

PSEUDEPIGRAPHY RECONSIDERED*

Michael E. Stone

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

In one mode of description, we may say that ancient Israel achieved an extraordinary breakthrough, which brought its unique and distinct religious approach into being. This was the perception that the source of authority and of norms of conduct lies outside this world and outside nature. This recognition of God as the transmundane source of authority for human conduct set complex and indeed revolutionary processes underway in ancient Israel.¹

These processes engendered the growth of a social elite, which represented and propagated the transmundane norms (i.e., the prophets and the lawgivers). Moreover, as time went on these norms, which were originally transmitted in oral form, became embodied in written documents. In turn, groups then developed in society that studied those written documents, the biblical books.

* This article is a somewhat reworked form of a paper originally written for a conference convened by S.N. Eisenstadt in 1984. I am indebted to Professor J. Neusner who encouraged me to publish this paper, so many years after the event.

¹ The theoretical background to this paper may be found set forth briefly in: S.N. Eisenstadt, "Introduction: The Axial Age Breakthroughs—Their Characteristics and Origins," in S.N. Eisenstadt, ed., *The Origins and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1986), pp. 1-25.

This second stage, the study of the written documents, was particularly typical of the Second Temple age, and the enshrined written norms became the object of learned exegesis, often of a legal character.²

There were, however, other responses to the normative written tradition. Certain of these were most typically expressed in and by specific literary genres and forms, many of which were shaped by social and historical movements. In this paper we shall discuss one such literary phenomenon and attempt to discern its social and historical origins and implications. The apocalypses are books that reveal the secrets that are beyond this world and this age. Such books first appear in the period of the Second Temple and are virtually all written in the name of biblical personalities such as Enoch or Abraham.³ It is this false attribution or pseudepigraphy of the apocalypses that will be the object of our attention.⁴

² See the writer's paper M.E. Stone. "Three Transformations in Judaism: Scripture, History and Redemption," in *Numen* 32 (1985), pp. 218-235. See A. I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 55; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997), pp. 114-136 who discusses the effect of literacy on the rise of sectarianism.

³ The literature on apocalypses and apocalyptic literature is extensive. The subject was much debated in the 1970's, see M.E. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," in M.E. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; Assen and Philadelphia: van Gorcum and Fortress, 1984), pp. 383-441. For recent summaries see "Apocalypses, Apocalypticism," in D.N. Freedman, ed., *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 1.279; C. Rowland, "Apocalyptic: The Disclosure of Heavenly Knowledge," in William Horbury, ed., *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 3.776-797.

⁴ Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," pp. 427-429. Hindy Najman discusses some aspects of this in, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: *Jubilees* and Its Authority Conferring Strategies," in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 30:4 (1999), pp. 379-410; Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai - the Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (SupJSJ 77; Leiden,

Pseudepigraphy in General

It is true that much literature of the Hellenistic-Roman period was pseudepigraphic, a phenomenon that has been studied frequently. The motives for it were complex. Eastern, oriental wisdom beguiled Hellenistic people and led to writings being fathered upon Nechepso, a legendary Egyptian king, or Zoroaster, the Persian sage. Old, learned traditions seemed to have had great authority just as later, works were attributed to Aristotle or Apollonius of Tyana.⁵ Occasionally, moreover, pseudepigraphy was the result of a chance of literary history or an error of learned tradition.⁶ So Philo was considered the author of the *Biblical Antiquities*, a work included frequently in Latin manuscripts of his writings. There is some pseudepigraphy in the Hebrew Bible, but most of the surviving literature of the First Temple period is not pseudepigraphical. Consequently, the predominance of this literary characteristic in Second Temple period writing demands our attention. In spite of the practice

Boston: Brill, 2003).

⁵ See the discussion by W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970); *idem, Die Literarische Fälschung im Heidenischen und Christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (München: Ch. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971). See also the remarks by Elias Bickerman in *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1988), pp. 219-220, 230, 239-240 and the earlier paper by Morton Smith, "Pseudepigraphy in the Israelite Literary Tradition," in *Pseudepigrapha*, (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 18; Vandoevres-Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1972), pp. 189-227. The scholarly discussion is extensive, and the above can only serve as indicative.

⁶ See, for example, the proposal of H.H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (New York: Association Press, 1963), pp. 40-42.

of the Greco-Roman world, certain aspects of Jewish pseudepigraphy require special consideration.⁷

A hint that Hellenistic practice may not be the only explanation of pseudepigraphy is provided by the fact that the only Jewish works that are signed by their authors are those that were written according to the canons of Greek literature (e.g., Philo of Alexandria or Ezekiel the Tragedian or Flavius Josephus - almost the only exception is the Wisdom of ben Sira). This is as true of literature produced in the Land of Israel as of that produced in the Diaspora.⁸

Second, the Jewish pseudepigraphical works of the Second Temple Period are overwhelmingly religious in character. Certain of them make very considerable claims about the authority of the teachings they promote. This is true, for example, of the *Book of Enoch* and of *Fourth Ezra*.⁹ This confirms the idea that pseudepigraphy was not just considered to be plagiarism.

Third, all the pseudepigraphic works, except for the Book of Daniel, were attributed to figures that are already known from earlier biblical sources, and there is good reason to

⁷ See the author's observations in M.E. Stone, "Apocalyptic, Vision or Hallucination?" in *Milla wa-Milla* 14 (1974), pp. 47-56.

⁸ Of course, a number of Jewish Hellenistic works in Greek literary form were pseudepigraphical, such as the Sibylline Oracles and Pseudo-Phocylides.

⁹ See 4 Ezra 14 and the observations in M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), pp. 410-413.

think that the Daniel figure too is rooted in an established tradition, although one that did not find expression in the Bible.¹⁰

Jewish Attitudes to Pseudepigraphy

The attitudes to pseudepigraphy cultivated in some Jewish circles in the age under consideration are best illustrated by presentation of a number of texts. The first is the *Book of Enoch* 1:1-2 (most probably 3rd century B.C.E.):

The words of the blessing of Enoch according to which he blessed the chosen and righteous who must be present on the day of distress . . . And Enoch answered and said, "There was a righteous man whose eyes were opened by the Lord, and he saw a holy vision in the heavens which the angels showed to me."¹¹

The sources of this are Deuteronomy 33:1: "This is the blessing with which Moses, the man of God, blessed the children of Israel . . ." Numbers 24:15-6: "The oracle of Balaam the son of Beor, the oracle of the man whose eye is opened, the oracle of him who hears the words of God, and knows the knowledge of the Most High"; and Ezekiel 1:1: "The heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God."¹²

¹⁰J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, 16; Missoula: Scholars, 1977), pp. 3-7; M.E. Stone, "The Book of Enoch in the Third Century B.C.E.," in *CBQ* 40 (1978), pp. 479-492; esp. pp. 485-486.

¹¹ H.F.D. Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 184.

¹² See M.E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in Apocalyptic Literature," in F.M. Cross, W. Lemke, and P.D. Miller, eds., *Magnalia Dei* (New York: Doubleday, 1976), pp. 414-454; esp. p. 444, note 1. The case for *1 Enoch's* use of the Balaam oracles is extensively and acutely developed by G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), pp. 137-139, but his stress is different to ours. The figure of Enoch has been much discussed lately: see the overall presentation by J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, S.C.:

By implication, then, the *Book of Enoch* 1:1-2 draws together in Enoch the prophetic attributes of Moses ("and there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses" -- Deut 34:10), of the greatest of the pagan prophets --Balaam, and of the great seer Ezekiel whose vision formed the paradigm of all later Jewish mystical and ascent visions. This is the elevated character of the pseudepigraphical figure to whom the book is attributed.

Other passages also highlight the particular privileges and status of Enoch. *Jubilees* 4:17-23 (early second century B.C.E.) asserts the heavenly source of Enoch's knowledge thus guaranteeing its importance and validity:

And what was and what will be he saw in a vision of his sleep, as it will happen to the children of men throughout their generations until the day of judgment; he saw and understood everything, and wrote his testimony, and placed the testimony on earth for all the children of men and for their generations.

Moreover, the end of the passage explains how and why Enochic writings survived. It is a certification of their antiquity and authenticity.

The *Book of Enoch* 82:1-3 (third or second century B.C.E.), Enoch's words to Methuselah, accounts for the transmission of his teaching from antiquity and its esoteric character; it is wisdom and by it people are saved. Enoch had previously asserted the verity of his teaching:

University of South Carolina Press, 1995). A theory has been cultivated in recent years, perhaps most intimately linked with the names of P. Sacchi and G. Boccaccini, which would set an "Enochic" Judaism in absolute and diametrical contrast with a "Mosaic" Judaism. See G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: the Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1998). As will be evident in our following pages (which were mostly written in 1984-85), this position is far too exclusive and other approaches to traditions associated with Enoch are possible, and in our view even likely. It is important not to quickly identify surviving literary remains with ancient socio-religious realities, thus assuming that what has survived is all that existed.

And now, my son Methuselah, all these things I recount to you and write down for you; I have revealed everything to you and have given you books about all these things. Keep, my son Methuselah, the books from the hand of your father, that you may pass them on to the generations of eternity. I have given wisdom to you and to your children and to those who will be your children, that they may give it to their children for all generations for ever--this wisdom, which is beyond their thoughts. And those who understand it will not sleep, but will incline their ears that they may learn this wisdom, and it will be better for those who eat from it than good food. Blessed are all the righteous and blessed are all those who walk in the way of righteousness and do not sin [in not acting in accordance with Enoch's astronomical teaching]:¹³

With this compare also the *Book of Enoch* 91:19. In *Slavonic Enoch* 47:1-3 (first century B.C.E./C.E.) again the knowledge is saving knowledge, the verity of the Enochic revelation is asserted and the faithfulness of its transmission is highlighted.

And now, my children, place the thought on your hearts, and give heed to the sayings of your father, which I am making known to you from the lips of the Lord. And receive these books in your father's handwriting, and read them. For the books are many; and in them you will learn all the deeds of the Lord. There have been many books since the beginning of creation, and there will be until the end of the age; but

¹³ Quote from Sparks, *Apocryphal Old Testament*, 271. This passage, which is not represented in the Qumran manuscripts of Enoch, has been the subject of considerable debate. Nickelsburg's contention that it belongs to a redactional level has been challenged, see Nickelsburg, *Enoch*, p. 26.

none of them will make things as plain to you as <the books in> my handwriting. If you hold onto them firmly you will not sin against the Lord.¹⁴

The examples could be multiplied further from a broad range of pseudepigrapha, which bear this general character.

The Pseudepigraphic Figure of Enoch

Enoch is, therefore, one of the central figures around which pseudepigraphic works clustered. It is impossible here to spell out and analyze all the sources relating to Enoch, but much can be learned from our brief consideration of some of them. Enoch appears in numerous documents including other parts of the *Book of Enoch* (actually a composite of five separate documents written at diverse times between the fourth or third and the second or first centuries B.C.E.), in *The Book of Jubilees*, in pseudo-Eupolemus (a Samaritan source written in Greek), in *The Wisdom of ben Sira* (early second century B.C.E. from Jerusalem), as well as other and later sources, including the New Testament.¹⁵

In addition to the five documents contained in the *Book of Enoch*, a further Enochic work survives from this age -- the *Slavonic Enoch* or *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (probably

¹⁴ F.I. Anderson, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New York: Doubleday, 1983, pp. 91-213; quote from p. 174.

¹⁵ On the dating of *The Parables (Similitudes) of Enoch* see David Suter, "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Parables of Enoch," and M.E. Stone, "Enoch's Date in Limbo: Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis," in *Proceedings of Camaldoli Enoch Conference, June 2005* (forthcoming). The *Book of Giants*, known from Qumran and Manichean sources, also has a good claim to be included in the Enochic corpus, see: J.T. Milik, "Turfân et Qumran. Livre des Géants juif et manichéen." in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt*, eds. J. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann; (Göttingen: 1971), pp. 117-127 and John C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of the Giants Traditions* (Hebrew Union College Monographs 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1989).

late first century B.C.E.). Moreover, the Enochic and associated traditions had wide circulation in Jewish circles (such as the Essenes) and beyond them, among Christians, Elchasaites, Manicheans and others. Perhaps not unexpectedly, Rabbinic literature regarded these ideas about Enoch with great suspicion, seeking to minimize Enoch's role (e.g., Gen. Rabba 25:1).

Although Enoch is mentioned only in passing in the genealogy of the antediluvian patriarchs in Genesis 5:21-24, in all the apocryphal sources the figure of Enoch stands forth full-formed; these are not tentative first gropings, nor are they merely the exposition of evident implications of the biblical text. Therefore, we are led to entertain two possibilities. The first is that here a tradition is reflected which was newly created in the Persian and Ptolemaic periods, though in this case the exegetical dynamic would remain unclear. More attractive, however, is the view that these later sources, with their developed Enoch figure, grew out of ancient, extra-biblical traditions at which the Book of Genesis itself hints. This possibility becomes a probability in light of the Mesopotamian evidence. More than half a century ago, two studies, independent and converging (Jansen in 1939 and Grelot in 1948), showed that the depiction of Enoch in the Bible and particularly in the pseudepigraphical and associated literature draws much from Mesopotamian sources, a connection, which was dramatically confirmed by the implications of certain of the finds from Qumran relating to Enoch.¹⁶

¹⁶ See Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," p. 392. See already M.E. Stone and J.C. Greenfield. "The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch," in *Numen* 26 (1979), pp. 89-103. The most exhaustive study of Enoch's Mesopotamian origins is Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1988). The older works referred to are H. Ludin Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: eine vergleichende Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Oslo: [Norske Videnskaps Akademi] i kommisjon hos J.Dybwad, 1939) and P. Grelot, "La Légende d'Enoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et signification," in *RSR* 46

Whatever theory we follow, the figure of Enoch was enriched and enhanced during the Persian and Ptolemaic periods, as is witnessed by the texts we have cited. Moreover, there is the striking, parallel and contemporary development of the figure of Daniel, which shares many features with Enoch.¹⁷

Complex issues are involved in the understanding of this development. From the summary statement in *Jubilees* we learn that Enoch is an agent of the revelation of heavenly secrets and teachings, parallel to Moses. Moreover, from the sources it emerges that the tradents were highly conscious of the need to authenticate the transmission of the tradition and that they regarded it as containing saving knowledge. The far-reaching claims made about the actual mode of revelation include direct revelation by God. These claims, we maintain, are not to be taken lightly. The teaching is seen as redemptive, adding yet another dimension of significance to the phenomenon.¹⁸

Explanations of Pseudepigraphy

The pseudepigraphic figure of Enoch exhibits a highly complex, self-conscious development. Concerns for transmission and authenticity immediately demand our attention, as well as the bold claims made in validation of the revealed material. Scholars have offered numerous explanations of this phenomenon. The most convincing of them have taken account of the seriousness both of the pseudepigraphic mode and the religious claims made

(1958), pp. 5-26, 181-221. Subsequent discussion has been considerable.

¹⁷ See note 10 above.

¹⁸ I discussed the issue of transmission in M.E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," in E. Chazon and M.E. Stone, eds., *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 133-149. It is a highly important question and arises directly in connection with current research being done on the Book of Noah.

by the authors.¹⁹ Such explanations have frequently emphasized the following considerations: (1) that ecstatic experiences are transmitted in many societies in highly traditional and even "artificial" literary forms; (2) that the actual literary remains indicate a developed and widespread traditional learning connected with the names of Enoch, Daniel and other alleged authors; (3) that it is likely that actual ecstatic experience lay behind many of the pseudepigraphic apocalypses, and that this was the standard of validating religious experience invoked by the authors.²⁰

There are, we must stress, other modalities of Jewish pseudepigraphy than the "apocalyptic". A wisdom tradition is known, strongly connected with Solomon from earliest times (see, e.g., 1 Kings 3:5-13, 5:9-14, 10:1-9, etc.) and begetting Solomonic sapiential pseudepigrapha such as the *Wisdom of Solomon* and the magical *Testament of Solomon* and such poetic works as the *Psalms* and *Odes of Solomon*.²¹ Other writings seem to be attributed to biblical figures out of piety or an exegetical urge, such as the Book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah. However, the claims made for these works are not of the same character as those made for the apocalypses; nor are they touted as containing saving wisdom received by direct pipeline from the Almighty. Finally, it should be observed that the pseudepigraphic

¹⁹ *Inter alios* D.S. Russell, *Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SPCK, 1964), pp. 127-139; Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," 427-428.

²⁰ M.E. Stone, "A Reconsideration of Apocalyptic Visions," in *HTR* 96.2 (2003), pp. 167-180 is a recent statement of this issue.

²¹ See Pablo Torijano, *Solomon the Esoteric King: from King to Magus, Development of a Tradition*. (SupJSJ 73; Leiden: Brill, 2002). See also the later question and answer literature related to Solomon such as *Questions of the Queen and the Answers of King Solomon* and see S.P. Brock, "The Queen of Sheba's Questions to Solomon. A Syriac Version," *Le Muséon* 92 (1979), pp. 331-345.

mode is virtually absent from Rabbinic literature and plays a relatively minor role in the sectarian writings of Qumran.²²

Pseudepigraphy and the Normative Written Tradition

Finally, then, having regarded the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy from a number of angles, the time has come to spell out in greater detail the specific issues to which this paper is addressed.

First, and most significant: it is obvious that traditions such as that associated with Enoch contrasted with and complemented the legal/exegetical tradition that bore Moses' name. Their claims to antiquity, to reliability, to present redeeming knowledge give them this role as an alternate channel of authority. Those claims are buttressed, nay made possible, by the use of pseudepigraphy. This provides an aura of antiquity and participation in a tradition of great status and authority.²³ Yet, it seems wisest not to formulate these traditions as diametrically opposed to the Mosaic tradition, and to bear in mind the complex, if less well-preserved traditions associated, for example, with Noah and with Daniel.²⁴

²² M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), pp. 1.205-206; M.E. Stone, "Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha," in *DSD* 3 (1996), pp. 270-295, esp. pp. 292-295; cf. D. Dimant, "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran," in *DSD* 1 (1994), pp. 151-159, esp. p. 157.

²³ So, of course, did the use of Moses' name for pseudepigrapha, from Deuteronomy on. See J. Strugnell, "Moses the Pseudepigrapher at Qumran," in *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 19, *Qumran Cave 4 I4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), pp. 131-136.

²⁴ It seems to us, therefore, that Sacchi and Boccaccini go too far in stressing the Enochic tradition and setting it up in opposition to the Mosaic material, rather than as complementing it. The complexity of Judaism in the third century B.C.E. is only just now starting to be revealed.

We can only speculate about the social realities that such claims might seek to sanction or from which the tradition gained its authority. We do not know how the apocalypses were used in society, or how their teachings were realised. What function did pseudepigraphy play in this? We cannot answer these questions since we have no information.²⁵ On the other hand, some hints in the apocalypses indicate that the apocalyptic authors held a socially recognized position. They drew their authority from this and in turn by their activity they reconfirmed the society's expectation of their role. Some such dynamic may have strengthened them in their pseudepigraphical self-consciousness and in part created it.²⁶

Despite these remarks, the social functioning of the apocalypses and the apocalyptic authors remains enshrouded in deep darkness.

Formulating this issue from a different perspective, we may say that pseudepigraphy provided a way of handling the authoritative written tradition of the past. In this respect it was parallel to the exegetical tradition in function, although differing from it in content. Both exegesis and pseudepigraphy were instruments for relating to the normative written tradition and for aggiorniamento, updating of it. Both techniques drew upon the authority of the written tradition. In that sense, they are both secondary to it, even if the apocalypses claim the authority of revelation.

²⁵ Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, p. 42. See note 9 above.

²⁶ The hints, unfortunately, are from a later period. See Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, p. 42 and note 9 above, though this is Torah centered and not "Enochic". See also D. Flusser, "The Apocryphal Book of *Ascensio Isaiae* and the Dead Sea Sect," in *IEJ* 3 (1953), pp. 30-47. For earlier periods, see the social contexts implied by the apocalypses of the Second Temple period. Greenfield and Stone, "Books of Enoch" stressed the sectarian type of language in 1 Enoch.

Apparently, the pseudepigraphic authors boldly claim that they possess a tradition of learning inspired by God but not deriving its authority through the Mosaic revelation. Nonetheless, they were dominated by the view that saw the inherited written tradition, which became the Scriptures, as normative.²⁷ It is instructive to contrast this attitude of the pseudepigraphic authors with that of the Dead Sea Sectaries whose pneumatic exegesis, so they claimed, uncovered meanings in scriptural prophecy that the prophets themselves had not known to be present (1QpHab 7:1-8). This claim asserts the authority of Scripture, even though the content they eisegete into it differs utterly from the patent intention of its authors.²⁸

In the pseudepigraphic apocalypses, however, a duality is felt. Even though the apocalyptic authors claimed to possess an equally authoritative and even rival way of understanding the central truths of religion, they nonetheless felt impelled to set this rival and authoritative understanding in the context of ancient tradition: this indicates the enormous influence of written Scripture.²⁹ This is the case whether or not the pseudepigraphical tradition also drew on extra-biblical or even pre-biblical material.

Again, they claimed -- and presumably they believed -- that the teachings that they propagated stemmed from the transmundane realm and, therefore, the norms they set forth

²⁷ Najman, "Primordial Writing".

²⁸ The subject has been treated a number of times during the past half century. See the remarks of S.L. Berrin, "Qumran Pesharim," in M. Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2005), pp. 123-126. This issue is avoided by M. Bernstein and S. Koyfman, "The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods," in M. Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2005), pp. 1-87, esp. p. 64.

²⁹ Above we referred to the Scriptural roots of the pseudepigraphic authors. The instance of David is at odds with this assertion but above we noted the sources of the Daniel tradition.

also derive from that realm. Yet this authority alone did not suffice, and the weight of the written Scriptures and the ancient normative tradition were also added to strengthen and confirm their claim. Pseudepigraphy was the means by which this was effected.³⁰

How self-conscious were these authors of innovating or of manipulating past tradition? Even in the brief passages we cited there is an awareness of this -- the authors' reflection on their action is evident from the reiterated stress on transmission and reliability. This is carried to a sort of absurd extreme in one work, which actually describes the mode of physical preservation from the days of Moses of the scroll on which it was written -- conserved in cedar oil and wrapped in a cloth, it was put in an earthen jar rather like a Dead Sea Scroll (*Test. Moses* 1:16-17). Traditions describing transmission from heavenly sources of Mosaic and other materials are widespread: see *Jubilees* 1 (Prologue); *4 Ezra* 14; *1 Enoch* 68:1, 81:1-5; *2 Enoch* 10, 13 and note especially 13:75-78, and many other sources.³¹

The theme of preservation of books from remote antiquity and their subsequent discovery was not unknown, of course. Josephus has the tale of the two antediluvian steles, one of pottery and one of metal, designed to survive the expected floods of fire and of water (Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.70-71, cf. *Jubilees* 8:3). Analogous stories are also to be found in pagan pseudepigraphic literature.³² Such tales serve to verify the transmission from remote

³⁰ By way of contrast, observe J.J. Collins' statement about the Book of Revelation: "In departing from the use of pseudonymity, Revelation merely dropped one of the accrediting devices of apocalyptic style, which was found superfluous in the historical context." ("Pseudonymity, Historical Reviews and the Genre of the Revelation of John," in *CBQ* 39 [1997], pp. 329-343: quote from p. 332).

³¹ See also M.E. Stone. "The Book of Noah", in *DSD* (in press).

³² See Speyer, *Bucherfunde*, pp. 68-69. The documentation of the steles is extensive. Later sources are set forth in M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha: Relating to Adam and Eve* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 150-151, 198-199. In addition to the sources cited there, see Moses

antiquity of works actually composed at a much later date. Yet these tales become part not merely of the "setting of the stage" but also of the claim for authority. While the idea of an active tradition of Enoch speculation may go a long way towards explaining some aspects of the apocalypticist's self-understanding,³³ it does not account for the fact that a book, written down in the third or second century, contains an elaborate explanation of how it (not its traditions nor the teachings it embodies) survived from the hoary past. That a need was felt to account for this is revealing. It betrays, by protesting overmuch, the awesome weight of the received scriptural tradition.

The consideration of this type of pseudepigraphy, then, uncovers conflicting directions of thought. On the one hand, the normative tradition of the past was authoritative and this engendered the attribution of books to ancient worthies. On the other, a tradition of teaching had developed, which claimed a different source of authority, thus enhancing its role as proponent of rival transmundane norms. This is evident from the bold claims made for the works and for the teachings they contained.

These far-reaching assertions are founded upon the possession of inspired knowledge of one or another sort, knowledge that derived from a tradition and context lying outside the central biblical revelation itself.³⁴ Moreover, the details supplied about the mode of transmission and preservation of the books indicate that the authors were conscious in large

of Choren 4:1. See W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989), pp. 91-93.

³³ D.S. Russell, *Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SPCK, 1964), pp. 107-118 and Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," p. 431. An early important discussion of the visionary dimension of apocalyptic writers is F.C. Porter, *The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers* (New York: Scribners, 1905), pp. 38-43.

³⁴ Stone, "Apocalyptic—Vision or Hallucination?" pp. 54-55.

measure of what they were doing, yet did it in dialectic with the received tradition.

Furthermore, the claims to redeeming knowledge and the propagation of norms originating in the transmundane realm reveal that at least part of what they were doing was validated for them by their actual experiential practice.

Pseudepigraphy and Social Matrix

A major limit to the understanding of the pseudepigraphic apocalypses is that there is no indication of how they actually functioned in society,³⁵ although they often express the tension between their teaching and social-historical reality in eschatological terms. Moreover, it is equally unfortunate that from the surviving sources virtually nothing can be inferred about the social position, group organization or way of life of the apocalyptic authors. Consequently, the social processes that might have engendered or been correlative to these developments in the history of religion and thought cannot be traced. Furthermore, although the pattern described here certainly seems true of Noah and Enoch traditions and of those of Daniel and Ezra and Baruch, we do not know how much broader its validity may be.

Speyer in his work on pseudepigraphy in antiquity excluded precisely this type of pseudepigraphy from his general treatment, as being atypical. "This type (of pseudepigraphy) comes into being out of the world view of the religious person and his or her experience of divine inspiration. Its true nature cannot be fully grasped scientifically, since a sort of thought and experience are present, which is not accessible to the scientific experience."³⁶ We suggest, however, that at least in a phenomenon such as is reflected in the literary works discussed here, the situation is even more complex. Pseudepigraphy does seem to reflect, to one measure or another, religious experience of the seers, and they regarded it as

³⁵ Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," pp. 433-434.

³⁶ Speyer, "Die literarische," p. 6. Translation is ours.

communicating norms and teaching gained from the transmundane realm. Yet the seers also had to put this into relationship with the literary crystallization of the tradition deposit of the earlier generations, itself also held to embody such norms. There are tensions inherent in this process, just as in the interplay between the religious experiences of the writers and the literary means used to present them.

Thus, we submit, pseudepigraphy may be one of the ways by which Judaism handled the normative intellectual tradition created in its own past "primary breakthrough". This was done partly ingenuously and partly very consciously.

Bibliography

- Adler, W. *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989).
- Anderson, F.I. "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New York: Doubleday, 1983), pp. 91-213.
- Baumgarten, A. I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 55; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997).
- Bernstein, M.J. and Koyfman, S.A. "The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods," in M. Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2005), pp. 1-87.
- Berrin, S.L. "Qumran Pesharim," in M. Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2005), pp. 123-126.
- Bickerman, E. *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1988).
- Boccaccini, G. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: the Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1998).
- Collins, J.J. "Pseudonymity, Historical Reviews and the Genre of the Revelation of John," in *CBQ* 39 (1977), pp. 329-343.

_____. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 16; Missoula: Scholars, 1977).

Dimant, D. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran," in *DSD* 1 (1994), pp. 151-159.

Eisenstadt, S.N. *The Axial Age; Rise of Transcendental Visions; the Emergence of Intellectuals and of Clerics and the Structuring of World History* (Jerusalem: Kaplan School and Truman Institute, 1986).

Flusser, D. "The Apocryphal Book of *Ascensio Isaiae* and the Dead Sea Sect," in *IEJ* 3 (1953), pp. 30-47.

Greenfield, J.C., and Stone, M.E. "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," in *HTR* 70 (1977), pp. 51-65.

Grelot, P., "La legende d'Enoch dans les Apocryphes and dans la Bible: origine et signification," in *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 46 (1958), pp. 5-26, 181-121.

Hengel, M. *Judaism and Hellenism* in 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).

Jansen, H. L. *Die Henochgestalt: eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Oslo: Norske Videnskaps Akademi, J.Dybwad, 1939).

Kvanvig, H.S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1988).

Knibb, M.A. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1978).

Najman, H. "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: *Jubilees* and Its Authority Conferring Strategies," in *JSJ* 30:4 (1999), pp. 379-410.

_____. *Seconding Sinai - the Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (SupJSJ 77; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003).

Nickelsburg, G.W.E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

Porter, F.C. *The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers* (New York: Scribners, 1905).

Rowland, C. "Apocalyptic: The Disclosure of Heavenly Knowledge," in William Horbury, ed., *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 3.776-797.

Rowley, H.H. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (New York: Association Press, 1963).

Russell, D.S. *Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SPCK, 1964).

Smith, M. *Pseudepigraphy in the Israelite Tradition* (Pseudepigrapha I, Vandoeuvres-Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1972).

Sparks, H.F.D. *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).

Speyer, W. *Die Literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (München: Ch. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971).

_____. *Bucherrunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970).

Stone, M.E. "Apocalyptic--Vision or Hallucination," in *Milla wa-Milla* 14 (1974), pp. 47-56.

_____. "Lists of Revealed Things in Apocalyptic Literature," in F. M. Cross, W. Lemke and P.D. Miller, eds., *Magnalia Dei* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), pp. 414-425.

_____. "The Book of Enoch in the Third Century B.C.E.," in *CBQ* 40 (1978), pp. 479-492.

_____. "Apocalyptic Literature," in M.E. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; Assen and Philadelphia: van Gorcum and Fortress, 1984), pp. 427-437.

_____. "Three Transformations in Judaism: Scripture, History, and Redemption," in *Numen* 32 (1985), pp. 218-235.

_____. "History, Eschatology and Cosmic Aporia" in S.N. Eisenstadt, ed., *The Origins and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations* (NY: State University of New York, 1987), pp. 241-251.

_____. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis:

Fortress, 1990).

_____. *Armenian Apocrypha: Relating to Adam and Eve* (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

_____. "Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha," in *DSD* 3 (1996), pp. 270-295.

_____. "The Axis of History at Qumran," in E. Chazon and M.E. Stone, eds., *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 133-149.

_____. "A Reconsideration of Apocalyptic Visions," in *HTR* 96.2 (2003), pp. 167-180.

_____. "The Book(s) of Noah", in *DSD* (in press).

_____. "Enoch's Date in Limbo: Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis," in *Proceedings of Camaldoli Enoch Conference, June 2005* (forthcoming).

Stone, M.E. and Greenfield, J.C. "The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch" in *Numen* 26 (1979), pp. 89-103.

Strugnell, J. "Moses the Pseudepigrapher at Qumran," in *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 19, *Qumran Cave 4 14* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), p. 131.

Suter, D. "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Parables of Enoch," in *Proceedings of Camaldoli Enoch Conference, June 2005* (forthcoming).

Torijano, P. *Solomon the Esoteric King: from king to magus, development of a tradition*. (SupJSJ 73; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

VanderKam, J. C. *Enoch, A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995).

