ в 4 день. Въ тои же день и диавол отпаде аггельскаго чина. Въ 5 день киты великыя, и рыбы, и прочая, и вся гады, и вся сущая во водахъ, и птица пернатыя. Сии велиции двѣ дѣлѣ въ 5 день сотвори Богъ. Въ 6 день звѣри, и скотѣ, и гады земныя. Сътвори же и человѣка. Сии 4 великая дѣла сътвори Богъ в 6 день. Та вся дѣла 20 и 2, и сконча вся дѣла своя, елико их на небеси, и елико их на земли и в водах. И почи Богъ в 7 день от всѣх дѣл своих и благослови и.[77]

> On the first day [God created] the upper heavens, and earth, and waters,[78] from which there is snow and ice and hail and frost and dew, and spirits which serve before Him.[79] Those are the angels before His face: angels of glory,[80] angels breathing spirit,[81] angels of the clouds and mist and snow

77. See Tvorogov, *Letopisets Ellinskii I Rimskii*, I, pp. 3-4.

78. Compare the Ethiopic version of *Jubilees* [2.2]: 'For on the first day He created the heavens, which are above, and the earth, and the waters'; see C. Rabin, 'Jubilees', in Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, p. 14.

79. Compare to the Ethiopic version of *Jubilees* [2.2]: 'And every spirit that serves before him—the angels of the presence'; see Rabin, 'Jubilees', p. 14.

80. Cf. 'the angels of holiness' (listed after 'the angels of the presence') in the Ethiopic version [2.2]; see Rabin, 'Jubilees', p. 14.

> and hail and frost,[82] and angels of sound and thunder, and angels of cold and heat and winter and autumn and spring and summer, and of all creations of His spirit, and of terrestrial waters and abysses, and of the subterranean Abyss and darkness, and the pristine earth which was above the Abyss, from which was darkness and evening and night and light of the day and of dawn. God did these seven works on the first day. On the second day [He created] the firmament, which is in the midst of the waters. On this day the waters were divided, half of which was placed above the firmament and half of which below the firmament. In the middle was the earth. This was the only work which God did on the second day. On the third day, [He created] the seas, rivers, lakes, and springs, and grass and trees and all the seeds from which trees would grow, whether with or without fruit, and groves. God did those four great works on the third day. On the fourth day [God created] the sun and moon, and suspended the stars. God did these three great [works] on the fourth day. On this day, the Devil fell from the angelic ranks. On the fifth day, [God created] great whales and fish and so forth, and all the crawling creatures and everything living in water and feathered birds. God did these two great works on the fifth day. On the sixth day, [God created] beasts and cattle and terrestrial animals. He also created Man. God did these four great works on the sixth day. Altogether, there are 22 works and He completed all his acts, whether in heaven or on earth or in water. And the Lord rested on the seventh day from all his acts and he blessed them.[83]

In comparison with the Creation account in the Ethiopic *Jubilees*, the corresponding fragment from *Epiphanius*' treatise *On Measures and Weights* is much leaner and concise; in fact, it is much closer to the cosmogonic *Jubilees* fragment from Qumran (4Q216) rather than to the corresponding passage in the Ethiopic corpus.[84] In contrast with Epiphanius' narrative, the Ethiopic one shows many interpolations and additions which testify to a heavy editorial dependence upon the canonical text of *Genesis*. This probably indicates that Epiphanius' version of the cosmogonic account originated from a *Jubilees* protograph which was less affected by editorial expansion than that of the Ethiopic redaction; furthermore the scribal attempts to harmonize the

81. Cf. 'the angels of the spirit of the winds' in the Ethiopic version [2.2]; see Rabin, 'Jubilees', p. 14.

82. Cf. 'angels of the spirit of the clouds and of darkness and of snow and of hail and of hoar-frost' in the Ethiopic version [2.2]; see Rabin, 'Jubilees', p. 14.

83. Author's translation.

84. In fact, the Qumran fragment is virtually identical with Epiphanius, both of which draw upon the no longer extant *Vorlage* of *Jubilees*.

Creation story of the treatise *On Measures and Weights* with the canonical biblical text appear to be less forceful than those exercised in the Ethiopic account. Obviously, the *Hexameral* passages within the Ethiopic text represent later renditions with interpolations, rather than the pristine layout of the text.

One further point. The significant fact is that the Slavonic compilers cited here quote from Epiphanius' treatise *On Weights and Measures* only the passages containing the *Jubilees* cosmogonic fragments while ignoring the rest of his work; this is probably because these pieces were considered to be of chief interest to the potential reader.

On the other hand, a rather trimmed, abbreviated version of the *Jubilees* cosmogonic fragment (with the typical for the *Palaea* interpolations concerning the Fall of Satanael)—yet this time without any reference to Epiphanius' treatise *On Weights and Measures*—is integrated into the corpus of one of the earliest Slavonic chronographic compositions, *The Russian Primary Chronicle* by the Monk Nestor (also known as *The Tale of Bygone Years*), originally compiled in Kiev in 1116, with the earliest extant copy, the Laurentian redaction (made in Novgorod) dating from 1377. The *Jubilees* cosmogonic fragment is inserted into the (ideologically charged) tale about the conversion of the Russian King Vladimir to Christianity and marks the pinnacle of his dialogue with a certain 'Greek' (that is, Byzantine) Philosopher who was supposed to disclose to the ruler the virtue of the Eastern Orthodox faith. The speech, in which the Philosopher was supposed to explain to his pagan interlocutor 'why God should have descended to earth' is as follows:

> In the beginning, God created heaven and earth on the first day. Upon the second, he created the land which is in the midst of the water. Upon this same day, the waters were divided. A part of them was elevated above the land and a part placed below it. On the third day, he created the sea, the rivers, the springs, and the seeds. On the fourth, God made the sun, the moon, and the stars, and thus adorned the heavens. When the foremost of the angels, the chief of the angelic host, beheld these works, he reflected and said, 'I shall descend to the earth and seize upon it. I shall then be like to God and shall establish my throne upon the northern clouds.' But God cast him straightway out of heaven and in his train fell the tenth order of the angels, who had been subject to him. The name of this adversary was Satanael, in whose place God sent Michael as chief while Satan, after sinning in his devices and falling from the former glory, is now called the adversary of God. Subsequently, upon the fifth day, God created whales,

> fishes, reptiles, and feathered fowl. On the sixth, God created beasts, cattle, and terrestrial reptiles. He also created man. Upon the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, God rested on his labours.[85]

In contrast to the fragment from Epiphanius' treatise *On Weights and Measures*, in which the twenty-two 'great works' of God are listed day by day, the cosmogonic account incorporated into the Philosopher's speech in *The Russian Primary Chronicle* omits the *numbers* of divine deeds performed each day, thus presenting a rather lean and simplified paraphrase of *Jubilees*' cosmogonic narrative. At the same time, while citing the list of 'God's works' day by day, the compiler of *The Russian Primary Chronicle* inserts into his account the tale concerning the expulsion of Satanael from the heavenly host on the fourth day of Creation, thus following the scheme attested in the *Palaea* and *LER*, after which he returns again to the narrative pattern of *Jubilees*, albeit in a somewhat abridged form. In this way the tradition of 'Jewish Jubilees' gets into the fabric of the homespun chronographic narrative about the conversion of the Russian people to Christianity, thus becoming part of their ethnohistory.

Last but not least, the *Jubilees* cosmogonic tale is not the only one to penetrate Slavonic parabiblical writings. As mentioned above, scattered references to the 'Little Genesis' and/or 'Little Scripture' occur in the corpus of the *Palaea* and chronographic compositions; amalgamated into the texture of apocryphal cycles about biblical characters (e.g. Abraham, Jacob and Esau, Moses, etc.), they continued to convey in their respective environments a memory of the book of *Jubilees*, one of the ultimate written witnesses to 'the Folk Bible' of the ancients.

85. Quoted after Samuel Hazard Cross, Olgerd Sherbowitz-Wetzor (trans. and eds.), *The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian Text* (The Medieval Academy of America Publications, 60; Cambridge MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1953), pp. 98-99.