

Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserrfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen

Herausgegeben von
JÖRG FREY, JENS HERZER,
MARTINA JANSSEN und
CLARE K. ROTHSCHILD

unter Mitarbeit von
MICHAELA ENGELMANN

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament*
246

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (München)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

246



Pseudepigraphie und Verfassersfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen

Pseudepigraphy and Author Fiction
in Early Christian Letters

Herausgegeben von

Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janßen
und Clare K. Rothschild

Unter Mitarbeit von
Michaela Engelmann

Mohr Siebeck

JÖRG FREY ist Ordinarius für Neues Testament an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.

JENS HERZER ist Ordinarius für Neues Testament an der Universität Leipzig.

MARTINA JANSSEN ist Pastorin und Lehrbeauftragte an der TU Braunschweig.

CLARE K. ROTHSCHILD ist Assistant Professor for Scripture Studies an der Lewis University, Romeoville, Illinois.

MICHAELA ENGELMANN ist wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Institut für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Leipzig.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151535-4

ISBN 978-3-16-150042-8

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© 2009 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlags unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Das Buch wurde von Gulde-Druck in Tübingen auf alterungsbeständiges Werkdruckpapier gedruckt und von der Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier gebunden.

Vorwort

Der vorliegende Band geht auf ein zweitägiges Symposium zum Thema „Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen“ zurück, das am 15./16. Juni 2007 im Rahmen der Veranstaltungsreihe Münchener Bibelwissenschaftliche Symposien an der Evangelisch-theologischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in München veranstaltet wurde. Anlass war der durch ein Forschungsstipendium der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung ermöglichte Forschungsaufenthalt von Clare K. Rothschild in München am Lehrstuhl von Jörg Frey im akademischen Jahr 2006/2007, in dessen Rahmen ein Buchprojekt zum pseudo-paulinischen Charakter des Hebräerbriefts durchgeführt und zum Abschluss gebracht werden konnte.¹

Die Diskussion des Phänomens Pseudepigraphie und der spezifischen Fragen um den Hebräerbrief ließ eine präzisere Erörterung der Vielfalt pseudonymer Konstruktionen und des Facettenreichtums der im Hintergrund stehenden Motive notwendig erscheinen – in Anbetracht einer nach wie vor oft zu undifferenzierten und festgefahrenen Diskussion in der Bibelwissenschaft. Es reicht nicht mehr aus, im Blick auf eine Schrift lediglich die Frage nach ihrer Authentizität oder Pseudonymität aufzuwerfen, vielmehr ist zu diskutieren, wann bzw. unter welchen Voraussetzungen von Pseudepigraphie gesprochen werden kann, welche Typen und Spielarten von pseudonymer Autorschaft es gibt, wodurch die Anwendung einer solchen Darstellungsweise motiviert und wann bzw. unter welchen Umständen sie als ‚legitim‘ oder ‚illegitim‘ zu bezeichnen ist. Ist Pseudepigraphie tatsächlich, wie oft behauptet, ein gebräuchliches und allgemein akzeptiertes Darstellungsmittel in einer bestimmten Epoche, Gruppe oder Bildungsschicht? Die oft allzu schematischen Antworten auf solche Fragen erscheinen angesichts der Vielfalt der pseudonymen Konstruktionen von Autoren, Adressaten, Situationen, Gegnern usw. zu undifferenziert. Es ist daher notwendig, im Kontext eines weiten Spektrums von Möglichkeiten pseudonymer Darstellungsformen zu einer differenzierten Beschreibung der jeweils vorliegenden Konstruktionen zu gelangen, die ein präzises Urteil über den Typus, die Intention und die Implikationen einer jeweiligen literarischen Gestaltung erlaubt.

¹ C. K. ROTHSCHILD, *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon. The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*, WUNT 235, Tübingen 2009.

Diese Diskussion wurde im Rahmen des Münchener Symposiums von neun Referenten aus sieben Ländern aufgenommen. Die Mehrzahl der in diesem Rahmen gehaltenen Vorträge wird in dem vorliegenden Band in einer erweiterten Form abgedruckt und durch eine größere Zahl weiterer Beiträge ergänzt, durch die wesentliche antike Horizonte pseudonymer Autorschaft sowie der ganze Bestand der als pseudonym geltenden neutestamentlichen Briefe in der Unterschiedlichkeit der in ihnen begegnenden Verfasser-, Adressaten- und Situationskonstruktionen berücksichtigt werden. Wir danken den Referentinnen und Referenten sowie den zusätzlich angefragten Autorinnen und Autoren für ihre substantielle Mitarbeit an dem Projekt, die es möglich gemacht hat, dass dieser Band zu einer Bestandsaufnahme wesentlicher Aspekte der gegenwärtigen Pseudepigraphieforschung werden konnte. Insbesondere danken wir David E. Aune, der als einer der ‚Altmeister‘ der literaturgeschichtlichen Forschung zum Neuen Testament die Mühe auf sich genommen hat, alle Beiträge zu lesen und ein Nachwort zu den hier gebotenen Forschungsarbeiten zu verfassen.

Das Symposium wurde am Lehrstuhl von Jörg Frey geplant und durch die von der Humboldt-Stiftung gewährten Betreuungsgelder finanziert, wobei insbesondere der damaligen Sekretärin Brigitte Becker für ihre umsichtige Organisation zu danken ist. Bereits in der inhaltlichen Konzeption des Symposiums hat sich Martina Janßen mit großem Ideenreichtum eingebracht. Die Sammlung und Redaktion der Beiträge erfolgte am Lehrstuhl von Jens Herzer in Leipzig, was ohne die souveräne Projektleitung und inhaltlich wie technisch außerordentlich gründliche Mitarbeit von Michaela Engelmann nicht möglich gewesen wäre. Sie hat die Druckvorlage erstellt und zusammen mit Clare K. Rothschild und Martina Janßen sowie den studentischen Hilfskräften Claudia K. Tost (Leipzig), Ann-Sophie Wich und Miriam Guggenmos (beide München) Korrektur gelesen. Die Register wurden schließlich von Sebastian Ziera und Paulus Enke (beide Leipzig) sowie Kathrin Hager und Miriam Guggenmos (beide München) erstellt. In Bezug auf die formale Gestaltung der Beiträge ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass für die deutschsprachigen Aufsätze die Abkürzungsverzeichnisse der RGG⁴ sowie der TRE zugrunde gelegt sind; die englischsprachigen Beiträge folgen den Regeln des SBL-Handbook of Style.

Der Erstherausgeber dankt der Alfried Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach-Stiftung für die Arbeitsmöglichkeiten im Rahmen eines Forschungsjahres als Senior Fellow am Alfried-Krupp-Wissenschaftskolleg Greifswald, während dessen der Abschluss des Bandes erfolgte. Ein besonderer Dank gilt der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, durch deren Engagement die hier dokumentierte internationale Zusammenarbeit ermöglicht wurde und mit deren großzügigen Betreuungsmitteln auch die weiteren Kosten der Erstellung des Bandes bestritten werden konnten. Schließlich danken wir

dem Verlag Mohr Siebeck und seinem Team für die Übernahme des Bandes und die bewährte und wie immer erfreuliche Zusammenarbeit bei der Drucklegung.

München / Leipzig / Estebrügge / Chicago, im Juli 2009

Jörg Frey
Jens Herzer
Martina Janßen
Clare K. Rothschild

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Einführung

MARTINA JANSSEN / JÖRG FREY

Einführung 3

I. Frühjüdische Kontexte

LEO G. PERDUE

Pseudonymity and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric.

Mimesis and the Wisdom of Solomon 27

KARINA MARTIN HOGAN

Pseudepigraphy and the Periodization of History

in Jewish Apocalypses 61

EIBERT TIGCHELAAR

Forms of Pseudepigraphy in the Dead Sea Scrolls 85

II. Griechisch-römische Kontexte

WOLFGANG SPEYER

Göttliche und menschliche Verfasserschaft im Altertum 105

MARTINA JANSSEN

Antike (Selbst-)Aussagen über Beweggründe zur Pseudepigraphie 125

MARCO FRENSCHKOWSKI

Erkannte Pseudepigraphie?

Ein Essay über Fiktionalität, Antike und Christentum 181

KATHARINA LUCHNER

Pseudepigraphie und antike Briefromane 233

TIMO GLASER	
Erzählung im Fragment.	
Ein narratologischer Ansatz zur Auslegung	
pseudepigrapher Briefbücher	267

ROBERT MATTHEW CALHOUN	
The <i>Letter</i> of Mithridates.	
A Neglected Item of Ancient Epistolary Theory	295

III. Frühchristliche Kontexte

HARRY Y. GAMBLE	
Pseudonymity and the New Testament Canon	333

EVE-MARIE BECKER	
Von Paulus zu „Paulus“.	
Paulinische Pseudepigraphie-Forschung als	
literaturgeschichtliche Aufgabe	363

MARTIN HÜNEBURG	
Paulus versus Paulus.	
Der Epheserbrief als Korrektur des Kolosserbriefes	387

NICOLE FRANK	
Der Kolosserbrief und die „Philosophia“.	
Pseudepigraphie als Spiegel frühchristlicher Auseinandersetzungen	
um die Auslegung des paulinischen Erbes	411

TREVOR THOMPSON	
A Stone that <i>Still</i> Won't Fit.	
An Introductory and Editorial Note for Edgar Krentz's	
“A Stone that Will Not Fit”	433

EDGAR KRENTZ	
A Stone that Will Not Fit.	
The Non-Pauline Authorship of Second Thessalonians	439

TREVOR THOMPSON	
As If Genuine.	
Interpreting the Pseudepigraphic Second Thessalonians	471

JENS HERZER Fiktion oder Täuschung? Zur Diskussion über die Pseudepigraphie der Pastoralbriefe	489
CLARE K. ROTHSCHILD Hebrews as a Guide to Reading Romans.....	537
MATTHIAS KONRADT „Jakobus, der Gerechte“. Erwägungen zur Verfasserfiktion des Jakobusbriefes	575
MATT JACKSON-MCCABE The Politics of Pseudepigraphy and the Letter of James	599
KARL MATTHIAS SCHMIDT Die Stimme des Apostels erheben. Pragmatische Leistungen der Autorenfiktion in den Petrusbriefen	625
LUTZ DOERING Apostle, Co-Elder, and Witness of Suffering. Author Construction and Peter Image in First Peter.....	645
JÖRG FREY Autorfiktion und Gegnerbild im Judasbrief und im Zweiten Petrusbrief.....	683
JUTTA LEONHARDT-BALZER Pseudepigraphie und Gemeinde in den Johannesbriefen.....	733
STEFAN KRAUTER Was ist „schlechte“ Pseudepigraphie? Mittel, Wirkung und Intention von Pseudepigraphie in den Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum et Pauli ad Senecam	765
 Nachwort	
DAVID E. AUNE Reconceptualizing the Phenomenon of Ancient Pseudepigraphy. An Epilogue	789

Autorenverzeichnis	825
Stellenregister	829
Autorenregister	878
Sach- und Personenregister	894
Register griechischer Begriffe	902

Einführung

Einführung

von

MARTINA JANSSEN / JÖRG FREY*

1. Zum Thema: Perspektiven der Pseudepigraphieforschung

Der vorliegende Band „Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen“ geht auf ein internationales und interdisziplinäres Symposium zurück, das vom 15.–16. Juni 2007 im Rahmen der „Münchener Bibelwissenschaftlichen Symposien“ stattgefunden hat. Genau 200 Jahre zuvor – im Jahr 1807 – bestritt Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher die Echtheit des Ersten Timotheusbriefes, was einem „Donnerschlag für viele Theologen“¹ gleichkam und gewissermaßen den Beginn der neutestamentlichen Pseudepigraphiediskussion markierte. Deren letzte umfassende Dokumentation erschien 1977 mit dem von Norbert Brox herausgegebenen Sammelband „Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike“.² Seitdem sind über 30 Jahre vergangen und die Diskussion gestaltet sich nach wie vor lebendig und kontrovers, nicht zuletzt deswegen, weil der Annahme von „Fälschungen“ in der Bibel in den Augen vieler Forscher eine gewisse theologische Brisanz nicht abzusprechen ist. Nicht selten war deswegen das erkenntnisleitende Interesse in der Pseudepigraphieforschung ein dogmatisches, das die historisch-kritischen Ergebnisse mitunter präjudizierte.

Fragen der Echtheitskritik an antiken Schriften und die sich daran anschließenden Überlegungen über mögliche Gründe, warum ein Autor unter falschem Namen schreibt und wie dieses Verfahren heute zu bewerten ist, haben eine lange Geschichte hinter sich. Die Anfänge der Echtheitskritik

* Die Einführung wird von beiden Autoren gemeinsam verantwortet, doch war für den ersten, thematischen Teil Martina Janssen verantwortlich, während Jörg Frey den zweiten, auf die Konzeption des Bandes bezogenen Teil verfasst hat.

¹ So formuliert in einer zeitgenössischen Rezension; vgl. H. PATSCH, Die Angst vor dem Deuteropaulinismus. Die Rezeption des ‚kritischen Sendschreibens‘ Friedrich Schleiermachers über den 1. Timotheusbrief im ersten Jahrfünft, ZThK 88 (1991), 451–477 (471).

² N. Brox (Hg.), Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike, WdF 484, Darmstadt 1977.

gehen bis in die Antike selbst zurück.³ Im Humanismus erfährt die Unterscheidung von echten und unechten Schriften eine Renaissance und erreicht im 17. Jh. mit Richard Bentleys bahnbrechender Untersuchung zur pseudepigraphischen Briefliteratur griechisch-hellenistischer Provenienz einen Höhepunkt.⁴ Im Bereich der Bibelwissenschaften brachte die Bestreitung der Echtheit des Ersten Timotheusbriefes durch Schleiermacher (1807) die Diskussion in Gang, die sich in der Folgezeit äußerst komplex gestaltete.⁵ Zwischen den beiden Extrempolen, der Verteidigung der Echtheit aller neutestamentlichen Schriften auf der einen und der holländischen Radikalkritik auf der anderen Seite, etablierte sich mit der Zeit der auch heute im deutschsprachigen Raum weitgehend anerkannte Forschungskonsens: Von den 27 Schriften des Neuen Testaments tragen lediglich die sieben echten Paulusbriefe den Namen ihres realen Verfassers, alle anderen Schriften sind anonym oder pseudonym. Allein dieser Befund führt die Relevanz des Themas klar vor Augen, das die theologische Forschung seit über 200 Jahren bewegt. Drei Fragestellungen greifen dabei ineinander: 1) die Frage nach Echtheit oder Unechtheit einer Schrift (Echtheitskritik); 2) die Frage nach Motivation, Intention und Rezeptionsbedingungen einer pseudepigraphischen Schrift (Pseudepigraphieforschung); 3) die Frage, wie biblische Pseudepigraphie heute zu verstehen und bewerten ist (Schrifthermeneutik).

Nahm am Anfang der bibelwissenschaftlichen Echtheitsdiskussion die mögliche Unechtheit biblischer Schriften mitunter die Dimension eines kanontheologischen Skandals an und erzeugte heftige Gegenwehr, so konnte apostolische Pseudonymität auch schon zu Beginn der Forschungsgeschichte als Ausdruck des Kanonbewusstseins gedeutet werden. Im Sinne idealistisch-dialektischer Denkmodelle interpretierte z.B. K. R. Köstlin

³ Vgl. dazu M. JANSSEN, *Unter falschem Namen. Eine kritische Forschungsbilanz frühchristlicher Pseudepigraphie*, ARGU 14, Frankfurt a.M./New York 2003.

⁴ R. BENTLEY, *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Sokrates, Euripides, and Others. And the Fables of Aesopus...*, London 1697 (ins Deutsche übertragen: Leipzig 1857).

⁵ F. D. E. SCHLEIERMACHER, *Ueber den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulos an Timotheos. Ein kritisches Sendschreiben an J. C. Gass*, Berlin 1807. Zu den Reaktionen siehe PATSCH, *Angst* (s. Anm. 1), 451–477. Eine ähnliche Wirkung im englischsprachigen Raum hatten die Forschungen von Edward Evanson (E. EVANSON, *The Dissonance of the Four Generally Received Evangelists, and the Evidence of Their Respective Authenticity Examined*, Ipswich 1792); siehe dazu A. STRACHOTTA, *Edward Evanson (1731–1805). Der Theologe und Bibelkritiker. Ein Beitrag zur anglikanischen Kirchengeschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, TABG 12, Halle 1940.

(1851)⁶ Pseudonymität als eine Synthese von einander gegenläufigen Prinzipien, nämlich der „fortwährenden Änderung und Bewegung“ und „dem Bewusstsein sich immer gleich bleibender Wahrheit“. Pseudonyme apostolische Schriften erscheinen somit als ein „aus dem Apostolischen heraus sich entwickelnder Fortschritt des Geistes.“ Solche hermeneutischen Zugänge blieben zunächst vereinzelt. Oft führten die Ergebnisse der historisch-kritischen Exegese in die bibelhermeneutische Aporie, die gewissermaßen zum „Warten auf ein volleres Licht“ (J. S. Candlish [1891])⁷ verdammt.

In den 30er Jahren des 20. Jh. folgte eine Fokussierung auf die psychologisch-moralischen Implikationen pseudonymer Literaturproduktion.⁸ Man versuchte, den Widerspruch zwischen religiösem Anspruch, sittlichem Ernst und der Tatsache der Fälschung aus der psychischen Verfassung der Autoren zu erklären. Der unter falschem Namen schreibende Autor sei „überwältigt von den religiösen Gedanken“ (A. Meyer [1932]) bzw. von „Wogen religiöser Erregung“ (R. F. Merkel [1936]), so dass „im Halbdunkel des Unterbewusstseins das Gewissen zum Schweigen gebracht wird“ (F. Torm [1932]). Solcherlei psychologische Zugänge verfolgten unterschiedliche Zielrichtungen. Für Frederik Torm stellte das psychologische Gutachten über den Verfasser einer unter dem Verdacht der Pseudonymität stehenden Schrift gewissermaßen einen Echtheitsbeweis dar: Bietet die Psyche ein integres Bild, so muss die Schrift echt sein. A. Meyer hingegen versuchte, Pseudepigraphie als „heilige Poesie“ psychologisch zu erklären und so zu rechtfertigen.

In den 60er/70er Jahren kam neue Bewegung in die Pseudepigraphieforschung. Sowohl die umfassende Dokumentation und Aufarbeitung des relevanten Materials als auch unterschiedliche methodische Ansätze verhalfen zu einer differenzierteren Betrachtung von pagan-antiker, jüdischer, biblischer und altkirchlicher Pseudepigraphie. Mit der Arbeit von Josef Sint (1960)⁹ und den zahlreichen Untersuchungen von Wolfgang Speyer,

⁶ K. R. KÖSTLIN, Die pseudonyme Litteratur der ältesten Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bildung des Kanons, ThJb(T) 10 (1851), 149–221. Eine ähnliche Denkstruktur findet sich in jüngerer Zeit bei D. G. Meade; s. Anm. 16.

⁷ J. S. CANDLISH, On the Moral Character of Pseudonymous Books, Exp. 4 (1891), 91–107. 262–279 (= ders., Über den moralischen Charakter pseudonymer Bücher, in: Brox, Pseudepigraphie [s. Anm. 2], 7–42).

⁸ F. TORM, Die Psychologie der Pseudonymität im Hinblick auf die Literatur des Urchristentums, SLA 2, Gütersloh 1932; A. MEYER, Besprechung von Torm, Pseudonymität, ThLZ 58 (1933), 354–357 (= Brox, Pseudepigraphie [s. Anm. 2], 149–153); ders., Religiöse Pseudepigraphie als ethisch-psychologisches Problem, ZNW 35 (1936), 262–279; R. F. MERKEL, Kirchen- und religionsgeschichtliche Fälschungen, Süddeutsche Monatshefte 33 (1935/36), 693–699.

⁹ J. A. SINT, Pseudonymität im Altertum. Ihre Formen und ihre Gründe, Commentatio-

allen voran seiner 1971 erschienenen Monographie „Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum“¹⁰, erschienen reichhaltige Materialsammlungen¹¹ zur antiken Pseudepigraphie, die auch heute noch wertvolle Differenzierungsansätze enthalten, biblische Pseudepigraphie aber weitgehend aussparen. Was Wolfgang Speyer mit seinen umfassenden Arbeiten im Bereich der Altphilologie geleistet hat, dem entsprechen dann im Bereich der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie die Forschungen von Norbert Brox. Abgesehen von seinen zahlreichen Arbeiten zur Forschungsgeschichte, zu einzelnen pseudepigraphischen Schreiben des Neuen Testaments und der Alten Kirche und zu den mentalitätsgeschichtlichen Rahmenbedingungen¹² war es das Verdienst von Brox, die

nes Aenipontanae 15, Innsbruck 1960. Sint unterscheidet zwischen „psn Schrifttum aus mythischen und religiösen Triebkräften“ und „psn Schriften aus literarischen Gestaltungskräften“.

¹⁰ W. SPEYER, Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung, HAW I/2, München 1971. Speyer hat darüber hinaus zu etlichen Einzelaspekten wie z.B. Echtheitsbeglaubigungen (ders., Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike. Mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit, Hyp. 24, Göttingen 1970) gearbeitet, wobei forschungsgeschichtliche (z.B. ders., Italienische Humanisten als Kritiker der Echtheit antiker und christlicher Literatur, Stuttgart 1993) und wirkungsgeschichtliche (z.B. ders., Das entdeckte heilige Buch in Novalis' Gedicht „An Tieck“, Arcadia 9 [1974], 39–47) Arbeiten das Forschungsprofil abrunden; besonders einflussreich indes wurde seine These von der ‚echten religiösen Pseudepigraphie‘; vgl. Anm. 24. Vgl. insgesamt zu den Arbeiten Speyers JANSSEN, Namen (s. Anm. 3), 75–102. Zweifelsohne haben Speyers Untersuchungen die Pseudepigraphieforschung auf eine neue Basis gestellt, wobei die Übertragung seiner Ergebnisse auf die neutestamentliche Pseudepigraphie auch noch nach fast 40 Jahren in einigen Bereichen ein Forschungsdesiderat darstellt.

¹¹ Im Bereich der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur zu nennen sind zudem vor allem die Arbeiten von Martin Hengel (M. HENGEL, Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und „Literarische Fälschung“ in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur, in: K. von Fritz [Hg.], Pseudepigrapha I. Pseudopythagorica – Lettres de Platon – Littérature pseudépigraphe juive, EnAC 18, Vandœuvres/Genève 1972, 231–308 [Diskussion: 309–329]; zur erweiterten Form vgl. ders., Judaica et Hellenistica. Kleine Schriften I. Unter Mitarbeit von R. Deines, J. Frey, C. Marksches, A. M. Schwemer mit einem Anhang von H. Bloedhorn, WUNT 90, Tübingen 1996, 196–251) und Nikolaus Walter (N. WALTER, Der Thorausleger Aristobulos. Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur, TU 86, Leipzig 1964; ders., Jüdisch-hellenistische Pseudepigraphie als Index interkulturellen Austauschwillens, in: J. Irmischer [Hg.], Die Literatur der Spätantike – polyethnisch und polyglottisch betrachtet, Amsterdam 1997, 13–22).

¹² Im Bereich der neutestamentlichen Literatur widmete sich Brox vor allem den Pastoralbriefen (vgl. z.B. N. BROX, Die Pastoralbriefe übersetzt und erklärt, RNT, Regensburg 1969; ders., Zu den persönlichen Notizen der Pastoralbriefe, BZ.NF 13 [1969], 76–94) und dem Ersten Petrusbrief (vgl. z.B. ders., Der erste Petrusbrief, EKK XXI, Zürich u.a. 1979; ders., Zur pseudepigraphischen Rahmung des ersten Petrusbriefes,

Erforschung neutestamentlicher Pseudepigraphie von dogmatischen Tabus zu befreien und dadurch den Weg zu einer objektiven Sichtweise zu ebnen. Brox scheute nicht davor zurück, den Begriff „Täuschung“ mit biblischen Schriften zu verbinden. Auch für die neutestamentliche Literatur gilt: „Die Täuschung stellt als Manipulation (häufig nicht hinsichtlich ihrer Kunstfertigkeit) eine Trivialform der Literatur dar und ist in den Augen der Antike noch dazu nicht unbedenklich. Die heutigen Überlegungen ... dürfen das beides nicht kaschieren wollen.“¹³

Das Spektrum der Fragen und Forschungsinteressen seit den 60er/70er Jahren war breit und die Methodenvielfalt beachtlich. Komparatistisch-literaturwissenschaftliche, religionswissenschaftliche, bibeltheologische und ideengeschichtliche Herangehensweisen stehen nebeneinander, ergänzen und befruchten sich; zentrale Fragestellungen bilden sich heraus. Stets war Pseudepigraphieforschung dabei mit der Erforschung der mentalitätsgeschichtlichen Rahmenbedingungen verbunden, die erst einen angemessenen Verstehenshorizont ermöglichen. Ein – häufig apologetisch überfrachteter – Diskussionspunkt war hier die Frage nach dem Echtheitsbewusstsein und dem Begriff des geistigen Eigentums in der Antike. Wenn es ein solches Bewusstsein geistiger Urheberschaft nicht gab, war pseudonyme Literaturproduktion automatisch von dem Verdacht literarischer Anrüchigkeit befreit. Kritik an solchen weit verbreiteten pauschalen Urteilen zwingt zu genauerem historischen Hinsehen, wie es etwa Wolfgang Speyer und Norbert Brox wiederholt eingefordert haben: Die antike Vorstellung von „geistigem Eigentum“ kann zwar mit modernen urheberrechtlichen Bedingungen nicht verglichen werden, ist aber in der Antike durch-

BZ.NF 19 [1975], 78–96). Brox bezog in seinen Forschungen stets den Bereich der altkirchlichen Literatur mit ein (vgl. z.B. ders., *Pseudo-Paulus und Pseudo-Ignatius. Einige Topoi altchristlicher Pseudepigraphik*, VigChr 30 [1976], 181–188; ders., *Quis ille auctor? Pseudonymität und Anonymität bei Salvian*, VigChr 40 [1986], 55–65). Einflussreich wurden vor allem seine Monographie *„Falsche Verfasserangaben. Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie“*, SBS 79, Stuttgart 1975, und seine Arbeiten zur Methodik der Pseudepigraphieforschung (s. Anm. 13 und 17).

¹³ Ders., *Zum Problemstand in der Erforschung der altchristlichen Pseudepigraphie*, Kairos 15 (1973), 10–23 (23). Ein Blick auf die Erforschung pseudepigraphischer Literatur altkirchlicher oder apokrypher Provenienz zeigt, dass man hier weitaus unbefangener war; vgl. z.B. G. BARDY, *Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, RHE 32 (1936), 5–23. 275–302 (= ders., *Betrug und Fälschungen in der Literatur der christlichen Antike*, in: Brox, *Pseudepigraphie* [s. Anm. 2], 163–184 [Auszüge]); aktuell jetzt P. F. BEATRICE, *Forgery, Propaganda and Power in Christian Antiquity. Some Methodological Remarks*, in: W. Blümer u.a. (Hg.), *Alvarium* (FS Gnlika), JAC.E 33, Münster 2002, 39–51. Im altkirchlichen und apokryphen Bereich wurde Pseudepigraphie oft als Fälschung zur Durchsetzung von kirchenpolitischen Interessen und als Mittel der Autoritätssicherung gedeutet. In der Spannung zwischen Orthodoxie und Häresie sah man geradezu ein *Movens* für pseudepigraphische Literaturproduktion.

aus vorhanden und erfährt ganz unterschiedliche Begründungen.¹⁴ Jedoch muss zwischen den jeweiligen literatursoziologischen Orten und geographischen Räumen unterschieden werden. Vor allem die von Martin Hengel (1972) angestoßene Diskussion um einen spezifisch jüdischen Begriff von geistigem Eigentum sei genannt.

Insgesamt wurde mit der Zeit die Auffassung, Pseudonyme seien ein bewusster Rekurs auf historische Persönlichkeiten im Sinne einer literarhistorischen Zuordnung mit dem Ziel der fiktiven Vervollständigung ihrer Werke, in Frage gestellt und durch eine Interpretation der Pseudonyme ersetzt, die in den Namensangaben personale Chiffren, literarische Gestalten, paradigmatische Repräsentanten, Traditionsgaranten oder Identifikationsfiguren sieht.¹⁵ Bedeutung erlangte auch hier die Position von Martin Hengel: Es geht bei der Namensangabe weniger um eine Autorenuweisung als um die Einordnung in eine bestimmte transsubjektive Tradition bzw. in einen religiösen Traditionsstrom (M. Hengel [1972]) – ein Gedanke, den David G. Meade (1986) in seiner Dissertation weiterentwickelt hat.¹⁶

Gegenstand der äußerst vielschichtigen Diskussion war weiter die Frage, ob *neutestamentliche* Pseudepigraphie Sonderbedingungen unterliegt oder nicht. Die exemplarische Diskussion zwischen Kurt Aland, der für eine exklusive Betrachtung plädiert, und Norbert Brox, der in seinen Arbeiten neutestamentliche Pseudepigraphie stets in den Kontext gemeinantiker Literatur stellt, führt dies eindrucksvoll vor Augen.¹⁷ Komparatis-

¹⁴ Vgl. jetzt auch aktuell K. SCHICKERT, Der Schutz literarischer Urheberschaft im Rom der klassischen Antike, Tübingen 2005.

¹⁵ Vgl. z.B. mit unterschiedlichen Akzentuierungen W. STENGER, Timotheus und Titus als literarische Gestalten. Beobachtungen zur Form und Funktion der Pastoralbriefe, Kairos 16 (1974), 252–267; BROX, Problemstand (s. Anm. 13); HENGEL, Anonymität (s. Anm. 11).

¹⁶ D. G. MEADE, Pseudonymity and Canon. An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition, WUNT 39, Tübingen 1986. Es geht nicht um eine erstarrte Überlieferung eines *traditum*, sondern um einen lebendigen Überlieferungsprozess (*traditio*), der ein dialektisches Zusammenspiel von Kanonbewusstsein und Vergegenwärtigung ist. Die paradigmatische Bedeutung der Vergangenheit führt zur Vergegenwärtigung der Tradition in Form von Interpolation und Pseudepigraphie. Diese sei insofern „a claim to authoritative tradition, not primarily a statement of literary origins“ (ebd. passim). Vgl. ähnlich H. NAJMAN, Seconding Sinai. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in the Second Temple Judaism, JSJ.S 77, Leiden/Boston 2003.

¹⁷ Vgl. N. BROX, Methodenfragen der Pseudepigraphieforschung, ThRv 75 (1979), 275–278, und K. ALAND, Falsche Verfasserangaben? Zur Pseudonymität im frühchristlichen Schrifttum, ThRv 75 (1979), 1–10. Beiden Zugängen ist je eine eigene Gefahr inhärent; die inklusive Betrachtung kann in phänomenologische Beliebigkeit münden, wäh-

tisch orientierte und interdisziplinär angelegte Arbeiten bemühen sich bis heute, neutestamentliche Pseudepigraphie in einen größeren allgemein-antiken Zusammenhang zu stellen und daraus zu erklären, wobei besonders die Pseudepigraphie in antiken Schulzusammenhängen nach wie vor eine große Rolle spielt.¹⁸ Dennoch sind neutestamentliche Pseudepigraphen nicht nur Zeugnisse antiker Literatur, sondern *auch* Bestandteile der Heiligen Schrift. Diese theologische Dimension neutestamentlicher Pseudepigraphie zieht sich wie ein roter Faden durch die Forschungsgeschichte. Haftet pseudepigraphischer Literaturproduktion bereits prinzipiell ein Beigeschmack im Sinne von falsch, epigonal und moralisch anrüchig an, so verschärft sich dieser Eindruck im Fall religiöser Literatur: Wie vertragen sich sittlich-religiöser Ernst, Anspruch auf Wahrhaftigkeit oder gar Inspiriertheit mit dem Abfassen von Schriften unter falschem Namen? Echtheitskritik an biblischen Schriften und die daraus resultierende Pseudepigraphiefrage beschränkte sich nicht auf die philologische und historisch-kritische Fragestellung, sondern erweiterte diese oft um eine bibelhermeneutische und sachlich-theologische Dimension.¹⁹ Neben den genannten allgemein religionsethischen und dogmatischen Aspekten ist die theologische Frage von neutestamentlicher Pseudepigraphie immer auch eine *kanontheologische*. Hier wiederum bietet sich eine komplexe Sachlage, die historische und bibeltheologisch-hermeneutische Fragen gleichermaßen umfasst: Welche Rolle spielen Kanonisierungsprozesse im Hinblick auf die Produktion pseudepigraphischer Schriften? Welche Bedeutung hatte die Kanonisierung für die Rezeption pseudapostolischer Schriften? Wie ist heute mit pseudepigraphischen Schriften innerhalb des Kanons umzugehen, wobei differierende Kanonverständnisse möglicher-

rend exklusive Zugänge möglicherweise einer ideologisch motivierten Engführung Tür und Tor öffnen können.

¹⁸ Vgl. dazu M. FRENSCHKOWSKI, Pseudepigraphie und Paulusschule. Gedanken zur Verfasserschaft der Deuteropaulinen, insbesondere der Pastoralbriefe, in: F. W. Horn (Hg.), *Das Ende des Paulus. Historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte*, BZNW 106, Berlin/New York 2001, 239–272.

¹⁹ Die theologische Dimension biblischer Pseudepigraphie führte nicht zuletzt dazu, dass das Vorhandensein pseudepigraphischer Schriften im Neuen Testament nur schwer akzeptiert wurde. Auch wenn nach katholischem Kanonverständnis Echtheit und Kanonizität einander nicht automatisch bedingen, kam es forschungsgeschichtlich betrachtet im protestantischen Bereich eher zu einer Akzeptanz von pseudepigraphischen Schriften innerhalb des Kanons als im katholischen. Allerdings stellt neutestamentliche Pseudepigraphie unter bestimmten dogmatischen Prämissen auch noch heute vor allem im Bereich evangelikaler Bibelwissenschaft ein Problem dar. Dieser Aspekt scheint gegenwärtig an Relevanz zu gewinnen, da evangelikale Schriftauffassungen zunehmend die exegetische Diskussion beeinflussen.

weise auch zu konfessionellen und innerkonfessionellen Differenzierungen zwingen?²⁰

Angesichts der Brisanz dieser Fragen verwundert es nicht, dass durch die Jahrzehnte hindurch immer wieder theologische Erklärungen unterschiedlichster Art für frühchristliche Pseudepigraphie erschienen sind, die aufgrund ihrer apologetischen Zielrichtung oft den Charakter von Rechtfertigungen haben.²¹ Wie im Bereich der Apokalyptikforschung²² griff man in der Bibelwissenschaft auf verschiedenartige inspirationstheologisch motivierte Deutungsversuche zurück. Kurt Alands These von der „Zeit der echten Pseudonymität“ (1961ff.),²³ in der der Autor einer „Feder“ gleicht, „die vom Geist bewegt wird“, wurde ebenso einflussreich und zum Gegenstand kontroverser Diskussionen wie Wolfgang Speyers Kategorie der „echten religiösen Pseudepigraphie“ (1965/1966; 1971),²⁴ bei der der Au-

²⁰ Eng hiermit verbunden ist die Frage nach dem angemessenen Verständnis der Kanonkriterien. Hier stehen sich die Sichtweise von Armin Daniel Baum, der Echtheit im Sinne literarischer Authentizität versteht, und die u.a. von Karl-Heinz Ohlig geprägte Auffassung, es handle sich bei den pseudepigraphischen Autorenangaben um einen Verweis auf *sachliche* Kontinuität, unvereinbar gegenüber; vgl. A. D. BAUM, Literarische Echtheit als Kanonkriterium in der alten Kirche, ZNW 88 (1997), 97–110; ders., Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum. Mit ausgewählten Quellentexten samt deutscher Übersetzung, WUNT II/138, Tübingen 2001; K.-H. OHLIG, Die theologische Begründung des neutestamentlichen Kanons in der alten Kirche, Düsseldorf 1972.

²¹ Dies zeigt sich nicht zuletzt an terminologischen Entschärfungen (z.B. ‚Heteronymität‘, ‚Allonymität‘, ‚Deuteronymität‘); vgl. z.B. H. JORDAN, Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Leipzig 1911, 140; P. MÜLLER, Anfänge der Paulusschule. Dargestellt am zweiten Thessalonicherbrief und am Kolosserbrief, AThANT 74, Zürich 1988, 305–320; I. H. MARSHALL, The Pastoral Epistles, ICC, Edinburgh 1999, 84. Dies entspricht dem Bemühen der allgemeinen Pseudepigraphieforschung, eine differenzierte Terminologie zu entwickeln, die eine Unterscheidung zwischen ‚guten‘ und ‚schlechten‘, d.h. legitimen und illegitimen Formen von Pseudepigraphie verfolgt; vgl. z.B. R. SYME, Fraud and Imposture, in: von Fritz, Pseudepigrapha (s. Anm. 11), 1–17 (= SYME, Fälschung und Betrug, in: Brox, Pseudepigraphie [s. Anm. 2], 295–310); A. GRAFTON, Forgers and Critics. Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship, Princeton 1990, 6.

²² Vgl. z.B. D. S. RUSSELL, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 BC – AD 100, London 1964, 127–139.

²³ K. ALAND, Das Problem der Anonymität und Pseudonymität in der christlichen Literatur der ersten beiden Jahrhunderte, in: ders., Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes, ANTT 2, Berlin 1967, 24–34; ders., Noch einmal: Das Problem der Anonymität und Pseudonymität in der christlichen Literatur der ersten beiden Jahrhunderte, in: E. Dassmann / K. S. Frank (Hg.), Pietas (FS Kötting), JAC.E 8, Münster 1980, 121–139.

²⁴ W. SPEYER, Religiöse Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im Altertum, JAC 8/9 (1965/66), 88–125 (= Brox, Pseudepigraphie [s. Anm. 2], 195–263); ders., Fälschung (s. Anm. 10), 37ff. u.ö.; ders., Fälschung, pseudepigraphische freie Erfindung und „echte religiöse Pseudepigraphie“, in: von Fritz, Pseudepigrapha (s. Anm. 11), 331–366

tor „unter einem Zwang aus transzendtem Bereich“ steht. Daneben findet sich in der katholischen Bibelwissenschaft der Rückgriff auf eine anamnetisch orientierte Inspirationslehre: So deutet Josef Zmijewski (1979) Pseudepigraphie als „objektiven Tatbestand der apostolischen Sukzession“ und sieht in dem unter einem Pseudonym schreibenden Verfasser das „Werkzeug, durch das der eigentliche Verfasser redet“.²⁵

Abgesehen von solchen Inspirationstheorien erscheinen weitere, ganz unterschiedliche Versuche, biblische Pseudepigraphie zu erklären und theologisch zu rechtfertigen. Vor allem in der katholischen Exegese finden sich kondeszendenztheologische Erklärungen von Pseudepigraphie als *logos embiblos* (K. H. Schelkle [1961]),²⁶ die im weiten Kontext von Akkommodationstheorien zu verorten sind und sich auf die „Befreiungszyklika“ *Divino afflante spiritu* (1943) von Pius XII stützen. Petr Pokorný (1984)²⁷ hingegen betont aus protestantischer Perspektive „Gottes Bekenntnis zu zweifelhaften Praktiken“ und fordert *sola gratia* auch für Fälschungen. Eine hervorgehobene Rolle nimmt indes der in breiten Teilen der Bibelwissenschaft bezeugte Verweis auf „mildernde Tatumstände“ ein, wobei oft auf gemeinantike Konventionen, mangelndes Bewusstsein von geistigem Eigentum oder die Medizinerlüge (*pia fraus*) verwiesen wird. Die Legitimierung von Pseudepigraphie als unvermeidlichem kirchenleitenden Instrument, das letztlich der „ökumenischen Verantwortung“ (K. M. Fischer [1977])²⁸ entspringt, erlangte nicht zuletzt durch Udo Schnelles „Einleitung in das Neue Testament“²⁹ eine beachtliche Breitenwirkung, die bis heute anhält. Wieder andere Erklärungsmodelle, die vor allem die Pseudepigraphie des Zweiten Petrusbriefes und der Pastoralbriefe im Blick

(Diskussion 367–372). Die Kategorie der „echten religiösen Pseudepigraphie“ ist bereits bei Josef Sint angedacht („psn Schrifttum aus mythischen und religiösen Triebkräften“); vgl. Anm. 9.

²⁵ J. ZMIJEWSKI, Apostolische Paradosis und Pseudepigraphie im Neuen Testament. „Durch Erinnerung wachhalten“ (2 Petr 1,13; 3,1), BZ 23 (1979), 161–171. Diesen Interpretationsansatz übernimmt und modifiziert H. J. RIEDL, Anamnese und Apostolizität. Der Zweite Petrusbrief und das theologische Problem neutestamentlicher Pseudepigraphie, RST 64, Frankfurt a.M. u.a. 2005. Riedels Schlüssel für die Lösung des Problems der neutestamentlichen Pseudepigraphie liegt in der Deutung von Pseudepigraphie als „Ausdruck *anamnetischer Apostolizität*“ (a.a.O. 241). Siehe dazu die Rezension von M. Janßen (ThLZ 132 [2007], 1315–1317).

²⁶ K. H. SCHEKLE, Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief, HThK.NT XIII, Freiburg i. Brsg. 1963, 245–258 (247 Anm. 3).

²⁷ P. POKORNÝ, Das theologische Problem der neutestamentlichen Pseudepigraphie, EvTh 44 (1984), 486–496, vgl. ders., Art. Pseudepigraphie I. Altes und Neues Testament, TRE 27 (1997), 645–655.

²⁸ K. M. FISCHER, Anmerkungen zur Pseudepigraphie im Neuen Testament, NTS 23 (1977), 76–81.

²⁹ U. SCHNELLE, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Göttingen 42002, 325–329.

haben, beziehen sich auf die literarische und pragmatische Ebene: Hinter den falschen Autorenangaben stünden keine Täuschungsabsichten, sondern die „Autorfiktion“ sei ein „anerkanntes Prinzip“ (H. Hegermann [1970]) und die Verfasserfiktion sei somit durchschaubar.³⁰

Der nicht selten apologetisch anmutenden Zielrichtung der Pseudepigraphiehermeneutik in all ihren unterschiedlichen Facetten liegt ein ganz bestimmtes Verständnis von Literaturproduktion unter falschem Namen zugrunde, das die neutestamentliche Bibelwissenschaft lange mit der altphilologischen Wissenschaft („*spuria*“!) und mit der alttestamentlichen Forschung teilte, die mittels Literarkritik „echte“ Worte z.B. des Jesaja von sekundären Erweiterungen zu trennen suchte: Nur das Originale ist das Wahre; Phänomenen wie Pseudepigraphie und Interpolation haftet hingegen als Verfallserscheinungen etwas moralisch (und theologisch) Anrüchiges an, das nicht zuletzt aus „Flucht vor personaler Verantwortung“ (H. Balz [1969])³¹ resultiert. Damit ist Pseudepigraphie als epigonenhaft qualifiziert.

Erst in jüngster Zeit verfestigt sich die Tendenz, pseudepigraphische Schriften als eigene theologische Entwürfe wahrzunehmen und zu würdigen.³² Damit zusammen hängt das Bewusstsein, dass es *die* neutestamentliche Pseudepigraphie nicht gibt. Vielmehr gerät die Eigenständigkeit und Unterschiedlichkeit der einzelnen neutestamentlichen Schreiben verstärkt in den Blick. Dies verändert die Wahrnehmung entscheidend. Die pseudepigraphische Abfassung einer Schrift wird nicht mehr auf eine apologetische Standardsituation im Rahmen einleitungswissenschaftlicher Topik

³⁰ Vgl. dazu beispielsweise die Beiträge von H. HEGERMANN, Der geschichtliche Ort der Pastoralbriefe, ThV II (1970), 47–64; A. VÖGTLE, Der Judasbrief. Der 2. Petrusbrief, EKK XXII, Solothurn u.a. 1994, 127ff.; R. J. BAUCKHAM, Jude. 2 Peter, WBC 50, Waco 1983, 134 u.ö. Aktuell auch H.-J. KLAUCK, Die antike Briefliteratur und das Neue Testament. Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch, UTB 2022, Paderborn u.a. 1998, 304f. u.ö.

³¹ H. R. BALZ, Anonymität und Pseudepigraphie im Urchristentum. Überlegungen zum literarischen und theologischen Problem der urchristlichen und gemeinanten Pseudepigraphie, ZThK 66 (1969), 403–436.

³² Ähnliche Entwicklungen finden sich im Hinblick auf die alttestamentliche Redaktionskritik, die auch jüngere literarische Schichten als eigene theologische Entwürfe würdigt und ins Zentrum der Forschung stellt. Gleiches gilt für die Neubewertung pseudepigraphischer Briefe in der altphilologischen Forschung. Pseudonyme Briefliteratur und Kleinliteratur werden in ihrer Eigenständigkeit wahrgenommen und zum Gegenstand altphilologischer Forschung; vgl. z.B. N. Holzberg (Hg.), Der griechische Briefroman. Gattungstypologie und Textanalyse, Classica Monacensia 8, Tübingen 1994; P. A. ROSENMEYER, Ancient Epistolary Fictions. The Letter in Greek Literature, Cambridge 2001. Hinzuweisen ist an dieser Stelle auch auf die zunehmende Erforschung und Würdigung apokrypher Literatur, die größtenteils pseudonym oder anonym ist. Die daraus resultierenden Erkenntnisse tragen nicht zuletzt etwas für das Verständnis auch der neutestamentlichen Pseudepigraphie aus.

reduziert, sondern fungiert zunehmend als Schlüssel zum Verständnis der jeweiligen Schrift. Entsprechende Untersuchungen z.B. zu den Pastoralbriefen (M. Wolter [1988];³³ A. Merz [2004]³⁴), dem Kolosserbrief (A. Standhartinger [1999]),³⁵ dem Zweiten Thessalonicherbrief (R. Börschel [2001]),³⁶ den Petrusbriefen (K. M. Schmidt [2003])³⁷ und dem Jakobusbrief (2003)³⁸ führen dies vor Augen.

In jüngster Zeit finden sich unterschiedliche Zugänge zum Phänomen der neutestamentlichen Pseudepigraphie, die zum Teil an alte Ansätze anknüpfen, diese differenzieren und neu akzentuieren, zum Teil aber auch neue Wege zum Verständnis der Pseudepigraphie eröffnen. So nimmt der Rückgriff auf wissenssoziologisch orientierte Zugänge zu, die die Aufmerksamkeit auf die jeweilige *Funktion* des Pseudonyms im Rahmen der Identitätskonstruktion und -sicherung lenken (z.B. M. Wolter [1988]; R. Börschel [2001]).³⁹ Weiter vorangetrieben wurde auch die Differenzierung der unterschiedlichen Formen von Pseudepigraphie (M. Wolter [1997]; R. Zimmermann [2003/2004]),⁴⁰ wobei sich die leitenden Faktoren

³³ M. WOLTER, Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition, FRLANT 146, Göttingen 1988.

³⁴ A. MERZ, Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus. Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe, NTOA 52, Göttingen/Freiburg (CH) 2004.

³⁵ A. STANDHARTINGER, Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte und Intention des Kolosserbriefes, NT.S 94, Leiden u.a. 1999.

³⁶ R. BÖRSCHTEL, Die Konstruktion einer christlichen Identität. Paulus und die Gemeinde von Thessalonich in ihrer hellenistisch-römischen Umwelt, BBB 128, Berlin u.a. 2001.

³⁷ K. M. SCHMIDT, Mahnung und Erinnerung im Maskenspiel. Epistolographie, Rhetorik und Narrativik der pseudepigraphischen Petrusbriefe, HBS 38, Freiburg i. Brsg. 2003.

³⁸ P. von Gemünden / M. Konrad / G. Theißen (Hg.), Der Jakobusbrief. Beiträge zur Rehabilitierung der ‚strohernen Epistel‘, Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel 3, Münster 2003.

³⁹ So Regina Börschel in Bezug auf den Zweiten Thessalonicherbrief (vgl. Anm. 36). Im Rahmen der Konstruktion der christlichen Identität in Thessalonich fungiert der Zweite Thessalonicherbrief als „die Fortsetzung des signifikanten Gesprächs zur Sicherung der Identität nach dem Tod des Sinnvermittlers“ (dies., Konstruktion [s. Anm. 36], 366ff. u.ö.). Die identitätsstiftende Funktion von Pseudonymität im Fall der Pastoralbriefe betont auch Michael Wolter in seiner Habilitationsschrift (s. Anm. 33). Vgl. allgemein zu diesem Aspekt z.B. B. Aland / J. Hahn / C. Ronning (Hg.), Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren in der Antike, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 16, Tübingen 2003.

⁴⁰ M. WOLTER, Art. Pseudonymität II. Kirchengeschichtlich, TRE 27 (1997), 662–670 (anonyme, pseudepigraphische und symbolische Pseudonymität); R. ZIMMERMANN, Unecht – und doch wahr? Pseudepigraphie im Neuen Testament als theologisches Problem, ZNT 12 (2003), 27–38; vgl. ders., Anonymität, Pseudonymität und Pseudepigraphie, in: K. Erlemann / K. L. Noethlichs (Hg.), Neues Testament und Antike Kultur. Bd. 1: Prolegomena – Quellen – Geschichte, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2004, 65–68; ders. Art. Pseudepigraphie/Pseudonymität, RGG⁴ 6 (2003), 1786–1788. Zimmermann unterscheidet zwi-

der Klassifizierung nun an den Entstehungsursachen von Pseudepigraphie und weniger an der moralischen Wertigkeit orientieren.

Vor allem aber profitiert die Pseudepigraphieforschung von dem Einfluss literaturwissenschaftlicher Methoden auf das Neue Testament. Durch eine kommunikationstheoretisch-hermeneutische Herangehensweise gelangt man zu einem differenzierten Autorbegriff (E. Reinmuth [1998]: „der fiktive Autor in der Rolle des abstrakten Autors“).⁴¹ Die Frage danach, wie Autorfiktion ‚funktioniert‘ und mit welchen Mitteln sie erzeugt wird, lenkt den Blick weiter auf die technische Seite von Pseudepigraphie: Was sind die einzelnen Elemente der Autorfiktion, wie werden sie eingesetzt und wie wird die Autorfiktion zementiert („Echtheitsbeglaubigungen“)? Welches Bild entsteht beim Leser und wie wirkt es? Pseudepigraphieforschung erschöpft sich nicht in dem Phänomen der Autorfiktion, sondern nimmt ebenso die Konstruktion des fiktiven Adressaten und der fiktiven Situation in den Blick. Gerade in Bezug auf letztgenannten Bereich wird gegenwärtig ein Desiderat deutlich, da zu oft die aus den Briefen rekonstruierte Situation als ‚real‘ rezipiert wird und als Basis für historische Schlussfolgerungen dient. Die konsequente Deutung pseudepigraphischer Texte als fiktionale Literatur führt zu einer vertieften, interdisziplinär angelegten Auseinandersetzung mit antiken Fiktionalitätstheorien und zur Rezeption der entsprechenden althilologischen Diskussion (z.B. K. M. Schmidt [2003]).⁴² Man nimmt pseudepigraphische Texte als fiktionale Literatur wahr und überträgt Elemente der Erzähltheorie auf fiktionale Briefe. Nicht zuletzt steht die textpragmatische Leistung des Stilmittels der Prosopopöie auf dem Prüfstand: Ist Täuschung Voraussetzung zur Wirkung? An dieser Stelle bricht die Frage nach der ‚Durchschaubarkeit‘ der Verfasserfiktion wieder auf („offene Pseudepigraphie“), wobei das vormals apologetisch motivierte erkenntnisleitende Interesse durch ein literaturwissenschaftliches ersetzt wird.

schen überlieferungsgeschichtlich motivierter Pseudepigraphie, gattungsbedingter, imitativ, zufällig oder technisch bedingter und religiöser Pseudepigraphie. Die neutestamentlichen Schriften ordnet er jeweils in diese Kategorien ein.

⁴¹ E. REINMUTH, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, Göttingen 2002, 104–107; ders., *Zur neutestamentlichen Paulus-Pseudepigraphie*, in: N. Walter / E. Reinmuth / P. Lampe (Hg.), *Die Briefe an die Philipper, Thessalonicher und an Philemon*, NTD 8/2, Göttingen u.a. 1998, 190–200.

⁴² S.o. Anm. 37. Eine solche Tendenz ist auch in weiteren Bereichen der Bibelwissenschaft auszumachen; vgl. z.B. R. LUX, „Ich, Kohelet, bin König...“. Die Fiktion als Schlüssel zur Wirklichkeit in Kohelet 1,12–16, *EvTh* 50 (1990), 331–342; U. LUZ, *Fiktivität und Traditionstreue im Matthäusevangelium im Lichte griechischer Literatur*, *ZNW* 94 (1993), 153–177; K. Backhaus / G. Häfner (Hg.), *Historiographie und fiktionales Erzählen. Zur Konstruktivität in Geschichtstheorie und Exegese*, *BThSt* 86, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2007.

Aber auch theologische Zugänge zur Pseudepigraphie (z.B. R. Zimmermann),⁴³ bibeltheologische Untersuchungen (H. J. Riedel [2004])⁴⁴ und dezidiert kanontheologische Forschungen (A. D. Baum [2001]) verschaffen sich in jüngster Zeit Gehör. Neutestamentliche Pseudepigraphie als Bestandteil des Kanons ist indes nicht nur in theologischer Hinsicht relevant, sondern auch in literarischer. Dass die einzelnen neutestamentlichen Pseudepigraphen keine isolierten Schriften, sondern auf andere Schriften innerhalb des Kanons bezogen und möglicherweise durch sie motiviert sind, zeigt allein das Verhältnis zwischen Judasbrief und Zweitem Petrusbrief. Auch in Bezug auf das *Corpus Paulinum* wurde dieser Aspekt immer wieder stark gemacht, wie die Deutung des Epheserbriefes als mögliche Einleitung zu einer Paulusbriefsammlung oder die These, die Pastoralbriefe seien als Abschluss des *Corpus Paulinum* konzipiert, zeigen. Die Wechselbeziehung zwischen Pseudepigraphie und Kanon rückt in das Zentrum des Forschungsinteresses. Neben komparatistisch angelegten Untersuchungen zu antiken Editions- und Kanonisierungsprozessen bringen vor allem Forschungen zur Intertextualität Licht in diese Funktion von Pseudepigraphie. Die Dissertation von Annette Merz (2004)⁴⁵ über das Pseudepigraphiekonzept der Pastoralbriefe zeigt nicht nur, wie Pseudepigraphie als „fiktive Selbstauslegung“ funktioniert, sondern liefert auch Kriterien für die Frage nach der sachlichen Angemessenheit der Inanspruchnahme eines Pseudonyms.

Ein letzter Punkt sei angemerkt: Schon Schleiermachers Bestreitung der Echtheit des Ersten Timotheusbriefes führte zu einer Apologie der Echtheit mit immer ausgewogeneren Argumenten. Auch heute brechen Echtheitsfragen neu auf, wodurch der zumindest in breiten Teilen der deutschsprachigen Forschung etablierte Forschungskonsens in Frage gestellt wird. Dabei kehrt sich die apologetische Richtung gewissermaßen um: Die Annahme von Pseudepigraphie muss verteidigt und in ihren einzelnen Elementen erklärt werden, was wiederum zu einem vertieften Verständnis der jeweiligen pseudepigraphischen Konzeption führen kann. Abgesehen von der Diskussion über den Zweiten Thessalonicherbrief geraten gegenwärtig vor allem die Pastoralbriefe verstärkt in das Zentrum des Forschungsinteresses: Lässt sich die Eigenart der drei Schreiben des Paulus an seine Schüler besser unter der Voraussetzung ihrer Echtheit oder unter der Vor-

⁴³ S. Anm. 40 und R. ZIMMERMANN, Lügen für die Wahrheit? Das Phänomen urchristlicher Pseudepigraphie am Beispiel des Kolosserbriefes, in: O. Hochadel / U. Kocher (Hg.), Lügen und Betrügen. Das Falsche in der Geschichte von der Antike bis zur Moderne, Köln u.a. 2000, 257–272.

⁴⁴ Vgl. z.B. die Arbeit von Hermann Josef Riedl zum Zweiten Petrusbrief (s. Anm. 25).

⁴⁵ Vgl. Anm. 34.

aussetzung ihrer Unechtheit verstehen? Die aktuellen Erklärungsmodelle schwanken von der Interpretation der Pastoralbriefe als antikem Briefroman bis zur Infragestellung der Corpushypothese bei gleichzeitiger Annahme der Echtheit zumindest einzelner Briefe. Das einstige „Kabinettstück“⁴⁶ neutestamentlicher Pseudepigraphie ist damit zum Testfall und zur „Herausforderung an die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft“⁴⁷ geworden.

2. Zum vorliegenden Band

In Anbetracht dieser Situation will der vorliegende Band die Problematik und Vielfalt der gegenwärtigen Diskussion dokumentieren, die neueren Ansätze zusammenfassen und eine differenziertere Diskussion voranbringen. Die darin versammelten Aufsätze sollen die Vielfalt antiker Briefpseudepigraphie und die damit verbundenen Probleme vor Augen führen sowie einen repräsentativen Querschnitt der aktuellen Forschung zur Pseudepigraphie in Antike und Neuem Testament geben. Da die neutestamentlichen Briefe stets im Zentrum der Diskussion standen, liegt der Schwerpunkt auf der neutestamentlichen Briefliteratur. Dabei wird eine repräsentative Breite angestrebt, die nicht nur alle im Neuen Testament als pseudonym beurteilten Briefe (einschließlich des Hebräerbriefs und der Johannesbriefe) berücksichtigt, sondern diese Untersuchungen auch in einen breiteren Kontext relevanter Bereiche frühjüdischer und griechisch-römischer Pseudepigraphie stellt. Daher werden aus den Bereichen außerhalb des Neuen Testaments jene herangezogen, die für das Verständnis der Entstehung der neutestamentlichen Briefe und der pseudonymen Texte inhaltlich von Bedeutung sind. Dazu gehören u.a. die Literatur der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik, die Weisheits- und Testamentenliteratur, aber auch der antike Briefroman und – zumindest mit einem knappen Blick – die nachneutestamentliche apokryphe Briefliteratur. Dass die Erklärung und Bewertung des Phänomens der Pseudepigraphie kontrovers ist und bleibt, zeigt sich auch an den in diesem Band zusammengestellten Beiträgen.

Der Band ist nach den unterschiedlichen religionsgeschichtlichen Kontexten gegliedert, so dass den beiden Teilen zu frühjüdischen (I.) und griechisch-römischen Kontexten (II.) ein sehr viel breiterer Teil zu frühchristlichen Kontexten (III.) folgt, in dem die einzelnen neutestamentlichen Briefe behandelt und übergreifende Probleme thematisiert werden. Auf

⁴⁶ BROX, Verfasserangaben (s. Anm. 12), 24. Ähnlich auch P. TRUMMER, Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition, BET 8, Frankfurt a.M. 1978, 74, der von „totaler Pseudepigraphie“ spricht.

⁴⁷ J. HERZER, Abschied vom Konsens? Die Pseudepigraphie der Pastoralbriefe als Herausforderung an die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, ThLZ 129 (2004), 1267–1282.

eine weitere Untergliederung konnte in Teil III. verzichtet werden. Das Arrangement folgt hier der Reihenfolge im neutestamentlichen Kanon.

2.1 Frühjüdische Kontexte

Der erste Teil zu *frühjüdischen Kontexten* enthält drei gewichtige Beiträge zu frühjüdischen Schriftenkreisen, in denen wesentliche Hintergründe der urchristlichen Pseudepigraphie studiert werden können. *Leo G. Perdue* spannt dabei den weitesten Horizont auf, beginnend mit der altorientalischen Literatur Mesopotamiens und Ägyptens. Perdue verfolgt die Frage nach den Anfängen der Zuschreibung von Werken an ‚individuelle‘ Autoren, vor allem im Kontext der Weisheitsliteratur des Alten Orients und dann auch des Alten Testaments und nachbiblischen Judentums bis hin zur Sapiencia Salomonis. Dabei erweist sich die rhetorische Technik der *mimesis*, der Nachahmung älterer Autoren, als ein wesentlicher Faktor der literarischen Gestaltung, was z.B. im Blick auf die Sapiencia wahrscheinlich macht, dass deren literarische Technik von den intendierten Lesern des Werks erkannt werden konnte.

Mit der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik betritt *Karina Martin Hogan* in ihrem Beitrag ein zweites Feld der biblisch-frühjüdischen Tradition, das für den Hintergrund der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie von großer Bedeutung ist. Ausgehend von der Periodisierung der Geschichte in frühjüdischen Apokalypsen untersucht sie die geschichtliche Stellung der jeweils als pseudonyme Autoren gewählten Figuren und deren Funktion hinsichtlich der Übermittlung von Traditionen. Die pseudonymen Autoren apokalyptischer Texte wie Henoch, Noah, Mose, Baruch, Daniel und Esra erscheinen in dieser Perspektive als ‚Brückenfiguren‘, die angesichts der Erfahrung von Diskontinuität in der Geschichte die Kontinuität der Überlieferung repräsentieren und somit gefährdete Identität wieder herstellen und sichern.

Ein interessantes Untersuchungsfeld, das besondere Beachtung verdient, sind die Textfunde vom Toten Meer, weil hier in einzigartiger Weise anhand erhaltener Manuskripte Einblicke in die literarischen Prozesse von Fortschreibung, Interpretation und Kanonisierung möglich sind. Nicht zuletzt haben die Qumran-Funde unser Wissen über zahlreiche bisher bekannte ‚Pseudepigraphen‘ wie z.B. der Henoch-Tradition, das Jubiläenbuch oder die Patriarchentestamente auf eine neue Grundlage gestellt und eine Vielzahl ‚neuer‘ pseudepigraphischer Texte ans Licht gebracht. *Eibert Tigchelaar* gibt in seinem Beitrag einen Überblick über die hier zu gewinnenden Einsichten und diskutiert die unterschiedlichen Formen ‚parabiblicher‘ Texte sowie die Frage nach dem Zusammenhang zwischen bestimmten Texten und Textgattungen, den für sie gewählten Pseudonymen und evtl. im Hintergrund stehenden religiösen Gruppen. Ein kleiner An-

hang benennt zumindest einige Texte, die – nach der fragmentarisch erhaltenen Evidenz – als Briefe gelten können.

2.2 Griechisch-römische Kontexte

In einem zweiten, umfangreicheren Teil (II.) werden wesentliche Textbereiche der griechisch-römischen Literatur untersucht und zugleich weitere übergreifende Sachfragen pseudonymer Autorschaft beleuchtet.

Zunächst erörtert *Wolfgang Speyer*, einer der ‚Altmeister‘ der Pseud-epigraphie-Diskussion,⁴⁸ in einem weiten Rahmen die Frage von göttlicher und menschlicher Verfasserschaft in der Antike. Als ein Ursprung pseudonymen Sprechens und Schreibens erscheint dabei die erfahrene und oral oder literarisch weitergegebene Gottesrede. Speyer weist so erneut auf die religiöse Dimension im Hintergrund pseudepigraphischer Verfasserkonstruktionen hin.

Martina Janßen erörtert in ihrem materialreichen Beitrag die ausgesprochen vielfältigen antiken (Selbst-)Aussagen zur Pseudepigraphie. Dabei zeigt sich eine differenzierte Palette von Möglichkeiten, wie es zu unrichtigen Verfasserangaben kommen kann: Diese reichen von einer unabsichtlich, aus Irrtum oder Verwechslung zustande gekommenen falschen Zuschreibung über die ästhetisch-literarische Form der Prosopopöie, die Abfassung eines Werks im Auftrag eines anderen oder auch im Kontext einer Schule, die pseudonyme Abfassung im Interesse, einen anderen zu diskreditieren oder ihm zu schaden, bis hin zur Pseudonymität im Interesse, dem eigenen Werk größere Wirkung und Autorität zu verschaffen. Alle diese Kategorien sind differenziert zu betrachten und in ihrer Übertragbarkeit auf Phänomene des frühen Christentums zu reflektieren, wenn die frühchristlichen Schriften angemessen und nicht anachronistisch verstanden werden sollen.

Die Diskussion, inwiefern Pseudepigraphie erkennbar war oder gar erkannt werden wollte, nimmt *Marco Frenschkowski* mit Blick auf die pagane Antike und – im Vergleich damit – das frühe Christentum auf, wobei die Pastoralbriefe, Judasbrief und Zweiter Petrusbrief als Paradigmen dienen. Frenschkowski beleuchtet das erstaunliche Phänomen, dass frühchristliche Autoren ihren paganen oder häretischen Gegnern den Vorwurf der Fälschung entgegenhalten konnten, während sie mit der Möglichkeit falscher Zuschreibungen im eigenen Kreis und beim eigenen Schrifttum nur selten rechneten, was sich für Frenschkowski durch das ‚subkulturelle‘ Milieu des frühen Christentums erklärt. Insgesamt ergibt sich aus diesen Beobachtungen eine größere Skepsis gegenüber der beliebten, da apologetisch brauchbaren These, dass die frühchristliche Pseudepigraphie, etwa in

⁴⁸ S. dazu o. Anm. 10.

den Pastoralbriefen oder im Zweiten Petrusbrief, für die jeweiligen Leser ‚durchschaubar‘ gewesen sein sollte.⁴⁹

Die beiden folgenden Beiträge beleuchten ein im exegetischen Horizont häufig vernachlässigtes Feld der antiken Literatur und eine relativ neue Diskussion: das Phänomen pseudepigraphischer Briefsammlungen oder der sogenannten antiken ‚Briefromane‘. Dabei rekurriert *Katharina Luchner* auf die Forschung zu diesen Sammlungen mit spezieller Berücksichtigung der Platon- und Chion-Briefe und plädiert am Ende eher für eine kritische Position zur These, dass in diesen Sammlungen ‚Briefromane‘ zu sehen seien. Die Interpretation der Briefsammlungen als ‚Briefromane‘ erscheint auch in der klassischen Philologie als ein ‚apologetischer‘ Versuch, die Sammlungen vom Geruch der ‚Fälschung‘ zu befreien und in den Horizont literarischer Fiktionalität zu stellen. Doch lassen nur wenige dieser Sammlungen das für Romane auch in der Antike vorauszusetzende narrative Kontinuum sowie das konsistente *ēthos* ihres Helden erkennen. Demgegenüber nimmt *Timo Glaser* die narratologische Lektüre von Briefsammlungen als eine mögliche Lektüre positiv auf, wobei er neben den Chion-Briefen die ‚Briefromane‘ des Aischines und des Euripides diskutiert und am Ende die Übertragung des Paradigmas auf die Pastoralbriefe vorschlägt, deren Lektüre als ‚Paulusbrieffroman‘ die Konstitution eines neuen Paulusbildes unter Aufnahme der älteren Tradition verständlich machen könnte.

Der letzte Beitrag dieses Teils – und ein besonderes Glanzstück des vorliegenden Bandes – bringt ein instruktives Beispiel für die Diskussion um pseudepigraphische Briefe und Briefsammlungen in der griechisch-römischen Antike. *Robert Matthew Calhoun* übersetzt und kommentiert den als ‚Einleitungsbrief‘ mit dem Corpus der Briefe des Marcus Iunius Brutus verbundenen Brief eines gewissen Mithridates zusammen mit weiteren Testimonia für das Corpus dieser Briefe. Das Schreiben ist deshalb besonders interessant, weil sich der Autor offen über seine eigene Tätigkeit in der Herausgabe und vermutlich Erweiterung des Corpus der Brutusbrieve äußert. Am Ende seines Beitrags deutet Calhoun einige Aspekte an, in denen der Mithridates-Brief die Produktion und Kanonisierung neutestamentlicher Briefe und insbesondere Pseudepigrapha illustrieren könnte.

2.3 Frühchristliche Kontexte

Der umfangreichste Teil (III.) des vorliegenden Bandes erfasst ‚frühchristliche Kontexte‘. Dabei werden – grob in der Reihenfolge des neutestamentlichen Kanons – alle in der Forschung als pseudonym angesehenen

⁴⁹ S. zu dieser Diskussion o. Anm. 30.

bzw. als solche diskutierten Briefe mit ihrer jeweiligen Verfasserkonstruktion behandelt, z.T. unter übergreifenden Gesichtspunkten.

Zur Eröffnung der Diskussion thematisiert *Harry Y. Gamble* die kanongeschichtlichen und kanontheologischen Aspekte des Themas. Sein Beitrag über „Pseudonymity and the New Testament Canon“ erörtert die Bedeutung des Phänomens der Pseudepigraphie für das Verständnis der Herausbildung des Kanons. Gamble skizziert zunächst historisch die Sammlung der einzelnen neutestamentlichen Teilkorpora und zeigt dabei, dass die Bedeutung der Autorschaft bzw. der ‚Authentizität‘ der jeweiligen Schriften im Prozess der Kanonbildung nicht einheitlich hoch veranschlagt werden kann. Er erörtert sodann den Umgang mit pseudonymen Schriften in den Kanonisierungsdiskursen der frühen Kirche und beleuchtet abschließend das theologische Problem der kanonischen Pseudepigrapha und die – unterschiedlich wirksamen – Strategien der Interpreten, die Präsenz pseudonymer Schriften im Kanon zu erklären und zu legitimieren.

Eve-Marie Becker bietet in ihrem Beitrag zur paulinischen Pseudepigraphie-Forschung als literaturgeschichtlicher Aufgabe einen knappen Forschungsüberblick zur Echtheitskritik der paulinischen Briefe, um auf diesem Hintergrund einerseits die Bedeutung der Orthonymität in der paulinischen Epistolographie und andererseits die Problematik und Funktion der paulinischen Pseudepigraphie im Ganzen zu skizzieren.

Die detaillierte Besprechung der einzelnen pseudepigraphischen Paulusbrieve leitet *Martin Hüneburg* mit seiner Analyse des Epheserbriefes ein, die dieses Schreiben als eine korrigierende Bearbeitung und Weiterführung des Kolosserbriefes ausweist. Dabei zeigt sich schon anhand dieser beiden literarisch eng miteinander zusammenhängenden pseudopaulinischen Schreiben die Differenziertheit des Phänomens der paulinischen Pseudepigraphie. Diese Beobachtung wird gestützt durch den Beitrag von *Nicole Frank*, die den Kolosserbrief als Paradigma zur Rekonstruktion der Entstehung paulinischer und allgemeiner der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie aus der Nötigung zur Auseinandersetzung um das Erbe des Paulus deutet.

Die Diskussion um den Zweiten Thessalonicherbrief ist besonders heftig, zumal angesichts der Tatsache, dass der Zweite Thessalonicherbrief selbst auf die Möglichkeit pseudonymer Briefe verweist und damit evtl. sogar den Ersten Thessalonicherbrief als gefälscht hinstellen könnte. Während in der deutschsprachigen Forschung die große Mehrheit der kritischen Exegeten den Zweiten Thessalonicherbrief als Pseudepigraphon ansieht, ist die Diskussion v.a. im nordamerikanischen Raum nach wie vor kontrovers. Als Beitrag zur Diskussion wird hier das bislang unveröffentlichte ‚Seminar Paper‘ von *Edgar Krentz* aus dem Jahr 1983 dokumentiert, das die deutschen Impulse v.a. aus dem Kommentar von Wolfgang Trilling in den

amerikanischen Kontext transportierte und dort eine langsame Wende hin zur Pseudepigraphie-These veranlasste. Die kurze editorische Notiz von *Trevor Thompson* führt in die forschungsgeschichtliche Bedeutung dieses Textes ein und stellt ihn in den Rahmen des gegenwärtigen Diskussionsstandes. Die aktuelle Diskussion um den Zweiten Thessalonicherbrief führt Thompson dann in seinem eigenen Beitrag weiter, der die schwierige Suche nach einem historischen Ort des Zweiten Thessalonicherbriefes seit Ferdinand Christian Baur diskutiert und nach dem Durchgang durch die wichtigsten Textdaten die Forderung nach einer Methode der Interpretation unterstreicht, die die Komplexität der pseudonymen Konstruktion und die ‚doppelte Persönlichkeit‘ des Autors eines pseudonymen Briefes hinreichend berücksichtigen kann.

Das ‚Sturmzentrum‘ der paulinischen Pseudepigraphie sind jedoch seit den Anfängen der kritischen Forschung die Pastoralbriefe.⁵⁰ Die Diskussion über dieses ‚Corpus‘ nimmt *Jens Herzer* in seinem ausführlichen Beitrag auf. Dabei zeichnet er zunächst in einem forschungsgeschichtlichen Überblick die Entstehung des gegenwärtig dominierenden Forschungsparadigmas nach und weist auf bislang unerledigte Probleme hin. Die bloße Frage nach ‚echt‘ oder ‚unecht‘ erscheint auch hier zu sehr simplifizierend, weil sie den Charakter der einzelnen Schreiben und ihr gegenseitiges Verhältnis nicht hinreichend berücksichtigt. Herzer plädiert zugleich gegen die in der Exegese wohlfeile apologetische ‚Erklärung‘ der Phänomene: Im Falle der Pastoralbriefe ist durchaus mit der Möglichkeit der ‚Fälschung‘ zu rechnen, andererseits ist die Anwendung der Kategorie der ‚Fiktion‘ geschichtstheoretisch besser abzusichern. Am Ende steht die provokante These, dass innerhalb des ‚Corpus‘ zwischen unterschiedlichen Autoren und Abfassungssituationen zu differenzieren ist. Nur der Erste Timotheusbrief kann als (relativ spät zu datierende) ‚Schulpseudepigraphie‘ verstanden werden, hingegen können Zweiter Timotheusbrief und Titusbrief als eigenständiger Teil der vom Ersten Timotheusbrief rezipierten Paulustradition gelten, so dass für diese beiden Schreiben die Frage der paulinischen Verfasserschaft noch einmal eigens und unabhängig vom Ersten Timotheusbrief zu prüfen ist. Der Beitrag zeigt mithin, wie durch differenziertere Beschreibungskategorien die oft schon als abgeschlossen betrachtete Diskussion um einzelne neutestamentliche Pseudepigrapha wieder neu belebt werden kann.

Als Teil des Corpus Paulinum und damit unter der irrigen Annahme paulinischer Verfasserschaft ist auch der Hebräerbrief lange überliefert worden, und es ist eine offene Frage, ob er nicht auch als vermeintliches Pseudepigraphon Eingang in den neutestamentlichen Kanon gefunden hat.

⁵⁰ S. dazu o. Anm. 1.

Clare K. Rothschild, deren Projekt zur Pseudonymität des Hebräerbriefes den Anlass für das dieser Sammlung zugrunde liegende Münchener Symposium und damit auch für die Zusammenstellung des vorliegenden Bandes bot, erörtert in Ergänzung zu den Überlegungen in ihrer eben erschienenen Monographie⁵¹ die spezifischen Allusionen des Hebräerbriefes auf den Römerbrief und die Parallelen zwischen beiden in der Schriftrezeption und stellt die These auf, dass der Hebräerbrief (zumindest auch) als Anleitung zu einer im Sinne des Autors ‚besseren‘ Lektüre des Römerbriefes und somit als subtile Umdeutung dieses Paulusbriefs fungieren konnte.

Die Diskussion zum Corpus der ‚Katholischen Briefe‘ beginnt mit zwei Beiträgen zum Jakobusbrief, dessen Zuschreibung in der internationalen Forschung nach wie vor umstritten ist. *Matthias Konradt* begründet in seinem Beitrag erneut die These der Pseudonymität des Jakobusbriefes, auch im Vergleich mit dem, was aus anderen neutestamentlichen Texten als Position des historischen Jakobus zu erkennen ist. Konradt analysiert die Verfasserfiktion des Jakobusbriefes und fragt nach den Gründen, die den tatsächlichen Autor veranlassen haben können, zu dieser Konstruktion zu greifen. *Matt Jackson-McCabe* beleuchtet angesichts der nach wie vor verhärteten Fronten in der Pseudepigraphiedebatte die Frage, welche Loyalitäten und welche ‚Politik‘ die Vertreter der unterschiedlichen Positionen leiten. Dabei verfolgt er in instruktiver Weise die Geschichte der christlich-theologischen Bewertung des Jakobusbriefes von Euseb bis Luther und problematisiert die literaturgeschichtliche Diskussion um das in beiden Diskursen bestehende Ineinander von innertheologischen und externen literarischen Argumenten und Leitmotiven. So wendet sich letztlich die Frage, was die ‚beste Lektüre‘ und die angemessenste Interpretation sei, in die viel kontextuellere Frage, für wen bzw. in welchem Kontext diese Lektüre als die ‚beste‘ gelten kann und zu bevorzugen ist.

Die folgenden drei Beiträge wenden sich den beiden Petrusbriefen und dem mit dem Zweiten Petrusbrief literarisch eng verbundenen Judasbrief zu. *Karl Matthias Schmidt* vergleicht in seinem Beitrag die in den beiden Petrusbriefen vorliegende Autorfiktion, wobei insbesondere die pragmatische Funktion der beiden Schreiben im Kontext der jeweiligen Gemeinde in den Blick genommen wird. *Lutz Doering* wendet sich eingehender dem Petrusbild des Ersten Petrusbriefes zu, das nach dieser Analyse darauf abzielt, das Heidenchristentum in seiner ‚Diaspora‘-Situation zu erreichen und – in der Tradition der jüdischen Diasporabriefe – an die grundlegende Autorität des Urchristentums zurückzubinden. *Jörg Frey* beleuchtet in seinem Beitrag vergleichend die Relation von Autorfiktion und Gegnerbild

⁵¹ C. K. ROTHSCHILD, *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon. The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*, WUNT 235, Tübingen 2009.

im Judasbrief und im Zweiten Petrusbrief, wobei sich trotz der stofflichen Nähe und literarischen Abhängigkeit eine tief greifende Differenz sowohl in der Wahl der pseudonymen Legitimationsstruktur als auch in der Durchführung der Autorfiktion zeigt. Dabei wird deutlich, dass die Interpretation pseudepigraphischer Briefe mehr als bisher damit rechnen muss, dass nicht nur das Bild des Autors, sondern auch die literarisch repräsentierte Situation der Adressatengemeinde sowie insbesondere das Bild der jeweiligen Gegner Bestandteil der literarischen Fiktion sind und keineswegs eine sichere Basis zur Interpretation bieten können. Die beispiellose Gegnerpolemik des Zweiten Petrusbriefes wirft dabei insbesondere die Frage auf, inwieweit sie zu großen Teilen auf Entlehnungen aus dem Jud und anderen polemischen Stereotypen beruht und damit zumindest partiell ebenso wie die Autorfiktion als ‚Fälschung‘ gelten muss, was für die ethische Bewertung des Schreibens wie auch der thematisierten Sachverhalte von Belang wäre.

Die Diskussion der Katholischen Briefe wird durch einen Beitrag von *Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer* zu den Johannesbriefen abgeschlossen. Diese drei Briefe werden nur selten unter dem Aspekt der Pseudepigraphie diskutiert, doch verdienen die komplexen Abfassungs- und Zuschreibungsverhältnisse, die Anonymität der Texte, die auffällige Nennung des *presbyteros* als Autor des Zweiten und Dritten Johannesbriefes und die in den Überschriften erfolgende Zuschreibung an einen im Text der Briefe (wie auch des Vierten Evangeliums) nicht erwähnten Johannes hier Beachtung, weil sie die Variabilität der Prozesse und Hintergründe im Umfeld der Beanspruchung und Zuschreibung von Autorschaft im frühen Christentum noch einmal in einem breiteren Horizont verdeutlichen.

Im letzten Beitrag dieses Teils geht der Blick über das Neue Testament hinaus, jedoch nicht etwa auf die Probleme des Corpus Ignatianum, sondern auf eine eher schlichte, aber interessante ‚apokryphe‘ Schrift, den pseudonymen Briefwechsel zwischen Paulus und Seneca. *Stefan Krauter* fragt hier dezidiert nach den Kennzeichen ‚schlechter‘ Pseudepigraphie und deutet den Briefwechsel sowohl anhand stilistischer Kriterien als auch aufgrund der inhaltlichen Dürftigkeit des Briefwechsels als ein solches Beispiel einer simplen, eben literarisch und theologisch ‚schlechten‘ Verfasserfiktion.

Als einer der ‚Altmeister‘ der literaturgeschichtlichen Erforschung des Neuen Testaments kommentiert *David E. Aune* in seinem Nachwort die in diesem Band gebotene Diskussion. Dabei geht er nicht auf alle Beiträge gleichermaßen ein, sondern stellt die einen ausführlicher, die anderen knapper in den Horizont der Forschung und benennt am Ende einige Aspekte für den Fortgang der Diskussion. Es ist zu hoffen, dass die hier gebotenen Überlegungen im Ganzen zu einer differenzierteren Wahrnehmung

der in den einzelnen Texten vorliegenden Autor-, Situations- und Gegnerkonstruktionen führen, die denn erst ein präzisiertes Urteil über den Typus, die Intention und die Implikationen der jeweiligen literarischen Ausgestaltung ermöglicht.

I. Frühjüdische Kontexte

Pseudonymity and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric

Mimesis and the Wisdom of Solomon

by

LEO G. PERDUE

1. Definition: Pseudonymity and Pseudepigraphy

In contrast to anonymity (ἄνωνυμία) in which a work does not disclose its author, pseudonymity (ψευδώνυμος) or “false name” refers to a text wrongly claiming to be written by an author in the title, the subscription, or the text itself. A related term, pseudepigraphy (ψευδεπίγραφα) literally means “false writing.”¹ According to William Adler, in the early church the term “pseudepigrapha referred to religious compositions falsely attributed to a revered figure of the past.”² Pseudepigraphic texts at times were identified as apocryphal, although the two terms, pseudepigraphy and apocrypha, were not viewed to be identical in meaning. The term apocrypha, beginning in early third and the late second centuries BCE, was used in two general senses: first, hidden or mysterious books, and second, spurious ones (i.e., literary forgeries). Eventually in Protestantism, the apocrypha came to be seen as the core of the pseudepigrapha, since there were numerous other texts that existed in addition to this small collection. The fourteen or fifteen books bore this name, not because they were inauthentic, but rather because they raised the matter of canon. The question whether they are canonical receives different answers given by Judaism (no), Catholicism (yes), and Protestantism (no).

¹ D. A. Carter, “Pseudonymity and Pseudepigraphy,” in *The New Testament Dictionary Background* (eds. C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Intervarsity, 2000), 857–58, and W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I/2; München: Beck, 1971).

² W. Adler, “The Pseudepigrapha in the Early Church,” in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L. Martin McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), 211–228 (211). Also see A. D. Baum, *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum: Mit ausgewählten Quellentexten samt deutscher Übersetzung* (WUNT II/138; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

Since not all pseudepigraphic books are literary forgeries, the distinction between literary forgery, a pseudonymous writing, and a pseudepigraphic work is important to maintain.³ The first has the calculated intention to deceive for a variety of reasons, including harboring the desire to achieve notoriety by associating a text with a famous person, the association of writing with a famous figure to add credence to the argument, economic profit (i.e., financial payment), malice and vitriolic criticisms (e.g., to sully someone's name or a particular idea), honor or respect shown to a particular person by attributing a text to him/her, and the identification with the teachings and thought of a earlier person or group.⁴ The second has normally been understood as deception either in order to claim authority for the text or to contain the avowal of a writer to stand within the tradition of the author. The third, pseudepigraphic writings, resulted from either intentional deception or honest mistakes.⁵

It is clear from the numerous references to forgeries and their condemnation that Graeco-Roman writers were aware of this practice. They also used their own knowledge of literary criticism, in particular their familiarity with the vocabulary and style of famous authors, to assist in verifying works falsely attributed to an author.⁶ The issue of pseudonymity and pseudepigraphy has been debated frequently by Biblical scholars. Much of the church's scholarship has focused on the issue of authority, arising in part from the fact that the New Testament quotes or alludes to texts not included in the early Jewish canon.

2. Authorship in Antiquity⁷

2.1 Introduction

In the West, interest in determining the authorship of a text in antiquity was not pursued prior to the fifth century BCE, when it was a question of interest in Classical Greece. As we shall see, pseudonymity and pseudepi-

³ See B. M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," *JBL* 92 (1972): 3–24 (4).

⁴ Carter, "Pseudonymity and Pseudepigraphy" (see n. 1), 859, and Metzger, *ibid.*, 5–12.

⁵ Baum, *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum* (see n. 2), 9.

⁶ Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Pseudepigrapha" (see n. 3), 13–4.

⁷ For a brief introduction, see K. van der Toorn, "Authorship in Antiquity," ch. 2 in *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), 27–49.

graphy were frequently practiced in the ancient Near East.⁸ While in the ANE authorship may at times have been viewed as collective, i.e., texts were produced by the scribal communities, attribution to individuals was a significant practice especially among the composers of the wisdom corpora. However, it was not until the Renaissance that efforts to ascertain who actually composed a writing was seriously undertaken in order to separate what appear to be accurate claims from those that were false.⁹ The notion of literary property developed in Greece in the fifth century BCE, although forgeries continued to appear. In Latin literature, forgeries appeared as early as the late second century BCE.¹⁰ Thus authorship was a matter of concern in both the eastern cultures and those of the west.

2.2 Cuneiform Literature¹¹

Colophons and epilogues were commonly written in the scribal cultures of the ancient Near East. In Mesopotamia the name of the scribal copyist, the owner of the text, or its patron may be mentioned, but only rarely the name of the original author. Although as we shall see, the sapiential texts did forth the presumed or falsely claimed composer. On occasion a god (or gods) is described as the one who “speaks” in the text or is the composer (e.g., “Dumuzi and Enkidu: the Dispute between the Shepherd-God and the Farmer-God,” *ANET*³, 41–42). Cases in which the patron/author is listed include the “Law Code of Lipit-Ishtar” (*ANET*³, 159–161) and the “Law

⁸ This opposes the view of P. R. Davies, “Spurious Attribution in the Hebrew Bible,” in *The Invention of Sacred Tradition* (eds. J. R. Lewis and O. Hammer; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 258–275 (259), who considered the matter of authorship to be unimportant in the literary tradition until the Hellenistic age.

⁹ Of course, under the impress of postmodernism, the “death of the author” has led to the recognition that the author, even if identified, is not the primary interpreter of his/her text. More importantly the author is not some isolated individual with “special” insight, but rather the social location and communities surrounding the writer and audiences shape both the text and its variety of meanings. The writer and meaning are not related, for writing destroys every “voice,” i.e., no single meaning can be attributed to a text for there is none. Instead, the writer is but a “scriptor” who creates the text but is not its authoritative interpreter, see R. Barthes, “The Death of the Author,” in *Image-Music-Text* (ed. idem; London: Fantana, 1977), 142–48.

¹⁰ “Forgeries, Literary,” *OCD*: 604–5.

¹¹ The standard work on cuneiform colophons is H. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone* (AOAT 2; Kevaelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1968). Other studies on authorship include W. G. Lambert, “Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity,” *JCS* 11 (1957): 1–14; idem, “Additions and Corrections,” *JCS* 11 (1957): 112; idem, “A Catalogue of Texts and Authors,” *JCS* 16 (1962): 59–77 (59–62); B. R. Foster, “Self Reference of an Akkadian Poet,” *JAOS* 103 (1983): 123–30; idem, *Before the Muses* 1 (3d ed.; Baltimore: CDL Press, 2005), 21, and J. Wyrick, *The Ascension of Authorship* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), 95–7.

Code of Hammurabi" (*ANET*³, 163–180), both of whom are implied to be the "authors" of these laws in both the prologue and the epilogue.¹² In a more indirect indication of authorship, Assurbanipal claims to have learned "the craft of Adapa the sage, the hidden esoteric knowledge of the whole of the scribal art."¹³

While anonymity proved to be the general rule, there were important exceptions. The few texts to which authors are ascribed were customarily important in the literary cultures of their civilizations, and their editors sought either to honor or to ascribe them to famous heroes, especially men who were kings and sages. The "Epic of Gilgamesh" begins with a legendary account of Gilgamesh, the King of Uruk (*ANET*³, 72–99, 503–507). In positioning a legend about a famous man at the beginning, the scribal editor transforms him into the text's author. Through this means the "Legend of Naram-Sin"¹⁴ and the "Legend of the Birth of Sargon" (*ANET*³, 119) become pseudepigraphic works. The authority of texts appears as the primary reason for assigned authorship by imputing them to famous heroes and creators of civilizations in the distant past. In Mesopotamia there were also texts where particular authors are identified, although the correctness of this claim is not verifiable. One important culture myth, an Assyrian text, is the Song of Era in which Kabti-ilāni-Marduk is identified as the author.¹⁵

2.3 Egyptian Literature

Egyptian scribes, who produced copies of Egyptian literary texts, beginning as early as the Twelfth Dynasty (1985–1773 BCE), created a brief form of the colophon: *ᵫw=fpw* "it has come (to the end)" (P. Prisse II,9). A slightly extended form, found in Sinuhe (P. Berlin 3022, col. 311), "The Dialogue of a Man with his Son" (P. Berlin 3024, col. 154–155), and the "Instruction of Ptah-hotep" (P. Prisse XIX,9), reads: "it has come from its beginning unto the end even as it has been found in writing." The addition of the name of the copyist is also attested, "it has come from its beginning unto the end even as it has been found in writing when it was written by

¹² Cf. the Mesha Stele of Moab (*ANET*³, 320–21).

¹³ M. Streck, ed., *Assurbanipal und die letzten Assyrischen Könige II* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1916), 256 n. 18. Also see his statement: "I understand the script of stone inscriptions from before the flood, which are difficult, obscure and confused" (see T. Bauer, *Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals* Bd. II [Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1972], 85).

¹⁴ B. R. Foster, "The Legend of Naram Sin," in *From Distant Days. Myths, Tales, and Poetry of Ancient Mesopotamia* (ed. idem; Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 1995), 171–77.

¹⁵ *COS* 1.404–16.

the scribe N" (*Naufragé*, P. Ermitage, "Amenâa, sons of Amen, Life, Power, Health").¹⁶

In addition to colophons, scribes sometimes introduced the text by the adding of a prologue in which the name and title(s) of the presumed author are given. Thus the introduction to "The Instruction of Ptah-hotep" (*ANET*³, 413) reads:

The Instruction of the Mayor and Vizier Ptah-hotep, under the majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt: Izezi, living forever and ever. The Mayor and Vizier Ptah-hotep says: ...

Egyptian instructions usually consist of two major parts: a prologue that identifies the teacher and the occasion of its utterance (written after the instruction) and a list of teachings (earlier than the prologue) of a general nature. It is not likely that the prologue to this instruction (or any other one for that matter) and the teachings that followed were actually written by the author identified. This particular instruction (*sb3yt*) identifies the teacher as a vizier to King Izezi who reigned in the Fifth Dynasty (2494–2345 BCE), although this was likely fabricated by the unknown author, a sage, either in the late Sixth Dynasty (2345–2181 BCE) or perhaps as late as the Twelfth Dynasty.¹⁷ The purpose of the list and its prologue was to pass down important teachings of behavior and virtue as seen at the time of their composition, which would guide young students in the necessary attributes for serving the divine king in some administrative capacity. In this instruction, the prologue contains the story of the vizier receiving the permission of his Lord to select his son as his successor and to educate him in the "ideas of the ancestors." There is, in addition, a second earlier introduction which reads:

The Beginning of the Expression of Good Speech, spoken by the Hereditary Prince and Count, God's Father and God's Beloved, eldest son of the king, of his body, the mayor and Vizier, Ptah-hotep, in instructing the ignorant about wisdom and about the rules for good speech, as of advantage to him who will hearken and of disadvantage to him who may neglect them (*ANET*³, 413).

It is likely that the first, more general introduction is added by a later editor and that the earlier is the second added, for it provides more precise information and reflects a greater interest in the identification of the role of the sage. While it is impossible to determine the precise authorship of the instruction, it is likely a text that was attributed to the authorship of a fa-

¹⁶ See G. Lenzo Marchese, "Les colophons dans la littérature égyptienne," *BIFAO* 104 (2004): 359–76.

¹⁷ See W. Kelly Simpson, ed., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003), 129–48.

mous sage of the Old Kingdom to provide it authority and greater influence.

A much briefer prologue introduces the list of teachings in the “Instruction for King Meri-ka-Re.” The text (Papyrus Leningrad 116A from the Eighteenth Dynasty, 1550–1295 BCE) has been reconstructed to read:

[The beginning of the instruction which the King of Upper and Lower Egypt: ... made] for his son, King Meri-ka-Re (*ANET*³, 414–415).

This text, placed in the period of the First Intermediate Period (2160–2055 BCE), an era of turmoil in Egyptian history, does reflect the difficult political and economic disasters of the time. Attributed to the last king of the Herakleopolitan Dynasty that ended by 2125 BCE, King Khety, who is presented as deceased when he instructs his son, does appear likely to have been composed during this time. Lichtheim considers the text to be pseud-epigraphic, in that it was not written by this ruler, but it does appear to have been genuine in the sense of its composition during the time of his reign.¹⁸ A piece of political propaganda, the instruction provides counsel to the new king at the time of his coronation on how to rule the kingdom wisely and well in order to bring about cosmic harmony and political order.¹⁹ Thus, the authority of the instruction is increased by attributing it to a dead king, who now is transformed into Osiris, the ruler of the underworld, and it justifies the actions of the king to secure stability by indicating they are the will not just of the earthly, divine ruler, but also of the ruler of the land of the dead.²⁰

A similar royal testament is “The Instruction of King Amen-em-het,” the first ruler of the Twelfth Dynasty (1985–1956 BCE).²¹ The best copy is preserved in Papyrus Millingen of the Eighteenth Dynasty, although this manuscript, while copied, was eventually lost. This royal “author” or teacher is also presented as deceased. The recipient of the instruction is Senusert I (1971–1928 BCE) at the time he “appeared as a God,” likely his coronation. In this text, the dead king relates the events that led to his as-

¹⁸ M. Lichtheim, “Royal Instructions,” *COS* 1.61.

¹⁹ See A. Schaff, *Der historische Abschnitt der Lehre für König Merikarê* (SBAW 8; München: Beck, 1936).

²⁰ For the political nature of the text, see A. Volten, *Zwei altägyptische Schriften* (AAeg 4; Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard, 1945), and S. Herrmann, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgestalt Mittelägyptischer Literaturwerke* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin Institut für Orientforschung 33; Berlin: Akademie, 1957).

²¹ The authority of this text also is enhanced by its coming from the dead father, now reigning as Osiris, king of the underworld, and it too legitimates the decisions made by the new ruler to re-establish order in the kingdom of Maat. See especially W. Helck, *Der Text der Lehre Amenemhets I. für seinen Sohn* (2d ed.; Kleine Ägyptische Texte 1; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988).

sassination, thus leading to the warning to the successor that he not trust any court official and that he eliminate any who oppose his rule. This theme of regicide is unique in Egyptian literature. The period to which the text is attributed, the early Twelfth Dynasty, follows the end of the disastrous First Intermediate Period. The content of this instruction well fits this period, which causes Lichtheim to argue that the new ruler commissioned the writing of this text to a court scribe for reasons of authorizing and legitimating his rule and the various decisions he made to secure political and social order.²²

Also from the Middle Kingdom, the stele of Sehetepibre from the Twelfth Dynasty has an instruction with a very brief prologue that introduces a pseudonymous instruction, since its engraving on the stele of this sage suggests he is the author. This sage had been a high official under two kings: Sesostri III and Amenemhet III. Two manuscripts, which are longer, are also known that date from the Eighteenth Dynasty of the Ramesside period. The instruction is written to extol the divine king as Horus who sits on the throne of Egypt and hence is usually regarded as one of the “loyalist instructions.”²³

The beginning of the teaching which he made for his children: I have something important to say; I shall have you hear it, and I shall let you know it: the design for eternity, a way / of life as it should be and of passing a lifetime at peace.²⁴

According to Loprieno, the Loyalist Instructions point to the “complicity between author and reader which characterizes fictionality.” These include three semantic neutralizations of spheres which could be conflictual: anonymity, loyalty to either god or king (or understood as both), and the contrast between a successful life and surviving death. The first is illustrated by the fact that the “author” of this particular instruction composing an *encomion* of loyalty to the king makes use at times of materials borrowed from the vizier Mentuhotep who lived a century earlier. This problem disappears in the New Kingdom copies which make no mention of any author. The second is expressive of the beginning of the desire for a more personal relationship with the god (*ntr*) who is not named. The third is the effort to remove the tension between success in life with the hope for an afterlife. Moral and virtuous behavior is now required for the transition to the West and not simply mortuary preparations and religion.²⁵

²² M. Lichtheim, “Amenemhet,” *COS* 1.66.

²³ See Simpson, *The Literature of Ancient Egypt* (see n. 17), 172–77, and A. Loprieno, “Loyalistic Instructions,” in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms* (ed. idem; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 403–14.

²⁴ Simpson, *ibid.*, 173.

²⁵ Loprieno, “Loyalistic Instructions” (see n. 23), 405–12.

In the New Kingdom (1550–1295 BCE), “The Instruction of Any”²⁶ has a brief Prologue that is preserved on a tablet in the Berlin Museum (No. 8934):

Beginning of the educational instruction made by the Scribe Any of the Palace of Queen Nefertari.²⁷

The content of this text, attributed to a minor scribe in the kingdom, suggests this date offers two innovations, according to Lichtheim: it is directed, not to the aristocracy, but to the “middle class,” and the debate between the father and son in which the latter complains the former’s teaching is too complex to understand. Even so, the father is presented as prevailing in the argument. The text is given to instruct students who hope to enter the royal bureaucracy.

The “Instruction of Amenemope,” composed sometime during the Ramesside period (1295–1069 BCE), is also a text that speaks to students anticipating becoming minor officials in the royal administration. The ideal person, “the silent man,” is content with being a person of humble circumstances, having a modest position and few possessions.²⁸ Well known among biblical scholars due to the editor of the collection in 22.17–24.22, “The Sayings of the Wise,” who knows and uses this text, this instruction contains lines that at times exhibit parallelism and are placed into lines of bicola, tricola, and quintrains. In addition, the instructions are grouped into thirty chapters. The Prologue is rather lengthy, for it includes not only the names and offices of the teacher and his student, but also their duties and the nature of the content of the instruction that follows.

Beginning of the teaching for life,
The instructions for well-being,
Every rule for relations with elders,
For conduct toward magistrates;
Knowing how to answer one who speaks,
To reply to one who sends a message.
So as to direct him on the paths of life,
To make him prosper upon earth;
To let his heart enter its shrine,
Steering clear of evil;
To save him from the mouth of strangers,
To let (him) be praised in the mouth of people.
Made by the overseer of fields, experienced in his office,
The offspring of a scribe of Egypt,

²⁶ See Lichtheim, *COS* 1.110–15. The single manuscript preserving this instruction is Papyrus Boulaq 4 of the Cairo Museum.

²⁷ Queen Ahmes-Nefertari was the wife of King Ahmose.

²⁸ See M. Lichtheim, “The Instruction of Amenemope,” *COS* 1.115–22. This text is preserved in its entirety in the British Museum Papyrus 10474.

The overseer of grains who controls the measure,
 Who sets the harvest-dues for his lord,
 Who registers the islands of new land,
 In the great name of his majesty,
 Who records the markers on the borders of fields,
 Who acts for the king in his listing of taxes,
 Who makes the land-register of Egypt;
 The scribe who determines the offerings for all the gods.
 Who gives land-leases to the people,
 The overseer of grains, [provider of] foods,
 Who supplies the granary with grains;
 The truly silent in this of Ta-wer,
 The justified in Ipu,
 Who owns a tomb on the west of Senu,
 Who has a chapel at Abydos,
 Amenemope, the son of Kanakht,
 The justified in Ta-wer.
 [For] his son, the youngest of his children,
 The smallest of his family,
 The devotee of Min-Kamutef,
 The water-pourer of Wennofer,
 Who places Horus on his father's throne,
 Who guards him in his noble shrine,
 Who ...
 The guardian of the mother of god,
 Inspector of the black cattle of the terrace of Min,
 Who protects Min in his shrine,
 Hor-em-maakher is his true name,
 The child of a nobleman of Ipu,
 The son of the sistrum-player of Shu and Tefnut,
 And chief songstress of Horus, Tawosre.²⁹

While it is possible this instruction is pseudonymous, the details of this prologue are such that it is also feasible that the identities of its author and editor, Amenemope, as well as the scribe, his son, who receives the teaching, are historical.

Finally, the prologue to "The Instruction of 'Ankhsheshonqi'" (fifth to the third century BCE),³⁰ composed in Demotic, has a narrative prologue and conclusion, which is reminiscent of the West Semitic text, "The Instruction of Ahiqar." The author is identified as a priest of the sun god Re in his temple at Heliopolis. According to the prologue, 'Ankhsheshonqi was imprisoned because of his failure to report a plot to assassinate the king. The question of the veracity of this ascription or its pseudonymity

²⁹ Lichtheim, *COS* 1.116.

³⁰ Eadem, *Ancient Egyptian Literature III: The Late Period* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1980), 159–84. The manuscript is British Museum Papyrus 10508. The state of this instruction is rather fragmentary in many places.

cannot be answered. However, the narrative, probably added later, suggests it is a pseudonymous instruction.

While not every instruction in ancient Egypt is clearly pseudonymous, many obviously are. The prologues range from very brief introductions to more extended ones, concluding with the narrative of ‘Ankhsheshonqi. One may conclude that pseudonymity is a frequent characteristic of Egyptian wisdom instructions in order to provide additional authority and legitimacy to the teachings.

2.4 Pseudonymity and Wisdom Texts in Ancient Egypt

Composers of texts in the ancient Near East, which are anonymous, generally have been understood not to be important as individuals with unique insights and understandings that differentiated them from others. However, some of the revered sages of the past are known and remembered through the centuries as those who are said to have offered understandings of virtue, politics, life and death, and the cosmos that were insightful and even authoritative. These sages, to some of whom classical instructions were attributed, were famous for their wisdom in the cultural periods in which they lived and taught. Thus pseudepigraphic wisdom writings were attributed to them. The text, “In Praise of Learned Scribes” (*ANET*³, 431–432), written ca. 1300 BCE, glorifies prominent sages of the past whose writings provided them immortality. Eight are mentioned in this text, five and perhaps six of whom have wisdom instructions, which are attributed to them. Four of these are depicted on the wall of the chapel of a Ramesside tomb at Saqqara. These scribes were honored through the collective memory of their social class who carried on their work largely under the veil of anonymity. The ones listed are:

1. Hor-dedef
2. Ii-em-hotep
3. Neferti
4. Khety
5. Ptah-em-Djedhuti (= Djed-Djehuti?)
6. Kha-kheper-(Re)-seneb
7. Ptah-hotep
8. Kairis

The best case for the identification of an historical figure who delivers an instruction is Amenemope. The others are anonymous, pseudonymous, and pseudepigraphic instructions from the Early Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period. In addition to those already mentioned, these include the following instructions: “The Instruction of Prince Hordjedef” (Fifth Dynasty, BCE), “The Instruction for Kagemni” (late Old Kingdom), “The Instruction of a Man for His Son” (1985–1773 BCE), “The Instruction of Khety, the Son of

Duauf" (between 2150 and 1750 BCE), the "Discourses of Sisobek" (Middle Kingdom), the "Instruction of Amennakhte" (New Kingdom), and the "Teaching of Pordjel" (the Ptolemaic period). Other genres that include names of pseudonymous or pseudepigraphic composers are the disputation/dialogue and the lament: "The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage" (or "Ipuwer"; ca. 2000 BCE) and the "Lament of Khakheperre-sonbe" (ca. 1950 BCE).³¹ Imhotep was a legendary sage, physician, priest, architect, and eventually worshipped as a god who is said to have composed several wisdom texts (e.g., see *ANET*³, 432), although no text survives bearing his name.

2.5 Authorship in the Cuneiform Wisdom Tradition

The cuneiform tradition also has important examples of sapiential texts, which name the authors/recipients. However, others are anonymous. Generations of scribes and storytellers participated in the shaping of a final form of a text. Thus, it is senseless in most cases to speak of an original author who is not mentioned.³² Even so, it is clear that the famous ancestors of scribes are well known in tradition and are said to have produced texts, which their scribal "descendants" have passed down. These ancestral names, much like modern surnames, are the attempts to link scribes with the famous sages of the past. Thus, they are much like family names. This concern with authorship begins as early as the Cassite period and continues into Parthian times. The naming of authors was the attempt to add authority and legitimacy to the text and its teaching. The Cassite period was the epoch in which the major cultural works of Akkadian literature obtained the form housed and later discovered in the great libraries. The use of ancestral names pointed to scribes who held positions at court and functioned in the temple, thus indicating that scribes lived with the families whose educated elders taught them their trades. Thus, one may speak of tribal families living in the major cities. There are also colophons that point to the belief that divine knowledge revealed to the antediluvian sages led to

³¹ For translations, see J. B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (3d ed.; Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969 = *ANET*³); G. Burkard et al., eds., *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* 3. *Weisheitstexte* 2 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1991) = *TUAT*; M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* (3 vols.; Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1973.1976.1980), and eadem, *Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context* (OBO 52; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983); H. Brunner, *Die Weisheitsbücher der Ägypter: Lehren für das Leben* (Zürich: Artimus & Winkler, 1998); Simpson, *The Literature of Ancient Egypt* (see n. 17), and *COS* 1.110–24; 483–97; 561–93.

³² Lambert, "Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity" (see n. 11), 1.

the canonical texts of Babylonian culture, a point that supports this civilization's understanding of canonicity (cf. Berossus).³³

The Assyrian "Catalogue of Texts and Authors" (1000–650 BCE) from the library of Assurbanipal mentions authors by using the phrase *ša pī* ("from the mouth of") or "from the mouth of Ea" (the Babylonian god of wisdom) or "from the mouth" of a particular editor. Four categories of authors are identified in this list:

1. Ea,
2. legendary heroes, particularly primeval sages: (Oannes-)Adapa, Enmerkar, a king and sage, Kabti-ilāni-Marduk, Enmedugga, and Lu-Nanna,
3. scholars (*ummānu*) whose family origin (ancestry) is not indicated: Pappatum, Taqīša-Gula, Bulluša-rabi, Sin-liqi-uninni, Enlil-ibni, and Ur-Nanna. They usually bear the titles of either lamentation-priest or magician.
4. and men who are the "son" of an ancestor and bear the titles of magician, or lamentation-priest, or haruspex. Those with legible names are Andullu, Enlil-bān-kudurri, Gimil-Gula, Ekurdumununna, Ibni-Marduk, and Gimil-Nanai. Rīmūt-Gula was either the author or the ancestor of the one said to have produced the text. The city in which they were active, if legible, is mentioned: Babylon and Eridu. In this final category, it is clear that the human scribe is identified as the author of a text. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the authorship of the fourth group.

The third category of men who are authors is difficult to assess critically. According to Lambert, it is unlikely that the information concerning this group is historical, although there could be some degree of factuality in this list. The references to the authorship of the famous prediluvian sages in the second category who passed down their revealed wisdom is the stuff of legendary invention similar to the presentation of Ea as an author coming from a mythological world view.³⁴ Thus pseudepigraphy and pseudonymity, especially in regard to sages, do occur on occasion in this literature and possibly some texts even carry the names of sages who wrote them. However, the factuality of authors mentioned actually composing preserved texts is rare.

Sapiential texts are found in a variety of genres. They include the Sumerian text, "The Instructions of Shuruppak" (earliest version ca. 2500 BCE), the disputation: "The Babylonian Theodicy" (Cassite period; an acrostic that contains the name of the author: "I, Saggil-kīnam-ubbib, the incantation priest, am adorant of the god and the king"); the psalm/poem: "The Šamaš Hymn" (perhaps Middle Babylonian, this text has an Assurbanipal colophon published in Streck, VAB VI.358; *BWL*, 121–138), and "The Poem of the Righteous Sufferer" (*Ludlul bēl nēmeqi*, Cassite period; written by Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan, who refers to himself in a dream in the

³³ Ibid., 1–14.

³⁴ See idem, "A Catalogue of Texts and Authors" (see n. 11), 59–77.

third person; *BWL*, 20–62).³⁵ In the Sumerian King List, Enmeduranki, a king who reigned “before the Flood,” was said to have received divine secrets before his ascension (thus mantic wisdom) and was described as the recipient of the gift of divination and the tablet of the gods in a text published by Lambert.³⁶ Ahiqar’s sayings are attached to a legend about a famous sage who was said to hail from Assyria, although Aram is the place of origins for both parts of the text, the prose narrative and the instructions (*ANET*³, 427–430; see Tob 1:21–22; 2:10, 11, 19; 14:10).³⁷ A Neo-Babylonian list of Assyrian kings and their chief counselors add the reference to Aba-enlil-dari, wrongly called the *umânnu* of Esarhaddon, who the Aramaeans call Aḥuqar. The legend, which proceeds the sayings, indicates the well known sage served at the courts of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon. The sayings (8th century BCE, written in a general Aramaic script of southern Syria) do not mention Ahiqar, indicating that the tradition of his authorship of the sayings derives only from the later narrative (6th century BCE, imperial Aramaic). Kottsieper contends the narrative consists of two different stories eventually brought together. The court story refers to him as a “wise scribe” who was father and counselor either to all Assyria or to its army, while the original introduction presents him as a counselor of the king. The combined introductions tell of the sage’s betrayal by his nephew, Nadin, who falsely accuses him of participation in a royal assassination plot. Eventually he was restored to the king’s good graces, while the evil nephew received what he deserved.

³⁵ See Foster, “Self-Reference of an Akkadian Poet” (see n. 11), 123–30. He indicates there are four means of self-reference that may be distinguished in this text: “the poet either refers to himself by name or selects words or particles that linguistically refer to the speaker”; ‘distancing’ in which the poet uses “second and third person to refer to the first person speaker”; “the speaker’s choice of verb forms, the temporality or activity of which are intended to point to him”; and “poetic devices invigorated by the author so that they extend and refine his self-reference beyond sing worlds to include whole passages.” A possible fifth means is “the relationship between the form of the text and the author’s self-reference,” in this case the hymn (123).

³⁶ T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian Kinglist* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966). For the full text of Enmeduranki, see W. G. Lambert, “Enmeduranki and Related Matters,” *JCS* 21 (1967): 126–38. For a discussion of mantic sages in Mesopotamia and Israel, see my essay, “The Mantic Sage,” in *The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls towards Understanding Prophecy in the Hebrew Bible* (from the proceedings of the Edinburgh DSS and HB seminar; eds. A. Lange and K. De Troyer; Peeters, forthcoming, 2009).

³⁷ See now the essay by I. Kottsieper, “The Aramaic Tradition: Ahikar,” in *Scribes, Sages, and Seers. The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World* (ed. L. G. Perdue; FRLANT 219; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 109–24.

3. Pseudonymity and Pseudepigraphy in the Old Testament

The identification of authors of some canonical texts of the Old Testament was not perceived to be important, while it is in others. The actual composers, editors, and copyists were usually hidden in the social class of scribes and sages who carried out their work largely under the veil of anonymity. In the Bible, Ben Sira is the first to identify himself as its author (Sir 50:27; cf. the Prologue of his grandson). His is the one book whose authorship can be attested historically.

In Israel and Judah Solomon and David are associated especially with a particular genre or set of genres: apocalyptic, proverbs, lists, songs, and psalms. The prophetic texts include sections that may be considered to be in most cases brief speeches uttered by an historical figure, the additions of later prophetic sayings by unidentified spokesmen, and the insertions of edited materials. The Book of Isaiah for example may include some texts from a figure of this name, as well as oracles and texts by unnamed prophets, including those found in Second- and Trito-Isaiah. In addition, scribes also inserted edited information and viewpoints.

In the Old Testament, more than half of the books lack any mention or attribution of authorship. Spurious attributions include Deuteronomy ascribed to Moses, who by implication became the author of the entire Pentateuch. The discovery of the "Book of the Torah" in 2 Kgs 22–23 is a likely explanation given by the Deuteronomistic History for the origin of the Book of Deuteronomy, thus providing it a secondary form of legitimacy.³⁸

Comparable to the cuneiform colophons are the superscriptions of many of the psalms. David (73), Solomon (2), and Moses (1) are attributed spuriously authorship of various psalms, while Asaph (12), Heman the Ezrahite (1), and Ethan the Ezrahite (1), perhaps singers or choir directors, are also mentioned.³⁹ More than half of the psalms have the *superscription* לְדָוִד ("for/to David"), possibly an attribution of authorship (*lamed auctoris*) or an expression of dedication. Fourteen even have the appearance of biographical allusions.⁴⁰ In 11QPs^a, col. XXVII,2–11 David is presented as the writer of 3600 psalms, 364 songs to sing before the altar, 52 songs for the Sabbath offering, 30 for the offering of the New Moons for the solemn assemblies and the Day of Atonement, 446 he spoke, and 4 for making music over the stricken. Altogether there were 4050 songs associated with David, they were spoken "through prophecy," thus enhancing the authority

³⁸ See, for example, van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (see n. 7), 27–36.

³⁹ Wyrick, *The Ascension of Authorship* (see n. 11), 93–102.

⁴⁰ Davies, "Spurious Attribution in the Hebrew Bible" (see n. 8), 269.

of this already famous ruler. This text mentioning “David’s Compositions” describes his psalm-composing as an act of sapiential/scrival prophecy. In the Septuagint psalms, more biographical psalm headings are provided and some compositions (Pss 145–148) are attributed to Haggai and Zechariah, while Psalm 64 has the names Jeremiah and Ezekiel. In the Tanakh Solomon is represented as the author of Proverbs, Canticles, Qoheleth, and Wisdom. In Proverbs he is mentioned in 1:1, 10:2, 25:1, and in the Song of Songs, Solomon is the author (1:1) and sometimes mentioned in the text. The Prologue in Qoheleth indirectly refers to Solomon (“The words of Qoheleth, the son of David, king in Jerusalem”) and 2:7–9 alludes to him. Daniel, a famous sage of antiquity (Ezek 14:14), is written some time following the victory of the Maccabean revolt (164 BCE) and attributed to this ancient hero of antiquity (Hebrew Daniel = Ezek 14:14, Dan’el in Ugarit). Only chs. 7–12 are attributed specifically to Daniel, thus comprising a pseudonymous text of apocalyptic visions belonging to the Hellenistic era.

Among the prophets nine have superscriptions bearing their dates and names: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Zechariah. Six others have simply a name, although Malachi may be a title (“my messenger”). These are presented as the revealed words of Yahweh to the prophets. Many have been edited by scribes in order to provide information and to insert their own literary, theological, and political agenda. Prophetic books were attributed to prophets by the Chronic writings (2 Chron 26:22, 35:25), while prophecies uttered by unknown prophets were often placed within existing prophetic books (e.g., II and III Isaiah). 2 Chron 35:25 attributes the authorship of Lamentations to Jeremiah.

Thus, in Israel and Judah anonymity is the most common feature of written texts. With the exception of Moses, the mentioned authors of specific texts are Yahweh (through prophecies), kings (David and Solomon), and sages. These factors parallel the common tradition of authorship in the ancient Near East.

3.1 Attribution of Authorship in Early Jewish Tradition

Authorship becomes a common element of Jewish literary culture in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, when anonymity is replaced almost entirely by pseudonymity and pseudepigraphy. Texts bearing the names of well known culture heroes and seers begin to appear. A Talmudic tractate that refers to the authorship (canonical order) of the books of the Old Testament is *Baba Batra* (14b–15a), while other early examples include Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.8), Ben Sirah (Prologue, 44:5, and 44–49), and Philo (*Contempl.* 3.25). The canonical categories of the writers of the (oral) Torah

were followed in succession in Tractate Avot (1.1): “Moses received the law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets; and the prophets committed it to the men of the Great Assembly.” Legends appearing in various early Jewish texts that speak of authorship or preservation of biblical books includes 2 Macc 2:13–15, which narrates that Judas Maccabeus collected the scrolls, lost due to the war, even as Nehemiah had done in the library that included “books about kings and prophets, writings of David and letters of kings about votive offerings.” 4 Ezra 14, following the revolt against Rome, tells of Ezra being instructed to take five men and many tablets and to depart for 40 days. A supernatural drink increases his wisdom and memory, whereupon he dictates to the five scribes the entire contents of 94 books. The 24 books of Scripture are restored along with 70 hidden ones, which are presumably those later known as the Jewish Pseudepigrapha. The Letter of Aristeas also contains the legend of 72 translators from Jerusalem who come to Alexandria by order of King Ptolemy II to translate the Books of Moses into Greek. This gives the LXX, at least the Torah, the authoritative status of the Greek translation.

4. Schools and Rhetoric⁴¹

4.1 Introduction

While authority and legitimacy appeared to be the two primary reasons for the false claims and attributions of authorship, there seems to be another important consideration in Graeco-Roman literature: μίμησις (*imitatio*), an important feature of rhetoric.

4.2 *Paideia*

Greek παιδεία infiltrated Hellenistic and Roman schools of the empires and became the primary means of influencing the cultures of the colonies brought within Alexander’s and the Roman Empires. *Paideia* involves two related features: the process of education that culminates in a young man’s eventually taking his place in society, and the character of the educated

⁴¹ W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989); N. M. Kennel, *The Gymnasium of Virtue* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (ASP 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996); eadem, *Gymnastics of the Mind* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), and D. Kah and P. Scholz, *Das hellenistische Gymnasium* (Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8; Oldenburg: Akademie Verlag, 2004).

person.⁴² In western civilization, the “cultivated mind” was thought to enable a person to become virtuous and civilized. Schools were of three types: the gymnasium, the school of rhetoric, and the tutoring of sophists.

4.3 *Gymnasia*⁴³

During the Hellenistic period, γυμνασία had become both schools of study and physical activity. The three stages in Greek education⁴⁴ included, first of all, teaching young boys the basic skills of reading and writing. Entrance into a secondary school was the next stage. Now students engaged in advanced language study that comprised learning to compose complicated texts and to master grammar. In addition the study of the classics began. The third stage had as its purpose the formation of the ideal person who was learned, physically fit, and virtuous. Graduates were suited for a number of different social and professional roles. Superior students in the gymnasia would often later attend *ephebeia*, which were professional schools for the education of military officers, teachers, and high ranking officials, posts that required specialized education.

The literature⁴⁵ studied in the educational curriculum of both gymnasia and schools of rhetoric, included model speeches that were to be imitated. These came from the poems of Homer, the plays of poets like Euripides, the works of Greek historians, and the declamations of especially famous orators. In addition, there were rhetorical handbooks (τέχναι or τέκναι λόγων or προγυμνάσματα) that provided students different *dicta* for learning to speak, debate, engage in dialogue, and present speeches noted for delivery, elocution, and persuasiveness.⁴⁶

⁴² A. Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1982), 1.

⁴³ R. Doran, “The High Cost of a Good Education,” in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (eds. J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 94–115. Also see M. P. Nilsson, *Die hellenistische Schule* (München: C. H. Beck, 1955); H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956); C. Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'Épèbe Attique dès Origines à 31 avant Jésus Christ* (Paris: Boccard, 1962), and S. G. Miller, ed., *Arete: Ancient Writers, Papyri, and Inscriptions on the History and Ideals of Greek Athletics and Games* (3d ed.; Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2004).

⁴⁴ See R. F. Hock, “Paul and Graeco-Roman Education,” *Paul in the Graeco-Roman World: A Handbook* (ed. J. P. Sampley; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity International, 2003).

⁴⁵ I. Worthington, ed., *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Blackwells Companions to the Ancient World; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), and R. A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* (2d ed.; Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1991).

⁴⁶ See *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (1st century BCE; author unknown) as the earliest complete and detailed treatment of rhetoric.

4.4 *Schools of Rhetoric*⁴⁷

One may trace the origins schools of rhetoric to the Classical Age in Greece. When Hellenization spread into the ancient Near East, due to the conquests of Alexander the Great, these schools began to appear with varied curricula. Unlike attendance in the gymnasia where rhetoric was also an important subject, Greek citizenship was not a requirement for participation in these schools. The best schools were located in cities, especially Rome, Athens, Antioch, Pergamum, or Alexandria, and thus required a lengthy residence.⁴⁸ Handbooks (ἐξηγητήματα or *colloquia*) were written and shaped to set forth rules for oratory and composition.⁴⁹ Students entered rhetorical schools to study theory, speeches of great orators, the writings of famous authors, and the declamation of their teachers.⁵⁰ One way to study these texts was practice through imitation (μίμησις) of various types of declamation and their composition. Declamation was considered by the teachers in these schools to be the most important art that was to be achieved by the learned man.

4.5 *Jewish Schools in Graeco-Hellenistic Alexandria*

From the third century BCE, Alexandria became the primary center of Hellenistic education until its incorporation in the latter part of the first century BCE into the expanding Roman Empire. Some Jews of privilege who were citizens of the *poleis*, attended Greek gymnasia, at least until the reign of Claudius when the recognition of new citizenship for Jews became unlawful.⁵¹ Attendance in these schools, along with participation in other aspects of Greek and Roman cultural life, including the games⁵² and the theater, opened highly educated Jews, who would have had to hold the status of citizen, to a new world that was not seen as inhibiting the liberal practice of their religion. Many Jewish writings were written in Greek dur-

⁴⁷ G. A. Kennedy, "Historical Survey of Rhetoric," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 B.C. – A.D. 400)* (ed. S. E. Porter; Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2001), 18–9.

⁴⁸ T. Habinek, *Ancient Rhetoric and Oratory* (Blackwell Introductions to the Classical World; Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 60.

⁴⁹ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind* (see n. 41), 15.

⁵⁰ Kennedy, "Historical Survey of Rhetoric" (see n. 47), 18–9.

⁵¹ L. Robert, "Un Corpus des Inscriptions Juives," *REJ* 101 (1937): 73–86.

⁵² H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletics and the Jews* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976). He notes that there is no evidence that even orthodox Jews refused to attend the games, once they presumably were established in Jerusalem in association with Jason's gymnasium. However, this is an argument from silence, since we cannot be certain this school was actually built and used by Jews. And there is no textual basis supporting his argument.

ing the Hellenistic period, and even the Torah was translated. The merging of Jewish religious ideals with the Greek world, including religion, occurred in the writings of many Hellenistic Jews.⁵³

In Philo's essay, *On the Preliminary Studies*, he describes in detail Greek παιδεία and refers to its curriculum of philosophy, grammar, geometry, and music. However, philosophy ranked about all other disciplines, receiving the honorific title of the "lawful wife" (*Prelim. Studies*, 74–76). The other disciplines were her "handmaidens." The areas of philosophy which were studied included ethics and physics (especially cosmology).⁵⁴ Philo also refers to the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία ("rounded education") in *Spec.* 2,230, *Prov.* 2,44–46, and *Congr.* 74–76, which included education of the elite Jewish students in both the humanities and the sciences.⁵⁵ Philo also speaks of "Sabbath schools" where the general population was taught a variety of virtues: good sense, temperance, courage, justice, and so on (*Spec.* 2,62). He notes, in addition, that Sabbath schools are in the thousands in every city (*Mos.* 2,216). These were likely attached to synagogues. Indeed, the people devoted their Sabbaths to study to improve their character and to examine their consciences (*Opif.* 128). He notes in *Spec.* 2,63–64 that the faithful on the Sabbath study both duty to God and duty to others. Thus, it may be that the population who was literate studied on the Sabbath, examining ethics in particular.⁵⁶

5. Rhetoric⁵⁷

5.1 Introduction

Rhetoric was a key component of Graeco-Roman education. The teachers of rhetoric were normally sophists, philosophers, and school instructors. The art of rhetoric was a much desired skill in many arenas of life, especially among the wealthy (see the treatise on public speaking by Dio Chrysostom, *Dic. exercit.* [= *Or.* 18]).⁵⁸ The sophists especially placed rhetoric

⁵³ See V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (New York: Athenaeum, 1970), 352.

⁵⁴ Kah and Scholz, *Das hellenistische Gymnasium* (see n. 41).

⁵⁵ J. M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan* (323 BCE – 117 CE) (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 161.

⁵⁶ Josephus claims he studied the major Jewish schools (Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes) and was instructed by the desert hermit, Bannus.

⁵⁷ See Kennedy, "Historical Survey of Rhetoric" (see n. 47), 3–41.

⁵⁸ Important works on rhetoric include D. L. Clark, *Rhetoric in Graeco-Roman Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957); G. A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963), and T. Cole,

at the center of *paideia*. Indeed, it was viewed as the culmination of the *enkyklios paideia*.⁵⁹ Rhetoric became a necessary skill of teachers and philosophers in their arguments about a variety of issues in trying to convince their audiences of the truthfulness of their position.

5.2 *Rhetoric and Mimesis: Imitation of Literary Models*⁶⁰

In Greek gymnasia and schools of rhetoric, one technique of learning declamation is by imitating the style, literary techniques, and treatment of subjects in the great poets, historians, and philosophers. Even more importantly, students were especially encouraged to imitate the literary style of their teachers.⁶¹ These impersonations provided not only proper literary and ethical models, but also the opportunity to develop a figure's arguments presented in his speech. While plagiarism was roundly condemned in Graeco-Roman literature, the imitation of earlier writers was a normal and acceptable practice.⁶²

Exercises of impersonation (μίμησις, ἡθοποιία, and *imitatio*) and praise (ἐγκώμιον) were common, then, in the teaching and learning of rhetoric.⁶³ The first, impersonation, involved the practice of studying and memorizing declamations that prepared students to assume the roles of mythological, heroic, or literary figures. These exercises encouraged students to use their imaginations and skills to develop the arguments of the figures within a new context. The second, ἐγκώμιον, is a panegyric that praises a significant person, thing, or idea (see Aristotle, *Rhet.* 2.20, 1393a23–1394a18).⁶⁴ This was occasionally combined with the historical recounting of the past through the celebration of ancestors, gods, and cities.

The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece (Ancient Society and History; Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991). For rhetoric in the Wisdom of Solomon, see C. Larcher, *Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse* (EBib; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1969), 185–87.

⁵⁹ T. Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 190–239.

⁶⁰ According to *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, imitation is one of three methods, along with theory and practice, which enables the student to acquire the faculties of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. “Imitation stimulates us to attain, in accordance with a studied method, the effectiveness of certain models in speaking.” See *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (eds. D. West and T. Woodman; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 1–16.

⁶¹ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind* (see n. 41), 228.

⁶² This distinction between imitation and plagiarism is seen, for example, in Seneca's statement that Ovid imitates Virgil “not as pilferer but as open appropriator” (*Suas* 3.7).

⁶³ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind* (see n. 41), 228.

⁶⁴ J. H. Freese, *Aristotle: Art of Rhetoric, Vol. XXII* (LCL 193; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926).

Among the great rhetoricians is Isocrates who lived in the first half of the fourth century BCE. His outline of the features (ιδέαι) of rhetoric is found in 13.6–7: proper selection of the elements of rhetoric (invention), joining and ordering together “striking thoughts” (arrangement), and the clothing of these thoughts in elegant phrase (style). What is especially required of the student is the knowledge of different kinds of discourse and an imaginative mind. Rhetoric for him required the ability to expound upon “the principles of the art” of speech. An important method of instruction was the use of his own written declamations and himself as an example that his students are to imitate.⁶⁵

One of the best treatments of Latin rhetoric is provided by Quintilian.⁶⁶ In his discussion, he emphasized *imitatio* as an important way that students learned to read and write, for learning is understood according to a prescribed standard (*Inst.* 10.2). He stresses that the imitation of literary models should lead to literary creativity.⁶⁷ While he stresses the study of the classics, he also speaks of the possibility of even making improvements. Thus, the student is to move beyond imitation to write even more creative literary works. Subsequently, artistry does not simply reside in the past, but is ever open to development in the present and the future. Creativity may be inspired by works that have preceded, but it may move toward greater artistry in new works that possess their own vitality and force. In addition, Quintilian indicates that not one model, but several should be used in a student’s speeches. In his view, imitation accounts for the countless allusions found in literary works.

5.3 Rhetoric and Mimesis: Imitation of Human Models

Related to the common emphasis on the moral character of the rhetorician is the fact that *mimesis* also involves ethics. Democritus, *frg.* 39 (2.155.5), stresses that “one must either be good or imitate a good man” (ἀγαθὸν ἢ εἶναι χρεὼν ἢ μιμεῖσθαι, cf. *frg.* 79 [2.160.5f.]), “it is bad to imitate the wicked and not even to wish to imitate the good” (χαλεπὸν μιμεῖσθαι μὲν τοὺς κακοὺς, μηδὲ ἐθέλειν δὲ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς). For Aristotle in *Ars Poetica*,⁶⁸ *mimesis* is a path to knowledge by which poets come to an under-

⁶⁵ See Isocrates, *Soph.* 16–18. Y. L. Too, *The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates: Text, Power, Pedagogy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

⁶⁶ See G. A. Kennedy, *Quintilian* (TAS 59; New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969), 113.

⁶⁷ Compare Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Imitation*. See M. Heath, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, On Imitation* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1989).

⁶⁸ G. A. Kennedy, *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

standing of the character and emotion of the human model, if they are to produce writing that is worthwhile. Horace wished to be considered among the great lyricists of ancient Greece, but to be so he had to imitate not only their poetry, but also their character. They are the models whose creative minds and moral actions are to be emulated. Thus, the writing of elegant poetry is related to virtuous living. The relation between parents and children (Euripides, *Hel.* 940f.) and between teachers and students (Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.2.3; 6.3) is also expressed in terms of the imitation of character.⁶⁹ In the *Institutio oratoria*, Quintilian rarely makes a concession to expediency, but rather emphasizes the morality of the speaker. The orator must be a good and virtuous man, thus connecting his understanding to the Stoics Cleanthes and Chrysippus who regard rhetoric as “the science of speaking rightly.” Some say that “bad men also can be orators, and others, with whose view I agree, confine this name ... to the good” (*Inst.* 2.15.2).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Greek teacher of rhetoric in the second half of the first century BCE, composed three volumes on imitation. He wrote in his first, partially preserved treatise, *On Imitation*, that μιμησις was the chief rule in the teaching of rhetoric, although it was necessary to choose one’s models (*On Imitation* 5.36.4). In his arguments, he makes an important distinction to keep in mind. Imitation involves the inspection and study of the best models. Emulation (ζήλος), however, is “an activity of the soul moved toward admiration of what seems fine” (*On Imitation* 5.35.6). For Dionysius imitation involves more than a literary process, for it has to do with moving beyond merely mimicking declamations to craft a more creative, literary, and evocative piece. Among the ancient writers whose literary value and virtues are worthy of imitating, he examines historians and their compositions. In writing of Thucydides, he describes the historian’s notable characteristics as “recording the truth,” disallowing “literary license,” and “blamelessly and single-mindedly maintaining the principle of avoiding all malice and flattery.” He goes on to write that these aspects “are admirable and worthy of imitation. [The most important thing of all is never to lie willingly or to defile one’s own conscience]” (*Thuc.* 1.8). Elsewhere, in his *Letter to Gnapus Pompeius*, he writes that the greatest quality of an historian is “the ability ... to examine even the hidden reasons for actions and the motives of their agents, and the feelings in their hearts ..., and to reveal all the mysteries of apparent virtue and undetected vice” (*Pomp.* 6). Finally, Horace portrays the different qualities of Lucilius, which are considered to be taken as exemplary. Indeed these are considered to embody features of Horace’s own life and work (*Ars*

⁶⁹ W. Michaelis, “μιμέομαι κτλ.,” *TDNT* 4:659–70.

1.26.10–12; 3.30.13–14; *ep.* 1.19.32f.; also see Horace’s portrayal of Alcaeus, *Ars* 1.32).⁷⁰

Especially in the Greek literature of early Judaism, emphasis is placed on imitating exemplary men and God: *T. Benj.* 4.1, *T. Jos.* 3.1, and *T. Ab.* 4.3, 4.5. In 4 Macc 9:23 the eldest brother cries out to his brothers “take me as an example” (μιμήσασθέ με, ἀδελφοί), meaning it is better to die a martyr rather than transgress the law (cf. 13:9 and Dan 3:17ff.). In the *Letter of Aristaeas* the good king should imitate God in dealing with his subjects 188, 210, 280, 281. In Philo, *Sacr.* 123 one is to imitate worthy physicians who do what is humanly possible even in hopeless cases or *Mos.* 1,158 where Moses set himself and his life as a model for imitation: παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐθέλουσι μιμεῖσθαι. Children do good, if they imitate their fathers (*Sacr.* 68). In *Migr.* 149 Lot refuses to imitate the better (take Abraham’s advice) in order to become better. The Logos imitated the Father (*Conf.* 63), while men should imitate God: *Decal.* 111; *Leg.* 1,48, *Virt.* 168; *Spec. Laws* 4,73. Josephus writes of the imitation of the good and the wicked and their qualities in *Ant.* 5.98, 8.315, 12.203, and 17.97.

In the New Testament, Heb 11:4ff., 12:1f. point to examples of faith, although not specifically mentioning the duty of imitating them (however, see 12:2f.). For Hebrews it is not human virtue that is mentioned, but rather what is stressed is that the willingness to take up the same way of faith as the saints who have gone before is necessary to attain the promised inheritance. Finally Paul presents himself as a model: 2 Thess 3:7, 9; Phil 3:17; 1 Cor 11:1 = 4:16, and 1 Thess 1:6, while in Eph 5:1 Paul is an imitator of God.

6. The Wisdom of Solomon: Features of Greek Rhetoric

6.1 Introduction

My argument that mimesis is a major factor in the pseudonymity of Wisdom is based in part on the recognition that this writer was well familiar with Graeco-Roman rhetoric. Another factor to consider is the realization that, counting Wisdom, the wisdom corpus has four of its five books written by pseudonymous authors. The composers and editors of four of the five books of the wisdom corpus (Job, Proverbs, Qoheleth, and Wisdom) wished to identify their authors with Solomon (Proverbs, Qoheleth, and Wisdom) and, in one case, a legendary paragon of righteousness, Job (cf. Ezek 14:14). These four books were pseudonymous (Prov 1:1, Qoh 1:1),

⁷⁰ C. W. Macleod, “Horatian Imitatio and Odes 2.5,” in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (see n. 60), 89–102.

although the term Qoheleth, likely a title for “one who assembles” (teacher?), is frequently mentioned in the text itself (1:2; also see 12:9–14). Ben Sirah is the one sapiential composer who historically is known as the real author of his sapiential book (50:27; verified by his grandson in the Prologue).

6.2 Pseudonymity

While the social location of the author is not identified in Wisdom, it is possible he taught in a Jewish school of rhetoric or synagogue school.⁷¹ His command of Hellenistic Greek, especially with a Hebraic tinge (e.g., *parallelismus membrorum* and a variety of Hebraisms), his knowledge of Greek rhetoric, and his awareness of certain philosophical teachings, including in particular those of Stoicism, suggest a well educated rhetor or teacher providing instruction in a Hellenistic Jewish school or to youth of Jewish families of privilege (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 2,62; and *Mos.* 2,16).⁷² The question of where the rhetor who composed Wisdom would have received his education in Hellenistic culture and Jewish religion may be answered by the suggestion that he likely attended both a Greek school of rhetoric and a Jewish “house of study,” which would have been attached to an Alexandrian synagogue.⁷³

While the author of the Wisdom of Solomon pseudonymously identifies himself as King Solomon in 9:8 (cf. 7–9), he does not do so to attempt to deceive his audience. His own name, historical context, and social class are not known. The book is generally attributed to an anonymous Jewish sage, living in Alexandria of Egypt,⁷⁴ who wrote his text in Greek⁷⁵ sometime between the first century BCE and 40 CE, that is, from the end of the Ptolemaic period to the early period of the Roman rule of Egypt.⁷⁶ His

⁷¹ For this date, see M. Kolarcik, *The Book of Wisdom* (NIB 5; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), 438–40.

⁷² See D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (AB 43; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979), 14–63.

⁷³ See J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 150–57. Otherwise, he would at least have listened to lectures by a sophist who instructed him in a variety of subjects, including popular renditions of current philosophies.

⁷⁴ The lengthy narrative on the exodus and the polemic against idolatry and animal worship strongly suggest an Egyptian origin.

⁷⁵ The best critical Greek text is that of J. Ziegler, *Sapientia Salomonis* (Göttingen Septuagint 12/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).

⁷⁶ The earliest references to the Wisdom of Solomon are those of Irenaeus (140–202 CE; *Haer.* 3.4, 7.5), Clement of Alexandria (175–230 CE), and the Muratorian Fragment (180–190 CE) that includes it within the New Testament canon. In addition, the similarities of Wisdom to Philo (20–50 CE) also suggest a common date. Winston points to the

mastery of rhetoric indicates that he merges traditional Jewish salvation history and creation theology with Hellenistic literary forms to create a text that suggests what Solomon in this new historical and social setting would say to his fellow Jews. The historical setting of his speech of exhortation (λόγος προτρεπτικός)⁷⁷ may have been the pogrom of Flaccus in 38 CE, due to the indications of persecution and opposition throughout the writing.⁷⁸ By adopting the name of Solomon, the writer allows the dead king to address an audience of Jews in a new context. Assuming the role of the wise and noble King Solomon, the rhetor gives reign to his imagination in order to encounter the life and thought of one of the most revered figures in Jewish tradition. He even enters into the mind, voice, and life of Solomon at a time when the famous ruler of the hoary past has excelled in his education that has prepared him to rule justly and well (chs. 7–9).

The author, who also served as an apologist of Judaism, drew from Greek philosophy, popularly understood, to compose his text: the Stoic understanding of the Logos and the four cardinal virtues as well as the Platonic teaching of the immortality of the soul and the corruptibility of the flesh that impeded the practice of the moral life. He also admired Greek philosophical religion in rejecting idols, although he chastises philosophers for having failed to recognize the creator in the beauty and order of the world. Thus, in his composition the pseudonymous author suggests an appropriate accommodation to Hellenistic culture, but not complete acculturation.⁷⁹ The use of the name Solomon adds legitimacy to his views.

early first century CE as the period of composition on the basis of the occurrence of numerous Greek words and phrases that do not appear before this period (*The Wisdom of Solomon* [see n. 72], 12–25).

⁷⁷ Winston, *ibid.*, 18–20, and J. M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences* (AnBib 41; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970), 117–18.

⁷⁸ See my essay, “Rhetoric and the Art of Persuasion in the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *The New Testament in its Hellenistic Context* (eds. S. E. Porter and A. W. Pitts; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

⁷⁹ Hengel uses acculturation to explain Hellenization and the Jews, and not syncretism or assimilation (M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* [2d ed.; trans. J. Bowden; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974], 1:114).

7. Rhetoric and the Wisdom of Solomon

7.1 *The Anonymous Author as Rhetor*

As the formulation of rhetoric took on more precise shape, different types of rhetoric were developed: epideictic that shaped the elegant character of the literary artistry, forensic speech delivered in the courtroom, political and deliberative oratory spoken before the assembly and occasionally even larger crowds, and protreptic or persuasive speech articulated by teachers, polemicists, and sophists seeking to prove the authenticity of their teaching, to attract students and other adherents, and to prevail in an argument.

During the Roman period, rhetoric took on a greater emphasis and was highly valued as an art and skill.⁸⁰ Prior to the Caesars and even during their reigns, some rhetoric was used to oppose tyrants especially when the Principate's assumption of autocratic power led to restrictions placed on free and open debate among the Roman elite.⁸¹ This anti-tyrannical rhetoric provided an increase in the social status of plebeians and less powerful patricians. Wisdom's criticism of pagan kings who, unlike the Jewish Solomon, disregarded justice and ruled by means of repressive power (6:1f.) fits well pro-republican criticism of despotic behavior of rulers and prefects of the empire and its kingdoms (e.g., see Cicero). However, the Jewish rhetor's tone, less than reproachful, may be a means of attempting to encourage his community to seek to persuade the prefect and other Roman officials in Alexandria and possibly elsewhere to allow Jews to assume an increased social status that might even lead to the attainment of citizenship and other privileges given to the powerful in the *polis* and the larger empire. This was an important effort undertaken by Philo in leading two Jewish embassies to Rome, first to speak with Caligula and then with Claudius. These efforts led finally to the decision of Claudius that, while the Jews were not allowed to have Alexandrian citizenship, their ancestral religious customs should be permitted as they had been during the reign of Augustus. While the Jews could enjoy the rights not to have their synagogues desecrated and not to be forced to participate in pagan customs

⁸⁰ Tacitus contended that the health of the Roman state was directly related to the wisdom and the persuasive abilities of highly intelligent speakers (*Dial.*). This is not a call to *libertas*, but rather an exhortation to reject the decisions being made by "an ignorant multitude" and to establish a hierarchy of one or more gifted orators who maintain the social structure that culminates in the elitism of the wealthy and highly educated (cf. Habinek, *Ancient Rhetoric and Oratory* [see n. 48], 12–3).

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 11–2. This is especially noticed in the orations of Cicero, a defender of the Republic, who attacked the despotism of some of the Roman elite, including Marc Anthony whom he accused of being despotic and "un-Roman."

that violated their religious sensibilities, they also were not allowed to participate in the *gymnasia*, which was open only to Greek citizens.

Speaking imaginatively as the long dead Solomon (cf. chs. 7–9), the rhetor addresses the “judges of the earth” and kings (1:1, 6:1), likely only a rhetorical device, and yet it was possible for rhetors who represented constituencies to address public assemblies, either gathered for open lectures, or to make a presentation in the prefect’s court.⁸² Pretence as a feature of his oration would have allowed him, as Solomon, to address orally an audience in a Jewish assembly by feigning a public of judges and prefects.

7.2 *Rhetoric and Rhetorical Forms in the Wisdom of Solomon*⁸³

The author of *Wisdom* knows numerous rhetorical features, which he uses throughout his *protreptic*. This is especially clear when he enters into the mind of the young Solomon who aspires to obtain from *Wisdom* eloquence beyond mere ornamentation (8:8c, 12). While the rhetor places emphasis on a popular understanding of classical philosophy and Hebrew texts, he also allows for improvements to the literary artistry of traditional Solomonic texts, something that Hellenistic Greek offered as a possibility. Thus, those who listen to and study his text would be encouraged to move beyond imitation to write even more creative literary works. Artistry does not reside in the past, in this case the presumed writings of a long dead Solomon, but is ever open to development in the present and the future.

Examples of his ability to compose clearly, to proceed logically, to make transitions smoothly from one topic to the next, to return to his main subject after a series of digressions, to provide appropriate answers to his questions, to balance gracefully words and phrases, and to make use of engaging images are found in such texts as 4:3–5; 5:9–12, 13; 7:9–10, and 17:18–19.⁸⁴

Perhaps the most noticeable feature of the Greek literary influence on the book is its overarching structure that combines *πρωτρεπτικός* (“hortatory”), *ἐπιδεικτικός* (“declamation, exhibition, display”), and *ἐγκώμιον* (“praise, eulogy, panegyric”).⁸⁵ The term *πανηγυρικός* (“for an

⁸² See J. G. Gammie, “The Sage in Hellenistic Royal Courts,” in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (eds. idem and L. G. Perdue; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 147–53.

⁸³ While the rhetor of *Wisdom* uses numerous Greek forms common especially to rhetorical speeches and texts, he also at times gives his own distinctive meanings to Greek vocabulary words (Larcher, *Études sur Le Livre de la Sagesse* [see n. 58], 182).

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 185–87.

⁸⁵ M. Gilbert, “Wisdom Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple. Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M. E. Stone; CRIBT 2; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 283–324.

assembly”; cf. LXX Ezek 46:11, Hos 2:13, 9:5, Amos 5:21)⁸⁶ refers to a formal oration, verse, or narrative of praise regarding a person, virtue, event, city, state, or deity. Thus the praise is intended to be laudatory and not critical. One occasion of this type of panegyric was the public oration given at the games in Athens in which the assembly of athletes and spectators were exhorted to emulate the examples of their esteemed “ancestors.” While this exact term does not occur in Wisdom, it is suggested in both the behavior of Solomon (chs. 7–9) and the righteous (2:1–3:9). A related expression is ἐγκώμιον (see Aristotle, *Rhet.* 2.20, 1393a23–1394a18).⁸⁷ This was occasionally combined with the historical recounting of the past through the praise of ancestors, gods, and cities. The rhetor of Wisdom engages in the praise of Wisdom (6:12–16, 7:22b–8:1), including her acts of salvation of the ancestors from Adam to Moses (10:1–11:1). When he assumes and plays the role of Solomon (ἡθοποιία), he presents Solomon as engaging in a royal περιαντολογία (self-praise, 7:1–22)⁸⁸ and as offering panegyric praise of and love for Wisdom (8:2–9:18). While self-praise is to be avoided, it is legitimate when uttered by others. It is also acceptable in one’s defense of his good name or when pleading for justice to those who have defamed him. Plutarch justifies legitimate boasting to enhance one’s reputation in order to achieve a greater good.⁸⁹ This would be the case with Solomon who presents himself in the text as the paragon of royal virtue and righteous rule in contrast to that of pagan kings and as a model of virtue for youth in Jewish schools to emulate.

In addition, other common forms and elements of Greek rhetoric present in this book include the δίπτυχος (diptych, “doubled, folding”; e.g., the pairing of the “skilled woodcutter” and the metal worker in gold and silver, both of whom make idols), σύγκρισις (“comparison: a comparison of opposite or contrary things”; see the contrastive pairing of the wicked and the righteous in 2:1–3:19 and the wicked enemies of Israel and the righteous Israelites in 12:19–27),⁹⁰ ἀποστροφή (“when one turns away from all oth-

⁸⁶ See D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, eds., *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981). Menander made frequent use of panegyrics in his treatises.

⁸⁷ See T. R. Lee, *Studies in the Form of Sirach 44–50* (SBLDS 75; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), and B. Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira’s Praise of the Fathers* (CSJH; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985). Cf. Wis 10:1–11:1.

⁸⁸ Plutarch, “On Praising Oneself Inoffensively,” *Mor.* 7; Dio Chrysostom, *Fifty-seventh Discourse* and Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.1.15–28. See H. D. Betz, “De Laude kipsies (*Moralia* 539A–547F),” in *Plutarch’s Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature* (ed. idem; SCHNT 4; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 367–93.

⁸⁹ See D. F. Watson, “Paul and Boasting,” in *Paul in the Graeco-Roman World* (ed. J. P. Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity International, 2003), 77–100.

⁹⁰ The *synkrisis* is a literary technique of contrasts, which in Wisdom places in opposition the features of creation that brought salvation to Israel with those that effect-

ers to address one,” in Wisdom’s case the prayer uttered to God, chs. 16–18), προσωποποιία (“the putting of imaginary speeches into one’s own or another’s mouth,” e.g., the speech of the wicked in 2:1–20),⁹¹ εὐλογία (“praise,” e.g., the praise of wisdom in 7:22–8:1),⁹² συνεκδοχή (“a figure of speech in which a more comprehensive term is used for a less comprehensive one, or vice versa”), and διαίρεσις (“separation”).⁹³ As noted earlier, the literary form of the text is the λόγος προτρεπτικός (“speech of persuasion”)⁹⁴ that seeks to persuade an audience to pursue a particular course of life (e.g., Wis 6:12).⁹⁵

Perhaps the most noticeable feature of the Greek rhetoric on the book is its overarching form that combines προτρεπτικός (“protreptic”), ἐπιδεικτικτός (“declamation, exhibition, display”), and ἐγκώμιον (“praise, eulogy, panegyric”).⁹⁶ While a πανηγυρικός (“panegyric, praise at a festival”) is suggested in Wisdom (e.g., 19:22), the rhetor also makes use of additional types of oratory, including the κατηγορία (“accusation”; cf., e.g., Wis 2:21–24), the ἀπολογία (“apology”; cf. the apology for the conquest of Canaan in Wis 12:3–18, and the punishment of the Egyptians in Wis 11:15–12:2), the ἐγκώμιον (“praise”; cf. Wis 7:22–8:1), and the ἐπιτάφιος (funeral oration; cf. Wis 3:1–9).⁹⁷ The identity of the wicked has been debated, but they are likely prominent Egyptians who had a Greek education, although not in a gymnasium, and appropriated a popularized, vulgar, and not altogether correct understanding of Epicureanism.⁹⁸

ated disaster for the Egyptians (16:1–4, 5–14, 15–29; 17:1–18:4; 18:5–25, and 19:1–12). An earlier one occurs in 11:1–14.

⁹¹ LSJ 1533. See the speech of the wicked in Wis 2.

⁹² See the praise of Wisdom in 7:22b–8:1 and the hymn to the Lord as the cosmic warrior (5:17–23, cf. Isa 59:17).

⁹³ *Diaeresis* is the classification of the world of phenomena according to the dialectical principle of the separation of things that are similar and yet different. The rhetor makes use of this principle in arguing that what punishes one group benefits another (thus the plagues). See Wis 15:18–16:1.

⁹⁴ Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (see n. 72), 18–20.

⁹⁵ T. C. Burgess, *Epideictic Literature* (New York: Garland Publishers, 1987), 229–30, and S. K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Graeco-Roman Antiquity* (LEC 5; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 92.

⁹⁶ Gilbert, “Wisdom Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple* (see n. 85), 283–324.

⁹⁷ The last two mentioned are examples of epideictic oratory.

⁹⁸ Winston provides numerous citations that are similar to the pessimism of the opponents of the teacher (*The Wisdom of Solomon* [see n. 72], 115).

7.3 Solomon as a Model of Virtue

Rejecting the divine kingship of Ptolemaic kings and Roman rulers, the rhetor plays the role of Solomon (προσωποποιία). The ruler cult in Ptolemaic and Roman Alexandria serves as the background of the rhetor's speech and prayer in 7:1–9:18. In contrast to Hellenistic and Roman rulers,⁹⁹ Solomon is a mere mortal who serves as the paragon of the ideal ruler who they should imitate in their governance and behavior: "I also am a mortal (θνητός) like other humans" (7:1a). In 9:5 he confesses that he is but a "man, weak and of short duration." These texts clearly oppose the ruler cult of Ptolemaic and Roman rulers who were believed to be divine immortals, either at birth or in their *apotheosis* at death. By contrast, the human Solomon asserts, "No king has had a different beginning of existence, for there is one entrance into life and one way out" (7:5–6, cf. Philo, *QE* 2,673). His virtue and election became the means by which the legitimation of his reign occurs (9:7). His immortality, like that of the righteous man, derives from the same Wisdom's dwelling within him due to his righteousness.

The rhetor describes Solomon's praise of Wisdom (chs. 7–9) by indicating his preference for her over scepters and thrones, while claiming that her value exceeds that of gold, silver, and gems (cf. 1 Kgs 3:1–15, Prov 3:14f., 8:10f., 16:16). Wisdom is the source of wealth and all good things, grants him friendship with and knowledge of God, enables him to speak correctly and in a refined manner, provides him with unerring knowledge of all things, and teaches him both the virtues of self-control, prudence, justice, and courage, and the knowledge of divine works and commandments. Further, as his teacher and the one who dwells within him, Wisdom grants to him knowledge of the past and foreknowledge of things yet to come. This "artificer" of all things dwells within Solomon's "undefiled body," a view based on the Platonic dualism of body and soul (8:20).¹⁰⁰ Finally, God has chosen Solomon to be king and to judge the people, to build a temple on the holy mountain, and to construct an altar in the city of God's habitation (see Alexander's building of the temple of Isis and Ptolemies' construction of the temples of Serapis and Harpocrates). Thus, the ideal ruler is the one who is dedicated to the worship of God and hon-

⁹⁹ L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Un concurrent du christianisme: le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine* (Bibliothèque de théologie 3/5; Tournai: Desclée & Cie, 1957); A. Wlosok, ed., *Römischer Kaiserkult* (Wege der Forschung 372; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978); S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), and H.-J. Klauck, *The Religious Context of Early Christianity* (Minneapolis/St. Paul: Fortress Press, 2003), 250–330.

¹⁰⁰ Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (see n. 72), 199.

ors his presence and temple through gifts. Finally, God has chosen Solomon (cf. 2 Sam 7 and Ps 89) to be the paragon of human virtue and to engage in righteous rule.

7.4 The Imitation of Solomon's Virtue

The trustworthiness and ethical character of the rhetor is to be revealed through the rhetor's speech, in this case represented pseudonymously as that of Solomon. Through Solomon the rhetor becomes, by means of the awakening of the imagination, both his and his audience, the virtuous model for people to imitate. In Graeco-Roman rhetoric, as noted above, impersonation was an important way to study and learn the literary and virtuous characters of declamations by allowing students to play the roles of mythological, heroic, or literary figures. These exercises encouraged students to use their imaginations and skills to develop the arguments of the figures within a particular context. The rhetor himself assumes the role of Solomon (chs. 7–9), the paragon of wisdom and the builder of the temple in Jewish history, who says his love for wisdom exceeds all else (cf. 1 Kgs 3:1–15), leading him to pray to acquire her. The virtues and benefits which Solomon enjoys are those he shares with the faithful Jews: righteousness (1:1, 15), truth (1:4), justice (3:10–13, 5:18–23), the punishment of the wicked (1:7–11, 11:15–12:2), the goodness and protection of God (1:13–14), the anticipation of divine salvation of those who persevere in righteousness and loyalty to God (4:7–19, 19:22), and immortality (1:15, 3:4, 5:15–23). Thus, the audience who hears this declamation is encouraged also to enter into the mind and life of Solomon to learn the elegance of speech and the virtues of the moral life.

8. Conclusion

8.1 Anonymity, Pseudonymity, and Pseudepigraphy in Early Judaism

Beginning in the Hellenistic period, individual authorship became customary in the Eastern Mediterranean world. Now the individual claimed his/her own recognition, often serving under wealthy people in a patronage system or in teaching in Graeco-Roman schools. At the same time a significant number of pseudepigraphic and pseudonymous writings began to appear during the third century BCE in the West. This tradition had already made its debut for two millennia in the ancient Near East. In Hellenistic Judaism a large number of pseudepigraphic texts were attributed to figures of hoary antiquity, including Enoch, Noah, Moses, Solomon, and Baruch, among others. One corpus of texts in Israel and the ancient Near East in

which anonymity, pseudonymity, and pseudepigraphy played an important role was wisdom. This may have resulted from the fact that scribes were copyists and editors who developed traditions, found especially in colophons, and often attached legends, superscriptions, and epilogues.

8.2 *The Wisdom of Solomon and Rhetoric*

The literary character of this λόγος προτρεπτικός points to an anonymous Jewish writer who was extremely knowledgeable of Graeco-Roman rhetoric and well skilled in its application. This suggests that the author was a rhetor who had studied in a rhetorical school and who undertook to compose a declamation to the Alexandrian Jewish *gerousia*, present in an assembly in a synagogue, or to a group of students. The rhetor merged Greek rhetorical forms and moral philosophy with Jewish traditions of creation and redemptive history, in particular the plagues and the exodus, elements of Philonic mysticism, and Jewish ethics.¹⁰¹ While he considers Judaism superior to the pagan religions of the Hellenists, he still uses Greek rhetoric and moral philosophy to aid in the integration of these two different cultures.¹⁰² The primary intention of the rhetor's use of προτρεπτικός is to exhort Jews to remain steadfast in their loyalty to their traditions, ethnicity, and religious identity, especially under the duress of ridicule and abuse at the hands of their Greek and Egyptian opponents. The occasion for the address suggests it is a time of violence, in which the Jewish *politeuma* is enduring victimization for its religious and cultural difference. This xenophobic harassment that broke into intense oppression may have taken place in pogrom that received the support of the civil authorities. If so, the most likely pogrom would have been the one initiated and pursued by Flaccus in 38 CE. The rhetor's hope for the future is based on his faith in the immortality of the souls of the righteous and the anticipated salvific acts of God (Wis 19:22).

8.3 *Mimesis (μίμησις) as Literary Process and Moral Virtue*

Imitation is an important feature of Greek and Latin rhetoric, mentioned often by Greek and Latin teachers of rhetoric. Wisdom's author is well versed in the elegance and techniques of imitation and provides his audience with a text for emulation in the enhancement of their own rhetorical skills and creative, literary writing and speaking. This text would have served well the students and social roles of Jews (teachers, jurists, politi-

¹⁰¹ Idem, "The Sage as Mystic in the Wisdom of Solomon" in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (see n. 82), 383–97.

¹⁰² For example, see J. M. Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995), 67.

cians, members of the *gerousia*, and so on) who were engaged in improving their own artistic skills and rhetorical knowledge. In addition, the topic of the moral character of the rhetor was a common one in Graeco-Roman teachings on rhetoric. This combined with the use of *mimesis* in which the audience was to emulate the ethical qualities of the speaker/writer as revealed in the text. Selecting the wise Solomon of Jewish tradition as his pseudonym, the rhetor entered into the mind and life of this legendary figure of the past in order to set forth teachings in moral philosophy that should address the contemporary audience in Alexandria. These included the preference for wisdom over wealth, health, beauty, insight, the rejection of guile and resentment, worthy thoughts, knowledge and skill in crafts, love of righteousness, self-control, prudence, justice, and courage. Because of Solomon's receiving of wisdom, he shall have honor, glory, admiration, keen judgment, and wise, just, and courageous rule. Those who heard, read, and studied this text had as their model of virtue the legendary Solomon now, at least in the imagination, addressing them.

While there may be a variety of explanations for the rhetor's selection of the pseudonym of Solomon, *mimesis* is perhaps the best explanation for its occurrence in this text, not deception, the desire for wealth, placement in a school tradition, and claims of authority. Thus, the audience is to emulate the literary quality and the moral virtues of this protreptic, which is attributed by the rhetor to Solomon. This case is not an example of deceit. Rather, entering the mind and thought of the famous, wise king of the past was a literary model for people to imitate. No one would have thought Solomon was actually speaking the words in this text.

Pseudepigraphy and the Periodization of History in Jewish Apocalypses

by

KARINA MARTIN HOGAN

1. Introduction

The discussion of pseudepigraphy in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, and in particular in apocalyptic literature, has very different contours from the debate on New Testament pseudepigraphy. In large part this is because, with the exception of Daniel, the Jewish apocalypses are not canonical, so a major component of the New Testament debate (the tension between pseudonymity and canonicity) is missing from the discussion. The lower stakes may account for the relative lack of interest in the ethical dimension of apocalyptic pseudepigraphy, or at least less direct engagement with the question of whether or not the apocalypses are “forgeries” intended to deceive their audiences.¹ Thus, most recent scholarship on Jewish apocalyptic literature accepts pseudepigraphy as an “authority-conferring strategy,” which may have deceived some members of its original audience, but which is so nearly ubiquitous in the apocalyptic literature that it must have been recognized as conventional within the circles that produced it.²

¹ Examples of this concern in the New Testament debate include K. D. Clarke, “The Problem of Pseudonymity in Biblical Literature and its Implications for Canon Formation,” in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L. Martin McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 440–68; E. Verhoef, “Pseudepigraphy and Canon,” *BN* 106 (2001): 90–8; D. G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987); B. M. Metzger, “Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha,” *JBL* 91 (1972): 3–24. Lewis Donelson’s brief but instructive summary of the “current discussion on pseudepigraphy” suggests that much of it has been pure speculation; his own work focuses on the literary techniques of pseudepigraphy. See L. R. Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* (HUT 22; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 9–23.

² See, most recently, M. E. Stone, “Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered,” *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 9 (2006): 1–15 (9–12). This is essentially the conclusion about pseudepigraphy reached by John J. Collins in his dissertation, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book*

On the other hand, some influential scholars have argued that the pseud-epigraphy of the Jewish apocalypses is essentially different, specifically with respect to psychological motivation, from that of early Christian and other pseudepigraphic writings. W. Speyer classified a number of Jewish apocalypses as “echte religiöse Pseudepigraphie,” meaning that the actual authors experienced a type of inspiration that caused them to identify fully with figures from the past.³ D. S. Russell similarly posited a psychological process whereby the apocalypticists identified with their pseudonyms, claiming that it involved three Hebraic tendencies that are alien to modern thought: “the idea of corporate personality, the peculiar time-consciousness of the Hebrews and the significance of the proper name in Hebrew thought.”⁴ While these psychological approaches to explaining apocalyptic pseudepigraphy have rightly been called into question by more recent scholars, it is worth considering in what sense the authors of apocalypses did identify with their pseudonyms. Christopher Rowland suggests that

of *Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 73–4, and maintained in his more recent works; e.g., idem, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 39–40; idem, “Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. G. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 43–58. The term “authority-conferring strategy” comes from the title of an article on Mosaic pseudepigraphy by H. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: *Jubilees* and its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410; see also eadem, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1–16, 41–69.

³ W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I/2; München: C. H. Beck, 1971), 150–60; idem, “Echte religiöse Pseudepigraphie,” in *Pseudepigrapha I: Pseudopythagorica – Lettres de Platon – Littérature pseudépigraphe juive* (K. von Fritz, ed., Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique 18; Vandœuvres-Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1972), 333–66; idem, “Religiöse Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung,” in *Pseud-epigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike* (ed. N. Brox; Wege der Forschung 484; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977), 195–263.

⁴ D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 BC – AD 100* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 132–39. The psychological notion of “corporate personality,” developed by H. W. Robinson in *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964) has been refuted by, among others, J. W. Rogerson, “The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Re-examination,” *JTS* 21 (1970): 1–16. Similarly, the notion of “contemporaneity” developed by T. Boman in *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (London: SCM, 1960), on which Russell depends, had already been called into question by James Barr in *Biblical Words for Time* (London: SCM, 1962). The third idea that Russell proposes, that by appropriating the name of someone from the past, an apocalypticist saw himself as an “extension” of that person, is purely speculative. See Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon* (see n. 1), 6–7.

apocalyptic seers experienced their visions in the context of reflection on Scripture.⁵ Presumably, they chose the pseudonyms they did because they perceived a significant similarity between their own historical situations and experiences, and those of particular biblical figures.⁶

Von Rad long ago pointed out that apocalypses tend to be attributed to wise men or scribes (e.g., Enoch, Daniel, Ezra, Baruch) and suggested that this indicates that the apocalyptic literature has its origins in wisdom circles.⁷ While virtually no scholar accepts von Rad's thesis in its original form, it gave rise to an ongoing debate about the relationship of wisdom and apocalyptic literature.⁸ That debate has tended to focus on the social context and function of Jewish apocalyptic literature in recent years,⁹ while in the same period comparatively little attention has been paid to apocalyptic historiography.¹⁰ Significantly, the question of the historical con-

⁵ C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 214–40.

⁶ While acknowledging that in many cases pseudepigraphy was a deliberate strategy to gain authority for visions, Rowland suggests that “a case can be made for some visions at least being linked with a pseudonymous author precisely because the character of the experience itself drove the visionary to the conclusion that narrating in the name of some other person was the only way in which he could do justice to the nature of the experience” (Rowland, *ibid.*, 245). Cf. Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision* (see n. 2), 72.

⁷ G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; 2 vols.; New York: Harper & Row, 1962–1965), 2:301–15. He was arguing against the prevailing view at the time, that apocalyptic literature was a development of prophecy. Besides the identity of the pseudonymous authors as wise men or scribes rather than prophets, his main argument was that the deterministic and universal view of history in the apocalypses has more in common with the wisdom literature than with the prophetic understanding of salvation history. Von Rad expanded his treatment of the problem in the fourth edition of his *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (München: Kaiser, 1965), 2:316–38, and argued further that the apocalyptic view of “the divine determination of times” is shared by the wisdom literature, in *Wisdom in Israel* (trans. J. D. Martin; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1978), 263–83.

⁸ A classic articulation of the problem is J. J. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalyptic and Generic Compatibility,” in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (eds. L. Perdue et al.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 165–85. The most up-to-date review of the debate is in L. DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part II),” *Currents in Biblical Research* 5.3 (2007): 367–432 (374–84).

⁹ See, for example, the essays collected in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (eds. B. G. Wright III and L. M. Wills; SBLSym 35; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005). For a review of recent scholarship on this topic, see L. DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I),” *Currents in Biblical Research* 5.2 (2007): 235–86 (250–65).

¹⁰ See DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part II)” (see n. 8), 384–90. He defines “apocalyptic historiography” as “the intellectual construct characteristic to historical apocalypica [sic] by which data about the past, present and future

sciousness of the Jewish apocalypticists has not been considered in relation to the problem of pseudonymity.¹¹ Rather than attempting a full discussion of apocalyptic historiography and its relationship to pseudepigraphy, this essay examines the relationship between the periodization of history in several Jewish historical apocalypses and the particular figures who were chosen to be the pseudonymous authors of those apocalypses. It argues that the scribal identity, or at least scribal activity, of these pseudonymous authors is intimately related to their historical location and their role of providing continuity and transmitting traditions between historical periods that were perceived to be discontinuous.

2. The Periodization of History in Jewish Historical Apocalypses

The periodization of history is by no means an innovation of apocalyptic literature; the biblical historians used periodization to make sense of the past (and in fact it is hard to imagine writing a history without some form of periodization).¹² The most obvious difference between biblical and apocalyptic historiography is that in the apocalyptic literature, history is presented (at least partly) prospectively, in the form of *ex eventu* prophecy. Another common element that sets the historical apocalypses apart from most biblical historiography is determinism: the belief that the course of human history, and especially the time of the end, has been set from the beginning. In a deterministic historiography, individual human figures are not so much agents whose actions influence events, as symbols that define

are selected and arranged" ("History and Apocalyptic Eschatology: A Reply to J. Y. Jindo," *VT* 56 [2006]: 413–18 [414]).

¹¹ A recent treatment of the historical consciousness of Jewish apocalyptic writers is G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "History-Writing in, and on the Basis of, Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," in *Historical Knowledge in Biblical Antiquity* (eds. J. Neusner, B. D. Chilton and W. S. Green; Blandford Forum: Deo Publishing, 2007), 79–104. Although he raises the issue of pseudepigraphy at the outset (80), Nickelsburg does not address the question I am asking: how is the choice of apocalyptic pseudonyms influenced by the apocalypticists' view of history?

¹² The periodization employed by the biblical historians is sometimes at odds with that used by modern historians of ancient Israel, however. See S. Japhet, "Periodization Between History and Ideology: The Neo-Babylonian Period in Biblical Historiography," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (eds. O. Lipschitz and J. Blenkinsopp; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 75–89; eadem, "Periodization Between History and Ideology II: Chronology and Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (eds. O. Lipschitz and M. Oeming; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 491–508.

the period in which they live, often by opposition to it. The particular figures with which this essay is concerned—Enoch (and Noah), Moses, Baruch, Daniel and Ezra—are exceptions to this rule, in that they bridge historical periods that are presented as discontinuous, or even opposite to one another. Before examining the various ways in which these figures fulfill a “bridging” function, it will be necessary to describe the way in which the Jewish apocalypses that are attributed to them periodize history. For this purpose, I will treat the selected apocalyptic reviews of history in the probable order of their composition: The Animal Vision and Apocalypse of Weeks in *1 Enoch*, Dan 7–12, the *Testament of Moses*, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*.

2.1 *The Animal Vision and the Apocalypse of Weeks*

1 Enoch contains two historical apocalypses, both reviews of history from creation to the eschaton. In the first, the Animal Vision (*1 En.* 85–90), the periodization of history is not explicit but can be inferred from repeated patterns and motifs. This allegory of biblical history can be divided into three eras: (1) from Adam and Eve to the Flood (85.3–89.8); (2) from the renewal of creation to the final judgment (89.9–90.27); and (3) a second renewal of creation and return to the primordial state (90.28–38).¹³ The long middle era can be subdivided into three periods on the basis of three acts of divine judgment that recall the Flood, the paradigmatic act of divine judgment: the Exodus, the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem, and the eschatological judgment. The Flood is presented as the result of the sins of the Watchers, represented as stars that fall from heaven (86.1; 88.1, 3).¹⁴ The human beings and giants who perish in the flood are represented by different types of animals, while Noah is a white bull who became a man, and his three sons are bulls of different colors (89.1, 9).

Besides Noah and his sons, the first period of the post-Flood era highlights two more white bulls (Abraham and Isaac, 89.10–11), a white ram who begets twelve sheep (Jacob, 89.12), and then two more sheep (Moses and Aaron, 89.16–18). It ends with an act of divine judgment upon Israel’s first Gentile enemy, the Egyptians (represented by wolves), which is described in terms reminiscent of the Flood: “And the water swelled up and rose until it covered those wolves” (89.26).¹⁵ Moses, who carries over from the first period to the second just as Noah carried over from the first era to

¹³ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36, 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 354–55.

¹⁴ Nickelsburg points out that for the author of the Animal Vision, *1 En.* 6–11 represents “the definitive way to read Genesis 6–8” (ibid., 359).

¹⁵ Nickelsburg’s translation ibid., 366; cf. his comment, ibid., 379.

the second, is also said, like Noah, to become a man, when he constructs the Tabernacle (89.36).¹⁶ In the second period (89.28–58), the sheep (Israelites) and rams (their kings) alternately prevail over and are oppressed by various kinds of wild animals (Gentiles), until in a third act of divine judgment, this time upon Israel, the “Lord of the sheep” abandons them into the hands of the wild beasts (89.55–58). In the third period (89.59–90.27), which lasts until the final judgment, the focus shifts from individual Israelite heroes, represented by animals, to the rule of seventy angelic “shepherds” to whom the “Lord of the sheep” hands over his flock.¹⁷ The sub-division of this period into four periods of 12, 23, 23, and 12 shepherds, respectively, may be influenced by a four kingdoms schema like that found in Dan 2 and 7, and the number 70 recalls the “seventy weeks of years” in Dan 9 (see below), but it is likely the case that the Animal Vision and Dan 7–12 drew on common traditions, rather than one directly influencing the other.¹⁸

Each of the previous three judgments (the Flood, the Exodus and the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem) can be seen as a precursor to the final judgment, which comes at the end of the period of the angelic “shepherds.” At that time, the fallen stars, the seventy shepherds and the blinded sheep will be judged and burned (90.20–27). The era that follows the final judgment (90.28–38) represents a gradual return to the pristine state before the fall of the Watchers and the Flood, in that initially the other animals are merely subservient to the sheep, but after the advent of a white bull (a messianic figure), the sheep and all other species are transformed into cattle.

The Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 En.* 93.1–10 + 91.11–17), which is embedded in the Epistle of Enoch (*1 En.* 92–105), is much briefer than the

¹⁶ Some commentators have explained “becoming a man” as necessary to the activity of building, which is ascribed to Noah and Moses, but since the author of the Animal Vision is not otherwise very concerned with realism, it is more likely that it represents elevation to an “angel-like status,” as Nickelsburg tentatively suggests (*ibid.*, 375, 381).

¹⁷ According to Nickelsburg, the author of the vision transforms the prophetic symbol of negligent shepherds, normally applied to human rulers (cf. especially Ezek 34 and Zech 11), by combining it with the notion of heavenly rulers of the nations (Deut 32:8 LXX, *Jub.* 15.32, Ps 82). See *ibid.*, 391.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 391–93. The first period of 12 shepherds, which may begin during Manasseh’s reign, includes the Babylonian destruction of the Temple and the Exile; the second period of 23 shepherds must represent the Persian period; the third period of 23 shepherds covers the Hellenistic period from Alexander into the second century; and the final period, the years leading up to the eschaton, including (in the present form of the Animal Vision, at least) the Maccabean revolt.

Animal Vision but it shares a similar view of history.¹⁹ The periods are more clearly delineated: there are seven “weeks” until the beginning of the eschaton and then three “weeks” of eschatological events. The first week is a time of righteousness, ending in the days of Enoch (93.3). The Flood, called “the first end,” falls in the second week, which ends with the covenant with Noah, called “a law ... for sinners” (93.4). The election of Abraham marks the conclusion of the third week (93.5), and the Sinai covenant (and building of the Tabernacle) falls at the end of the fourth week (93.6). The building of the Temple comes at the end of the fifth week (93.7), and its destruction at the end of the sixth week (93.8). The seventh week is characterized by perversity, but at its conclusion, “the chosen will be chosen” (93.10), and they will be given wisdom, and a role in executing judgment on the wicked, in the eighth week (91.11–12). The Temple will be restored at the conclusion of the eighth week (91.13), righteousness will spread over the whole earth in the ninth (91.14), and “everlasting judgment” will be executed upon the Watchers in tenth (91.15). After that, “a new heaven will appear” (91.16)—to complement the newly righteous earth—and “there will be weeks without number forever” of piety and righteousness (91.17).²⁰

While none of the biblical heroes is mentioned by name in either the Animal Vision or the Apocalypse of Weeks, there can be little doubt about their identification, based on their descriptions and the order in which they appear. Whereas the emphasis is on the biblical heroes themselves in much of the Animal Vision, in the Apocalypse of Weeks it is more on the events associated with them, which fall at the conclusions of “weeks.” The following events and characters are emphasized in both Enochic reviews of history: Enoch and the fall of the Watchers; the Flood and covenant with Noah; Moses, the Sinai covenant and building of the Tabernacle; the building of Solomon’s Temple; the ascension of Elijah; and the destruction of the Temple and Babylonian Exile. Both take a dim view of the entire Second Temple period and deny the legitimacy of the Second Temple itself, and both envision a long eschatological period, with the redemption of Israel, and subsequently of the whole world, happening in stages.

2.2 *Daniel 7–12*

In contrast to the universal scope (creation to eschaton) of the two historical apocalypses in *1 Enoch*, the periodization of history in Dan 7–12 spans

¹⁹ Nickelsburg (“History-Writing” [see n. 11], 83) says it is “either a prototype for the Animal Vision or a stylized summary of it.”

²⁰ See Nickelsburg’s commentary on the Apocalypse of Weeks in *1 Enoch 1* (see n. 13), 438–50.

only the period between the pseudepigraphical setting (the Babylonian Exile) and the actual time of the author. Two systems of periodization coexist in Dan 7–12. The four kingdoms schema in ch. 7 (which is introduced in ch. 2) is world-historical in outlook,²¹ while the “seventy weeks of years” introduced in ch. 9 represent the duration of Jerusalem’s desolation, from its destruction by the Babylonians through its desecration by Antiochus IV Epiphanes.²² The chronological framework of the book of Daniel as a whole is based on the four kingdoms schema, assuming the sequence Babylonians, Medes, Persians and Greeks (i.e., the Hellenistic kingdoms of the Ptolemies and Seleucids), and is therefore impossible to reconcile with actual historical events and persons. The main inaccuracies are making Belshazzar the son of Nebuchadnezzar (5:2; he was the son of King Nabonidus, who was unrelated to Nebuchadnezzar, and was a regent for his father, never a king) and inventing a king “Darius the Mede” (6:1) who took over the kingdom of Babylon after the death of Belshazzar.²³ The apocalypse in Dan 7–12 fits within the chronological framework established by the tales in chs. 1–6, setting the first two visions (chs. 7 and 8) in the reign of Belshazzar, ch. 9 in the reign of Darius the Mede, and the long final revelation (chs. 10–12) in the third year of King Cyrus the Persian (10:1, cf. 6:29).

The first three kingdoms are passed over lightly in chs. 7, 8 and 11. Although ch. 11 goes into some detail on earlier events in the Hellenistic period, the focus is on the demise of the fourth (Hellenistic) kingdom. Likewise, only the final week of the seventy is described in any detail, in Dan 9:26–27. Both historical schemata presuppose an eschatological reversal, and in fact the historical focus throughout chs. 7–12 is on the events leading up to that expected reversal; namely, the crisis under Antiochus Epiphanes, culminating in the desecration of the Temple. The duration of the period from the desecration to the end is described in several different ways in these chapters: “a time, times and half a time” (7:25, 12:7); “twenty-three hundred evenings and mornings” (8:14); “half a week [of years]”

²¹ On the historical background of the four kingdoms schema found in Dan 2 and 7, see Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (see n. 2), 92–8; idem, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 166–70. See also A. Momigliano, “The Origins of Universal History,” in *The Poet and the Historian: Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism* (ed. R. E. Friedman; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), 133–55 (144–48).

²² That is, it covers the same period from the point of view of Jerusalem. In contrast to the seventy shepherds of the Animal Vision, the seventy weeks of years are not subdivided into four periods, but rather into three very uneven periods of 7 weeks, 62 weeks and 1 week (Dan 11:25–27). Thus the author of Dan 7–12 clearly has not made any attempt to harmonize the two systems of periodization.

²³ See Collins, *Daniel* (see n. 21), 29–33.

(9:27), “one thousand two hundred and ninety days” (12:11), revised to “one thousand three hundred and thirty-five days.”²⁴ This redundancy reveals a strong sense of determinism about the current crisis, or one might say a conviction that the turning point of history is at hand.

Despite the relative lack of interest in the first three kingdoms *per se* in Dan 7–12, Daniel’s periodization of history according to four kingdoms was extremely influential on later Judaism. The fourth kingdom was naturally identified as Rome during the Roman period; this reinterpretation of the four kingdoms schema (and of the fourth beast in Dan 7) can be seen in later apocalypses (4 *Ezra* 12.11, Rev 13:1–8, cf. 2 *Bar.* 39.5–8), in Josephus (*Ant.* 10.276), and frequently in rabbinic literature.²⁵

2.3 *The Testament of Moses*

Although the *Testament of Moses* (also known as the *Assumption of Moses*) is not technically an apocalypse because it is a revelation to Joshua by Moses, not by an otherworldly being, it mainly consists of an *ex eventu* prophecy of the history of Israel from the time of Joshua through the end times, with apocalyptic eschatology.²⁶ Its historical review does not go back to the beginning of human history, partly because of its pseudepigraphic setting and testamentary form, but also because its focus is more narrowly on Israel than is the case in *1 Enoch*. In fact, this book contains the earliest attestation of the idea that the world was created for the sake of Israel (1.12).²⁷

²⁴ See *ibid.*, 322, 400–1.

²⁵ On the reinterpretation of Daniel in later apocalypses, see G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984); on Josephus’ “Daniel segment,” see G. Vermès, “Josephus’ Treatment of the Book of Daniel,” *JJS* 42 (1991): 149–66; on the use of the four kingdoms schema and the identification of the fourth kingdom with Rome in rabbinic midrash, see J. Neusner, *Judaism and its Social Metaphors: Israel in the History of Jewish Thought* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1989), 153–63, 169–70.

²⁶ Nickelsburg includes the *Testament of Moses* in “History-Writing” (see n. 11). Its final form can be dated with some certainty between 4 BCE and 30 CE, but Nickelsburg believes it is a reworking of a document written just prior to the Maccabean Revolt, so slightly earlier than the Animal Vision of *1 Enoch* and Dan 7–12 (*ibid.*, 84). On the apocalyptic features of the *T. Mos.*, see Nickelsburg’s introduction to *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers* (ed. *idem*; SBLSCS 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 11–4. Collins (*Apocalyptic Imagination* [see n. 2], 132) notes, however, that the *T. Mos.* is less deterministic than most apocalypses, in that the course of history can be influenced by human intercession (in chs. 4 and 9).

²⁷ J. J. Collins, “The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses,” in *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (see n. 26), 15–32 (27).

The periodization of history in the *T. Mos.* follows the Deuteronomic schema of sin-punishment-repentance-salvation, in two cycles.²⁸ In the first cycle, the main example of sin is the division between Israel and Judah, which is presented, in typical Deuteronomic fashion, as apostasy from the Temple on the part of the ten northern tribes (ch. 2).²⁹ The first punishment is the destruction of Jerusalem and the Babylonian Exile; in exile, significantly, the twelve tribes of Israel reunite in mourning and repentance (ch. 3). An intercessor arises, who is identified only as “one who is over them,” and in answer to his prayer the two (southern) tribes are returned to their land (ch. 4).³⁰ The sin in the second cycle is once again division within the chosen people, this time “as to the truth” (5.2)—evidently concerning the Second Temple (5.3–6). The remainder of the second cycle is somewhat garbled because ch. 6, which alludes to events in the time of King Herod and his sons, is probably a later addition to a historical review that originally culminated with the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes (described in ch. 8).³¹ The eschatological redemption of Israel is apparently brought about by the intercession of one Taxo, who advocates martyrdom and leaving vengeance to God (9.6–7).³² Whether the original composition

²⁸ Nickelsburg, “History-Writing” (see n. 11), 88.

²⁹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (see n. 2), 130.

³⁰ Translation by J. Priest in *OTP* 1:929. The identity of this intercessor has been the source of much speculation. R. H. Charles identifies him as Daniel on the basis of a general similarity between his prayer and that in Dan 9 (*The Assumption of Moses* [London: Black, 1897], 14). Goldstein thinks it is more likely to be Isaiah than Daniel if it is a human intercessor, but he thinks it is most probably an angel, assuming that the title “one who is over them” is taken from Job 33:23. See J. Goldstein, “The Testament of Moses: Its Content, its Origin and its Attestation in Josephus,” in *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (see n. 26), 51. Tromp identifies him as Ezra, on the grounds that Ezra is a fitting counterpart to Moses. See J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 174–76. None of these identifications takes into account that the real counterpart of this figure in the *T. Mos.* itself is Taxo, who is otherwise unknown. Therefore the identity of the intercessor in ch. 4 may not matter; what matters is his function.

³¹ This theory of the book’s redaction history was first suggested by Jacob Licht in “Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance,” *JJS* 12 (1961): 95–103, and developed by Nickelsburg in his dissertation, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), 28–31, 43–5, 97. Collins considers this redaction history probable (*Apocalyptic Imagination* [see n. 2], 129), but Tromp maintains that the book is an original composition of the first century CE (*ibid.* 120–23).

³² Scholars are divided on whether there is a causal relation between Taxo’s (and his sons’) promised martyrdom (9.6–7) and the divine visitation described in the poem in the following chapter. Licht, *ibid.*, first proposed such a causal relation, and he is followed by a number of scholars, including Collins (*ibid.*, 131), and G. W. E. Nickelsburg (*Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*

dates to the second century BCE or the early first century CE, the important point about the periodization of history in the *T. Mos.* is that the author saw his own historical situation as parallel to the Babylonian Exile, and looked for an intercessory figure to bring about the transition from divine punishment to redemption.

2.4 *Fourth Ezra*

Fourth Ezra adopts Daniel's four kingdoms schema and with it, an even more extreme focus on the recent past, in the Vision of the Eagle (chs. 11–12). The vision alludes only obliquely to the first three kingdoms (11.39–40), while the angelic interpreter (Uriel) simply identifies the eagle as the “fourth kingdom that appeared in a vision to your brother Daniel,” and acknowledges that “it was not explained to him as I now explain it to you” (12.11). The vision and interpretation make veiled references to Roman rulers from Caesar (treated here as the first emperor) through Domitian, according to most scholars.³³ It is on the basis of the Vision of the Eagle that the book is commonly dated to the last years of the reign of Domitian, or shortly after his death.³⁴

Although the Vision of the Eagle reveals more about the author's view of the recent past than about his perspective on Israel's history, there are reflections elsewhere in the book of an eschatologically-oriented Deuteronomistic periodization of history similar to that of the *T. Mos.* and *2 Baruch* (see below). First, the setting of the book thirty years after the destruction of Zion by Babylon (3.1) implies that the Babylonian conquest is the paradigmatic event, and Israel's current crisis is merely a recapitulation of it, as is also the case in *2 Baruch* and the *T. Mos.* Ezra's opening monologue in ch. 3 contains a brief summary of Israel's history, although it functions differently from the other examples considered here in that it does not extend beyond the fictive date of the book and serves as an argument or

[2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005], 76, 247). J. Priest disagrees; see his introduction to the *T. Mos.* in *OTP* 1:923.

³³ See, for example, M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 363–65; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (rev. and ed. G. Vermès, F. Millar and M. Goodman; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 3/1:298–300; R. J. Coggins and M. Knibb, *The First and Second Books of Esdras* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 240–44.

³⁴ An alternative view, that the vision and its interpretation were significantly revised around 218 CE, is proposed by L. DiTommaso, “Dating the Eagle Vision of 4 Ezra: A New Look at an Old Theory,” *JSP* 20 (1999): 3–38. For a critique of his proposal and an alternative theory about the “updating” of the vision after the death of Domitian, see K. Martin Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution* (JSJSup 130; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 182–85.

complaint against God. Ezra treats the transgression and punishment of Adam as the paradigmatic event setting the course of human history (it is recapitulated in the Flood, 3.10) and especially Israel's history (just as Adam transgressed the one commandment due to the presence of the "evil heart," Israel has consistently transgressed the Sinai covenant for the same reason [3.20–22], leading ultimately to the fall of Jerusalem to Babylon).³⁵

The final chapter of *4 Ezra* contains a reckoning of the time remaining to the end which divides "the age" into ten or twelve periods (the versions disagree), but without connecting these periods to any historical events (14.11–12).³⁶ And then the final verse of the book, which is missing from the Latin version, records Ezra's translation to heaven "in the seventh year of the sixth week, five thousand years and three months and twelve [or twenty-two] days after creation" (14.49). Even though both of these forms of periodization can be reconciled with a world-age of 6000 years, which is found in some rabbinic sources and is compatible with the idea that the Temple was built in the 3000th year after creation (10.45), they cannot be reconciled with one another.³⁷ Thus it appears that the author of *4 Ezra* was less concerned with calculating the exact amount of time between the pseudepigraphic setting and his own time (in contrast to Dan 7–12) than with understanding the events of his own time as conforming to the pattern of biblical history.

2.5 *Second Baruch*

Like *4 Ezra*, *2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch* is set at the time of the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem, and was written sometime between 70 and 132 CE.³⁸ It contains two symbolic visions, the interpretations of

³⁵ Although Ezra's brief historical review does not make any reference to the divided monarchy or the fall of Samaria (in contrast to *T. Mos.* and *2 Baruch*), the northern tribes are the subject of a long digression (13.39–50) in the sixth episode, which envisions a restoration of the twelve tribes in the messianic age.

³⁶ For the textual variants, see Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (see n. 33), 414, and 421 for a discussion of parallels. The fact that two apocalypses of the same period, *2 Baruch* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, divide history into twelve periods makes that the more likely figure.

³⁷ Stone assumes that a "week" in 14.49 means a millennium (*Fourth Ezra* [see n. 33], 442), so Ezra's translation takes place approximately 1000 years before the end of the age, whereas 14.11–12 places Ezra either 1250 years before the end (if 9 ½ out of 12 periods have passed) or 300 years before (if it is 9 ½ out of 10), assuming a 6000-year world age. For a more detailed treatment of the problem, see Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict* (see n. 34), 209 n. 12.

³⁸ Since there is only one, very obscure piece of internal evidence pointing to a more exact date (*2 Bar.* 28.2), the discussion of the dating of *2 Baruch* has tended to focus on its date relative to *4 Ezra*, with which it clearly has some sort of literary relationship.

which employ two different types of periodization: a brief four kingdoms schema in chs. 39–40, and a much more detailed recounting of biblical history from creation to the eschaton, in chs. 55–74. The reference to four kingdoms comes in the interpretation of the vision of the forest and the vine (2 Bar. 36–37), in which the “tall cedar” of the vision is identified as a “fourth kingdom ... whose power is harsher and more evil than those which were before it.”³⁹ Although there is nothing in either vision or interpretation to identify this kingdom definitively with Rome, it could hardly be identified otherwise, given the generally accepted dating of the book and the fact that the fall of the fourth kingdom coincides with the revelation of the Messiah.

More interesting for present purposes is the interpretation (in 2 Bar. 56–74) of the vision of the clouds in ch. 53; this is a detailed account of human history schematized as twelve alternating periods of dark and bright waters (i.e., periods of wickedness alternating with briefer periods of righteousness), followed by a period of more intense darkness (representing the author’s own time) and a final bright period (representing the messianic age). Unlike the Animal Vision and the Apocalypse of Weeks in 1 Enoch, this retelling of biblical history includes the names of individuals and unambiguously identifies the key events that mark the beginnings and ends of periods. The following chart outlines the dark and bright periods according to 2 Bar. 56–74:

Dark:	Bright:
1. Sin of Adam through Flood (56.5–16)	2. Abraham, his son and grandson (57)
3. Wickedness of the land of Egypt (58)	4. Moses and his generation (59)
5. Days of the Judges (60)	6. David, Solomon, building of Zion (61)
7. Jeroboam through fall of Samaria (62)	8. Hezekiah and deliverance of Zion (63)
9. Days of Manasseh (64–65)	10. Josiah’s reform (66)
11. Fall of Zion to Babylon (67)	12. Restoration of Zion, Second Temple (68)
[13]. Eschatological woes (70–71)	[14]. Messianic age (72–74)

The emphasis on Zion in this review of history is notable, but not surprising, given that the destruction of Jerusalem is a central theme of this apocalypse. The evaluation of periods and figures is entirely consistent with the Deuteronomistic history, but as in the other historical apocalypses, the whole pattern of biblical history was pre-determined from the beginning, according to ch. 69. There is something of a gap, however, between the

Although there are good arguments on both sides of this question, the balance of the evidence points to 2 Baruch’s dependence on 4 Ezra. See Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature* (see n. 32), 283–85. For a summary of the possible interpretations of 28.2 and their implications for the dating of the book, see M. F. Whitters, *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message* (JSPSup 42; Sheffield: Academic Press, 2003), 149–55.

³⁹ Translation by A. F. J. Klijn in *OTP* 1:633.

restoration of the Temple and the beginning of the eschatological events, which are described in extremely general, conventional terms in ch. 70. The entire Second Temple period is summed up in one sentence: “But it will happen after these things [i.e., after the restoration of the Temple cult] that there will be a fall of many nations” (68.7). Perhaps the author felt no need to go over that period again, since it is covered by the four kingdoms schema in ch. 39. But that does not explain why neither vision contains any specific reference to events in the author’s own time, which presumably corresponds to the period of the eschatological woes. The contrast with Daniel and 4 *Ezra* is striking: there is none of the *ex eventu* prophecy of events in the author’s present to make more credible the predictions of an eschatological reversal. The author clearly looks forward to the messianic age as the end of Israel’s suffering (chs. 40 and 72–74), but it does not appear to be the purpose of either vision to suggest that the advent of the Messiah is imminent.

3. The Pseudonymous Authors as Bridge Figures

The reviews of history in the apocalyptic texts considered here, to the extent that they encompass the whole of biblical history, consistently identify three moments as watershed events or breaking-points in the historical narrative: the Flood, the Exodus, and the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and subsequent Exile. Since these apocalyptic works tend to view the present situation in which they were written as another breaking-point, parallel to one or all of those events of the past, those events could be described as paradigmatic, in the sense that they provide a model for understanding the present. Deutero-Isaiah may have been the first author to present the Flood (or its aftermath; 54:9) and the Exodus (e.g., 43:16–21) as paradigmatic events, analogous to the present situation—in his case the end of the Babylonian exile. The authors of the apocalypses under consideration are able to use the Babylonian Exile and Return, which is analogous to the Flood in its destructive aspect and to the Exodus in its redemptive aspect, as a paradigm for the events that they are living through. Hence it is no surprise that these historical apocalypses are set around those three paradigmatic events. What is interesting is the way in which the apocalyptic seers who are their pseudonymous authors function to counteract the tendency to perceive history as broken into discrete periods by these watershed events. Primarily through scribal activity, and secondarily through oral teaching, they provide continuity of tradition across the perceived breaks between historical periods. In this section, I will look at the pseudonymous authors in the order in which they appear in the biblical narrative.

3.1 Enoch and Noah

The Flood represents the most complete break imaginable between historical periods, from the biblical perspective, according to which Noah and his family are the sole survivors. Yet the pseudepigraphic premise of all of the apocalypses contained in *1 Enoch*, and *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* as well, is that they were written by Enoch before the Flood. The advantages to an apocalyptic author of choosing Enoch as a pseudonym are obvious, since he is able to “predict” all of Israel’s history, but the choice presents one large problem: how to explain the transmission of texts written before the Flood. The Enoch literature is exceptional among the apocalypses considered here in that Noah is the actual bridge-figure, in the sense that he lives on earth both before and after the Flood, but it is Enoch’s apocalyptic writings that he transmits.⁴⁰ Enoch is addressed as “righteous scribe” in the Book of the Watchers (*1 En.* 12.4) and the motif of his scribal activity runs through all of the apocalypses in *1 Enoch* and is also prominent in *2 Enoch*.⁴¹

First Enoch in its final form is quite concerned to establish a relationship between Enoch and his great-grandson, Noah, in order to account for the survival of Enoch’s writings. Noah figures prominently in the Animal Vision: he is one of only two figures transformed from an animal into a man (89.1), the other being Moses (89.36). He is also singled out in the Apocalypse of Weeks (93.4), but in neither of those short apocalypses is the question of textual transmission addressed. There is a segment in the Book of Parables, the latest portion of *1 Enoch*, in which Noah comes to his great-grandfather in distress, and Enoch explains to him what is about to happen to the earth (chs. 65–67), and then gives him the Book of Parables (68.1). A narrative in 81.1–82.4, which is interpolated into the Book of Luminaries (72–82) but which may belong to the same strand of tradition as the Book of the Watchers, records the giving of books written by Enoch to Methuselah, “so that [he] may give (them) to the generations of

⁴⁰ There are some references to a book or books by Noah himself (in *Jubilees* 10.13–14, 21.10, *Genesis Apocryphon* 5.29 and *Aramaic Levi Document* 10.10), but if any book attributed to Noah ever existed, it did not survive. See M. E. Stone, “The Book(s) Attributed to Noah,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 4–23. Stone believes that such a book probably was known to the authors who mention it. For the contrary view, see C. Werman, “Qumran and the Book of Noah,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives* (see n. 2), 171–81.

⁴¹ E.g., *1 En.* 68.1 (Parables), 81.6 (Luminaries), 83.10 (Dream Visions), 92.1, 104.11–12 (Epistle), *2 En.* 23.6, 33.8–9, 35.2, 40.2–13, 47.1–2, 48.6–7, 64.5, 66.8, 68.2. References are to the longer rescension (J) of *2 Enoch*, translated by F. I. Andersen, in *OTP*. On the scribal consciousness of *1 Enoch*, see A. Y. Reed, “Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent and the Transmission of Knowledge in *1 Enoch* 6–16,” in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions* (eds. R. Boustani and eadem; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 47–66 (48–9).

eternity”—presumably by passing it on to Noah.⁴² The theme of the transmission of Enoch’s books down to the end of days is picked up in the conclusion of the Epistle (104.9–105.2), and the presumption that Noah is the means of transmission is confirmed in the appendix on the birth of Noah that immediately follows in chs. 106–7, which affirms the transmission of revelation from Enoch to Noah through Methuselah and Lamech (107.3).⁴³

Similarly, *2 Enoch* ends with a notice of Noah’s survival of the flood (ch. 73), and a good bit of the book (chs. 36–68) is taken up with Enoch’s instruction of his son and grandsons during the thirty days that he is allowed to return to earth after receiving revelations for sixty days in heaven. Moreover, it says that the 366 books that Enoch wrote while in heaven (ch. 23) were handed over to his sons (68.2; cf. 47.2). More explicitly, in ch. 33 God appoints angels to preserve Enoch’s writings and those of his ancestors until the end of the age, when God will raise up a righteous man to reveal those writings (ch. 35).⁴⁴

3.2 *Moses*

The book of *Jubilees* is technically an apocalypse, in that it is a revelation to Moses mediated by an angel, but it is generally considered an example of the “rewritten Bible” genre, since it is a retelling of Gen 1–Exod 12 with a strong halakhic emphasis.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, its pseudepigraphical premise, that Moses received other revelations on Mt. Sinai in addition to the Torah, and wrote them down, is alluded to in *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra* (*2 Bar.* 4.5, 59.3–11, *4 Ezra* 14.5–6). Moses is presented as a paradigmatic apocalyptic seer in those works, in the sense that Baruch and Ezra are modeled on him. Moses is the quintessential bridge figure, in that he lived during the period of Israel’s enslavement in Egypt (albeit without direct experience of being a slave), led Israel through the Exodus and Sinai events and the forty years in the wilderness, during which all of the other members of his generation died, except for Joshua and Caleb, who were much younger than Moses but old enough to remember the Exodus (Num 14:30, Josh 14:6–10, 24:29). Moses led the children of the Exodus generation right up to the

⁴² Nickelsburg thinks this passage originally fell at the end of the Book of the Watchers and functioned as a narrative bridge to the Epistle. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (see n. 13), 334–37.

⁴³ Compare *Jub.* 7.38–39, which records the same chain of transmission.

⁴⁴ Incidentally, in *2 Enoch* there is another survivor of the flood, Noah’s nephew Melchizedek, who is preserved in the Garden of Eden, but this subplot (in chs. 69–72) does not have any connection to the transmission of Enoch’s writings.

⁴⁵ On *Jubilees* and 11QTemple as Mosaic pseudepigrapha, see Najman, *Seconding Sinai* (see n. 2), 41–69.

point of entry into the Promised Land, at which point he passed on the leadership of Israel to Joshua and died (Deut 31–34).

The *Testament of Moses* is an account of that transition of Moses' leadership, and hence can be considered a rewriting of Deut 31–34.⁴⁶ Joshua's acceptance of leadership is overshadowed in the *T. Mos.*, however, by his reception of the text itself, designated a "prophecy" (1.5), which is a revelation of Israel's future.⁴⁷ There is a striking emphasis on the means of preservation of the written prophecy down to the author's present: Moses tells Joshua to "arrange [the scrolls], anoint them with cedar, and deposit them in earthenware jars in the place which (God) has chosen from the beginning of the creation of the world ..." (1.17). The scrolls to be preserved in this way clearly include the text of the *T. Mos.* itself. Later, Moses admonishes Joshua to "keep these words and this book" (10.11), and the words spoken by Moses to Joshua are themselves the text of the testament, "And when Joshua heard the words of Moses, so written in his testament, all the things which he had said, he tore his garments and fell at Moses' feet" (11.1). The testament is again self-referential in 3.11–13, when at the time of the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem the people exclaim, "Is this not that which was made known to us in prophecies by Moses ...? These things which have come upon us since that time are according to his admonition declared to us at that time." Since the scrolls themselves are sealed until the time of the end, it may be that Moses' "prophecies" concerning Israel's future are believed to have been transmitted orally down to the time of the Babylonian Exile, as well as being preserved in writing "until the day of recompense" (1.18).

It is worth noting that Moses is described near the end of the *T. Mos.* as "the great messenger," who was continuously occupied with interceding on behalf of his people and reminding God of the covenant (11.17). Earlier in the book he is called "the mediator of the covenant" (1.14, cf. 3.12), a role for which he was "prepared from the beginning of the world" (1.14). This role is significant because it ties Moses to the other two focal figures in the book: the "one who is over them" (4.1) during the Babylonian Exile, whose intercession leads to the restoration of Jerusalem (4.7), and Taxo, whose martyrdom apparently brings about the divine visitation in the end time.

⁴⁶ D. J. Harrington, "Interpreting Israel's History: The *Testament of Moses* as a Rewriting of Deut 31–34," in *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (see n. 26), 59–70, citing Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life* (see n. 31), 29.

⁴⁷ For Moses' foreknowledge of Israel's future transgression and punishment, based on an interpretation of Deut 32 as a prediction, cf. 2 *Bar.* 84.4–5, *L.A.B.* 19.2–7 and Josephus, *Ant.* 4.303, 313–14.

3.3 *Baruch*

In *2 Baruch*, in contrast to the book of Jeremiah (43:6–7, in which he is taken to Egypt with Jeremiah) or the book of Baruch in the Apocrypha (which is supposedly written in Babylon, according to 1:1), Baruch remains in and around Jerusalem after its destruction by the Babylonians.⁴⁸ The destruction of Jerusalem (rather than the Exile) is very much the focus of the book; it begins in the days leading up to the destruction and the rest takes place in the weeks immediately following it. The book begins with Baruch protesting the imminent destruction of “Zion” (3.1–9, 5.1) and being reassured by God that the city that is about to be destroyed is not the true Zion, which is preserved with God (4.1–6).⁴⁹ Although God commands Baruch to leave the city before it is destroyed, he also commands him to “stay here in the desolation of Zion” while Jeremiah goes to the exiles in Babylon (10.2–3). Baruch remains in the valley of Kidron with the people who were not taken into exile, but returns several times to Mount Zion to pray in the ruins of the Temple (10.5, 35.1) and receives some of his revelations there.

Baruch’s close ties with Zion enable him to console the survivors of the destruction who remain in the land, assuring them that Zion will be “renewed in glory” and “perfected into eternity” (32.4).⁵⁰ This message is part of his role as a bridge between the present desolation and future redemption of Israel. To this end, Baruch is told that he will be “preserved until the end of times to be for a testimony” (13.3, cf. 25.1), which turns out to mean that he will shortly be taken up to heaven alive and kept there until the last days, when he will be required to testify concerning the retribution that came in his own days (13.5–11).⁵¹ The motif of testimony, combined

⁴⁸ On the historical Baruch ben Neriah and the development of his persona in the various texts attributed to him, see J. E. Wright, *Baruch ben Neriah: From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer* (Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament; Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2003).

⁴⁹ “Zion” carries several different meanings in *2 Baruch*, as in other texts of the period: the Temple, Jerusalem, or the inhabitants thereof. Moreover, the author refers to the Land as “the region of Zion.” See L. I. Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch* (JSJSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 31–58.

⁵⁰ Whittiers suggests that the cumulative message of Baruch’s three speeches to the people left in the Land (31–4, 44–6, 77), which he sees as precursors to the Epistle of Baruch in 78–87, is “Things are bad now and will get worse, but eventually (eschatologically), Zion will be restored” (Whittiers, *Epistle of Second Baruch* [see n. 38], 42–8 [46]).

⁵¹ Pace Klijn (*2 Baruch* in *OTP* 1:625 n. 13a), there is no conflict between the theme of Baruch’s imminent “departure” from this world (mentioned in 43.2, 44.2, 46.7, 48.30, 76.2, 78.5, 84.1) and that of his being “preserved” until the end, as 76.2 makes clear. It is only when addressing the people that Baruch suggests that he is about to die (e.g., 44.2), but that is because he is hiding from them that he is going to be “taken up” (46.7).

with the testamentary character of Baruch's speeches to the people, recall the closing chapters of Deuteronomy, to which *2 Baruch* alludes several times, sometimes explicitly likening Baruch to Moses.⁵² Baruch is unique among the bridge figures under consideration here, however, in that he is expected to return to earth to testify in person in the last days.⁵³

At the same time, Baruch also participates in the more typical apocalyptic manner of bridging from the pseudepigraphic setting to the present, through writing. The book ends with a lengthy letter (78–87) from Baruch to the “nine and a half tribes which were across the river” (78.1), that is, the Northern tribes who were taken into captivity by the Assyrians. In fact Baruch was asked by his people to write to their brothers in Babylon to strengthen them as he had strengthened those remaining in the Land (77.12). This he agreed to do, adding that he would also write to the nine and a half tribes (77.17), but while he did write two letters (77.19, 85.6), only the letter to the “lost tribes” is included in the book. Assuming that the author chose to include only one letter to avoid redundancy, it is significant that he chose the one with the broader audience, perhaps to indicate that the message of the book (which the letter summarizes) is intended for all Jews everywhere.⁵⁴ Moreover, the letter is specifically intended to be handed down to future generations (84.9). Since Baruch is the putative author not just of the letter, but of the book as a whole, the letter functions to underscore his role as a bridge both between Jews of the Land of Israel and Jews of the Diaspora, and between Jews of the Babylonian period and Jews of the (author's) present.

3.4 *Daniel*

Although the book of Daniel begins with a reference to the siege and destruction of Jerusalem, the book is set entirely in Babylon, although not entirely during the period of the Exile. The effect of adding the kingdom of the Medes between the Babylonians and Persians (see the discussion of the chronology of Daniel above) is to make Daniel a part of the royal administration of three different empires in his lifetime—three of the four kingdoms in his vision in ch. 7, in fact. Since he was taken into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon in his youth, and is referred to repeatedly as one of the “exiles of Judah” (2:25, 5:13, 6:14), Daniel's lifetime extends beyond the Babylonian Exile both temporally and spatially. Simply by outliving the Babylonian and Median kingdoms, Daniel sends a message about the

⁵² See *2 Bar.* 19.1–3, 59.4, 76.3–5, and especially 84.1–7.

⁵³ Although Ezra is likewise “taken up” to heaven at the end of *4 Ezra*, there is only a hint that he will return in the last days; see below.

⁵⁴ Whittiers, *Epistle of Second Baruch* (see n. 38), 49.