THE SCROLLS AND THE LITERARY LANDSCAPE OF SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM

Michael E. Stone

We are in the happy position of having at our disposal a whole bookcase of green volumes with the letters DJD (i.e., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*) on the spine. The job of editing is not quite all done, and a little more remains to be published: *Enoch* and *Genesis Apocryphon*, among other works. Moreover, not all the DJD volumes contain material from Qumran, but it is to that Qumran material that, not unsurprisingly, I wish to direct my attention here. It is worth remembering that we are much more fortunate than colleagues studying other major finds of documents, such as the Turfan fragments from Chinese Turkestan, the Oxyrhyncus papyri from Egypt and others. Some of the documents found in these discoveries have been in the process of edition for a century or more. The Oxyrhyncus papyri, for example, have been under publication since 1898, while the Qumran Scrolls now, a little over sixty years after their discovery, are virtually all published. The reason for this difference is, of course, that the Dead Sea Scrolls bear directly on Christian origins in the context of Judaism of the Second Temple age and have, therefore, attracted a quite disproportionate amount of attention. Although some years ago there were many complaints about delay in publication of the material, considering the number of manuscripts and the task of piecing them together, in fact sixty years from initial discovery to today's situation is very commendable.

The overall configuration of manuscript finds in the Judean Desert, from Masada at the south of the Dead Sea to Wadi Daliyeh well north of it has been the subject of considerable discussion.[1] The physical circumstances that contributed to the manuscripts' survival, the sorts of social and political events that brought people to live in the

[1] Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls By Fellows of the Institute of Advanced Studies in the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1989–1990* (STDJ 16; ed. Devorah Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58 was an influential, early study along these lines.

wilderness of Judea, the almost urban legend narrative of their discovery are well known. The same physical circumstances, wilderness not too distant from Jerusalem, contributed to the rise, a few centuries after the destruction of Qumran, of the early installations of Palestinian monasticism in the adjacent region of the Judean Hills. Indeed, a discovery like Khirbet el-Mird, dated to the late Byzantine-early Arab period, gives us some insight into the manuscripts of Christian settlement in the wilderness. The Judean desert is true desert, with annual rainfall of a few millimetres, but not too far west is area best viewed as wilderness. The Judean hills proper include the borderland between settled territory and the very low rainfall areas, the true desert where Qumran is located.

The imperatives of the physical landscape, of rainfall and of both proximity to and separation from Jerusalem characterize the west side of the watershed ridge that descends into the Jordan valley. This is not, however, the point of this paper. Our intention is different and is focused on the actual works discovered in the caves of Qumran and their place in Second Temple Judaism. There have been a number of studies of the make-up of the sectarian library—biblical, known apocryphal and sectarian manuscripts, as well as numerous works whose genre or content were quite unknown to us before the Scrolls were discovered. This study of the manuscripts and the actual works that comprised the library is a necessary preliminary to the considerations we will bring here. Without the identification and decipherment of the texts discovered there, many by scholars participating in this volume, we would be floundering in the dark.

The issue that concerns us here today, however, is that of the role and character of the Qumran corpus within Judaism of the Second Temple period. Before we proceed to discuss this, however, it is important to remember that the texts presently identified and characterized at Qumran are only part of that library. In the first place, the numerous unidentified fragments, many being published in the last volumes of the DJD series (vols. 33, 36, 38), represent a substantial corpus of books that time and circumstances have all but destroyed. We may venture to hope that, in the future, some of these fragments will be placed in known manuscripts and, perhaps, joins made between others that will reconstitute still further unknown documents. However, for the moment this is not the case, and even when these processes have advanced, we will almost certainly be left with thousands of unknown and unidentifiable fragments.

In addition, two more factors strengthen our doubts about the exhaustive nature of the list of known or identified texts. One is the likelihood that certain of the discoveries of manuscripts "south of Jericho" mentioned in ancient sources were of caves at Qumran. The most famous ancient discoveries are two: first, the uncovering of Quinta, an additional Greek Bible translation used by Origen (ca. 185–254 CE) in the Hexapla, the story of which is given by Epiphanius in *de mensuris et ponderibus* 18 [Dean, 34–35]—it is described as being "found in wine-jars in Jericho;" second, the cache of manuscripts discovered in a cave in the seventh century and brought to the attention of the Syriac Nestorian patriarch Timothy. In an epistle by him, written about 800 CE, he reports that a decade earlier a cache of books had been discovered in a cave "near Jericho." A dog belonging to a local Arab chased another animal into the cave and its owner found "a cave dwelling" (*byt' dbwr'*) containing many scrolls. Later in the epistle we read that this was *bwr"' wbm'r"'* "in mountains and caves." The find was reported to Jews in Jerusalem and a group came, explored the cave and found many books written in Hebrew script, including copies of books of the Hebrew Bible.[2]

The story is eerily reminiscent of the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, which were early brought to the Syrian Bishop, Mar Athanasius Samuel. But unlike the latter, who smuggled part of the find to the United States and eventually sold the smuggled scrolls through middle-men to the Hebrew University, Patriarch Timothy summoned the leaders of the Jews in Jerusalem to whom he gave these documents. If indeed this story explains how the Damascus Document and *ALD* got into the Cairo Geniza, the documents were pretty definitely connected with the Qumran sect. So, while it is not certain whether the find in Origen's time was of specifically Qumran caves, it is more than likely that the find in Bishop Timothy's time was. It has been suggested that at least *Aramaic Levi Document*, Damascus Document, and most

[2] M. E. Stone, "Aramaic Levi in Context," *JSQ* 9 (2002): 307–26. See the Syriac text in O. Braun, "Der Katholikos Timotheos I und seine Briefe," *Oriens Christianus* 1 (1901): 299–313, here 304–305 and an English translation by S. P. Brock, *A Brief Outline of Syriac Literature* (Moran ʾEtho Series 9; Kottayam: St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute, 1997), 247. Thanks are expressed to Prof. L. van Rompay who advised me in matters Syriac. John Reeves discusses this find in "Exploring the Afterlife of Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Medieval Near Eastern Religious Traditions: Some Initial Soundings," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 148–77, especially 160–61.

likely the Hebrew of ben Sira, reached the Geniza from "Qumran-type" caves. One or two other compositions preserved among the Geniza fragments have been proposed to have derived from this cache,[3] and regardless of that, Patriarch Timothy records that the find included numerous Hebrew books in addition to the biblical documents.

In addition to the implications of the recovered fragments which have not been fitted into contexts in surviving manuscripts, as well as the loss of most of the material from the medieval finds, a third dimension of physical loss at Qumran must be considered. The marl cliff behind the plateau on which the remains of Khirbet Qumran are found is friable, and remains of caves that were destroyed by the action of the elements may be seen even today. Thus, even if we restrict our view to Qumran proper, it seems that a substantial number of manuscripts has been lost over the centuries. In principle, therefore, we can ask how representative even the material that has survived actually is of the corpus of texts that was once there and it is worth bearing in mind that we have absolutely no way of answering this question. Consequently, it is clear that any statements about the literary landscape witnessed by the surviving documents must be modified by an acute consciousness of what has been lost from Qumran itself. For example, we should draw general inferences based on the number of copies of one or another work that survived, with the greatest caution. I regret that this paper, instead of making bold assertions and painting a picture with confident brush-strokes, must emphasize the caution that we have to employ in making general statements. Yet, it seems to me that this warning is appropriate at present.

One more concern about the Qumran manuscripts themselves should be mentioned. It seems to be the *communis opinio* that Cave 4 held the library of the sect or the sectarian settlement of which the centre was in the Khirbet Qumran buildings. There has been some discussion recently about the character of the other ten caves in which

---

[3] D. Flusser and S. Safrai, "The Apocryphal 'Songs of David'," in *Teuda B: Sefer Zikkaron lĕ-Y.M. Grintz* (Tel-Aviv: Darchka, 1984), 83–105 [Hebrew]; K. Berger, *Die Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza: Erstedition, Kommentar und Übersetzung* (TAZNZ 1; Tübingen: Francke, 1989); K. Berger, "Die Bedeutung der wiederentdeckten Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza für das Alte Testament," *ZAW* 103 (1991): 113–24; H. P. Rüger, *Die Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza* (WUNT 53; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991). It is surprising that these compositions have received relatively little scholarly attention and that further searches of Geniza texts have not been made.

scrolls have been found.[4] These were certainly not of one piece, a fact that must be taken into account when thinking about the silhouette and shape of the Qumran manuscripts as a collection. The assemblage of manuscripts from Cave 7, for example, is so distinctive as to demand attention (though that demand will not be acceded to in this essay). Moreover, our subject is not the character of the Qumran manuscripts that have been preserved, about which a fair amount has been written, but their position in the context of Judaism of the Second Temple period.

If we are to try to sketch that landscape, we must seek to uncover its hidden hills and valleys and that means to gain a sense not just of what has survived, but of specific works we know existed once but which have not survived. This information is necessary when we come to assess which further works might have existed but did not survive and whose very names are lost. The first source of information about lost works is to be found in Patristic writings, where two types of sources are to be observed. The first is citations from and references to works no longer extant. Johannes Fabricius in the early eighteenth century and Abbé J.-P. Migne in the mid-nineteenth mined and assembled such information together with other types of data. The learned Englishman, M. R. James (also known as an author of ghost stories), brought it together in his work *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Their Titles and Fragments* (London, SPCK, 1920). He organized this collection on the basis of biblical chronology and it embodied a lifetime's learning (he lived from 1862 to 1936). Recently, Robert Kraft undertook to "revive, refurbish and repurpose" this work on the CCAT internet site, and his reworked entries and associated studies may be seen at http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rs/rak/publics/mrjames/. This work, some of which is embodied in an article,[5] is one of a number of writings inspired by James' collection. We cannot deal with all these here, but we should note the major work of the late Father A.-M. Denis. Denis attempted

---

[4] The most far-reaching of these hypotheses is that promoted by Steven Pfann. It is not certain that all his conclusions are valid, but he highlights some real phenomena. See Pfann, "Qumran," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed.; ed. M. Berenbaum and F. Skolnik; Detroit: Macmillan, 2007), 16: 768–75, esp. 774. Cf. now the contributions by Florentino García Martínez and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra in this volume.

[5] R. A. Kraft, "Reviving (and Refurbishing) the *Lost Apocrypha* of M. R. James," *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (JSJSup 89; ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Satran and R. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 37–51.

to collect all the fragmentary apocrypha surviving in Greek in Patristic sources. He included these in his work: A.-M. Denis. *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum Judaeorum Hellenistarum Fragmentis*. (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970). As distinct from M. R. James, however, he includes only Greek fragments and not those in other languages, but he gives the texts and not just references and extracts.[6]

The Christian traditions preserved the footprints of Jewish apocryphal books in various contexts. These included citations given in the course of patristic discourse, such as the numerous citations given by Clement of Alexandria in the second century, or the much later Latin apocryphal *Epistle of Titus*, preserved in an eighth century manuscript.[7] In addition, names of apocryphal works were often included in Canon lists and extensive citations from some known and unknown apocrypha were also embedded in the chronographic tradition. Moreover, the learned tradition of Christian scholastic annotation (*scholia*) and collections of citations (*catenae*) also preserved 'lost' materials, such as the fragments of Greek Philo recovered by Paramelle[8] and of Greek *Jubilees* uncovered by Françoise Petit.[9] It is beyond doubt that further Greek pieces of unidentified or lost Jewish apocrypha are preserved in these sources, fragments of the type familiar already to M. R. James.[10] In monographic studies of the apocryphal Elijah and Ezekiel fragments and traditions, for example, the character and shape of lost apocrypha were recovered and more can certainly be done along this

---

[6] Of course Denis mentions works in many languages in his posthumous book A.-M. Denis and J.-C. Haelewyck, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), which is a second edition of his *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1970). Lorenzo DiTommaso documents a range of such works in *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850–1999* (JSPSup39; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

[7] D. de Bruyne, "Epistula Titi discipuli Pauli de dispositione sanctimonii," *Revue Benédictine* 37 (1925): 47–72.

[8] J. Paramelle, *Philon d'Alexandrie: Questions sur la Genèse II 1–7* (Genève: Cramer, 1984).

[9] F. Petit, *La chaîne sur la Genèse* (Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 452 presents a catena citing *Jubilees* 46:6–12, 47:1.

[10] In these cases, scholars have concentrated on identified citations, and particularly those of known works, like the ones mentioned in the text. James gave some anonymous citations in *Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* and one wonders what more a search for anonymous fragments might turn up.

line.[11] Moreover, once we bring the traditions other than Greek into consideration, the volume of such source material will increase manyfold. What we can learn from all this is that, in addition to whole works, the Churches' interest in biblical and biblical associated materials led to the preservation of many fragments of Jewish literature. Those fragments and the works to which they witness are an integral part of Jewish literature of the Second Temple period.

The same is true, though we can do less reconstruction, of works whose names are mentioned by Patristic and other early Christian sources, but whose content remains unknown. There are a number of well-known lists of titles of ancient apocryphal works, usually connected with their proscription, which was part of the developing process of canonization. On rare occasions subsequent discoveries have led to the filling out of such titles with content. Famous instances were the strange "Book of the Giant Og" and also "The Penitence of Jannes and Mambres" mentioned in the Gelasian decree, a list of permitted and forbidden books ascribed to the fifth-century Pope Gelasius I (492–496 CE). These titles refer to two works, lost for millennia, which were discovered in the last century by archaeological chance and excavation, viz., *The Book of the Giants* and *The Book of Jannes and Mambres*.[12] Thus there is good reason to think that ancient reality lay behind the names of works mentioned in this and other lists preserved in Greek, Latin, Armenian and other languages.[13]

---

[11] English translations of some fragmentary apocrypha were included in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1983), 2: 775–918. See also M. E. Stone and J. Strugnell, *The Books of Elijah, Parts 1 and 2* (Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series 5; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979) and M. E. Stone, B. G. Wright and D. Satran, *The Apocryphal Ezekiel* (SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 18; Atlanta: SBL, 2000). An edition of Noah writings and traditions reconstructed from citations and quotations is now being prepared, edited by A. Amihai, R. Clements, V. Hillel and M. E. Stone.

[12] J. C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of the Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1989), 1–7 and A. Pietersma, *The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres the Magicians: P. Chester Beatty XVI (With New Editions of Papyrus Vindobonensis Greek Inv. 29456+29828 Verso and British Library Cotton Tiberius B. v f. 87)* (Leiden: Brill, 1994). These are cited as: *Liber de Ogia nomine gigante qui post diluvium cum dracone ab hereticis pugnasse perhibetur*; and *Liber qui appellatur Paenitentia Iamne et Mambre*. See E. von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum* (Leipzig: Hinrich's, 1912). Jannes and Jambres were known in medieval Jewish tradition, being mentioned in midrashim, in the Zohar and other sources. M. Avi-Yonah, "Jannes and Jambres," *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 9: 1278.

[13] The transmission of Second Temple material and information about Second Temple Jewish texts, and the like, in the Islamic realm is coming into its own as a

Now, if we conceive of our task as the study of Judaism in the Second Temple period and the challenge of the present paper to be the question, "Where and how does the corpus of literature found in the Qumran Scrolls fit into the literature of Judaism at that time?" then the fragmentary books found in ancient manuscripts at Qumran should not be privileged over the fragmentary works attested by ancient sources such as Clement of Alexandria, *scholia* or lists of proscribed books or others. A parade example of this is the work of B. G. Wright who identified fragments of the Ezekiel Apocryphon known from Qumran fragments in 1 Clement and subsequently isolated, on this basis, further important fragments in Clement of Alexandria.[14] And, as was also the case with the instances of Petit and Paramelle, it is easier to identify fragments of already known works than to recognize other fragments that witness to otherwise unattested compositions.[15]

This dimension of the world of learning, often focused on the marches of late antique and medieval studies, requires a different range of skills from the study of the Hebrew, Aramaic and even Greek fragments from Qumran. When we move beyond the classical and well-known Semitic languages into Oriental Christian traditions, the problem is compounded. But the isolation and study of fragments of ancient Jewish works from oriental manuscripts is as significant as excavating for them in the Qumran caves or in Khirbet el-Mird.

Moreover, there is a further consideration that should be brought to bear, which is the following. Distinctive Qumran sectarian material does not seem to have entered the Christian or Rabbinic traditions and the only post-destruction source for it is the Cairo Geniza, itself transmitting the fruit, as we explained above, of an archaeological dis-

---

source. A leader in this field is John Reeves, see "Exploring the Afterlife," and, for example, the articles by Wasserstrom, Himmelfarb, Adler, Reeves himself and others in the volume edited by John C. Reeves, *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994). The bibliography in this realm could be greatly expanded and it is a most promising field for future research.

[14] B. G. Wright, III, "Qumran Pseudepigrapha and Early Christianity: Is 1 Clement 50:4 a Citation of 4QPseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385 12)?" in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 31; ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 183–93.

[15] Of course, the same proved true in the course of the identification of the fragmentary manuscripts from Qumran.

covery.[16] It seems most likely to us that the reason for this situation is the esoteric nature of the Essene teachings, as presented by Josephus, *J.W.* 2.142, "and that he will neither conceal any thing from those of his own sect, nor discover any of their doctrines to others, no, not though anyone should compel him so to do at the hazard of his life. Moreover, he swears to communicate their doctrines to no one any otherwise than as he received them himself." In fact, as was true of the Gnostics as well, the only way ancient esoteric doctrines got into the broad stream of transmitted knowledge was in the case of apostates (like Augustine and Manichaeism) or by modern archaeological chance. Consequently, for example, the teachings of Mithraism are still unknown, except as far as can be inferred from their material remains. Similarly, were it not for Apuleius' paradigmatic story, we would know very little of the teaching of the Isis cult.[17]

Consequently, we may conclude that the material that the Churches transmitted illuminates a different part of the Jewish geographical and social spectrum in antiquity than that from which the Dead Sea Scrolls derived and that the Qumran sectarian works, being esoteric, did not circulate outside the initiates. In view of the clearly sectarian character of the Qumran covenanters, it also seems reasonable to assume that a broad understanding of Second Temple Judaism is better derived, not from the Qumran finds and their configuration, but from the material transmitted to us in other channels, chiefly, so far, the Christian church and to some extent the Jewish tradition. This part of the literary landscape demands more attention than it has received and from the perspective we have highlighted.

---

[16] N. Wieder, *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism: A Reproduction of the First Edition with Addenda, Corrigenda and Supplementary Articles* (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 2005) has various suggestions about the transmission of Qumran material and Karaism. He speculates that Qumran sectaries continued to exist during the first part of the first millennium. No clear evidence, he admits, supports this beyond the textual similarities he has discerned. This matter has been discussed in scholarly literature since his time, and a bibliography may be found at the end of the reprint of Wieder's book. *Non liquet*. John Reeves has also discussed the possible early currents feeding into Karaism in "The Afterlife."

[17] H. J. W. Drivers and A. F. de Jong, "Mithras," in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P. W. van der Horst; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 1083–19; J. Assman, "Isis," *ibidem*, 855–60. A. S. Geden, *Mithraic Sources in English* (Hastings: Chthonios Books, 1990); R. E. Witt, *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1971); J. G. Griffiths, *Plutarch's de Iside et Osiride: Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1970).

In addition to the above, we must bear in mind that the fragmentary literature is not only from the Land of Israel. The Greek-speaking Diaspora had a significant literary production. Certain Jewish writings in Greek have been preserved in their entirety by Christian traditions. This includes the Apocrypha that scholars agree were written in Greek, such as 2–4 Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, and a few more. In addition, it seems very likely that a number of the works conventionally included among the Pseudepigrapha were composed in Greek, such as *2 Enoch, Testament of Abraham, Testament of Job*, the so-called *Synagogal Prayers, the Sibylline Oracles* and others. Some complete Jewish Hellenistic works are also preserved in daughter translations of the Greek, even if they have perished in the Greek original. These include two Pseudo-Philonic Jewish Hellenistic homilies, *de Iona* and *de Sampsone*, among other writings.[18]

Partly due to the differing channels of their transmission, but in fact perhaps more because of the role they came to play in Christianity and their consequent extensive preservation, Philo and Josephus have usually been put into a different category. Certainly, the amount of writing by these two authors far outweighs the surviving literary production of any other Jewish author from late Antiquity. To the Greek Philonic material, we should also add Philo's writings that were preserved integrally only in the Armenian daughter translation, such as the *de animalibus* and the *de providentia*.[19] To this corpus of preserved complete works, which is itself very considerable indeed, we should add the large number of fragmentary writings, most of which were found in the work of Alexander Polyhistor, in turn cited by Eusebius, particularly in his *preparatio evangelica*. This writing includes philosophy (Aristobulus), belles lettres (Ezekiel the Tragedian), chronography (Demetrius), sapiential compositions (pseudo-Phocylides), history (Artapanus, pseudo-Eupolemus), etc. In contrast to literature

---

[18] Substantial abstracts from these are being translated into English by Aram Topchyan and Gohar Muradyan and will be included in the new collection of Jewish Literature of Late Antiquity being prepared by the Jewish Publication Society of Philadelphia.

[19] See A. Terian, "Appendix," in *A Repertory of Published Armenian Translations of Classical Texts* (ed. C. Zuckermann; Jerusalem: Institute of African and Asian Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1995), 36–44 and online at: http://micro5.mscc.huji.ac.il/~armenia/repertory.html. Terian also deals with *de Iona* and *de Sampsone*.

produced in the Land of Israel, the authors of this literature are known by name.[20]

Jewish production in Greek also included translations of works composed in Hebrew and Aramaic. In addition to those found among the Apocrypha (e.g., the grandson's translation of ben Sira) and Pseudepigrapha (such as *1 Enoch* and *Aramaic Levi Document* and *Jubilees*), the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures formed a fundament of Jewish writing in Greek. In the field of Bible translation, the translations known as Quinta and Sexta, available from ancient discoveries, or the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets codex—a modern archaeological find, indicate that even in the translation of biblical books, a very considerable part of what existed in antiquity has been lost.[21]

Some mysteries remain regarding the preservation of this part of the ancient, Jewish heritage. Two of a number of open questions are: how and where in the Greek-speaking world did literary production flourish? We know a good deal about Alexandria; we assume that Jason of Cyrene, author of 2 Maccabees, came from Cyrene in North Africa, though where he wrote is unclear as is where the Epitomator worked, who produced the version we have.[22] We know of active Jewish communities in cities like Sardis in Asia Minor, Antioch in Syria and so forth, but the character of literary production, indeed of intellectual life, in these places remains veiled in darkness. A second question relates to Jewish writing in Greek in the Land of Israel. Wacholder's identification of Judas Maccabeus' ambassador to Rome, Eupolemus, with the author of the fragmentary history has not been widely accepted.[23] There was a considerable pagan literature in Greek from the Greek cities of Palestine,[24] but we do not know whether Jews

---

[20] See Denis, *Fragmenta*; J. H. Charlesworth, "Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works," in Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2: 775–919.

[21] Compare the Samaritan Greek literature such as Pseudo-Eupolemus and the Bible translation of which a fragment was published by E. Tov, "Pap. Giessen 13,19,22,26: A Revision of the LXX," *RB* 78 (1971): 355–83.

[22] Daniel Schwartz, in his recent edition, cannot pronounce on these two issues, but is of the view that the appended epistles were added in Greek in the Land of Israel: see D. R. Schwartz, *The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Hebrew Translation, and Commentary* (Between Bible and Mishnah; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004), 23 [Hebrew].

[23] B. Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974).

[24] A survey is given by M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 83–88.

from that land used Greek as a literary language. Facilely, it is usually assumed that this was not the case, but the instance of the epistles in 2 Maccabees, if Schwartz is correct, weighs in favour of this.[25] In fact, beyond this, we do not know.[26]

As to literature in Hebrew and Aramaic, our knowledge of literary production in the Aramaic-speaking Diaspora north and east of the Land of Israel, as indeed our knowledge of the Jewish communities of these areas, is fragmentary. It seems to us likely that the Book of Tobit was written in the Eastern Diaspora, and that it was written in Aramaic. The Epistle of Jeremiah, which was apparently composed in Hebrew, was written by someone familiar with Babylonian religious practice.[27] But these works are just debris of what must have been the literature of a very considerable and ancient Diaspora, with roots going back, perhaps, as far as the destruction of the northern kingdom of Israel in the eighth century. We do not find substantial information or literature about Mesopotamian Jewry until the Babylonian Talmud, from the third century CE on.[28] Yet, we must assume that this community had a literature, basically in Aramaic, which would have been readily comprehensible to Aramaic-speaking Jews of the Land of Israel, often perhaps even more readily than literature in Greek. So, in looking to the Diaspora, a major factor in Judaism in those days, it behoves us to be completely aware of how little information we have.[29]

To the information given above we might add certain books mentioned in rabbinic literature. In particular, y. Sanhedrin 10:1

---

[25] See note 22 above.

[26] A substantial number of ossuaries from the Jerusalem area in the first century have Greek inscriptions. See also C. A. Moore, "Tobit, Book of," *ABD*, 6: 585–93 and D. Mendels, "Epistle of Jeremiah" *ABD*, 3: 706–21.

[27] G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), on "Tobit," 29–35, esp. 34–35 and "The Epistle of Jeremiah," 35–37, esp. 37; J. A. Fitzmyer, "Tobit, Book of," *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; New York: OUP, 2000) 2: 948–950, esp. 949. Tzvi Abusch and the writer are researching this question.

[28] A good deal of evidence has been gathered by J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (Leiden: Brill, 1969) and some associated studies. But, it is far from reflecting any sort of picture of the intellectual or literary production of these Jews in the pre-Amoraic period. Armenian Jewry, north of Mesopotamia, in the first century BCE is discussed by Aram Topchyan, cf. A. Topchyan, "Jews in Ancient Armenia (1st Century BC–5th Century AD)," *Le Muséon* 120.3–4 (2007): 435–476.

[29] M. Stern, "The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature," in *The Jewish People in the First Century* (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum; ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976), 1101–159.

(Krotishin 28a), in seeking to characterize ספרים חיצונים mentions "Sefer ben La'ana" of which we have no knowledge otherwise, as well as, ספרי מירוס וכל הספרים שנכתבו מכאן ואילך ("the books of *meros*: and all the books written thenceforth").[30] This is one of a number of expressions in Rabbinic literature referring to non-rabbinic works that were at the Rabbis' disposal. The subject is too broad to be discussed in detail here. In b. Sanhedrin chap. 11 an eschatological prediction is quoted from a "scroll" written in Hebrew and in square script כתובה אשורית ולשון קודש that was found in the Roman archives (גנזי רומי). In fact, moreover, we know as little about composition in Hebrew and Aramaic in the Greek-speaking Diaspora as we do about composition in Greek in the Land of Israel, but there seems to be no particular reason to assume that all Hebrew and Aramaic writing is from the Land of Israel and all Greek[31] writing is from the Diaspora.[32]

We have deliberately painted a very broad canvas, but it seems a reasonable one and it forms a necessary context in which to try to place the Qumran manuscripts. They are an expression of one, sectarian library or assembly of books within a very much larger literature. Within this broader context, it becomes as significant to observe what does not occur as what does. This we cannot do here and, in fact, a number of studies have already done so. If there is a *desideratum* at this level, it has to do with the integration of the literature known from Qumran with the other Jewish writing that is preserved from this age. But, equally or more important, is to view the Qumran literature as part of the Jewish literature of the age, judged not just by what has

---

[30] The term "books of *meros*" is an old chestnut that no-one has cracked satisfactorily. The most commonly accepted interpretation, which is not necessarily convincing, is that it is short for "Homerus" and designates secular, Greek literature. The reasons for doubt to be thrown on this explanation are not explored here.

[31] It is intriguing, but perhaps natural enough, that there is no Jewish literature originally produced in Latin, though Momigliano has discussed one possible such work: A. Momigliano, "The New Letter by 'Anna' to 'Seneca'" *Athenaeum* 69 (1985): 217–19.

[32] The standing of *Megillat Ta'anit* and of *Tanna debe Eliyyahu* is unclear, but at least the former seems to be from the Second Temple period. See Vered Noam, *Megillat Ta'anit: Versions. Interpretation. History With a Critical Edition* (Between Bible and Mishnah; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2003) [Hebrew]. *Tanna debe Eliyyahu* is extant in citations (not all necessarily genuine) in Rabbinic literature and some Geniza fragments. Our remark above refers only to literary compositions and not to later crystallizations of early traditions, such as scholars have attempted to recover from Tannaitic literature. See, for example, J. Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditions About the Pharisees before 70* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1971).

survived in integrally or substantially extant works, but by what we know and can reasonably infer to have existed. This is a far more complex task, for what survives or is known to have existed is most likely just the tip of an iceberg.

Indeed, the picture of the shape of Jewish literature from the fourth century BCE to the first century CE is like a jigsaw puzzle missing many pieces. Recently there has been a debate within the Editorial Advisory Board of a new translation of the Pseudepigrapha about the organization of the books to be included just in this collection. This question, by its nature, raises the issue of the configuration of the books and sharpens those questions of classification and categorization that were debated over twenty years ago when the large translation of Pseudepigrapha edited by J. H. Charlesworth was published. But the question today is more complex than it was in the 1980s. At that time, the issue was the corpus of books called, *faut de mieux*, "the Pseudepigrapha." This was so little a coherent corpus that it varied enormously from one collection to another as is clear to anyone who compares the tables of contents of the Pseudepigrapha volumes edited by Emil Kautzsch, R. H. Charles, H. D. F. Sparks and J. H. Charlesworth, not to speak of Paul Riessler.[33] The Apocrypha, as they are called in Protestant usage, were a fixed collection, largely overlapping with the Roman Catholic Deuterocanonical books. The Pseudepigrapha were books of roughly the same character, associated with biblical figures and not in the Apocrypha. All were supposedly Jewish or re-workings of Jewish works (or occasionally traditions). But the delimitation of this collection was unclear because it has existed as a collection only in relatively recently times, starting from the end of the nineteenth century, and even that "collection" has no organic coherence. Even the early handbook of Pseudepigrapha by Johannes Fabricius of 1729 is better viewed as "A guide book to the Pseudepigrapha and associated works and traditions;" he does not intend it to be taken as a fixed collection of "the Pseudepigrapha." Fabricius gathered a vast amount of material in his two volumes but did not intend to form a

[33] E. Kautzsch, ed., *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1900); R. H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913); H. F. D. Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 1984); Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* and P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel* (Heidelberg: Kerle, 1928), 138–55, 1273–274.

delimited collection, or even to do more than collect an assembly of fragments, texts, and attestations, with one or two whole works (4 Ezra and the Hypomnesticon of Josephus). The same is true of the impressive corpus of information collected by Abbé J.-P. Migne in 1856–58 as part of his encyclopedian enterprises.[34]

From the period of Fabricius and of Migne's *Dictionnaire des Apocryphes* down to the middle of the twentieth century, not much consideration was devoted to the question of how the various pseudepigrapha, discovered in oriental and western manuscripts, could be defined as Christian or Jewish. In general, if a work on a topic or figure from the Hebrew Bible turned up that had no overt Christian markers, it was considered to be Jewish and added to the pseudepigrapha. In the last fifty years, however, this simple assumption has been questioned and certain books, once regarded as pillars of the pseudepigrapha, are now realised to be Christian, at the least in the editions that have reached us. The reception history of pseudepigrapha is now becoming an important field of learning in its own right. When scholars started to doubt overly facile identifications of Jewish pseudepigrapha, they reacted in the reverse direction, wishing to identify the contexts of transmission of these works, which were Christian in nearly all cases, and work back in detail through the various functions these works have played in the course of their transmission from antiquity. While this is an ideal pattern of work for an ideal world, it is actually only partially practicable. For one thing, few scholars have the combination of breadth and depth of learning required to peel the layers off the literary onion. But it has become very evident that a high consciousness of the ambiguity of the categories "Jewish" and "Christian" is required.[35]

This issue of Jewish and/or Christian categories is, however, ancillary to our major point. This chapter is a call for us to step back from the siren song of the Scrolls and to broaden our perspective, to see them as

---

[34] J.-P. Migne, ed., *Dictionnaire des Apocryphes* (Paris: 1856, 1858).

[35] The best-known, but far from the only name in this discussion is that of Robert A. Kraft: see R. A. Kraft, "The Multiform Jewish Heritage of Early Christianity," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at 60* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 3: 74–99; *idem*, "Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions," *JSJ* 32.4 (2001): 371–95. The history of learning in this field is beyond our scope here. A recent work dealing with Kraft's methodology is J. R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

a part of a much broader landscape. That broader landscape is the literary and religious creativity of Judaism in the Second Temple period and it is that total landscape that we strive to apprehend. The danger is that the richness of the Dead Sea Scrolls' witness, which is incomparable, may entice us to give them a place in historical reconstructions that is disproportionate to the significance of the sect and which may even (in extreme cases) shade over into making them virtually normative. As Delphi said: μηδὲν ἄγαν even the Dead Sea Scrolls!