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The English word “pseudepigrapha” (sing. “pseudepigraphon”) is the transliteration of a Greek term that refers to “falsely attributed writing,” from pseudēs (false) and epigraphē (inscription, superscription). It occurs nowhere in biblical or Second Temple sources but is attributed to Serapion (ca. 191–211 CE) with respect to writings falsely attributed to Christ’s apostles and therefore rejected by the church.\(^1\) More generally, it is used to designate works falsely attributed to, or in some way related to, prominent individuals. In the case of the so-called Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the individuals in view are featured in the body of literature contained in the Hebrew Bible. Yet the category can be misleading. First, the very notion of falsehood with respect to authorship conjures up negative prejudices that can do injustice to the documents in their respective contexts (see below). Second, some works within this category are associated not with an esteemed figure from antiquity but with their real authors.\(^2\) Third, the category of pseudepigrapha can be taken as implying a degree of coherence among its constituent parts. For instance, the Apocrypha are usually identified as works present in the Septuagint but not in the Hebrew Bible. Yet the texts typically identified as pseudepigrapha, even those originating from the Second Temple period, are not attested as collections in any single manuscript. Also unlike the Apocrypha, which are preserved in Greek and many of which stem from a Semitic original, a variety of documents designated as pseudepigrapha are extant also, and sometimes exclusively, in Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, and a number of other languages. Moreover, nearly all the documents in question

---

2. Stuckenbruck (“Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” 152) cites Aristeas the Exegete, Aristobulus, Artapanus, Cleodemus Malchus, Demetrius the Chronographer, Eupolemus, Ezekiel the Tragedian, and Theodotus as examples.
are preserved exclusively in Christian traditions. Finally, unlike the works of the Apocrypha, which date prior to the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–135 CE), the date of composition of some of these pseudepigraphic documents, or even one’s ability to ascribe a date, is less clear.

The category “pseudepigrapha” was first used in biblical scholarship by Johann Albert Fabricius (1713). Since then it has been largely adopted by subsequent collections of documents, such as the first English collection by R. H. Charles. Published in 1913, Charles’s two-volume The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament remained the only English-language collection for seventy years. The term was retained in the anthologies of James H. Charlesworth and, more recently, Richard J. Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander Panayotov. Yet from its inception, the nomenclature has been largely negative. Whereas the designation “Old Testament Apocrypha” has been used since Jerome with reference to collections of books found in Greek codices of the Scriptures (and sometimes the Latin Vulgate) not found in the Hebrew Bible or the Greek New Testament, the Pseudepigrapha enjoys no such ancient grouping. Pseudepigrapha is a classification of omission—a designation not for what type of literature they are but for what they are not. As Annette Yoshiko Reed observes, they are “not modern, not ‘classical,’ not preserved with the names of their authors, not found in the Jewish Tanakh, Catholic Bible, or Protestant ‘Old Testament apocrypha,’ not concerned with figures in the New Testament, and not generally known in the Latin West during the Middle Ages.” And so typically the texts listed among the Pseudepigrapha are grouped together simply because they do not fit in any of the other defined collections.

Despite its problems, the term remains “the most familiar and identifiable label for a shifting group of ancient writings deemed somehow related to ‘the Bible’ but also somehow distinct.” The impasse of nomenclature serves to illustrate the complexity of the documents under consideration. That a work

3. See the analysis by Reed, “Modern Invention.” For a thorough summary of developments in scholarly research, see DiTommaso, “Pseudepigrapha Research.”
4. In 1900, E. Kautzsch edited the first German collection of the Pseudepigrapha, titled Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments.
8. Though she calls for new “modes of categorization,” Reed offers none herself (“Modern Invention,” 436). VanderKam suggests the abandonment of such categories as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in favor of delineating texts in terms of their chronology within the Second Temple period, despite the difficulties that necessarily entails (Introduction to Early Judaism, 58). For their volume Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Bauckham, Davila, and Panayotov retain
is classified as a pseudepigraphon should not be taken as a designation, necessarily, of any degree of coherence or uniformity with other texts so classified. It is a diverse collection of texts depicting views and perspectives as disparate as the communities that composed and preserved them. Charlesworth wisely cautions, “Too many critics incorrectly assumed . . . that there was a canon of pseudepigrapha.”

One may find, however, some very general similarities within the nature and form of these writings. These are ancient documents whose historical authors’ identities are (deliberately?) obscure. In this respect, the Pseudepigrapha can be placed within the subset of anonymous writings in which what can be known about the authors is ascertained only from the texts themselves. Furthermore, they tend to communicate either in the first person by assuming the identity of an ancient figure (as in 1 Enoch, 2 Baruch, and the Testament of Job) or in a third-person narration of experiences of a revered figure (as in Jubilees [for Moses], the Life of Adam and Eve, and the Testament of Abraham). This fact provides an intriguing analytical perspective whereby one can examine the development of historical and hagiographic traditions surrounding various Old Testament figures. If one limits the scope of pseudepigrapha to the Second Temple period, some additional characteristics common among them can be adduced: they were written in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, and typically originate from a form of Judaism for whom the Mosaic Torah was central. These generalizations are, of course, fluid, but they illustrate the complexity created by the diversity of genre, setting, outlook, and ideology attested among them on the one hand, and the commonality in the shared matrix of Second Temple Judaism on the other.

Pseudepigraphy in Antiquity

Among the challenges in the study of this literature is its infamous association with falsehood associated with the literary characteristic in which a document is attributed to an individual who did not, in reality, write it. For modern readers this is a distasteful moral matter that casts a dim shadow on the term “despite its unsatisfactory associations, because none of the proposed replacement terms ('parabiblical literature,' 'parascriptural literature,' 'scripturesque remnants,' etc.) yet commands general acceptance or is as widely recognized by the public” (xxvii).


12. Clarke (“Problem of Pseudonymity,” 441) carefully observes a distinction between pseudepigraphy and pseudonymity. The former refers to literature, whereas the latter addresses the author. Both, however, employ false titles.
document itself. Recent discussion of ancient pseudonymity in the context of Second Temple Judaism has addressed this matter and shown that careful attention to the practice in antiquity can enhance the modern reader’s appreciation for the cultural phenomena at play.

Types of Ancient Pseudepigraphy

As we build on works found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, three general categories of the practice of Jewish pseudepigraphy are evident. First, there are writings attributed to a figure by their title or superscription alone. This is called “decorative” pseudepigraphy in that such documents do not indicate within themselves the identities of the authors responsible. Works such as the Prayer of Manasseh and the Psalms of Solomon would suit this category. Second, scholars identify the use of “convenient” pseudepigraphy, or what others call “pseudepigraphic voices.” In these texts one finds traces of a revered figure in editorial interventions or compositional allusions, which serve as a convenient way “to inculcate morals and values in a society which needs chastisement.” To this category one may ascribe works such as the Wisdom of Solomon, 1 Baruch, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, as well as the respective testaments of Job, Abraham, and Moses. The final category of pseudepigraphy is perhaps the one that more likely comes to mind in this literature. This includes documents in which the primary speaker of a work is the main figure within it and is understood to be a revered ancient figure. This category presses the named figure into service to strengthen the work’s authority. This is called “authoritative pseudepigraphy,” which is best suited to legal material and prophetic/apocalyptic utterances. Works that fall into this category are autobiographical in nature and would include 1 Enoch, 3 Enoch, Jubilees, 2 Baruch, 3 Baruch, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse of Abraham, the Apocalypse of Zephaniah, and the Apocalypse of Elijah among the more common pseudepigrapha. From Qumran one could include the Genesis Apocryphon, the Testament of Naphtali, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Temple Scroll, and Psalm 151. As these lists indicate and as we will see below, apocalyptic writings are a common genre in which pseudepigraphy occurs. A subcategory of authoritative pseudepigraphy encompasses the few instances where texts are

13. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls.”
15. Wyrick, “Pseudepigraphy,” 1115.
falsely ascribed (pseudonymity) to a figure—fictional or historical—who lacks the authoritative recognition enjoyed by others. These may include works such as Tobit or the Letter of Aristeas. Other works, such as the Biblical Antiquities, are mistakenly attributed to Philo of Alexandria. Still others—Jewish and Christian—may attribute authorship to a figure not from the Hebrew Bible but from pagan contexts (Sibylline Oracles and Pseudo-Orphic Hymns) or to Gentile figures (Pseudo-Phocylides, Syriac Menander, Pseudo-Hecataeus, etc.).

**Rationale for Pseudepigraphy**

Several reasons can be posited for the practice of pseudepigraphy. Some libraries, such as the famous Alexandrian library, collected works of well-known writers. Therefore, one might write in another’s name to gain a place among well-known writers. This could be done to get a hearing for one’s own views, whether to counter a false claim by an opponent or opponents or to draw the circumstances of the ancient figure into the context of the real author’s setting. So, for example, the author of 4 Ezra draws from the biblical Ezra. The book of Ezra is set in a context of the return from exile and reconstitution of the temple. Fourth Ezra, drawing from Ezra’s narrative setting, is written after the destruction of the Herodian temple in 70 CE, and “the affinities between biblical context and the time of writing were overwhelmed by the real author’s pressing interests.” In some instances the genre of a work may influence the figure to whom it is attributed. Sapiential material would be attributed to Solomon, hymnic writings to David, legal matters to Moses, and so on.

**Reception of Pseudepigraphy**

Although the practice of writing in the name of another was sometimes criticized, particularly in early Christianity, ancient responses to the books

21. Stuckenbruck, “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” 154–55. Clarke (“Problem of Pseudonymity,” 448–49) has compiled a list of twelve possible motivations: (1) financial gain; (2) to malign, discredit, or defame opponents or enemies; (3) to guard or preserve traditions or doctrines; (4) to express admiration for an attributed author; (5) to express an author’s belief that he is extending teachings of the ascribed author; (6) to express an author’s belief that he has received visionary sanction or been filled with the Holy Spirit; (7) out of personal modesty; (8) as an aspect of artistic or dramatic composition; (9) as an educational, literary, or rhetorical exercise; (10) to invoke the reputation of an important figure of antiquity for various reasons, including the desire to secure greater prestige and credence for teaching or doctrine; (11) to create distance from or hide true authorship for various reasons including fear and the need to maintain anonymity; (12) to provide earlier attestation for contemporary requirements.
themselves were not uniform. Perhaps it is this diversity of opinions that led to, from the third century BCE, means to discern the authenticity of the attribution of a text. For instance, in some circles writing in one’s own name may have been perceived as unethical, whereas writing in the name of another would have been perceived as a more modest way of expressing one’s indebtedness to a tradition. But it is also the case that many ancient readers were unaware that what they were reading was written by someone other than the one to whom it is attributed, since many pseudonymous works were not recognized as such until more recently. A survey of a wide swath of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian contexts in which the practice was employed illustrates this mixed reception. Among Greco-Roman literature, numerous examples can be adduced, including Pythagoras (ca. 582–507 BCE), to whom a large corpus of literature is attributed despite his leaving behind none of his own writings. Yet in some instances the practice was negatively received. Livy (59 BCE–17 CE) expresses disdain for the practice, and in other instances pseudonymity was used to defame the name under which one wrote. Galen describes remuneration for those providing works of respected authors to the libraries of Alexandria and Pergamum, which surely provided some impetus for pseudepigraphy.

In Second Temple Jewish contexts, writings from the Hebrew Bible were often authoritative if derived, in some capacity, from a “succession of prophets” from Moses to Ezra. In the Apocrypha one finds ascriptions of authorship in the books of 2 Esdras (1:1–3), Tobit (1:1–2), Sirach (50:27), and 1 Baruch (1:1–2). Works such as the Wisdom of Solomon, the Letter of Jeremiah, and the Prayer of Manasseh bear less obvious ascriptions, whereas 1 Esdras, Judith, and 1–2 Maccabees are anonymous. Prominent among Jewish writings from the Second Temple period is the pseudepigraphon 1 Enoch, a compilation of works associated with the figure Enoch from the Hebrew Bible (Gen. 5:24). It may be that works written in the name of an esteemed figure were intended to elaborate on that figure and were thus attributed to him. In this rubric, texts expand on traditions associated with the figure on which they are founded.

27. Livy, Ab urbe cond. 40.29; Diogenes Laertius, Vit. phil. 2.521; Pausanias, Descr. 6.18.2–5.
28. Galen, In Hippocratis de natura hominis librum commentarii 1.42.
Thus, the ancient figure serves to lend credence to the views espoused in his name, and ensuing research examines the evolution of discourse associated with him.32

The practice of pseudepigraphy is well attested in early Christianity, where the issue is often one of pseudo-apostolicity.33 Scholars have long contended that, among early Christians at least, texts known to be pseudepigraphic in nature were rejected as authoritative.34 Zeal for determining the historical origins of a text with respect to its authorship finds some attention in early Christianity, where the reception of texts as sacred—or not—was often tied to apostolic origin.35 Tertullian’s (ca. 160–220 CE) criticism of a presbyter writing (falsely) in the name of Paul is frequently cited, as is the account of Serapion (d. 211 CE), cited in Eusebius, regarding the pseudonymous Gospel of Peter.36 At times early Christians received pseudonymous works, mistaking them for authentic works. A letter allegedly from Pilate to Tiberius concerning Christ was thought authentic,37 as was the Correspondence of Paul and Seneca.38 Some held Enoch to be the actual author of 1 Enoch and so regarded it as scripture.39 Others held 1 Enoch in high esteem, regardless of its origin.40

Recent scholarly assessment focuses on the canonization of Christian literature,41 which figures only tangentially into the present purposes. Yet the views expressed in that discussion may exert an influence on views of pseudepigraphy in Second Temple Judaism and so merit some consideration. In the discussion of the canonization of Christian literature, two general modern views on the phenomenon in antiquity are maintained: the first sees the practice as a literary convention without tarnish to the integrity of the pseudepigrapher or the document; the second is quite the opposite, asserting the practice was viewed with disdain. Those with a favorable view of the practice could look to the influence of F. C. Baur (1792–1860), who, in the

32. Such as the work of Stone and Bergen, Biblical Figures outside the Bible.
34. Candlish, “Moral Character.”
35. Cf. 2 Thess. 2:1–2; 3:17; Origen, Princ. Preface 8; Contra Celsum 5.54; Rufinus, Epilogue to Pamphilus; Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 4.23.12, 9.5.1; Jerome, Adversus Rufinum 3.25; Augustine, Civ. 18.38.
36. Tertullian, De baptismo 17; Adversus Marcionem 4.5; Cult. fem. 3; Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 6.12.3–6.
37. Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 2.2.1–2; Tertullian, Apol. 5; Justin, 1 Apol. 35 and 48.
38. Jerome, De viris illustribus 12; Augustine, Epistula 153; Clarke, “Problem of Pseudonymity,” 456n71.
39. Barn. 4:3; 16:5–6; Tertullian, Cult. fem. 3; De idololatria 4.
40. Irenaeus, Haer. 4.16; Clement of Alexandria, Eclogae propheticae 2.53; Anatolius of Alexandria, Paschal Canon 5; Ethiopic Orthodox tradition.
41. See esp. Clarke, “Problem of Pseudonymity,” and the literature cited there.
context of critical scholarly inquiry into the origins of New Testament books, was a strong advocate for the presence and acceptability of pseudonymity in the New Testament documents. Others along this trajectory—A. Jülicher, M. Kiley, B. S. Childs, D. G. Meade—collectively point to the notion of intellectual property as a modern construct foreign to ancient contexts where the theological content of a work bore greater weight than its historical authorship. Modern criticism of the practice fails to account for the cultural factors of antiquity, particularly in the context of Second Temple Judaism. In Jed Wyrick’s view, more culturally aware approaches recognize the practice of pseudepigraphy as an attempt by an ancient author (or authors) to re-create the discourse of esteemed figures of the past, or as a practice of appropriate self-effacement. Regardless of one’s assessment of the practice of pseudepigraphy, it is nonetheless a practice used in antiquity and sometimes—though not always—employed in the documents here under discussion. This suggests that negative connotations regarding the nature of a Second Temple Jewish work because of its classification as pseudepigraphic should be held in check.

Study of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

Pseudepigrapha in Their Judaic Context

Though the present work analyzes a small cross section of Jewish literature from the Second Temple period, appreciation for the Pseudepigrapha would be lacking without recognition of other contemporary literature. Pseudepigrapha, along with other literature, “need to be read together for a more comprehensive understanding of the diversities of Judaism that flourished during the centuries leading up to and after the turn of the Common Era.” Typically, Jewish literature prior to 135 CE is divided into five categories: in addition to the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, these categories include some of the Old Testament Apocrypha, the writings of Philo, the writings of Josephus, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In more recent scholarship the writings of the New Testament are factored into the matrix of literature from Second Temple Judaism. Long ago Charles insisted that without the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,

43. Wyrick, “Pseudepigraphy.”
44. Wyrick, “Pseudepigraphy,” 1114. This point is contended at length by Najman, Second Sinai.
and one could add these additional texts as well, “it is absolutely impossible to explain the course of religious development between 200 BC and AD 100.”

Since Jerome the term “apocrypha” has been applied to collections of books found in Greek codices of the Scriptures (and sometimes the Latin Vulgate) but not found in the Hebrew Bible or the (Greek) New Testament. The term derives from the Greek adjective *apokryphos*, meaning “hidden,” perhaps stemming from apocalyptic traditions that view certain divine disclosures as lying hidden or sealed (cf. Dan. 8:26; 12:4, 9–11; 2 Bar. 20:3–4; 87:1; etc.). However, the decision about which books to include in this category is not uniform, even among the major Greek codices. Works they hold in common are Greek Esther, Judith, Tobit, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Letter of Jeremiah, and Sirach. Additional works include 1 Baruch, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, 1–4 Maccabees, the Psalms of Solomon, the Prayer of Manasseh, and Psalms 151–155. Modern collections typically also include 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras (a portion of which, chaps. 3–14, is the same as 4 Ezra), and the Prayer of Manasseh, while omitting 3 and 4 Maccabees and the Psalms of Solomon. Some of these works (e.g., Sirach, Tobit, Letter of Jeremiah, Psalm 151) are attested at Qumran. To these lists one could add documents from Qumran previously unknown, such as the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 or 1QapGen), Apocryphon of Moses (1Q22, 1Q29, 2Q21, 4Q375, 4Q376, 4Q408), and 11QApocryphal Psalms (11Q11), to name but a few.

These writings are important for our purposes for several reasons. First, they are all Jewish texts from the Second Temple period. Second, like many of the Pseudepigrapha, they are often related to some figure or issue of interest deriving from the Hebrew Bible. Third, like the Pseudepigrapha, the collection as a whole exhibits a diversity of genres, including historical narratives (1 and 2 Maccabees, 1 Esdras), “tales” (Tobit, Judith, 3 Maccabees, Additions to Esther, and Additions to Daniel), Wisdom literature (Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach [or Wisdom of Ben Sira]), prophetic literature (1 Baruch and the Letter of Jeremiah), liturgical or hymnic texts (Psalm 151, Prayer of Manasseh, Prayer of Azariah, and the Song of the Three Young Men), an apocalypse (2 Esdras), and a philosophical treatise (4 Maccabees). Fourth, the Apocrypha illuminate the rich historical, social, and religious contexts of the period. For instance, the narratives of 1 and 2 Maccabees in particular provide historical accounts of events shaping the late Second Temple period.

48. APOT 1:x.
49. Gurtner, “Noncanonical Jewish Writings.”
50. Most are thought to date from the third century BCE through the first century CE. Some were written in Greek, others in Hebrew or Aramaic.
These include the Hellenization of Palestine under the high priests Jason and Menelaus (175–164 BCE), the rise of the Hasmonaeans and political revolutionary movements (later Zealots), and the shaping of major Jewish sects and doctrinal distinctives among them. Ben Sira (ca. 180 BCE) affirms Torah as the means to wisdom, while the Wisdom of Solomon chides the folly of gentile religions (similarly, 4 Maccabees).

The works of Philo and Josephus are likewise important for the study of the Pseudepigrapha. Philo (ca. 20 BCE–50 CE) was a Jewish historian and philosopher from Alexandria, Egypt, whose more than seventy-five treatises address a variety of issues. His Allegorical Interpretation is the work for which he is perhaps best known and consists of a running biblical commentary in the Alexandrian allegorical tradition. This method surely drives what seems to be his chief concern: to articulate the superiority of Judaism to other philosophical schools. Scholars debate the place of Philo’s work in early Judaism and in Hellenistic Judaism in particular. Perhaps more important than Philo is Flavius Josephus (ca. 37–100 CE), who provides some of the most significant historical documentation of the events in Palestine from antiquity available. He is responsible for four works: Jewish War, Jewish Antiquities, his Life, and Against Apion. In his Jewish War, Josephus describes, in part, his own role in the revolt against the Romans and his subsequent surrender to them, assistance in their intelligence against the Jews, and ultimate liberation and move to Rome. Throughout this seven-volume work, the author goes to great pains to show that the revolt was contrary to typical Jewish piety and instigated by a small group of misguided fanatics, on the one hand, and by corrupt and incompetent Roman governors on the other. Josephus’s Jewish Antiquities and Life illustrate the uniqueness of Judaism as a philosophical school of thought, more ancient, pure, and effective in the promotion of virtue and punishment of vice than any other. Moreover, the works argue for the superiority of Israel’s theocracy over all other forms of political constitution (a long-standing debate among Greeks and Romans). Similarly, in Against Apion Josephus provides a concise articulation of the tenets, antiquity, and virtues of Judaism.

The discovery of ancient Jewish documents, the Dead Sea Scrolls, in the Judean desert from 1947 to 1956 marks a watershed in the study of the Pseudepigrapha. Among these documents is found some of the earliest manuscript evidence of previously known, in addition to some previously unknown, pseudepigrapha. The particulars of these attestations will be addressed in the following discussions of the respective books. Yet here it is worth noting that

52. See esp. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls”; Stone, “Dead Sea Scrolls.”
among the Qumran documents one finds evidence from 1 Enoch, Jubilees, the Testament of Judah, the Testament of Naphtali, the Aramaic Levi Document, and Psalms 151, 154, and 155. Two general categories of pseudepigrapha are found among the Qumran documents previously unknown: traditions related to the book of Daniel and testamentary material. There is also a curious absence from Qumran of certain texts believed to be circulated in Palestine prior to 70 CE, such as the Psalms of Solomon, the Testament of Moses, and the Similitudes of Enoch. While the pseudepigrapha found at Qumran did not likely originate with the Qumran sectarians, their presence among the Scrolls does provide manuscript evidence from the third century BCE to just prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE in an incontrovertibly Jewish context. The significance of their preservation in Jewish contexts will become evident in our discussion of their respective provenances. Furthermore, their presence among the Scrolls suggests their acceptance, in some manner, among the Qumran sectarians. The numerous scrolls outside the category of pseudepigrapha are likewise crucial. All of these are Jewish and date from the Second Temple period. These, like the other Jewish texts from antiquity, serve to provide material for a more comprehensive understanding of the diversities of Judaism from the period.

Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha

Among the most challenging topics in recent discussion of the Pseudepigrapha is determining their provenance. That is, are the documents in question Jewish or Christian, and can or should such a distinction be made, and if so, how? Even the categories of “Jewish” and “Christian” may be more fluid than one might expect. Such texts could be associated with Jews, Jewish Christians, gentile Christians, Samaritans, gentile Godfearers, gentiles sympathetic to Judaism, and pagans with some interest in Jewish traditions. Any one of these groups, perhaps more, could lay claim to the interests contained in these documents.

Some texts, such as 1 Enoch and Jubilees, are clearly Jewish, as their presence among the Dead Sea Scrolls attests. But many are not found among the Qumran documents, and most texts of the so-called Old Testament Pseudepigrapha were preserved not by Jews but by Christians. In the course of their transmission, documents could be, and sometimes were, adapted to the communities that preserved them. A document may have been Jewish, even

55. The complexities are addressed succinctly by Davila, “Pseudepigrapha, Old Testament.”
pre-Christian, yet in the course of its transmission by Christians its Jewish original was lost (e.g., Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 3 Baruch, 4 Baruch). Only in some instances are the interpolations by Christians evident. Still other documents may revere an Old Testament figure and evince no distinctly Christian material, yet originate entirely within Christian contexts. In other words, they are Christian documents making use of Jewish traditions (Lives of the Prophets, History of the Rechabites), or even Christian documents with little evidence of other influences at all (Sibylline Oracles 6–8, Vision of Ezra, Greek Apocalypse of Elijah). Conversely, some Jewish literature could seem just as at home in Jewish or Christian contexts. For example, the Qumran Thanksgiving Hymns (1QHα) is a Hebrew composition of incontrovertibly Jewish origin. Yet if it had been found among medieval Syriac manuscripts, for example, it could easily be identified as a Christian document of Syriac-speaking origin. Jewish materials can become embedded in Christian literature, such as the writings of Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, and Augustine of Hippo. Lastly, some documents in this corpus give little indication of either Jewish or Christian influences (Sentences of the Syriac Menander).

A final challenge concerning the provenance of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha is linguistic in nature. Many texts existed at some point in Greek, whether originally in that language or as a translation from Hebrew (e.g., Pseudo-Philo’s Biblical Antiquities), even if some or all of a Greek translation is now lost. Some texts are extant today in secondary, even tertiary translations. Moreover, often the Christian manuscript traditions are preserved in a variety of ancient church languages, such as Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, Georgian, Greek, Latin, Old Church Slavonic, and Syriac. This compounds the difficulties in determining a text’s provenance.

The present work examines Jewish pseudepigrapha composed before or around the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–135 CE). How the date of a document is determined will be addressed with individual texts. The concern here is how to determine whether a document is “Jewish” or not. In the past some scholars presumed that if a document that revered an Old Testament figure was void of explicitly Christian content, it must necessarily be a Jewish document. Others held a default position that, for some documents, presumed a Christian provenance influenced by Jewish scriptures and traditions, such as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Lives

of the Prophets, 3 Baruch, and Joseph and Aseneth.\textsuperscript{57} Some have employed a technique of removing Christian interpolations from documents. Yet such a method presumes that Christian elements distinct from the Jewish original can be identified with clarity. One may think, for example, of the New Testament epistles of James or Jude, which, if excised of a few Christian distinctives, would look very “Jewish” indeed. The similarities between what may be Jewish and what may be Christian, coupled with the inevitable complexities involved in the transmission of texts that wove the traditions together, render the method ineffective. More recent scholarship is shifting from the assumption that a text with both Jewish and Christian elements is Jewish and then reworked as Christian to the assumption that it is a Christian document influenced by Jewish traditions.\textsuperscript{58}

Robert Kraft advocates understanding these documents in the Christian contexts in which they are preserved, at least initially.\textsuperscript{59} More recently, James R. Davila calls for a seemingly more objective set of criteria for discerning the origins of a pseudepigraphon.\textsuperscript{60} This he does by isolating what he perceives to be “signature features”—that is, common characteristics among indisputably Jewish texts. These include monotheism; acceptance of certain sacred books and a historical narrative drawn from them; adherence to Jewish customs, laws, and rituals; support of the temple cult; self-identification as Jewish; usage, value, and reading within a specific Jewish community; and recognition of Palestine as the Holy Land. A text need not have all these characteristics, and of course the identification of a text as Jewish depends at least to some extent on what description of Judaism one adopts—that is, what one means by “Jewish.” Richard Bauckham challenges this notion of documents exhibiting a sort of “boundary maintenance,” for it a priori marginalizes texts congenial to Christianity, some of which are preserved in Christian contexts.\textsuperscript{61} Moreover, he suggests, one must be clear about why such documents were preserved in Christian contexts and recognize that a document predates the manuscript in which it is preserved. In this view, a “default” position may be unwarranted. But the question does raise awareness of the difficulties in determining, let alone presuming, a “Jewish” provenance to a pseudepigraphon.


\textsuperscript{58} Stuckenbruck, “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” 158.

\textsuperscript{59} Kraft, “Pseudepigrapha in Christianity”; Kraft, “Pseudepigrapha and Christianity Revisited.”

\textsuperscript{60} Davila, \textit{Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha}.

\textsuperscript{61} Bauckham, “Continuing Quest.”
For the present purposes, the provenance of respective writings will be assessed on an individual basis. Yet the ongoing debate on the matter illustrates the complexities involved in determining the date and religious provenance of these texts, with the stark differences between Jewish and Christian texts on the one hand and the similarities of Jewish, Jewish Christian, and non-Jewish Christian traditions on the other. Again, the collection is rich and diverse and often defies simple categorization with respect to provenance.

The Books of the Pseudepigrapha

Overview

Which books are included among the so-called Old Testament Pseudepigrapha is by no means uniform, even among published collections. The first such collection was that of Albert Fabricius, whose *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (1713) included a number of Greek and Latin texts from this category (published in a second edition in 1722 and a second volume in 1723). Works from other languages, such as Ethiopic, were made available for the Ascension of Isaiah (1819) and 1 Enoch (1821). The latter half of the nineteenth century saw the publication of still more books, such as Jubilees, 2 Baruch, 3 Baruch, 2 Enoch, the Apocalypse of Abraham, and the Testament of Abraham. They were eventually published as collections of thirteen (Kautzsch), seventeen (Charles), twenty-five (Sparks), sixty-one (Riessler), sixty-five (Charlesworth), and nearly eighty (Bauckham, Davila, and Panayotov). The first volume of Bauckham, Davila, and Panayotov’s collection contains fifty documents and nearly thirty fragments or quotations from other sources. In some instances, writings that properly belong to the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (e.g., Prayer of Manasseh and 4 Ezra) are contained in the writings of the Old Testament Apocrypha. Similarly, some apocryphal works (e.g., 3 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees, and Ps. 151) are found in collections of pseudepigraphic writings.

One could add to this collection a dizzying array of texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls that fall within this broad category. A selection of these includes documents known about before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls but attested among the Scrolls also, such as the Book of Watchers (1 En. 1:1–36; 4Q201–202, 4Q204–206), the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90; 4Q204–207), and the Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 92:1–5; 93:11–105:2; 4Q204, 4Q212). Also found were Hebrew texts from Jubilees (e.g., 1Q17, 1Q18, 2Q19, 2Q20 and Psalms 151, 154, and 155 (11Q5). Some documents attested at Qumran and classified broadly as pseudepigrapha were previously unknown, such as the
Aramaic Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), Four Kingdoms (4Q552, 4Q553), and the Testament of Jacob (4Q537), to name but a few. Other works are attributed to the archangel Michael (4Q529), to Obadiah (4Q380), to Manasseh (4Q381), and perhaps to Moses (1Q22, 2Q21, 4Q385a, 4Q387a, 4Q388a, 4Q389, 4Q390).

**Scope of the Present Work**

Published collections employ their own criteria for inclusion into respective lists of pseudepigrapha. For Charlesworth, a date of origin between 200 BCE and 200 CE is generally in view. H. F. D. Sparks does not employ a cutoff date, and the volume *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures* (Bauckham, Davila, and Panayotov) includes documents generally composed up to the rise of Islam in the early seventh century CE. Both Charlesworth and Sparks include Jewish and Christian documents, yet the *More Noncanonical Scriptures* volume also includes works of pagan origin. Sparks omits works of pagan origin or works featuring pagan figures. Where there is general agreement pertains to the affiliation of the text. For example, Sparks bases his inclusion on “whether or not any particular item is attributed to (or is primarily concerned with the history or activities of) an Old Testament character (or characters).” Charlesworth considers the category more broadly as works that are typically attributed to ideal figures of Israel’s past, lay claim to God’s message, and exhibit some continuity with ideas or narratives of the Hebrew Bible. Yet as noted before, these are merely descriptive rather than prescriptive distinctions.

It is important to observe here that the present and likely the future state of Pseudepigrapha scholarship are largely removed from some of the above constraints. It is true that the works of Sparks and Charlesworth alone have “brought the Old Testament pseudepigrapha into popular consciousness and generated and influenced an enormous amount of scholarly study.” Bauckham and Davila note the burgeoning of the field in the founding of scholarly journals, monographs, commentaries, bibliographies, and modern-language editions that have been produced since the early 1980s. The study of the Pseudepigrapha has come out of the shadow of Christianity as well as Judaism and taken a place as a field of study in its own right. As Lorenzo
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DiTommaso puts it, “As a category, the Pseudepigrapha of Kautzsch and Charles is extinct.”67 If the More Noncanonical Scriptures collection is any indication of recent trends, the parameters of provenance and dating will be much more inclusive. DiTommaso observes the evolution of “an inclusive corpus of potentially hundreds of texts—ancient and medieval, Jewish and Christian, attributive and associative, even (according to some) drawn from the Old Testament and the New—plus hundreds of other traditions.”68

While the field of Pseudepigrapha research as a whole has expanded, there remains a place for the analysis of a subset of these texts within the context of Second Temple Judaism. That is, while acknowledging the important progress the field makes beyond the traditional boundaries of Second Temple Judaism, there remains a place for analysis within. It is within these parameters of provenance and dating that the present study aims to survey Jewish pseudepigrapha composed before or around the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt. This is so despite the fact that these parameters are notoriously difficult, and Bauckham, Davila, and Panayiotov rightly caution against optimism in determining the provenance and date of a pseudepigraphon.69

The selection of works for inclusion—and exclusion—are waters that must be navigated carefully. As we have seen, the scope of what has been called “pseudepigrapha” is impossibly vast, and lists inevitably vary. The present work includes writings for which little doubt remains pertaining to their place in the above parameters, so primary attention here is devoted to works whose Jewish provenance in the Second Temple period is largely established. However, it is important to note that the works included are by no means intended to be comprehensive but rather representative of either the most important or a particular type of pseudepigraphon. Only cursory attention will be given to those works whose provenance remains generally unresolved. Here too the list of texts addressed is selective.

How to best arrange these texts is also a challenge, and any system of ordering creates problems. A chronological listing is impractical both because of the uncertainty about the date of a number of texts and because their composition occurred over an expanded period of time. An alphabetical listing is inhibited by the fact that some texts are known by more than one title. Charlesworth, as well as Kautzsch and Charles, arranges texts first by genre and secondarily by the name of the character in biblical order. Others, such as Fabricius, Sparks, and Bauckham, Davila, and Panayiotov, list texts

by the name of the Old Testament character with which it is affiliated in its biblical order. Bauckham, Davila, and Panayotov prefer the latter in that it avoids the necessity of categorizing a text by its genre. A further appeal of this arrangement is that it lends itself more readily to comparing traditions relating to the same individual. Nevertheless, it seems expedient here to adopt the system of arrangement based broadly on genre, similar to that employed by Charlesworth. This facilitates the provision of an overview of the nature of that particular genre in general prior to examination of specific writings within it. At the close of each genre segment is a summary of “things left out”—writings that belong to the genre but are excluded from discussion typically because of provenance. The genre categories and affiliated writings are as follows:

- **Apocalypses**: Primary attention is given to 1 Enoch, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, the Apocalypse of Abraham, and Sibylline Oracles 3–5, 11. Secondary consideration is given to 2 Enoch, 3 Baruch, the Apocalypse of Zephaniah, the Testament of Abraham, and fragmentary apocalyptic texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

- **Testaments**: Primary attention is given to the Testament of Moses, the Testament of Job, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram. Secondary consideration is given to the Testament of Solomon, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the (Qumran) Testament of Naphtali, and various testamentary Dead Sea Scrolls fragments.

- **Expansions of biblical narratives and rewritten scripture**: Primary attention is given to Jubilees, Biblical Antiquities, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Letter of Aristeas, and Joseph and Aseneth. Secondary consideration is given to the Life of Adam and Eve, 4 Baruch, Ezekiel the Tragedian, and the Book of Giants.

- **Poetic literature, Wisdom literature, and prayers**: Primary attention is given to Psalms 151–155, the Psalms of Solomon, and Pseudo-Phocylides. Secondary consideration is given to the Hellenistic Synagogue Prayers, the Prayer of Joseph, and the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242).
The word “apocalypse” is derived from the Greek *apokalypsis*, meaning simply “revelation.” As a genre, however, it describes a type of literature dating from around 200 BCE to 200 CE\(^1\) that depicts the reception of some divine disclosure to a person—typically a famous figure from the Hebrew Bible—alongside its interpretation by a heavenly figure such as an angel.\(^2\) The manner in which one receives such disclosures is typically by a vision or dream directly conveyed by a heavenly being, or the visionary is taken on an otherworldly journey, often with an angelic guide.

Though apocalypses exhibit some variety, there are some points of commonality: an appeal to heavenly revelation, the importance of angelic mediators, and an expectation of a judgment of individuals after death. Typically apocalypses exhort readers/hearers to perceive the present life “in light of impending judgment and to adopt one’s values and lifestyle accordingly.”\(^3\)

2. John J. Collins has defined the term in his seminal work as follows: “‘Apocalypse’ is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.” “Introduction,” 9.
Or, more poignantly, an apocalypse is “intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence the understanding and behavior of the audience by means of divine authority.” Apocalypses are saturated with symbolic language and images of a wide variety, using these images as communicative devices for their messages. They use symbols as metaphors for the purpose of referring to concrete objects or events as well as abstract ideas, often expressed in specific, nonliteral language, typically using imagery drawn from a set of recognizable symbols that were often understood to represent things beyond themselves.

Apocalypses are found in portions of the Hebrew Bible, such as the book of Daniel (chaps. 7–12; cf. Ezek. 40–48; Isa. 24–27, 34–35, 56–66; Zech. 9–14). Apocalypses within the Pseudepigrapha include 1 Enoch, which is composed of a set of distinct apocalypses, including the Book of Watchers (chaps. 1–36), the Similitudes of Enoch (chaps. 37–71), the Astronomical Book (chaps. 72–82), the Dream Visions (chaps. 83–84), the Animal Apocalypse (chaps. 85–90), and the Epistle of Enoch (chaps. 91–108). Also discussed in the coming chapters are 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, Sibylline Oracles 3–5, 11, and the Apocalypse of Abraham.