1. Definitions of Scrolls and of Pseudepigrapha

A good deal has been written on some aspects of the relationship between the DSS and the Pseudepigrapha, with most attention focused on certain particular works, with the Book of Enoch holding pride of place in this scholarly discussion.

The term “Pseudepigrapha” is difficult. The word means, of course, “falsely ascribed” or “falsely attributed.” Only in the last generation has the attempt been made to separate “Pseudepigrapha” and “Pseudepigrapha Studies” from the study of the Apocrypha, and even today, I am uncomfortable using the term “Pseudepigrapha” on its own. We can readily define the Apocrypha: these are Jewish works of the period of the Second Temple not included in the Hebrew Bible but which are to be found in the Greek and Latin Old Testaments. This usage is Protestant, of course, and the terminology “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament” was made predominant through the title of the great English language collection edited by R.H. Charles at the beginning of this century. The Catholic, Oriental and Orthodox churches include the Protestant Apocrypha (and certain churches some of the Pseudepigrapha) in their canons of Scripture. Jewish tradition in modern times has called all this literature the ספירה זוערה or “exterior books,” i.e., exterior to the canon of the Hebrew Bible.

In this Protestant usage, then, the term “Pseudepigrapha” designates literature similar to the Apocrypha which is not in the Apocrypha. Generally these are books connected with the Bible or the biblical period, mostly written in the age of the Second Temple, and for the most part Jewish. There are various modern published collections of
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Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and just of Pseudepigrapha. While the collection of the Apocrypha is fixed in all of these, that of the Pseudepigrapha differs in range and content. The delimitation of Pseudepigrapha is very much a matter of the individual decisions of the modern editors and of modern editorial policy, and this matter has been the subject of considerable discussion and debate in recent years. In the present paper the whole of the literature of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha will be discussed as one corpus and its relationship with the Qumran finds considered.

Intriguingly, the channel of transmission is the dominant criterion for inclusion of a writing in the Pseudepigrapha. They are all Jewish or supposedly Jewish works which were transmitted by the Christian churches, either in Greek—which is sometimes original—or in translations made from Greek. There seem to be almost no Jewish Latin works which have survived, though, in principle, there is no reason why such should not have existed.

The criteria for inclusion in the collection of Pseudepigrapha are not unambiguous, and sometimes customary usage overcomes the general guidelines set out above. Thus Philo and Josephus are not included, while the third and fourth Books of Maccabees are. Most collections of the Pseudepigrapha contain the Sibylline Oracles, on the one hand, which are Jewish and Greek but not biblical; and the Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs and Lives of the Prophets on the other. These are "biblical" and transmitted by the Church, but most probably not Jewish, though incorporating Jewish sources.

With all of these reservations in mind, then, I must address myself to the question of "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha," taking Pseudepigrapha in the sense of Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The DSS, it should be remarked, is a grouping which, like the Pseudepigrapha, is determined by its channel of transmission. The Scrolls are obviously distinguished from Pseudepigrapha by the fact that most of them are transmitted in their original languages, and they occur in a fixed context, both chronological and archeological.

Not all the DSS have reached us in their original language, and such translations as, e.g., the Aramaic of Job, Greek of the Epistle of
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