This book seeks to trace the appropriation of a particular “Old Testament pseudepigraphon” – the *Book of Jubilees* – in early Christian sources from the New Testament (NT) to Hippolytus (and beyond). More specifically, our study focuses on the reception of *Jubilees 8–9*, an expansion on the so-called Table of Nations in Genesis 10 (1 Chronicles 1). There are three primary motivations for undertaking such a study at this particular time. First, my previous work on the Table of Nations tradition has led me to the conclusion that *Jubilees 8–9* had a powerful influence on geographical conceptions found not only in Second-Temple Jewish sources but also in early Christian writings. In order further to articulate and substantiate this thesis, the present study delves more thoroughly than before into some of the important primary source material. For instance, our study gives greater scope to a Hellenistic epigram that opens up the possibility of Jewish cartographic activity in the Second-Temple period (Chapter 1). The study also augments my previous work by re-considering the relationship of *Jubilees 8–9* both to the lost “Book of Noah” and to other writings of the Second-Temple period (Chapter 2). The study greatly expands our earlier discussion on the geography of Luke-Acts (Chapter 3) and penetrates more deeply into early Christian literature outside the NT (Chapters 4–6). Finally, the study ventures a foray into the medieval *mappaemundi* as possibly our earliest extant cartographic remains of the *Jubilees 8–9* tradition (Chapter 7). First and foremost, therefore, the present study is motivated by the desire to offer further evidence of the influence of the *Jubilees 8–9* tradition.

Second, our study is motivated by the need to base the investigation of the NT on a firmer historical foundation. NT scholars have often been negligent in investigating historical geography, let alone ancient geographical conceptions. William Ramsay decries “the general lack of interest taken by scholars in mere geographical matters – which are commonly regarded as beneath the dignity of true scholarship…” Moreover, as Philip S. Alexander observes, “It has long been understood that our images of the
world can be extraordinarily revealing about our mentality, yet this insight has taken some time to make any real impact on the study of the ancient world. Ancient historians have been quite happy to investigate man’s relationship to time (e.g. through a study of his concept of history), but reluctant to investigate his orientation towards and organisation of space, as revealed, for example, in his ideas about the geographical world.5

Clearly, the historical investigation of the NT must have its proper boundaries in time and space, its beginning, its aim, and its localities. It presupposes some sort of basic chronology and geography.6 To this end, our study contributes particularly to the geographical framework of the NT. Unfortunately, NT scholars often simply assume geographical knowledge of the past, thus regarding a thoroughgoing geographical investigation as practically superfluous.7 Indeed, most attempts to write the history of early Christianity use the benefit of modern hindsight and global perspective to trace the larger patterns and developments. They describe the developments, as it were, from the “outside.” The danger of such an approach is that it reads back later perspectives into the earlier material, and thereby fails to respect the inevitably more limited horizons of the ancient writers themselves.8 A classic example of this can be seen in the standard maps of “The Journeys of Paul the Apostle,” included in most Bible atlases or appended to many modern Bibles. Such maps have become so familiar that we hardly stop to consider that the image of the world portrayed on them looks strangely modern in orientation, outline, and scale.9 Thus, we unwittingly read back into the biblical text our image of the world, an image that itself is the product of a centuries-long development.10 The present book attempts the more difficult task of describing the process from the “inside.” How did the Jerusalem apostles, for example, imagine the world of their day? What conception(s) of world geography informed early Christians as they carried their message from place to place throughout the oikoumene? Such questions have scarcely been asked and yet require answers. As P. M. Fraser aptly observes, “full understanding of the outlook of any individual in antiquity – or indeed any period before the modern era – depends to a considerable extent on our ability to assess his geographical horizon.”11

To answer such questions is no easy matter, given the paucity of the extant evidence. There is no ancient map to which we may facilely appeal, and other relevant sources are few and far between. We must carefully sift through a great quantity of exotic materials to extract even a few clues that may help us, and some of these are subtle. To complicate matters even further, our investigation must be interdisciplinary by its very nature, incorporating the insights and methods of such disparate...
disciplines as Jewish Studies, classical philology, ancient and medieval cartography, ancient history, and patristics. At the risk of becoming mere dilettantes, we must have the courage to pass over the boundaries of our too narrowly specialized field and so become much more familiar with allied disciplines. Only in this way can we avoid what Martin Hengel has rightly called a science of surmises and a merry-go-round of hypotheses which has so long characterized NT Studies. Admittedly, more thorough acquaintance with the ancient sources will not solve all of the problems that currently bedevil our discipline and even threaten its demise, but it will hopefully provide a firmer historical basis on which to build in various directions.

Third, the present study is motivated by the desire to provide a case study of the reception of the so-called “OT pseudepigrapha” in the early Christian literature. The pseudepigrapha are a rather amorphous collection of writings that have been preserved to the modern period primarily by Christian efforts but are attributed to or closely identified with various heroes of the pre-Christian Jewish tradition. For instance, before their discovery as part of the Qumran scrolls, important Jewish works like 1 Enoch and Jubilees were known only in the versions transmitted in Christian communities. Hence, Robert A. Kraft may well be right when he insists that the pseudepigrapha should first be studied as witnesses to Christian interest and activities before they are mined for information about pre-rabbinic Judaism. By the same token, Christian material cannot always be illuminated by Second-Temple sources without first placing those sources in a trajectory of Jewish development. The point is, however, that the NT’s exegesis of the OT may be seen within a continuum of Jewish biblical interpretation that begins already in the OT itself, continues through the Greco-Roman period, and extends all the way to Jewish and Christian literatures of the Middle Ages.

The pseudepigrapha are no strangers to Christian tradition, and the pervasiveness of their influence on the NT and early Christian literature should be reckoned as highly probable, even if direct citations are comparatively rare. The most famous example, of course, is the citation of 1 Enoch 1:9 in Jude 14–15 as a prophecy coming from the seventh patriarch from Adam; however, several other Christian writers called a book of Enoch “scripture” (e.g., ἡγ ρ α ΣΕ in Barn. 16:5). There was a remarkable continuity of exegetical tradition from the Second-Temple period through the first few centuries of the early Christian period, and the line between “Jewish” and “Christian” is frequently either blurred or non-existent.

Thus, a tradition that is found in Jubilees (e.g., the testing of Abraham through the offering of Isaac [Jub. 17:16–18]) is
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recycled in Augustine, *De civ. D.* 16.32. Similarly, a Qumran pseudepigraphon (4QPs.-Ezekiel) is apparently cited in 1 Clem. 50:4. The *Book of Jubilees* itself is called “divine scripture” (δικαιότης) in the 13th-century copy. On the other hand, in the recently discovered papyri at Tura near Cairo, a commentary on Job by Didymus the Blind (ca. 310–98 CE) was found that refers to a story in *Jubilees* (17:16) with the proviso, “if one wants to recognize the Book of the Covenant (ἰνθεῖτο δικαιοσύνης).” Hermann Rönsch adduces numerous examples of the use of *Jubilees* in ancient and medieval Christian literature.

Along with 1 Enoch, the *Book of Jubilees* is among the very earliest and most extensive of the Jewish pseudepigrapha from the Second-Temple period. Since the discovery of the Ethiopic version by Western scholars in the nineteenth century, *Jubilees* has sustained intense scholarly interest as a document of central relevance for the understanding of ancient Judaism, not least as a prime example of the so-called “Rewritten Bible.” This interest has only increased since the official publication in 1994 of the entirety of the *Jubilees* manuscripts from Qumran cave 4.23 With this improved textual basis for studying the book, a research symposium on *Jubilees* was organized in Leipzig in 1996, and its proceedings have recently been published. Curiously, however, the scripture index to the volume contains only five references to the NT, none of which relates to the possible influence of *Jubilees* on the NT. Likewise, the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland edition of the Greek NT records only three allusions to *Jubilees* in the whole NT, all of them in Romans. Since *Jubilees* obviously had a strong influence on Second-Temple Jewish sources and on later Christian literature, being on par with scripture in some quarters, we may suspect that this pseudepigraphon – “the Little Genesis,” as it was sometimes called – also influenced the NT. As we shall see, the traces of the *Jubilees* 8–9 geographical tradition found in early Christian literature may be useful in detecting its influence on the NT as well. The influence of *Jubilees* need not have been constant over time, but it sustained a remarkable legacy over a considerable period.
THE MAPPAMUNDI OF QUEEN KYPROS

Introduction

A most interesting and enigmatic cartographic text has apparently escaped the notice of historians of cartography – an epigram of Philip of Thessalonica, who wrote in Rome during the reigns of Tiberius (14–37 CE) and Gaius (37–41 CE). This epideictic epigram (Anth. Pal. 9.778) praises an artistically woven tapestry that was sent as a gift from a queen to an unnamed, reigning Caesar, presumably one of the aforementioned Roman emperors. The tapestry itself is said to display the inhabited world and the surrounding Ocean. We are evidently dealing here with a world “map” done in either wool or linen, making it perhaps one of the earliest recorded mappaemundi in the literal sense of the term (i.e., “cloth of the world”). It should be noted here that the image of weaving is used extensively in connection with weaving narratives, so literary and visual productions, in which the world may be described, are neatly linked.

Philip’s tantalizingly brief poem prompts several questions. Who was the queen who made the tapestry and sent it as a gift? What picture of the world are we to imagine on the tapestry? What is the cartographic source(s) for the “map”? In seeking to answer these questions, however provisionally, the present chapter opens our discussion of Jewish geographical conceptions with a cameo of the subject at hand. This will provide us not only with a fitting example of the kind of evidence that is available for our work, but also with a salient reminder of the difficulties inherent in the task.

Philip’s Epigram (Anth. Pal. 9.778)

Γαῖαν τὴν Σ/ρΩκαρπων οὖσην ῎ωκ ρωθών
πάληθον οὐκεκαίνης Καίσαρες Πειθομένην
καὶ γαλακτίνε με θάλασσαν ἀπηκριῶσατο [Κύπρος]
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κερκώσαν ἵστοσάνως πάντ’ ἀπομείζομένη
Καύσαρι δ’ εὐξείνοις χάρις ἠλθομέν, ἵνα γὰρ ἀνύσασης
doίμα φέρεν τα θεῖα καὶ πρὶν ὀφειλομένα.

Modelling all with shuttle labouring on the loom, [Kypros] made me, a perfect copy of the harvest-bearing earth, all that the land-encircling ocean girdles, obedient to great Caesar, and the gray sea too. We have come as a grateful return for Caesar’s hospitality; it was a queen’s duty, to bring gifts so long due to the gods.

Here, we read of a woman’s skillful handiwork at the loom. Philip’s description suggests that the resulting tapestry was a genuine work of art, for the participle ἀπομείζομένη comes from a verb (ἀπομείζω) which in the middle voice is used in the sense of “model” as a sculptor (cf. LSJ, s.v., 209). Moreover, the participle is construed with a main verb (ἀπακριθήματα) which is likewise used of sculpturing, this time in the sense of “make exact.” Hence, the tapestry is described not only as a work of art but also as an exact replica of the world that it sought to portray.6 Allowing for some exaggeration and poetic license, we may nevertheless conclude that the tapestry must have been quite impressive to behold.9 We will return to Philip’s description of the tapestry after attempting to identify the “queen” who made it and the “Caesar” for whom she made it.

The identification of the queen and the reigning Caesar

It is difficult to ascertain who the maker and giver of this artistic tapestry may have been. We know that the artist must have been a woman, for in line 5 she is called an ἀνάσσα (“queen, lady”). Furthermore, the name of the queen is undoubtedly to be found in Κύρπος, which is the reading preserved in line 3 of the manuscript. While the masculine Κύρμος is not usually a name for a woman, the text clearly presupposes that the name belongs to a woman, as seen by the feminine participle ἀπομείζομένη, which takes its gender from the assumed subject of the main clause. Very likely, therefore, Κύρπος is a corruption for another name. The identification of this person is indeed the linchpin for the interpretation of the entire epigram.

As a solution to this problem, Conrad Cichorius made the ingenious suggestion that Κύρμος should be emended to the orthographically similar name Κύσπρος, and that this Kypros should be identified as the granddaughter of Herod the Great and the wife of Agrippa I, another grandchild of Herod.10 Kypros, too, seems to be a relatively uncommon name for a
woman, which may perhaps explain why the textual corruption happened in the first place. Indeed, we may note that apparently the only women of royal lineage who are known to have had this name belonged to the Herodian dynasty.

Interpreting the emended name as a reference to Kypros, the wife of Agrippa I, is consistent with the description of the woman in Philip’s epigram. First, the term ἄνασσα applies to a “queen” or a “lady” of a royal household. Used mostly in poetry rather than in prose (cf. LSI, s.v., 121), ἄνασσα is not one of the most common terms for the queen of a Roman client kingdom. Nevertheless, it is used apparently of Cleopatra Selene (Anth. Pal. 9.752.3), the daughter of Antony and Cleopatra VII whom Augustus married to King Juba II of Mauretania (ca. 20 BCE). Hence, the reference to Kypros as an ἄνασσα may signal that she belongs to one of the client kingdoms that stand in a vassal relationship with Rome. Upon his accession to the throne in 37 CE, Emperor Gaius declared Agrippa “king” (Ωβεταφιλασιλ/Η9280/ύς) of the former tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias (JW 2.181; Ant. 18.237), thus making Kypros a “queen” of a Roman client kingdom.

Second, the poem seems to suggest that the queen in question has some kind of rapport with the reigning “Caesar.” Again, this fits Kypros, whose husband enjoyed a close, personal relationship with Emperor Gaius. Like other sons of client kings, Agrippa had lived in Rome from childhood under patronage of the imperial family (Josephus, Ant. 18.143). He had, in fact, been brought up with Gaius (§191). When Emperor Tiberius later accepted Agrippa into his own inner circle, Agrippa deepened his relationship with Gaius and tried to impress him with extravagant spending (Josephus, JW 2.178; Ant. 18.166–7). Agrippa went so far in currying favor with Gaius that he expressed the hope that Gaius would soon replace Tiberius as emperor, a remark which provoked Tiberius and landed Agrippa in prison (JW 2.179–80; Ant. 18.168–9, 186–92). After Tiberius’ death, Gaius released Agrippa from prison and appointed him king as a reward for his loyalty. If Agrippa’s wife is the one described in Philip’s epigram, then her gift pays tribute to the Roman emperor as an expression of the long-standing, personal relationship between Agrippa and Caesar.

Third, Philip’s epigram implies that the queen in question was politically involved for the sake of her husband. Again, this fits Kypros. As Josephus tells us, Agrippa had a particularly intelligent wife, who often intervened on behalf of her husband. For example, when Agrippa was destitute and at the point of suicide, Kypros’ intercession won for Agrippa the help of his sister’s husband, Antipas (Ant. 18.147–9). On
another occasion, when he was again in dire financial straits, Agrippa begged Alexander the alabarch to loan him a large sum of money, but Alexander refused. Only when Kypros intervened did Alexander relent, “because he marveled at her love for her husband and all her other good qualities” (Ant. 18.159). If Agrippa’s wife is the one described in Philip’s epigram, then her gift to Caesar provides yet another example of how she intervened with a political benefactor on behalf of her husband. It could be argued that weaving was the ideal for Jewish women of high repute who enhanced their husbands’ political standing.24 The epigram does not state the occasion for the gift to Caesar. If the queen is Kypros, then Josephus records an episode during the reign of Agrippa, probably in the summer of 39 CE,25 which may have been the occasion for Kypros’ gift. Herod Antipas was urged by his wife Herodias, Agrippa’s sister, to go to Italy to petition Gaius for the status of king, to equal his brother-in-law (Josephus, Ant. 18.240–54). But Agrippa, when he learned of their plan and of the lavish gifts that they were bringing to Gaius, made his own preparations. “And when he heard that they had set sail,” Josephus writes, “he himself also dispatched Fortunatus, one of his freedmen, to Rome, charged with presents for the emperor and letters against Herod...” (§ 247).26 Perhaps Kypros’ artistic tapestry was among the presents that were delivered to Gaius on this occasion. Certainty is, of course, impossible.

Nikos Kokkinos suggests another possible occasion for the queen’s gift.27 If, as he believes, Agrippa I and Kypros accompanied Gaius to the western extremes of the Empire in 39/40 CE,28 then Kypros may have wanted to commemorate this grand expedition with the production of a mappamundi. Kokkinos surmises that the tapestry must have been prepared in Rome, for Agrippa’s return to Palestine occurred only in the autumn of 41. Therefore, Roman influences, such as the famous “map” of M. Vipsanius Agrippa, may be relevant here (see further below). We may wonder, however, whether the emperor’s invitation to accompany the expedition was prompted by the gift, or rather the gift by the expedition. Moreover, the commonly accepted date for publication of the Garland of Philip (40 CE) seems to point toward the earlier date for the gift and the epigram, although the date of publication is disputed and may have been during the reign of Nero (see above).

The imago mundi of the tapestry

As befitting an epigram, Philip’s description is quite laconic, mentioning only the two most basic components of the world map depicted on the tapestry – land and sea. Nevertheless, by carefully examining the poem...
line by line, we may be able to make some reasonable deductions about the nature of the image.

In line 1, Philip refers to the “harvest-bearing earth” (>gai>tae, phi>reo)%sic. Although an Orphic hymn addresses the “goddess Gaia” (Gei>tae, phi>reo)%sic, among other things, “harvest-bearing” (phi>reo)%sic, we need not conclude from this that Philip also uses >gai>ta as a proper noun. For the very next clause in line 1 – “as much as the land-encircling Ocean girdles” (gai>tae, phi>reo)%sic. This shows that >gai>ta is meant primarily in the geographical sense of “earth.” On the other hand, the whole concept may reflect Homeric mythology, for in the Iliad (14.200; cf. 301) Hera is made to say: “For I shall see the bounds of the fertile Earth, and Ocean, progenitor of the gods” (gai>tae, phi>reo)%sic. Strabo, who defends the Homeric picture of the known world as substantially true, also refers to this passage in the Iliad (Geo. 1.1.7), showing that this conception persisted even to the first century BCE.

Philip describes Kypros’ mappamundi in terms that would have been readily understandable in both Greco-Roman and Jewish cultures. The Homeric notion of Earth as an island landmass encircled by Ocean retained an astonishingly persistent hold. Homer conceived of Ocean as a great river that compasses the earth’s disk, returning into itself (Il. 18.399; Od. 20.65). Ocean is represented as wrought on the circular rim of Achilles’ shield (Il. 18.607–8), which provides a fitting parallel to Kypros’ artistic production. Anaximander (610–540 BCE) is reportedly the first to have mapped such a conception. Already in the fifth century BCE, Herodotus (4.36; cf. 2:23) scoffed at this conception: “I laugh to see how many have now drawn maps of the world, not one of them showing the matter reasonably; for they draw the world as round as if fashioned by compasses, encircled by the river of Ocean...” Nevertheless, this image of the world never really died out. In fact, it experienced a renaissance in the first century BCE precisely because it so well suited Roman imperial ideology and aspiration. Thus, Cicero (Somn. 20) describes the inhabited world which the Romans dominate as a “small island,” oblong in shape and surrounded by Ocean. Strabo (Geo. 2.5.17) states that the “inhabited world” (gai>tae, phi>reo)%sic is “surrounded by water” (gei>tae, phi>reo)%sic, a view that he explicitly attributes to Homer as the first geographer correctly to describe the earth as surrounded by Ocean (1.1.3–10). Ovid (43 BCE –17 CE) regards Delphi as the center of the earth (Met. 10.167–8), and holds the Homeric concept of the earth as a disk surrounded by Ocean (Met. 2.5–7). An epigram of Antipater of...
Thessalonica (Anth. Pal. 9.297), which was probably addressed to Gaius Caesar when sent by Augustus to the East in 1 BCE, describes the Roman Empire as “bounded on all sides by Ocean” (ὡκοτετιμωντο περίκεπον). Writing in 43/44 CE, Pomponius Mela (De chorographia 1.3–8) likewise describes the earth in his pioneering Latin geography as encircled by Ocean. Obviously, the Ocean as a definer of the Roman Empire was a crucial feature of the Roman mental map. In light of all the other strong Homeric echoes in our epigram, it seems clear that Philip describes Kypros’ tapestry map in terms of the Homeric geographic tradition that had recently been reinstated for use in Roman imperial ideology.

The Old Testament (OT) contains a similar conception of the world, whose closest Near Eastern parallel is the famous Babylonian world map from Sippar, dating to the late eighth or seventh century BCE. This celebrated, little map (ca. 90 mm in diameter), which is unique among ancient Mesopotamian maps, shows the world as a circular disk surrounded by Ocean (marratu). A hole at the center of the map is evidently the result of the compass used to carve the concentric circles; it does not seem to represent a city or other landmark conceived of as the center or navel of the world. Circles are used to indicate cities or countries, but none of them is at the center of the disk. Eight outlying regions, triangular in shape and radiating out from the outer edge of the world, are the home of strange or legendary beings. At the top the scribe has written, “Where the sun is not seen,” to indicate the north. The accompanying text, apparently describing these regions, mentions Utnapishtim (the well-known hero of the flood story in the Gilgamesh Epic), Sargon of Akkad (the famous third-millennium king who was remembered as the conqueror of the entire world), and the “four quadrants” of the earth’s surface. Evidently, we are dealing here with a map that is concerned to show the worldwide extent of the Babylonian Empire.

According to Job 26:10, God “has described a circle on the face of the waters, at the boundary between light and darkness.” This could be interpreted as meaning that the disk-shaped world is bounded by water all around. According to Gen. 1:9–10, describing the third day of creation, “God said, ‘Let the waters under the sky be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear.’ And it was so. God called the dry land Earth, and the waters that were gathered together he called Seas.” 4 Ezra, a late first-century pseudepigraphon, goes beyond Gen. 1:9–10 by adding that the ratio of earth-to-sea was six-to-one: “On the third day you commanded the waters to be gathered together in the seventh part of the earth; six parts you dried up and kept so that some of them might be planted and cultivated and be of service for you” (4 Ezra 6:42).
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