Chapter 3: Genesis Pseudepocryphon

As one of the first seven scrolls discovered in the judean desert beginning in 1947, the Genesis Apocryphon is one of the more well-studied works among the Dead Sea Scrolls. When the scroll was initially analyzed by scholars, it could not be fully unrolled and only a small portion of the outer layer of the scroll could be read. These visible portions, however, written in Aramaic, referenced the ante-deluvian Lamech, the father of Noah, and his wife, Batenosh, known from the book of Jubilees. The text appeared to be written in the first-person from the perspective of Lamech leading Trevor to conclude that the scroll was a copy of the so-called "Book of Lamech" listed as an apocryphal work by a 7th century CE Greek canon list.[1] Once the scroll was completely unrolled, however, it became obvious that the scope of the scroll contained more than just a first-person account from Lamech and instead contained additional first-person accounts from figures found in the Genesis stories including Noah and Abram. Thus, the more descriptive title, *A Genesis Apocryphon,* was given to the scroll by Avigad and

1. This fact led Trevor to refer to the scroll as the "Ain Feshkha Lamech Scroll" and Milik to refer to it as the Apocalypse of Lamech for the publication of the fragment in DJD 1. See John C. Trever, "Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from ʿAin Feshkha", *BASOR* 115, 1949, 8–10 and "Apocalypse de Lamech" in DJD I, 86–87

Yadin in 1956 for the publication of its *editio princeps* in 1956.[2]

Although much of the scroll was very badly damaged, illegible, or missing, enough survied for Avigad and Yadin to make the generalized observations that Genesis Apocryphon followed the basic order and events of Genesis from the Flood into the Abram narrative. The events are generally (though, not exclusively) narrated in a series of three first person accounts by Lamech, Noah, and Abram, respectively and show a clear affinity with the roughly contemporaneous works of 1 Encoh and Jubilees.[3] The literary relationship of Genesis Apocryphon to both 1 Enoch and (especially) Jubilees remains a matter of debate, with Avigad and Yadin suggesting that Genesis Apocryphon more probably preceeded Jubilees, while the prevailing opinion more recently seems to prefer the opposite.[4]

---

2. Hebew: מגילה חיצונית לבראשית. See Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (1956). While the name Genesis Apocryphon remains in wide use, it is notable that the name has been criticized and a number of, perhaps more descriptive, titles have been suggested. "Book of the Patriarchs" (Hebrew: ספר אבות. As suggested by Mazar in D. Flusser, "GETTHIS", *KS* GETTHESE [379 n. 2]), "Memoirs of the Patriarchs" (as suggested by T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation,* 3rd ed. [Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1976], 358), and כתב אבהן (as suggested by Józef T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea,* trans. John Strugnell [London: SCM Press, 1959], 14 n. 1.). Fitzmyer suggests כתב אבהתא would be, perhaps, even more suitable (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 3rd ed., BO 18a [Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 2004], 16).

3. Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon,* 16–37.

4. ibid., 38; cf. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 20–21. Fitzmyer cites Hartman's suggestion, built on Fitzmyer's own work, that the similarity between Genesis Apocryphon's and Jubilee's chronology of Abram's life. Because the chronology seems to have been closely tied to Jubilee's more rigid calendar, it fol-

The name given to the Genesis Apocryphon in the *editio princeps* set the agenda for scholarly inquiry on the work into the modern era by connetcing it to the biblical book of Genesis while simultaneously categorizing the it as apocryphal. Much of the attention given to the Genesis Apocryphon, tehrefore, has focused on its literary genre and its relationship to the Bible and resemblance of the Targums and later midrashic works. As already noted, Vermes's treatment of Genesis Apocryphon focused on the role that it played in showing the continuity between the interpretation of Jewish scripture during the Second Temple period and the aggadic traditions of early rabbinic Judaism. In Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies,* StPB 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1961), Vermes treats in detail the relationship between Gen 12:8–15:4 and Genesis Apocryphon cols. 19–22, ultimately declaring Genesis Apocryphon to be "the most ancient midrash of all" and the "lost link between the biblical and the Rabbinic midrash."[5] The result of this framing (whether one considers it appropriate or not) has been that much of the scholarly attention paid to Genesis Apocryphon has focused on its relationship to Genesis and especially how its author(s) may have been addressing exegetical issues found within the (later) biblical work. Yet, as Fitzmyer observes, the roots of biblical midrash are now generally accepted to be found within the Hebrew Bible itself. Together with the fact that a number of targums have been found at Qumran makes the presence of targumic and midrashic qualities in Genesis Apocryphon less remarkable and, I think, frees us from any

lows that Genesis Apocryphon drew from Jubilees. See Louis F. Hartman, review of *Qumran Cave 1, The Genesis Apocryphon,* by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 28 (1966): 495–98.

5. Ibid., 124.

obligation to try and fit it cleanly within either category.[6] However, the treatment of Genesis Apocryphon as primarily exegetical (or in the case of Vermes, as midrash) tacitly implies that the purpose of Genesis Apocryphon was to explain or interpret Genesis. Put another way, Genesis Apocryphon is often treated as if its purpose in antiquity was to say something *about how to read Genesis*. Placing Genesis Apocryphon under the rubric of "biblical interpretation," for example, does not, to my mind, adequately appreciate the potential for Genesis Apocryphon to be a creative work in its own right.

What remains uncertain about the Genesis Apocryphon is what its function may have been for its original audience. I am in agreement with Fitzmyer that it seems unlikely that Genesis Apocryphon would have been used liturgically and that the general character of the work is "for a pious and edifying purpose,"[7] yet, I can not help but feel somewhat dissatisfied with this answer. How might Genesis Apocryphon have edified its readers? Works such as Jubilees and 1 Enoch, perhaps, have more obvious rhetorical aims, but for all its similarities to these texts, Genesis Apocryphon maintains a different character which has generally eluded commentators.

While I have no illusions that I will be able to offer a satifactory answer to the question of Genesis Apocryphon's specific purpose, approaching Genesis Apocryphon as an object of cultural memory, I believe, is a useful hueristic for addressing the problem holistically. The advantage that a memory approach has in addressing this problem is that it offers a way to talk

6. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 20.

7. Ibid., 20.

about the manifold ways that Genesis Apocryphon both builds from its social location and speaks back into it at a number of "discursive levels."

I have chosen to frame the discussion of Genesis Apocryphon around the ways that Genesis Apocryphon functions as social memory at three such discursive levels. First, and as a point of departure, I will discuss the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon engages with the biblcial tradition. Second, I will discuss the ways that Genesis Apocryphon engages with its reader through the lens of genre and its shared formal characteristics with other similar texts. Finally, I will discuss Genesis Apocryphon as and work of pseudepigraphy and its direct engagement with the cultural memory of ancient Israel.

3.1 'SAY YOU ARE MY SISTER': GENESIS APOCRYPOHON AND THE BIBLICAL TRADITION

The longest, mostly complete, portion of the Genesis Apocryphon is found in cols. 19–22 which retells the stories of Abram and Sarai's sojourn in Egypt (|| Gen 12:10–20), Abram's subsequent conflict with Lot (|| Gen 13:1–18), the Elamite campaign (|| Gen 14:1–24), and the beginning of Abram's vision (|| Gen 15:1–4). Genesis Apocryphon's retelling of these stories follow the chronology of Gen 12–15 very closely, but Genesis Apocryphon embelleshes and augments the narrative throughout. The similarity of these retellings to their putative biblical *Vorlage*[8]

8. Of course, we cannot be certain that the *Vorlage* of Genesis Apocryphon was, in fact, the same as the MT. That said, relative stability of (especially) the Torah texts during the Second Temple Period is widely accepted. For the purposes of this section, I will work under the assumption that the MT represents a very close approximation to the text that the authors/editors of Genesis Apocryphon were familiar with.

prompted some (esp. early) scholars to suggest that Genesis Apocryphon represents a sort of prototype for the later Pentateuchal Targums.[9] While this may be a fair assessment for the very end of the scroll (which offers, at times, a near word-for-word translation of the MT)

Notably, although narrated in the first-person voice starting in col. 19, Genesis Apocryphon switches to the more familiar thrid-persion voice in the middle of col. 21 when the narrative shifts focus away from Abram to introduce the Mesopotamian kings in line 23.[10]

3.2 ABRAM IN THE DIASPORA: KEYING AND FRAMING IN GENESIS APOCRYPHON

While retelling portions of Genesis as first-person narrative reorients the way that the story engages with the received tradition and collective memory at the macro-level the narrative of the Genesis Apocryphon is not simply a straight-forward retelling of Genesis from the perspectives of Lamech, Noah, and Abram. Indeed, what is most compelling about RwB texts very often is the ways that they depart from the biblical narrative. These departures can come at the level of story by adding, removing, or rearranging events or at the level of narrative discourse by describing events differently or with different emphases. In the case of Genesis Apocryphon, and in particular in the account of Abram in cols. 19–22, the biblical narrative has been recast as a (first-person) Hellenistic novella in a similar vein to other well-known Second

9. Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 193.

10. Line 23 seems to begin a new paragraph, following *vacat* of the previous line. Fitzmyer adds the caveat that Genesis Apocryphon returns to the first person at theend of col. 22

Temple Jewish works such as the narrative portions of Daniel (including the Greek additions), Esther, Tobit, and (arguably) the so-called Joseph novella of Genesis 37 and 39–50.[11]

The reading of Genesis Apocryphon 19–20 as a Hellenistic Jewish novella has recently been very thoroughly explicated by Blake Jurgens, who has further argued that the utilization of Hellenistic literary motifs and structures in Genesis Apocryphon altered the overall purpose the the pericope for the purpose of edifying Jews living in the Hellenistic world in the shadow of empire.[12] Although much of Jurgen's paper is based on long-established observations about the literary influences on Genesis Apocryphon, he makes the important discursive turn toward the audience by claiming that the Genesis Apocryphon was meant to be useful to readers:

> By imbuing its story with literary tropes and techniques similar to those found in Dan 1–6, Esther, and other Jewish texts arising out of the Hellenistic period, the author successfully attends to the narratival ambiguities of Gen 12:10–20 through interpretive expansion upon the latent exegetical links of the text while concurrently modifying the narrative to appeal to contemporary literary

11. See especially Lawrence Wills work on the Jewish novels and novellas in antiquity: Lawrence Wills, *Ancient Jewish Novels: An Anthology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); as well as his important earlier works: idem, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995); and idem, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990).

12. Blake A. Jurgens, "A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh's Court: The Literary Relationship Between Abram's Sojourn in Egypt in 1QapGen 19-20 and Jewish Fictional Literature", *JSJ*, 2018, 1–34.

expectations.[13]

The process of this transcription, which he terms "fictionalization," is described by Jurgens in the six distinct narrative units within cols. 19-20 of Genesis Apocryphon which describe Abram and Sarai's sojourn in Egypt: the decent into Egypt, Abram's dream vision, the banquet Scene, praise of Sarai's beauty, Abram's prayer, and the final court contest. In each section Jurgens notes the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon utilizes literary structures common to it broader Hellenistic mileu to rewrite the the events of this story. Jurgens offers a very thorough description of the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon utilizes these literary structures and makes a plausible claim that these changes were meant to engage readers in familiar style. Thinking in terms of social memory, however, we can appreciate the way that the story of Abram and Sarai in Egypt is "remembered into" the social context of Hellenistic Judaism and is fitted into the contemporary social frameworks (read: literary conventions) therein.

While Halbwachs addressed the fact that memories are shaped by the present, recently Barry Schwartz has attempted to more clearly articulate this process. One of the most important contributions of Schwartz's work in this area is his conviction that the interactions between the remembered past and the present are not unidirectional. Where Halbwachs limits his discussion to the describing the ways that memories of the past are shaped by the present, Schwartz sees the past as a potent force in the present as well. In other words, not only does the present influence the way the past is remembered, but the past *itself* (that is, both the

13. Jurgens, "A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh's Court", 27.

remembered and "actual" past) also effects the present.

Schwartz employs two terms, "keying" and "framing," to describe this additional dimension to the way that the past impacts the present. On the one hand the idea of "keying" can be understood as way of

3.2.1 Setting

One of the primary features of these novellas is their setting. Jurgens notes that, typically, these Jewish novellas are set in the diaspora, which invariably place the Jewish (or, in Tobit and Judith's case, Israelite) protagonist under the hegemony of a foreign power. In the case of Genesis Apocryphon, although not properly "diaspora," Abram is a sojourner in a foreign land and is under foreign hegemony. Moreover, from a modern perspective, these stories have a tendency to commit rather egregious factual errors about certain historical particulars such as the names of rulers (Judith 1:1; Dan 4; Tobit) and geographic items (Tobit 5:6). Likewise, Genesis Apocryphon seems to utilize details which almost certainly were inventions of the author (or an earlier tradant) such as referring to "Pharaoh Zoan" (we know of no such figure) and Herqanos, a name popular in the Ptolemaic period, but not attested otherwise as well as referring to the "Karmon River" (probably the Kharma canal), as the one of the seven heads of the Nile river, which it is not.[14] These details, according to Jurgens, are meant to create a sense of verisimilitude and authenticity within the narrative. Thus, although the story of Abram's

14. Jurgens, "A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh's Court", 7; See also Daniel A. Machiela, "Some Egyptian Elements in the Genesis Apocryphon: Evidence of a Ptolemaic Social Location?", *AS* 8 (2010): 47–69; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 197–99.

sojourn in Egypt as narrated in the biblical text engages with discourses of the *foundation* of Israel, the narrative of the Genesis Apocryphon seems to be turning the story to engage with the contemporary discourses around the idea of *diaspora*.

3.2.2 Abram in the Court of a Foreign King

3.2.3 Abram the Sage

3.2.4 Abram the Oracle

3.3 GENESIS APOCRYPHON, FIRST PERSON NARRATIVE, AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHY

One of the most striking features of the Genesis Apocryphon when compared to other RwB texts is its pervasive use of the first-person voice to narrate the events of its story. This quality sets Genesis Apocryphon apart from the majority of narrative material in the Hebrew Bible which, with notable exceptions, usually maintains an omniscient third-person voice. The Genesis Apocryphon's use of first person must be nuanced, however, by the fact that the work presents itself as a collection of first person "memoirs"[15] from three of the Patriarchs from Genesis (Lamech, Noah, and Abram). So, while each memoir does indeed utilize the first person, the narrator itself changes throughout the course of the text.

15. I will use the term "memoir" throughout this chapter as a way of referring to the distinct (mostly) first-person narratives found in the Genesis Apocryphon. This is simply a convenience term that highlights the formal characteristic of being written in the first person voice without any reference to the authenticity of the work and in alignment with the convention of referring to first-person narratives in the Bible as "memoirs" (e.g., the "Nehemiah Memoir" or the "Isaiah Memoir").

Speaking of the Genesis Apocryphon as a single text, however, should not be taken for granted. Therefore, it is necessary for the moment to consider whether the Genesis Apocryphon should be considered "a" text or whether instead it should be treated as a collection of "texts." Although the composite character of the Genesis Apocryphon was noted in the *editio princeps* by Avigad and Yadin, they maintained that Genesis Apocryphon functioned as a single literary unit though allowing that it was made up of several literary sources.[16] Since then, however, the unity of the work has been further interrogated and analyzed from a number of perspectives and the unity of Genesis Apocryphon is more tenuous than ever.

Perhaps the most compelling argument for the genuinely composite nature of Genesis Apocryphon has been offered by Moshe Bernstein, who has pointed out that discrete units of the Genesis Apocryphon utilize distinct titles and epithets for Yahweh.[17]

From a structural standpoint, it is not at all clear whether these three "memoirs" are meaningfully related and any thematic consistency is readily explained through the collating process itself.[18] One could certainly imagine the Genesis Apocryphon as a collection of

16. Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 38.

17. Moshe Bernstein, "Divine Titles and Epithets and the Sources in the Genesis Apocryphon", *JBL* 128 (2009): 291–310. It is delightfully reminiscent of the classical formulations of the Documentary Hypothesis. Attributed to Graf and Wellhausen. See also Moshe J. Bernstein, "Is the Genesis Apocryphon a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?", *AS* 8 (2010): 107–34 and Matthias Weigold, "One Voice or Many? The Identity of the Narrators in Noah's Birth Story (1QapGen 1–5.27) and in the 'Book of the Words of Noah' (1QapGen 5.29–18.23)", *AS* 89–105

18. In other words, we could easily suppose that the reason that three "texts" such as these would be grouped

fictional patriarchal memoirs collected onto a single scroll, and organized roughly by each text's correspondence to the chronology of the biblical narrative.

In fact, this is precisely how the Genesis Apocryphon presents itself. Although the beginnings of the Lamech and Abram accounts are lost due to damage to the scroll, col. 5.29 seems to offer a superscription for the account of Noah, reconstructed as [*pršgn*] *ktb mly nwḥ* "[a copy of] the book of the words of Noah." Based on this superscription, it is reasonable to suppose that the accounts of Lamech and Abram, too, had such superscriptions, although at least two complicating factors should be taken into account. First, while the extant portions of Genesis Apocryphon present themselves as distinct units, both the very beginning and the very end of the scroll have been lost. From a structural standpoint, this fact should elicit caution because it is at the beginning and end of texts where such features as "framing narratives" and other explanatory material is often located. Without definitive evidence of the presence or absence of such features one must be extra cautious when making observations about the rhetorical purpose of the macro structure of a particular text. Second, although all three accounts are *generally* written in the first-person, as noted above, none of them are rigorously committed to maintaining the voice. As Loren Stuckenbruck notes, each of the three "documents," at one point or another, falls into some kind of third-person voice: Lamech in 5.24–25, Noah in 16.14–17.19, and Abram in 21.23–22.34. Curiously, Stuckenbruck includes the superscription(s) as examples of this inconsistency and does not distinguish between instances where the narrator moves into the third person *within* the narrative and cases where one might

together on a single scroll was that they shared certain common themes or formal characteristics.

suppose the presence of an editorial voice.

The problem of whether to understand the superscription(s) as "internal" to the work is a good example of how the macro-structure of the work is important for this kind of analysis. By treating the superscription as a contribution of the "author" of a unified Genesis Apocryphon, Stuckenbruck understands the superscription to be "in the third person" and would (apparently) treat each first-person account as an embedded narrative within a larger framing narrative (of which the superscription would be a part). For example, if the beginning of the scroll gave a brief framing narrative, describing a young man who discovered three scrolls in the desert and thus proceeded to provide "a copy of the book of the words of X," Stuckenbruck would be absolutely correct. However, if one understands the superscription to be an editorial insertion, it does not make sense to include it as an example of third-person discourse for the same reasons it does not make sense to say that Ps 23 uses third-person discourse by beginning with *mizmôr lə-dāwid*.[19] In other words, the way that the Genesis

19. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse in the Dead Sea Documents: From the Aramaic Texts to the Writings of the *Yaḥad*", in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008),* ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 295–326. See also Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions", in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the [Second] International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997,* ed. Estelle Glickler Chazon, Michael Edward Stone, Avital Pinnick, et al., STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–26. Even supposing a single author for Genesis Apocryphon, as Stuckenbruck and others imply, I am still inclined to consider the superscriptions separately from the former examples because they would exist outside the frame of each embedded narrative.

Apocryphon presents itself, I believe, should best be understood as a *collection* of memoirs compiled by an editor who would have, putatively, supplied a set of paratextual superscriptions.

The fact that Genesis Apocryphon presents itself as a collection of disparate texts, however, does not demand that the work cannot be treated as a whole.

3.3.1 Pseudepigraphy and the Implied Author

Writing in the voice of these early biblical figures formally places Genesis Apocryphon into the literary category of pseudepigraphy and so we should take a moment to clearly state the way that I will use the "pseudepigraphy," "pseudepigrapha," and related terms.[20]

20. The topic of pseudepigraphy has received a large amount of very sophisticated attention in recent years. See especially Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); Eibert Tigchelaar, "Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures", in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures,* ed. Eibert Tigchelaar, BETL 270 (2014), 1–18; Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Pseudepigraphy and/as Prophecy: Continuity and Transformation in the Formation and Reception of Early Enochic Writings", in *Revelation, Literature, and Community in Late Antiquity,* ed. Philippa Townsend and Moulie Vidas, TSAJ (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 25–42; idem, "The Modern Invention of 'Old Testament Pseudepigrapha'", *JTS* 60 (2009): 403–36; idem, "Pseudepigraphy, Authorship and the Reception of 'the Bible' in Late Antiquity", in *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11–13 October 2006,* ed. Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu, BAC 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 467–90; Hindy Najman, "How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra", in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino Garcia Martinez,* ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, JSJsup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 529–36; idem, *Seconding Sinai : The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

In the simplest terms, pseudepigrapha are texts which fictively purport to be written by figures (typically) from the ancient past. For our purposes, I would like to further distinguish between texts which *portray themselves* and texts which were latter *attributed to* ancient figures. Bernstein helpfully distinguishes between these two phenomena by labeling the former "authoritative" pseudepigraphy and the latter "decorative" pseudepigraphy.[21] While the two phenomena are no doubt related, it is the act of writing in the name of another figure which interests me. Thus, Ps 23, again, although attributed to David, I assume was not *actually* written by him, nor was it written *as if* it had been written by him. Major portions of 1 Enoch, on the other hand (in particular the latter three books, Astronomical Writings [72–82], Dream Visions [83–90], and the Epistle of Enoch [91–107]) were *written as though* they were written by Enoch himself. Less clear-cut examples, however, require a more nuanced definition. For example, Deuteronomy is not generally referred to as among the pseudepigrapha (see below), yet, from a literary perspective, it is framed as *had-dəbārîm ʾăšer dibber mōšeh ʾel-kol-yiśrāʾēl* "the words which Moses spoke to all Israel" (Deut 1:1a). Was Moses the author? Many Jews and Christians from antiquity up to (and for some, including) the modern era, of course, believed so. But whether Deuteronomy was *written* as pseudepigrapha or just attributed to Moses is difficult to say with certainly. What we *can* say is that there are concrete literary cues within Deuteronomy which suggest Mosaic authorship more strongly than, say Genesis, which was also attributed to Moses in antiquity.

21. He also identifies a third form, "convenient" pseudepigraphy which is located somewhere between the two. I do not find this category as helpful. (Bernstein, "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls", 3–7).

The ancient use of the term pseudepigrapha denoted spurious texts which Church leaders believed to be intentionally misleading about their authorship.[22] The number of (esp. Jewish) pseudepigraphical texts discovered within the past century provide good reason to question the assumption that pseudonymous authors's intentions were to deceive their readers.[23] Thus, I wish to eschew the value judgments of this ancient usage. At the other end of the spectrum, in some scholarly discourse, the term "pseudepigrapha" has become generalized to encompass any text written in around the turn of the era which did not make it into the canon of rabbinic Judaism or early Christianity. Bernstein observes, for example, that although the first volume of James Charlesworth's two-volume *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* contains formally pseudepigraphi works, the second volume includes many which do not meet the formal definition of pseudepigrapha.[24] This expansive practice, likewise, is not particularly helpful for clarifying the term and so I will attempt to restrict my useage to a more clearly defined set of criteria.

Thus I will use the terms pseudepigraphy and pseudepigrapha to refer to texts (or

22. See esp. Hist. Eccl. 6.12.2 where the Bishop of Antioch, Serapion, refers to the * Gospel of Peter* among the a number of works "falsely attributed": γάρ, ἀδελφοί, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀποστόλους ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν. "For we, brothers, accept both Peter and the other apostles as Christ, but we skillfully reject those falsely ascribed writings, knowing that they were not handed down to us."

23. Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity,* 53–58; See also Reed, "The Modern Invention of 'Old Testament Pseudepigrapha'", 403–36.

24. Bernstein, "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls", 2; OTP.

practices) which seem to actively construct a fictive implied author whose identity would have been well-known and meaningful to its reader and who (typically) would have lived in the distant past.

The term "implied author" also deserves a clear definition; I have adopted that of H. Porter Abbott:

> Neither the real *author* nor the *narrator*, the implied author is the idea of the author constructed by the reader as she or he reads the *narrative*. In an *intentional reading*, the implied author is that sensibility and moral intelligence that the reader gradually constructs to infer the intended meanings and effects of the narrative. The implied author might as easily (and with greater justice) be called the "inferred author"[25]

Because the implied author is a construction of the reader, it is frequently not desirable to talk about this construct as a literary feature so much as a heuristic for intentional reading. Part of the advantage of basing the definition of pseudepigraphy on the idea of the implied author is that it mitigates any prejudice toward the intention of the author to deceive (maliciously or otherwise) his reader. Thus, the question of "who" the implied author *is* generally misses the point. In the case of pseudepigraphy, however, the central formal characteristic of the work seems to be the *intentional construction of a known implied author*. Therefore, one could make the case that what is characteristic about pseudepigraphi texts is the

25. H. Porter Abbott, *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative,* 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 235.

intentionality on the part of the real author to shape the processes by which their readers's construct an implied author. Where Abbott notes that the term "inferred author" may be a better term than "implied author" (the connotation shifts the active role to the reader) when discussing pseudepigraphy, "implied" still fits quite well (since we can attribute some intentionality to the real author). The implied author, therefore, provides an important point of contact between the reader and the (real) author.

and further to consider that their readers were aware of and participants in the authorial fiction. In such a case, the implied author would elicit an entirely different set of sensibilities for the reader to "infer the intended meanings ad effects of the narrative."[26]

3.3.2 Scripture, Pseudepigraphy and Memory Construction

The vast majority of the Hebrew Bible is narrated in the third-person omniscient and is formally anonymous. There are, of course, exceptions to this generalization, most notably within the prophetic corpus (such as Isa 6–8), the so-called Nehemiah Memoir (Neh 11–13), and perhaps works such as Deuteronomy and Song of Songs. But for the lion's share of the biblical text, the the implied author operates invisibly.

The rhetorical force of this particular authorial voice, as observed by Erhard Blum, is significant for the function of the Hebrew Bible's participation in the collective memory of the communities that claim it as their own. Although the implied author does occasionally engage directly with the reader by offering explanatory observations (for example where the author

26. Abbott, *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative,* 235.

inserts phrases like "this is why…" or "…until this day"), for all intents and purposes, the implied author presents as both *reliable* and *authoritative* without a hint of subjectivity. As Blum puts it, "In this sense the narrative does not distinguish the depiction from the depicted."[27] Put another way, the text does not acknowledge that it *has* an author, it simply *is*. The rhetorical effect of this invisible, omniscient author is to collapse the knowledge gap between the reader and the events narrated by removing the author from view. This move, according to Blum, allows the text to convey "an unmediated truth claim which is not based on the author's distinguishable critical judgments and convictions."[28] The effectiveness of this implied author, according to Blum, is tied to the pragmatics of the text, that is, tied to the context of the biblical narratives as scripture (though, Blum does not refer to "scripture" *per se*). The implied audience of the biblical narratives by-and-large can be understood as group-insiders for whom the biblical text worked to reinforce group identity. Such "unmediated truth claims" *were* in fact mediated and reinforced by those who (orally or otherwise) transmitted the tradition from one generation to another.[29] In other words, one might say that the implied author of the biblical text is the community's collective memory.[30]

---

27. Erhard Blum, "Historiography or Poetry? The Nature of the Hebrew Bible Prose Tradition", in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004), September 2004),* ed. Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold, WUNT 212 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 25–45.

28. Ibid., 33.

29. Ibid., 33.

30. Blum writes, "If we assume that the traditional literature was primarily transmitted through oral means,

In contrast to the omniscient implied biblical author, the Genesis Apocryphon frames itself as a collection of first-person accounts which formally fall into the category of pseudepigraphy. If we take seriously Blum's characterization of the way that the biblical text may have engaged with the collective memory of Israel based on the formal, narratological features of the text, it stands to reason that the Genesis Apocryphon as first-person pseudepigraphy would engage that collective memory in a different way despite the relative similarity of the textual content. The pseudepigraphi quality of Genesis Apocryphon shapes the way that the text engages with the remembered past by describing the biblical story through the mouthes of important figures. Here "story" refers to the abstract sequence of actions which the narrative describes. The *way* a story is recounted, on the other hand, is referred to by narratologists as *narrative discourse.* Thus the Genesis Apocryphon's change from third-person omniscient to a pseudepigraphical first-person narrative can be understood as a change in *narrative discourse* which, broadly, retains the same *story* as that of the biblical text.

Approaching these questions from the perspective of Social Memory Studies asks us to think about the way that differing social frameworks and cognitive contexts may have allowed for or demanded presenting this material in a different form than its *Vorlage*.

One of the difficulties in dealing with pseudepigraphy is the apparently divergent ways that the authors and original readers may have understood pseudepigraphy as compared to the

---

than the narrator who is speaking supplies the material with a personal presence; he is not present as an author who judges and evaluates his sources from a critical distance, but as a 'transmitter' who participates in the tradition itself and is able to lend it credence through his own personality, his standing, and/or his office." Blum, "Historiography or Poetry?", 33.

way that later groups (e.g., Church Fathers, modern scholars) treat it. The crux of the issue, it seems to me, is less to do with whether the author intended to "deceive" his audience, and more to do with whether the readers understood themselves to be reading something "authentic" or were willing participants in an authorial fiction. Yet, even language of "authenticity" or "fiction" presupposes that such terms were a meaningful part of the discourse surrounding "scripture" during the late Second Temple period.

Bibliography

Abbott, H. Porter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Avigad, Nahman, and Yigael Yadin. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea.* 1956.

Barthélemy, Dominique, and Józef T. Milik, eds. *Qumran Cave 1.* DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Bernstein, Moshe. "Divine Titles and Epithets and the Sources in the Genesis Apocryphon". *JBL* 128 (2009): 291–310.

Bernstein, Moshe J. "Is the Genesis Apocryphon a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?" *AS* 8 (2010): 107–34.

———. "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions". Pages 1–26 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the [Second] International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997.* Edited by Estelle Glickler Chazon, Michael Edward Stone, Avital Pinnick, et al. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Black, Matthew. *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament.* Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

Blum, Erhard. "Historiography or Poetry? The Nature of the Hebrew Bible Prose Tradition". Pages 25–45 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004), September 2004).* Edited by Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1.* 3rd ed. BO 18a. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 2004.

Flusser, D. "GETTHIS". *KS* GETTHESE.

Gaster, T. H. *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation.* 3rd ed. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1976.

Hartman, Louis F. Review of *Qumran Cave 1, The Genesis Apocryphon,* by Joseph A. Fitzmyer. *CBQ* 28 (1966): 495–98.

Jurgens, Blake A. “A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh’s Court: The Literary Relationship Between Abram’s Sojourn in Egypt in 1QapGen 19-20 and Jewish Fictional Literature”. *JSJ,* 2018, 1–34.

Machiela, Daniel A. “Some Egyptian Elements in the Genesis Apocryphon: Evidence of a Ptolemaic Social Location?” *AS* 8 (2010): 47–69.

Milik, Józef T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea.* Translated by John Strugnell. London: SCM Press, 1959.

Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Najman, Hindy. “How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra”. Pages 529–36 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino Garcia Martinez.* Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. JSJsup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. *Seconding Sinai : The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism.* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. “Pseudepigraphy and/as Prophecy: Continuity and Transformation in the Formation and Reception of Early Enochic Writings”. Pages 25–42 in *Revelation, Literature, and Community in Late Antiquity.* Edited by Philippa Townsend and Moulie Vidas. TSAJ. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

———. “Pseudepigraphy, Authorship and the Reception of ’the Bible’ in Late Antiquity”. Pages 467–90 in *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11–13 October 2006.* Edited by Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu. BAC 6. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. “The Modern Invention of ’Old Testament Pseudepigrapha’”. *JTS* 60 (2009): 403–36.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. “Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse in the Dead Sea Documents: From the Aramaic Texts to the Writings of the *Yaḥad*”. Pages 295–326 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008).* Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Tigchelaar, Eibert. “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures”. Pages 1–18 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures.* Edited by Eibert Tigchelaar. BETL 270. 2014.

Trever, John C. “Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from ʿAin Feshkha”. *BASOR* 115, 1949, 8–10.

Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies.* StPB 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

Weigold, Matthias. “One Voice or Many? The Identity of the Narrators in Noah’s Birth Story (1QapGen 1–5.27) and in the ‘Book of the Words of Noah’ (1QapGen 5.29–18.23)”. *AS* 89–105.

Wills, Lawrence. *Ancient Jewish Novels: An Anthology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

———. *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990.

———. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.