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Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*L.A.B.*), is an interesting witness to Jewish interpretation and reception of scripture in the first century CE. Like other examples of the literary corpus sometimes dubbed ‘rewritten Bible,’ *L.A.B.* evinces great creativity in compressing, embellishing, and interpreting the biblical storyline from the creation of Adam to the death of Saul. It is Pseudo-Philos imaginative retelling of scripture through the lens of Jewish interpretive traditions that makes *L.A.B.* “one of the most significant links between early haggadah and rabbinic midrash.”

The first section of this article will introduce the reader to what have been dominant interpretive issues in the scholarly reception of Pseudo-Philos *L.A.B.* While not claiming to be exhaustive, this discussion will suffice as a brief survey of academic research on this text over the last half century. The remainder of this article will specifically examine Pseudo-Philos varied reception of Genesis traditions, making a distinction between the sequential retelling of Genesis offered in *L.A.B.* 1–8 and out-of-sequence citations of Genesis found in later chapters of the work. In particular, the Noahide and Abrahamic covenant traditions will be examined to illustrate the interpretive strategies that Pseudo-Philos brings to bear on Genesis.

**L.A.B. in Recent Scholarship**

Pseudo-Philos work survives in eighteen complete and three fragmentary Latin manuscripts dating from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries. It is quite possible that an original longer ending of *L.A.B.* has been lost since all

---

complete manuscripts end abruptly in the middle of Saul’s final testament, but it is impossible to determine how much further the text may have once extended. Leopold Cohn reintroduced \textit{L.A.B.} to the academic community in 1898, but the lack of a critical edition hampered scholarly research on this text for most of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{4} Daniel Harrington’s publication of a Latin critical text in 1976 laid the necessary foundation for all subsequent work on Pseudo-Philo.\textsuperscript{5} Since that date, English translations of \textit{L.A.B.} have been produced by Harrington in 1985 and Howard Jacobson in 1996.\textsuperscript{6}

During much of the twentieth century, scholarly research on \textit{L.A.B.} focused on determining the original language, precursor text type, provenance, date, and polemical stance or social location of Pseudo-Philo’s work. Following Cohn, most interpreters argue that the text was originally composed in Hebrew before being translated into Greek and then Latin.\textsuperscript{7} Perhaps the most compelling evidence for an original Hebrew composition is Pseudo-Philo’s apparent reliance upon a Hebrew biblical text. Harrington’s contention that the biblical text presupposed in \textit{L.A.B.} was of the Palestinian type (as opposed to Babylonian or Alexandrian) has gained widespread acceptance.\textsuperscript{8} However, as Jacobson rightly notes, Pseudo-Philo’s tendency to paraphrase scripture and cite it from memory might reasonably call into question any attempt to draw secure conclusions about \textit{L.A.B.}’s precursor text.\textsuperscript{9}

If Pseudo-Philo did use a Palestinian-type text and if \textit{L.A.B.} was indeed composed in Hebrew, then a Palestinian provenance for the work would be all but certain. The likelihood of this provenance is also supported by Pseudo-Philo’s apparent familiarity with Palestinian geography and \textit{L.A.B.}’s strong literary parallels with \textit{4 Ezra} and \textit{2 Baruch} (both of Palestinian ori-