

CHALLENGING THE AUTHENTICITY OF CAINAN, SON OF ARPACHSHAD

ANDREW E. STEINMANN*

Abstract: Most English versions list Cainan as son of Arphaxad and father of Shelah at Luke 3:36, although this person is not mentioned in the genealogies in Genesis 10, Genesis 11, or 1 Chronicles 1. This study examines the evidence for Cainan as a member of these genealogies in ancient Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek sources from the second century BC through the fifth century AD. After demonstrating that there is no evidence for Cainan in these genealogies before the late fourth century AD, the study concludes that Cainan was an accidental scribal displacement of the name from Luke 3:37 into the text of Luke 3:36. Subsequently, under the influence of this later text of Luke, Christian scribes added the name to other texts, including Genesis 10 LXX, Genesis 11 LXX, some manuscripts of 1 Chronicles 1 LXX, and the book of Jubilees.

Key words: Cainan, Samaritan Pentateuch, targums, Codex Alexandrinus (A), Codex Vaticanus (B), Josephus, Julius Africanus, Theophilus of Antioch, Augustine, Jubilees

One little-discussed problem in the biblical genealogies is the presence of Cainan, a supposed son/descendant of Arpachshad and father/ancestor of Shelah in the genealogies. This name is present in the genealogy of Jesus provided by Luke (Luke 3:36) as well as in Septuagint genealogies in the Table of Nations (Genesis 10) and in the genealogy from Shem to Abram in Gen 11:12 LXX.¹ However, Cainan is absent from the Masoretic text in the OT at Gen 10:24, Gen 11:12, and 1 Chr 1:18. In these texts Arpachshad is the forebear of Shelah, and Cainan is not mentioned. Few studies of which I am aware have attempted to explain whether Cainan was accidentally or purposefully omitted from the Hebrew text or whether he was inserted for some reason into Luke and the parallel LXX texts.² I believe a careful examination of all of the extant ancient sources up to and including rabbinic writings and the Church Fathers demonstrates that Cainan was an early addition to the

* Andrew E. Steinmann is distinguished professor of theology and Hebrew at Concordia University Chicago, 7400 Augusta Street, River Forest, IL 60305. He may be contacted at Andrew.Steinmann@cuchicago.edu.

¹ The name *Arpachshad* (transliterated from Hebrew texts) is usually spelled *Arphaxad* when transliterated from Greek texts.

² The only recent studies of which I am aware are Helen R. Jacobus, "The Curse of Cainan (Jub. 8.1–5): Genealogies in Genesis 5 and Genesis 11 and a Mathematical Pattern," *JSP* 18 (2009): 207–32; and Jonathan Sarfati, "Biblical Chronogenealogies," *Journal of Creation* 17 (December 2003): 14–18, republished at <http://creation.com/biblical-chronogenealogies>. Jacobus argues that Cainan was originally present in the MT, whereas Sarfati believes that Cainan was added to Luke by a scribal error which led to purposeful alteration of the LXX texts.

text of Luke which led to purposeful alteration of LXX. The sources will be examined in four groups:

1. Hebrew and Aramaic language sources that consistently have no mention of Cainan: MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, *Seder 'Olam Rabbah*, and targums;
2. the Gospel of Luke;
3. the LXX: Gen 10:22, 24; 11:13–14; 1 Chr 1:18;
4. early Greek sources that are aligned with the LXX but demonstrate no knowledge of Cainan: Josephus, Julius Africanus, and Theophilus of Antioch;
5. Jubilees 8:1–5; and
6. a source allied with LXX that includes Cainan: Augustine.

I. HEBREW AND ARAMAIC SOURCES

1. *The Masoretic Text*. MT clearly has precursors dating back to at least 200 BC, as demonstrated by the ancient texts from Qumran. They testify to the relative stability of the tradition that culminated in the MT. There is no evidence to suggest that the MT of Genesis ought not on the whole be viewed as an early witness to a particular recension of the Hebrew text of this book. In all three instances in the OT where Arpachshad is included in a genealogy his son is listed as Shelah (Gen 10:24; 11:12; 1 Chr 1:18). Perhaps the most prominent of these is Gen 11:12–13:

וארפכשד חי חמש ושלשים שנה ויולד את־שלח ויחי ארפכשד אחרי הולידו את־שלח
שלש שנים וארבע מאות שנה ויולד בנים ובנות

Arpachshad lived 35 years and fathered Shelah. After he fathered Shelah, Arpachshad lived 403 years and fathered [other] sons and daughters.³

Since this is part of a longer genealogy (Gen 11:10–26) where each member of the ancestry of Terah (Gen 11:26) is introduced formulaically, it could be argued that Cainan was omitted through parablepsis. Perhaps a scribe's eye skipped from **ויולד** ("and fathered Cainan...") to **ויולד את שלח** ("and fathered Shelah..."), thereby eliminating Cainan as Arpachshad's son. However, this would also have required another adjustment to the text: If Cainan was original to the text of Gene-

³ For convenience, I will refer to successive generations in the genealogies as "son" and to their progenitor as "father" even though the relationship may be more distant than that. I will also use "fathered" to translate Hebrew **יולד**. Strictly speaking, masculine forms of H (Hiphil) stem verbs from the root **ילד** do not necessarily denote fathering a son but may be applied to being an ancestor of someone. Note that at Deut 4:25 it refers to having children *and* grandchildren, and in some genealogies it most likely refers to a more distant generation. For instance, **הוליד** is used at Num 26:58–59, which contains information relative to Moses's genealogy (cf. Exod 6:18–23). In both Exodus and Numbers, the same three generations are listed: Kohath—Amram—Moses. Kohath was one of the original Israelite migrants to Egypt with Jacob (Gen 46:11). Moses was born eighty years before the Exodus (Exod 7:7). Since the Egyptian sojourn lasted 430 years (Exod 12:41), Moses was born some 350 years after Kohath entered Egypt. Surely more than one generation separated Moses from Kohath. Considering that Moses was one of 8,600 male descendants of Kohath at the time of the exodus (Num 3:27–28), there must have been quite a few generations between him and Kohath.

sis 11, then Gen 11:13 would have read, “After he fathered Shelah, *Cainan* lived 403 years...” This would then have continued to preserve Cainan in the text and likely would have prompted it to be restored in the MT or its precursors. Alternately, one could posit an accidental loss of Cainan in Gen 11:12 and then a purposeful substitution of Arpachshad for Cainan at Gen 11:13 to remove the anomaly and further purposeful editing of Gen 10:24 and 1 Chr 1:18 to remove Cainan. Either way, in order to defend Cainan as original to the text one is forced to propose a fairly complicated series of events that may have involved both accidental and purposeful changes to the text.

A different formula is in the Table of Nations (Genesis 10) at Gen 10:24 and also at 1 Chr 1:18 where Arpachshad is said to have fathered Shelah. These cases, however, could also be explained by parablepsis. In these verses, a scribe’s eye may have skipped from *יָלַד אֶת קַיִן* (“fathered Cainan”) to *יָלַד אֶת שֵׁלַח* (“fathered Shelah”), thereby eliminating Cainan. The problem with such an explanation is that it requires the unlikely occurrence of three parallel cases of parablepsis at the identical generation in all three genealogies. One could perhaps argue instead that in one of these three passages, most likely Gen 11:12, Cainan was omitted by parablepsis and then Gen 10:24 and 1 Chr 1:18 were purposefully adjusted by later scribes who eliminated Cainan to match Gen 11:12.⁴

One glaring problem for this approach, as we shall see, is that none of the evidence before the fourth century AD supports Cainan as part of the genealogy from Shem to Terah. If Cainan was part of the original texts containing these genealogies, one would expect that he would appear in the earliest evidence and be missing at times in later texts. Instead, the opposite is true. He is missing from the earliest witnesses and appears in some of the later witnesses.

There is also another indication that Cainan probably was not originally part of the text of Genesis. The combined genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11 trace the descendants of Adam through Noah down to Abram. The members of the genealogies appear to have been selectively chosen to place important persons at numerically significant points in the list. These involve multiples of the numbers seven and ten. Enoch, who did not die but was taken by God, is seventh (Gen 5:21–24). Noah is tenth (Gen 5:32). Eber, the eponymous ancestor of the Hebrews, is fourteenth (Gen 11:16–17). Abram and his brothers are twentieth (Gen 11:26). However, if Cainan were included in the genealogy in Genesis 11, this pattern would be eliminated. Eber would become the fifteenth, and the relatively insignificant Shelah would be fourteenth. Abram would become the twenty-first member of the list, while his father Terah—a relatively minor figure compared to either Noah or Abram—would become the twentieth. While this would place Abram in a position that is a multiple of seven, it eliminates the parallel between Noah (tenth) and Abram (twentieth): both are righteous men through whom God blessed humanity

⁴ If the initial parablepsis occurred at Gen 10:24 or 1 Chr 1:18, Gen 11:12 would have survived not only with Cainan’s name but also with his age when he fathered a son and his remaining years of life. Under such a scenario, it is more likely that Cainan’s name would have been restored in either Gen 10:24 or 1 Chr 1:18 rather than being expunged from Gen 10:24.

and whose stories are narrated immediately following the end of a genealogy. Moreover, having Abram as twenty-first generation and no significant person in the fourteenth generation makes little sense.

2. *The Samaritan Pentateuch*. The SP offers a particularly ancient glimpse into an alternate Hebrew text of Genesis. This recension of the Pentateuch arose around 100 BC.⁵ The text of SP is particularly challenging in the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11. In the case of Genesis 5, it seems to be more closely aligned with the MT than the LXX, although the SP normally supports the LXX against the MT.⁶ In the cases of the years assigned to a man when he fathered a son, the SP agrees with the MT against the LXX in six cases in Genesis 5. In one case (Noah), the SP agrees with both the MT and the LXX. In one case (Lamech) it agrees with neither the LXX nor the MT. In one case, the SP agrees with neither the MT nor the LXX but contains a number derived from them (Jared, 62 years vs. MT and LXX, 162 years). In another case, it agrees with neither the MT nor the LXX but seems to have a number derived from the LXX (Methuselah, 67 years vs. LXX B 167 years; LXX A and MT 187 years). In the case of additional years of life, the SP again agrees with the MT against the LXX in six of the ten cases. In one case (Noah), it agrees with both the LXX and the MT. In the other three cases, the SP agrees with neither the LXX nor the MT.

Turning to the more important genealogy for this study, Gen 11:10–26, the SP appears to be more closely aligned with the LXX than the MT. In the cases of the age when a man fathered a son, the SP agrees with the LXX in all eight places where the LXX and MT disagree (i.e. all except Shem and Terah). In the cases of the additional years of life, the SP appears to have numbers that are dependent upon the LXX. Since the LXX has seven cases where fathering ages are 100 years more than the MT, the SP correspondingly reduces the remaining years of life by 100 years in comparison to the LXX. This occurs in the case of Eber, and in the cases of Peleg, Reu, and Serug it reduces them 100 years in comparison to the number held in common by both the MT and the LXX. In the cases of Arpachshad and Shelah the SP reduces the remaining years of life by 100 years in comparison to the MT, lending it support versus the LXX. In the case of Arpachshad, the SP attributes 303 further years to him, suggesting that the 403 years in the MT is quite ancient, as is the alternate 430 years in the LXX.⁷ In two cases, Nahor and Terah, the SP has numbers different from both the LXX and the MT. In total, out of the eleven places in this genealogy where the LXX differs in its numbers from the MT, the SP supports the LXX eight times, favoring the MT only twice. Clearly, the SP is much more closely aligned with the LXX than the MT. Despite this, the SP contains no mention of Cainan even though its general tendency and its tendency in this passage is to align itself with the LXX.

⁵ Bruce K. Waltke, "Samaritan Pentateuch," *ABD* 5.934.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ See the discussion of the targums below.

3. *Seder 'Olam Rabbah*. This rabbinic treatment of biblical chronology is traditionally attributed to Yose ben Halaftha, a disciple of Rabbi Akiba, which would date it to about AD 160.⁸ However, it appears rather to have originated among the earliest Amoraim, ca. AD 200–250.⁹ For both the Genesis 5 and 11 genealogies it appears to follow strictly the MT when listing the age at which a man fathered his son.¹⁰ However, unlike the biblical text, it does not list the remaining years of life for these patriarchs. Like the MT, *S. 'Olam Rab.* makes no mention of Cainan following Arpachshad. Instead, Shelah is listed as Arpachshad's son. Thus, *S. 'Olam Rab.* bears witness that the text of the early genealogies in the MT of Genesis, especially Gen 11:10–26, was in its current form at least as early as the late second century AD.

4. *The Targums*. Three targums contain material paraphrasing Genesis: Targum Onkelos, Targum Neofiti, and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch. Targum Onkelos is the oldest of the three, probably having originated in Palestine in the late first or early second century AD.¹¹ Targum Neofiti, though exhibiting some signs of late editing (i.e. twelfth century AD), “probably represents on the whole an older recension of PT [Palestinian Targum]. ... There are no good grounds for dating anything in *Neof.* later than the 3rd/4th cent. C.E.”¹² Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is later—probably contemporary with early medieval midrash (i.e., ca. fifth century AD), though it appears at times to preserve earlier traditions, including those of Onkelos.¹³

In the case of the early genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11, these targums are clearly aligned with the MT. For Genesis 5, all three agree exactly not only in the persons included in the genealogy but also in the numbers used for the age of each man when he fathered a son, the additional years of life after fathering a son, and the total years of life. Turning to Genesis 11, all three targums agree that Shelah—not Cainan—was fathered by Arpachshad. In addition, they generally agree in the numbers used for the age of each man when he fathered a son and for the additional years of life after fathering a son. However, they all contradict MT in one significant way: they agree that Arpachshad lived 430 years after fathering Shelah (cf. Gen 11:13 LXX), not 403 years (Gen 11:13 MT).¹⁴ Thus, precisely at the point where some sources have the variant genealogy that includes Cainan, the targums have a different variant. It is interesting to note that Gen 11:13 LXX suggests that

⁸ Heinrich W. Guggenheimer, *Seder Olam: The Rabbinic View of Biblical Chronology* (Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD, 1998; repr., 2005), x.

⁹ *Ibid.*, xi.

¹⁰ One anomaly is that it lists Mahalalel's age as 68 years instead of the MT's 65 (Gen 5:15). This appears to be a variant on the MT, since the LXX gives Mahalalel's age as 165 years.

¹¹ Philip S. Alexander, “Targum, Targumim,” *ABD* 6.321.

¹² *Ibid.*, 6.323.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 6.322–323.

¹⁴ There is one other minor difference: Targum Pseudo-Jonathan lists Terah's years after fathering his sons as 116, not 119 as in Gen 11:25 MT.

430, not 403, may have been the original number in the text.¹⁵ However, despite agreeing with the LXX on the number 430, the targums are uniform in not including Cainan. Therefore they exhibit evidence that from the late first century through the fifth century AD the Hebrew text of Genesis did not contain any mention of Cainan as a son of Arpachshad.

5. *Summary of the Hebrew/Aramaic evidence.* The evidence from Hebrew and Aramaic sources dating from before the time of Christ through the fifth century AD suggests that the Hebrew text of Gen 11:12–13 always listed Shelah, not Cainan, as the son of Arpachshad. While the targums favor the LXX's reading concerning Arpachshad's age when he fathered a son, they stand squarely with the rest of the Hebrew/Aramaic evidence against the presence of Cainan in the text of the OT.

II. THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

The Gospel of Luke contains a genealogy of Jesus that traces his lineage backward in time to Adam and God (Luke 3:23–38). If one consults any English version, it is clear that Luke lists Cainan (Καϊνάμ) between Shelah and Arphaxad, making Cainan, not Shelah, Arphaxad's son (Luke 3:35–36).¹⁶ However, the evidence from the Greek manuscripts offers some reason for pause before accepting Cainan in this genealogy. Two early manuscripts do not include Cainan: the early third-century AD Papyrus Bodmer XIV.XV (P⁷⁵) and the fifth-century AD Codex Bezae (D).

P⁷⁵ is the oldest extant manuscript of Luke. This is a very important witness, and it indicates that Cainan may not have been included in the original text of the Gospel. Moreover, P⁷⁵ shows close affinities with another early important manuscript, the early fifth-century AD Codex Alexandrinus (A). This may suggest that the addition to Cainan the genealogy in Luke 3 occurred sometime between the early third century and the beginning of the fifth century.

It is not difficult to propose a mechanism by which Cainan came to be inserted into Luke 3:36. The same name occurs later in the genealogy in the next verse (Luke 3:37; cf. Gen 5:12 [Kenan]). All that would be required for an accidental transfer of Cainan from the subsequent verse is a skip of the eye. If a scribe was nearing the end of a line in his exemplar as he was copying the name *Shelah* and by a simple skip of the eye looked at his exemplar's next line that ended with Cainan, he might have accidentally inserted Cainan into the genealogy between Shelah and Arphaxad.

The lack of Cainan at Luke 3:36 in Codex Bezae is harder to assess. D's Greek text is very idiosyncratic. It contains many interpolations that are found in no other manuscript, has quite a few remarkable omissions, and demonstrates a

¹⁵ The difference is a variant of a few letters in the Hebrew text: שלש שנים (three years) versus שנים שלשים (thirty years). However, the SP evidence indirectly demonstrates that 403 also has very old attestation. See the discussion above.

¹⁶ Although many NT and LXX manuscripts contain the spelling Καϊνάμ, the variant spelling Καϊνάν is found in other manuscripts.

tendency to rephrase entire sentences. In the first part of the Lucan genealogy of Jesus it contains Matthew's genealogy of Jesus inverted (Matt 1:1–17). However, this only allows it to trace Jesus's genealogy back to Abraham. For the generations before Abraham (i.e. Luke 3:34b–38), it follows the standard list of names. It is in this portion of the genealogy that D omits Cainan between Shelah and Arphaxad.

One would tend to dismiss D's testimony at this point due to the peculiar nature of its Greek text. However, when D agrees with other early important witnesses, it lends strong support to the authenticity of that reading, since it is liable to demonstrate a text that was not part of the peculiar alteration of Gospel texts that happens elsewhere in D.¹⁷

It is much harder to explain how Cainan was omitted from Luke 3:36 in \mathfrak{P}^{75} and D than it is to posit how Cainan came to be inserted into the text. There is no obvious trigger for parablepsis that would account for an accidental omission of Cainan. Moreover, there is no evidence for early NT scribes having a purposeful tendency to correct the Gospel texts toward MT-type readings, and certainly no evidence for this in either \mathfrak{P}^{75} or D. Therefore, although there are only two Greek manuscripts of Luke's Gospel that omit Cainan, the argument for their containing the reading corresponding to the original text of Luke is strong and in evidence among the earliest extant manuscripts. In addition, the evidence suggests that the accidental inclusion of Cainan occurred in the mid-to-late third or early fourth century AD.

III. GENESIS 10:22, 24 LXX; 11:13–14 LXX; 1 CHRONICLES 1:18 LXX

Cainan is present in four places in the LXX: twice in the Table of Nations (Gen 10:22, 24), in the genealogy beginning with Shem (Gen 11:12–13), and in 1 Chronicles 1 in the genealogy from Adam to Abraham in Codex Vaticanus and later manuscripts (1 Chr 1:11–23 LXX), but not in Codex Alexandrinus and other later manuscripts (1 Chr 1:17 LXX; other verses are missing).¹⁸

1. *Gen 11:12–13 LXX.* Cainan appears in the text of Gen 11:12–14 LXX, which has a longer text than the MT at this point:

καὶ ἔζησεν Ἀρφαξάδ ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα πέντε ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν τὸν **Καιναν καὶ ἔζησεν Ἀρφαξάδ μετὰ τὸ γεννηθῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸν Καιναν ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱὸς καὶ θυγατέρας καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν Καιναν ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σαλα καὶ ἔζησεν Καιναν μετὰ τὸ γεννηθῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸν Σαλα ἔτη τριακόσια τριάκοντα καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱὸς καὶ θυγατέρας καὶ ἀπέθανεν**

And Arphaxad lived one hundred thirty-five years and fathered Cainan. **And after he fathered Cainan, Arphaxad lived four hundred thirty years and had sons and daughters and died. And Cainan lived one hundred thirty years**

¹⁷ The Alands note, "When D supports the early tradition the manuscript has a genuine significance." Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 108.

¹⁸ 1 Chronicles 1 is not extant in Codex Sinaiticus (8).

and fathered Shelah. And after he fathered Shelah, **Cainan** lived **three hundred thirty years** and had sons and daughters and died.¹⁹

This longer text of Gen 11:12–13 is found in nearly all LXX manuscripts including all of the earliest manuscripts. However, there is one feature that immediately ought to call its authenticity into question: The age given for Cainan when he fathered Shelah is given as 130 years, and his remaining years of life are given as 330 years. These two numbers match the years assigned to Shelah before and after fathering Eber (Gen 11:14–15 LXX).²⁰ This creates a situation unique to the genealogies in both Genesis 5 and 11: father and son share the same assigned ages both before and after fathering an offspring. In fact, in these two genealogies there is no other case of a father and a son sharing both of these numbers in the MT, LXX, SP or any other ancient source. That Cainan and Shelah share these two numbers in the LXX strongly suggests that Cainan was a rather inelegant insertion into the text of the LXX by reproducing Gen 11:14–15 and simply substituting *Cainan* for *Shelah*. This purposeful alteration may have been motivated by a desire to harmonize the text with Luke 3:36 once the name Cainan made its appearance there.

In fact, the earliest LXX manuscripts are later than \mathfrak{P}^{75} , the third-century NT Lucan manuscript that does not contain Cainan's name. Cainan appears at Gen 11:12–13 in both Codex Vaticanus (B) from the first half of the fourth century and in Codex Alexandrinus (A) from the early fifth century. Again, the evidence suggests that Cainan was an addition to the text, an addition that took place sometime in the mid-to-late third or early fourth century AD.

2. Gen 10:22, 24 LXX. Cainan appears twice in the Table of Nations:

υἱοὶ Σημ Αἰλαμ καὶ Ἀσσοῦρ καὶ Ἀρφαξὰδ καὶ Λουδ καὶ Ἀραμ καὶ Καϊναν

The sons of Shem: Elam and Asshur and Arphaxad and Lud and Aram **and Cainan**. (Gen 10:22 LXX)

καὶ Ἀρφαξὰδ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Καϊναν καὶ Καϊναν ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σαλα Σαλα δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἐβερ

And Arphaxad fathered **Cainan**, and **Cainan** fathered Shelah. Shelah fathered Eber. (Gen 10:24 LXX)

As can be seen from the text of these two verses, the insertion of Cainan into them would have been relatively simple. One might argue that Cainan was originally in the text of Gen 10:24 LXX and later lost due to parablepsis.²¹ However, the same cannot be said of Gen 10:22 LXX. The occurrence of Cainan there appears to be a purposeful addition, since Cainan was never the son of Shem on the same level as Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad, Lud, and Aram. In fact, throughout the Table of

¹⁹ Differences from the MT are highlighted in **bold** type. The LXX adds the first bold material that is not found in the MT. The name *Cainan* as the father of Shelah contrasts with the MT's *Arphaxad*. The 330 years lived after the birth of Shelah contrasts with the MT's 430 years.

²⁰ The numbers for Shelah in the MT are 30 and 403 respectively.

²¹ A simple skip of the eye from one occurrence of ἐγέννησεν to the next is all that would have been required.

Nations, the listing of several sons of a patriarch never includes someone mentioned later as coming from a subsequent generation (cf. Gen 10:2–4, 6–7, 13, 15–18, 23, 26–29). This again looks as if it is a fairly maladroit addition of Cainan to the text of Genesis 10 in order to harmonize with Luke 3:36 once the name Cainan made its appearance there.

3. *1 Chr 1:11–23 LXX*. While the texts of Gen 11:12–13 LXX and Gen 10:22, 24 LXX suggest that Cainan is a later addition to the text, the evidence from 1 Chr 1:1–27 LXX is fairly clear-cut: Cainan was a later addition to the text. However, the relationship of these two texts to each other, to the MT, and to the text of Genesis is complicated:

	MT	LXX B	LXX A	Genesis Parallels
Adam-Noah	1 Chr 1:1–4	1 Chr 1:1–4	1 Chr 1:1–4	Gen 5:3–32
Japheth's descendants	1 Chr 1:5–7	1 Chr 1:5–7	1 Chr 1:5–7	Gen 10:2–4
Ham's descendants	1 Chr 1:8–16	1 Chr 1:8–10 (11–16 missing)	1 Chr 1:8–16	Gen 10:6–8, 13–18a
Shem's descendants	1 Chr 1:17–23	1 Chr 1:17a (17b–23 missing)	1 Chr 1:17–23	Gen 10:22–30
Shem-Abram	1 Chr 1:24–27	(24a missing) 1 Chr 1:24b–27	(24a missing) 1 Chr 1:17a, 24b–27	Gen 10:22a (LXX B) Gen 11:10–26

Codex Vaticanus (B) presents a highly disturbed text. There is no mention of Cainan. B appears to contain two long lacunae: both 1 Chr 1:11–16 and 1 Chr 1:17b–24a are missing. It is difficult to explain how the first lacuna occurred. There is no trigger for parablepsis in either LXX or MT (if we assume the translator's Hebrew exemplar had a text similar to the MT). Although Cainan appears in Gen 10:22 LXX, only the first part of the reflection of that verse in 1 Chronicles 1—up to Arphaxad—is extant in B, and we cannot be certain whether or not it appeared in the copyist's exemplar.

In the text of 1 Chr 1:17a, 24b, there is no mention of Cainan between Arphaxad and Shelah. This is significant in that this is part of the second lacuna, which is probably a case of parablepsis. A copyist's eye skipped from *Αρφαξάδ* in 1 Chr 1:17a to *Αρφαξάδ* in 1 Chr 1:24b, omitting all of the intervening text. He then continued with the words that followed *Αρφαξάδ* in 1 Chr 1:24b. If Cainan had been part of that text, that name ought to appear before Shelah, but it does not. This provides testimony that Cainan was not part of the predecessor text of B.

In Codex Alexandrinus (A) it appears as if the missing material from 1 Chr 17b–24a has been restored from Gen 10:13–18a, 22–30 LXX, but in a rather inept fashion, since text from Gen 10:22a LXX now appears twice in A: once as 1 Chr 1:17b and again as a preface to 1 Chr 1:24b.

What did this corrector do? First, Gen 10:13–18a LXX and Gen 10:22–30 LXX were inserted after 1 Chr 1:10 and before 1 Chr 1:17a, yielding a text that is a fair match for the missing 1 Chr 11:16–23. The inserted material included no mention of Cainan after Aram as at Gen 10:22 LXX in current LXX manuscripts. This indicates that Cainan was a later addition to Gen 10:22 LXX in A (as well as B), but that the restoration in 1 Chronicles 1 came from a time *before* Cainan was inserted into Gen 10:22 LXX. Then the corrector left 1 Chr 1:17a, which must have been in his exemplar and now was followed by 1 Chr 1:24b–27 (as in B). Cainan appears between Arphaxad and Shelah in the restored 1 Chr 1:18 (= Gen 10:24 LXX). This probably indicates that at an early stage Cainan was inserted into Gen 10:24 LXX. However, since Cainan does not appear earlier in 1 Chr 1:17 LXX A (= Gen 10:22), it must have been inserted into Gen 10:22 LXX at a later time.

Finally in both A and B the text of 1 Chr 17a, 24b–27 LXX is:

οἱ Σημ Αιλαμ καὶ Ασσουρ καὶ Αρφαξὰδ Σαλα Εβερ Φαλεκ Ραγου Σερουγ
Ναχωρ Θαρα Αβρααμ

Sons of Shem: Elam and Asshur and Arphaxad, Shelah, Eber, Peleg, Reu, Serug, Nahor, Terah, Abram

Note that Cainan does not appear between Arphaxad and Shelah as in Gen 10:24 LXX, Gen 11:13–14 LXX, or 1 Chr 1:18 LXX A. What the corrector who added the material from Genesis LXX did not recognize is that he ought to have restored Gen 1:13–18a LXX following 1 Chr 1:10, left 1 Chr 1:17a as in B, then inserted Gen 10:22b–30 LXX followed by Gen 10:22–30 LXX and then inserted only the names in the genealogy from Gen 11:10–12 LXX before resuming with Shelah in 1 Chr 1:24b. Had he done this using a text similar to that in current manuscripts of Gen 11:10–12 LXX, Cainan would appear between Arphaxad and Shelah in 1 Chr 1:24 LXX A.

Since the corrector who inserted the material found in B (but not in A) made this mistake, there is no doubt that Cainan did not appear in the earliest LXX manuscripts of 1 Chronicles 1. Instead, the confused state of the text in A and B—the earliest manuscripts of 1 Chronicles 1 LXX—demonstrates that Arphaxad was the father of Shelah, not Cainan.

IV. SOURCES THAT ARE ALIGNED WITH THE LXX BUT OMIT CAINAN

1. *Josephus*. The first-century AD Jewish historian Flavius Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* is an early witness to the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11. In general, Josephus is aligned with the LXX against the MT, and these genealogies are no different. In relating the genealogy from Adam to Noah (cf. Genesis 5), Josephus lists not only the names of the patriarchs but also the ages when each except Noah fathered their sons.²² Of the nine ages given, Josephus agrees with the LXX against the MT five times in reporting an age that is 100 years more than is given in the

²² Josephus, *Ant.* 1.83–87 [1.3.4].

MT.²³ In one instance, Josephus reports an age different from both LXX and MT: Seth (250 years). This appears to be a variant based on the LXX (205 years) aligning Josephus against the MT (105 years). In one case, Josephus aligns with both LXX and MT: Jared (162 years). Twice Josephus agrees with the MT against the LXX: Methuselah (187 years; also LXX A, but not LXX B) and Lamech (182 years; Gen 5:25). The LXX appears to contain accidental scribal variants of these numbers: Methuselah (167 years; LXX A) and Lamech (182 years). Thus, the text of Josephus appears to be based on a version of Genesis 5 that was very similar to the LXX.

Turning to the genealogy in Gen 11:10–26, Josephus lists the forebears of Abram in reverse chronological order, listing the age when each patriarch except Shem fathered his son.²⁴ Again Josephus shows remarkable agreement with the LXX against the MT. In four of the eight cases Josephus agrees with the LXX against the MT in reporting an age that is 100 years more than is given in the MT.²⁵ In two cases Josephus seems to have switched ages versus the LXX, but each is 100 years more than is given in the MT: Rue (130 years; LXX 132 years) and Serug (132 years; LXX 130 years). In one case Josephus agrees with neither LXX nor MT: Nahor (120 years). In the final case, Josephus has the same age as both LXX and MT: Terah (70 years). Once again, as per his general tendency, Josephus exhibits a text that is very much like that of the LXX. However, unlike the LXX, Josephus does not include Cainan in this genealogy, thereby demonstrating that Cainan was added to the genealogy at Gen 11:13–14 after the first century AD.

2. *Julius Africanus*. Sextus Julius Africanus was a late second and early third-century AD Christian historian. His work *Chronographi* was a history of the world to AD 221. Though it has been mostly lost, a few excerpts are quoted in the *Extract of Chronography* of the Byzantine chronicler George Syncellus (died after AD 810). Among the fragments preserved are two that treat the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11:10–26.

With respect to Genesis 5, Africanus appears to have followed a text similar to that of the LXX. Of the ten patriarchs from Adam to Noah (Genesis 5), he agrees with LXX against MT seven times when giving the age at which a man fathered a son.²⁶ In one instance he, like Josephus, agrees with the MT against LXX: Methuselah (MT and LXX A 187 years; LXX B 167 years), affirming that Gen 5:25 LXX B contains an error introduced sometime before the fifth century AD. In another instance, like Josephus, he agrees with both MT and LXX: Jared (162 years). He lists no age of fatherhood for Noah. In addition, Africanus twice mentions remaining years of life for two patriarchs: Adam (700 years) and Enoch (200 years), again agreeing with the LXX against the MT.

In material drawn from Gen 11:10–26, Africanus lists only the fathering age of four of the nine men in the genealogy, each time agreeing with the LXX against

²³ Adam (230 years), Enosh (190 years), Kenan (170 years), Mahalalel (170 years), Enoch (165 years).

²⁴ Josephus, *Ant.* 1.149–150 [1.6.5].

²⁵ Arphaxad (135 years), Shelah (130 years), Eber (134 years), Peleg (130 years).

²⁶ Syncellus, *Extract of Chronography* 19.15 (NPNF¹ 6.131).

the MT.²⁷ In addition, he credits Peleg with 209 more years of life, in agreement with both LXX and MT.

While Africanus clearly was drawing on the LXX for his chronology, he makes no mention of Cainan as a son of Arphaxad, listing instead Arphaxad's son as Shelah. Once again, a witness before the fourth century AD exhibits no knowledge of Cainan.

3. *Theophilus of Antioch*. Theophilus was Patriarch of Antioch during the second half of the second century AD, succeeding Eros ca. AD 169. He died ca. AD 184. Theophilus's one undisputed extant work is *Apology to Autolytus*. In this work he treats the genealogical material in both Genesis 5 and 11:10–26.²⁸ In the case of Genesis 5, Theophilus gives the fathering ages of all ten patriarchs, agreeing with the LXX against the MT in all eight places where they differ and agreeing with both LXX and MT where they agree (Jared and Noah). For Gen 11:10–26, Theophilus's nine fathering ages agree with the LXX against the MT in six instances, agrees with both LXX and MT in two instances (Shem and Terah), and has a unique age in one instance (Nahor, 75 years). This last example appears, however, to be a scribal mistake based on the LXX (LXX A: 79 years; LXX B: 179 years).²⁹

Once again, like Josephus and Africanus, Theophilus does not include Cainan between Arphaxad and Shelah despite basing his numbers on the LXX. Instead, he, too, lists Shelah as son of Arphaxad. He provides a third witness in the early Christian centuries that the LXX did not originally contain any reference to Cainan as son of Arphaxad.

V. JUBILEES 8:1–5

The book of Jubilees is a heavily edited reworking of Genesis 1–Exodus 12 composed in Hebrew. Various dates for its composition have been proposed, all of them in the second century BC. Charles dated it between 109 and 105 BC.³⁰ Both Nickelsburg and Goldstein place its composition just before 167 BC.³¹ VanderKam argues that it was written between 161 and 152 BC.³² Fragments of Jubilees in Hebrew were discovered at Qumran, but they preserve very little of the text.³³ There was an ancient Greek translation, but it survives only in scattered quotations among later Greek writers.³⁴ Fragments of an ancient Syriac translation also survive.³⁵

²⁷ Arphaxad (135 years), Shelah (130 years), Eber (134 years), Peleg (130 years). Syncellus, *Extract of Chronography* 86.68 (NPNF¹ 6.131).

²⁸ *Antol.* 3.24. For an English translation see *ANF* 2:118–119.

²⁹ The MT reads 29 years (Gen 11:24).

³⁰ R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1920), lxiii–lxiv.

³¹ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 78–79; Jonathan A. Goldstein, “The Date of the Book of Jubilees,” *PAAJR* 50 (1983): 63–68.

³² James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977), 207–13.

³³ For a list see James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Scriptorum Aethiopicum 88; Lovain: E. Peeters, 1989), vii.

³⁴ For a list see *ibid.*, xiii–xiv.

Likewise portions of an ancient Latin translation are also extant.³⁶ The only complete version of Jubilees is found in twenty-seven Ethiopic manuscripts, the earliest of which date to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries AD.³⁷ It is generally thought that the Ethiopic translation was produced from the Greek translation, not from the Hebrew original.

In discussing the descendants of Shem the Ethiopic Jubilees and the Syriac text contain a discussion of Cainan as Arpachshad's son:

In the twenty-ninth jubilee, in the first week—at its beginning—Arpachshad married a woman named Rasueya, the daughter of Susan, the daughter of Elam. She gave birth to a son for him in the third year of this week, and he named him Kainan. When the boy grew up, his father taught him (the art of) writing. He went to look for a place of his own where he could possess his own city. He found an inscription which the ancients had incised in a rock. He read what was in it, copied it, and sinned on the basis of what was in it, since in it was the Watcher's teaching by which they used to observe the omens of the sun, moon, and stars and every heavenly sign. He wrote (it) down but told no one about it because he was afraid to tell Noah about it lest he become angry at him about it. In the thirtieth jubilee, in the second week—in its first year—he married a woman whose name was Melka, the daughter of *Madaï*, Japheth's son. In its fourth year he became the father of a son whom he named Shelah, for he said: 'I have truly been sent.' (*Jub.* 8:1–5)³⁸

The text then proceeds to speak of the life of Shelah.

At first blush it would appear as if Jubilees contains a significant and possibly early reference to Cainan. However, there is good reason to suspect that this text has been inserted into Jubilees at a later date. According to *Jub.* 2:23, there were twenty-two leaders of humanity from Adam to Jacob. This is the number of persons in the genealogy *without Cainan* that traces from Adam through Noah to Jacob, and Jubilees compares it to twenty-two works of God during creation (cf. *Jub.* 2:15). This has been noted by both Charles and Artom as evidence that *Jub.* 8:1–5 is mostly likely a later insertion into Jubilees to harmonize it with LXX and Ethiopic Genesis.³⁹

Jacobus has attempted to blunt this observation and argues that Cainan is original to Jubilees. Citing Halpern Amaru, she argues that the negative depiction of Cainan in *Jub.* 8:1–5 disqualifies him since the twenty-two patriarchs are said to be “blessed and holy” (*Jub.* 2:23), which Cainan is not.⁴⁰ The problem with this argument is twofold. One is that the text does not say that Cainan's sin disqualified him as one of the blessed and holy leaders of humanity—that is simply an assump-

³⁵ For a list see *ibid.*, xvi.

³⁶ See *ibid.*, xvii–xviii.

³⁷ For a discussion of the Ethiopic manuscripts see *ibid.*, xviii–xxxi.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 50–51.

³⁹ Charles, *The Book of Jubilees, or the Little Genesis*, 66; Elia Samuele Artom, *Sipure Agadah* (3rd ed.; Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1969), 2.38, note to 8:1 (Hebrew).

⁴⁰ Jacobus, “The Curse of Cainan,” 209. See Betsy Halpern Amaru, “The First Woman, Wives, and Mothers in *Jubilees*,” *JBL* 113 (1994): 619–20.

tion by Jacobus. The other is that this argument can be turned on itself: If Cainan is an insertion, then the author may have purposely created a storyline that disqualified Cainan as among the twenty-two, since he could not change the number to twenty-three—there are only twenty-two creative acts of God noted in *Jub.* 2:1–23.⁴¹

Thus, there is good reason to believe that Cainan was inserted into the text of Jubilees. Unfortunately, we possess no early extant copies of *Jubilees* 8 in Hebrew to attest to his presence or absence there. Therefore, *at best* the evidence from Jubilees is unhelpful, since there are arguments on both sides of the debate as to whether *Jub.* 8:1–5 is original to the text or a later expansion of it. However, the present author finds the argument favors *Jub.* 8:1–5 being a late expansion of the text, especially in light of the evidence that other early sources do not include any mention of Cainan.

VI. A SOURCE ALLIED WITH THE LXX THAT INCLUDES CAINAN: AUGUSTINE

As far as I know, Augustine (November 13, AD 354—August 28, AD 430) is the only Church Father who treats the genealogies of Genesis. In his *City of God* he includes Cainan in his discussion. Obviously Augustine, writing in the fifth century AD, is a late source compared to the other Church Fathers discussed so far.

Augustine clearly follows the LXX, as his discussion of the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts of Genesis demonstrates.⁴² In treating the genealogy of Genesis 5, he lists ages of six patriarchs when they fathered sons, all of which agree with the LXX. Five of these are readings where the LXX disagrees with the MT.⁴³ For Gen 11:10–26, he lists the fathering ages for all ten patriarchs, including Cainan, and agrees with the LXX in every instance. In eight of these, the LXX disagrees with the MT.⁴⁴ Thus, like Luke 3:35–36 in manuscripts from the fifth century onward, Augustine testifies to the presence of Cainan in the genealogies from Shem to Abram.

VII. CONCLUSION

The sum of the evidence from all sources examined in this study points to the same conclusion: Before the fourth-century AD Codex Vaticanus, there is no evidence conclusively pointing to the inclusion of Cainan as a son of Arpachshad and

⁴¹ Later Jacobus attempts to argue that the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 in the MT, SP, and LXX exhibit a mathematical pattern that indicates Cainan is original to the text of Genesis. However, it is significant to note that if Cainan is eliminated from the LXX, the same mathematical pattern is found, thereby calling into question her conclusion about Cainan's presence in the original text of Genesis or even in the Hebrew text type behind the LXX. See Jacobus, "Curse of Cainan," 218–24.

⁴² Augustine, *Civ.* 15.12 (NPNF¹ 2.292–93). Since Augustine had no knowledge of Hebrew, his most likely source for information on the Hebrew text was Jerome via the Vulgate.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Augustine, *Civ.* 16.10 (NPNF¹ 2.316–17).

father of Shelah. Early sources that have no knowledge of Cainan are (in chronological order):

Samaritan Pentateuch	ca. 100 BC
Josephus	late first century
Targum Onkelos	first–second century AD
Theophilus of Antioch	second century AD
Julius Africanus	late second or early third century AD
<i>Seder 'Olam Rabbah</i>	ca. AD 200–250
¶ ⁷⁵ (Luke 3:36)	early third century AD
Targum Neofiti	third–fourth century AD
LXX B (1 Chr 1:17–23)	early fourth century AD
Targum Pseudo-Jonathan	ca. fifth century AD
Codex Bezae (Luke 3:36)	fifth century AD

The one source that might be used to argue for inclusion of Cainan before the fifth century—Jubilees—is at best inconclusive. All other sources for Cainan are from the fourth or fifth century or later. Cainan son of Arpachshad first appears in fourth-century (Codex Vaticanus) and fifth-century Greek manuscripts of the Gospel of Luke and in early surviving manuscripts of the LXX from the fifth century onward. Augustine demonstrates knowledge of Cainan, son of Arpachshad in his *City of God* written in the early fifth century (i.e. after the sack of Rome by the Visigoths in AD 410).

The evidence suggests that Cainan was not original in Genesis, 1 Chronicles, or Luke. He was first included in the Gospel of Luke through a copyist's error sometime in the mid-to-late third or early fourth century. By the fifth century, this name was a standard feature in manuscripts of Luke. During this same period, Genesis LXX and 1 Chronicles LXX were probably altered in order to insert Cainan between Arphaxad and Shelah, thereby harmonizing them with Luke. However, the insertions were rather clumsily executed, thereby exposing their true origin. At some point, Cainan was also inserted into Jubilees in a longer expansion that depicted him as sinning by practicing astrology.