

*LIBER ANTIQUITATUM BIBLICARUM*

REWARD AND PUNISHMENT IN PSEUDO-PHILO'S *LIBER ANTIQUITATUM BIBLICARUM*

By ERICH ENGLER, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University © Copyright by Erich Engler, July 2012

McMaster University DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2012) Hamilton, Ontario (Religious Studies)

TITLE: Reward and Punishment in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* AUTHOR:  
Erich Engler, B.A. (Briercrest Bible College), M.A. (Trinity Western University) SUPERVISOR:  
Professor Eileen M. Schuller NUMBER OF PAGES: ix, 275

## ABSTRACT:

Almost every narrative in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*L.A.B.*), a late first or early second century C.E. rewriting of scriptural texts and traditions, deals in some way with issues of reward and punishment, a prominent theme in early Jewish literature. In 1917, M. R. James observed that two "truths" were "foremost" among the "great truths" in *L.A.B.*: (1) "the indestructibility of Israel" and (2) Israel's "duty of faithfulness to the one God" (*Biblical Antiquities*, 34). Most studies of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* emphasize one of these two "great truths" to the virtual (or complete) exclusion of the other. This has resulted in sharply contrasting conclusions concerning the concepts of reward and punishment within Pseudo-Philo's ideology.

A promising perspective from which to reconsider the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* is the view of reward and punishment, which, according to E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism, was pervasive within Judaism of the first centuries of the Common Era (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 75, 421–423, 426). Such an investigation will be the focus of this thesis. Scholars such as Heikki Räisänen (*Paul and the Law*, 180 n. 92), Frederick J. Murphy (*Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*, 233 n. 18), and Sanders (*Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 263–275) have contended that *L.A.B.* exemplifies covenantal nomism but this premise has never been examined thoroughly. In this study, through a side-by-side analysis of *L.A.B.* and scriptural texts and traditions, we will identify the changes that Pseudo-Philo made to the scriptural account and then extract Pseudo-Philo's ideology through a careful analysis of these changes. The recognition that *L.A.B.* is a late Second Temple period rewriting of scriptural texts and traditions is central to this examination.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

I thank Dr. E. Schuller for supervising my Ph.D. program, Dr. S. Westerholm and Dr. D. Machiela for serving on my supervisory committee, and Dr. A. Mendelson for serving on my supervisory committee at the beginning of my studies. I also thank Dr. M. G. Abegg, Jr., who supervised my M.A. program at Trinity Western University, for his encouragement during this stage of my studies. Finally, I thank my wife, Ruth, and our children, Daniel, Sarah, and Isaac, for their support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Pseudo-Philo’s <i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i> .....	4
Framework for Research .....	11
Research Question.....	42
A Preliminary Discussion of Key Terminology .....	45
Methodology .....	49
Outline of Thesis.....	54
<b>2: THE REWARD AND PUNISHMENT OF ISRAEL’S PRE-SINAITIC ANCESTORS IN L.A.B. 1–8 .....</b>	<b>56</b>
The Noahic Covenant in <i>L.A.B.</i> 1–5.....	57
<i>The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon the Establishment of the Noahic Covenant in L.A.B. 1–3</i> .....	66
<i>The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Life in the Noahic Covenant in L.A.B. 4–5</i> .....	79
The Abrahamic Covenant in <i>L.A.B.</i> 6–8 .....	85
<i>The Impact of Reward and Punishment on the Establishment of the Abrahamic Covenant in L.A.B.</i> .....	97
<i>The Impact of Reward and Punishment on Life in the Abrahamic Covenant in L.A.B.</i> .....	104
Conclusions concerning the Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Israel’s Ancestors in <i>L.A.B.</i> 1–8 .....	106
<b>3: THE REWARD AND PUNISHMENT OF THE ISRAELITE COVENANT COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE IN L.A.B.....</b>	<b>109</b>
The Establishment of the Mosaic Covenant in <i>L.A.B.</i> .....	109
The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon the Establishment of the Israelite Covenant Community in <i>L.A.B.</i> .....	122
The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Life in the Israelite Covenant Community in <i>L.A.B.</i> .....	136
Conclusions concerning the Impact of Reward and Punishment upon the Israelite Covenant Community as a Whole in <i>L.A.B.</i> .....	170

<b>4: THE REWARD AND PUNISHMENT OF INDIVIDUAL ISRAELITES IN L.A.B. ....</b>	<b>173</b>
Moral Causality.....	174
The Reward and Punishment of Individuals and the Acquisition of Membership in the Israelite Covenant Community in L.A.B. ....	182
The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Life in the Israelite Covenant Community for Individual Israelites in L.A.B. ....	184
<i>Individual Israelites in L.A.B. Whose Punishment for Sin Extends into the World to Come</i>	184
<i>Individual Israelites in L.A.B. Whose Punishment for Sin Might Extend into the World to Come.....</i>	200
<i>Individual Israelites in L.A.B. Whose Punishment for Sin does not appear to Extend into the World to Come.....</i>	221
Homilies or Exhortations within L.A.B. Concerning the Impact of Reward and Punishment on Individuals within the Israelite Covenant Community .....	238
<i>Deborah’s Parting Exhortation (L.A.B. 33:1–5) .....</i>	238
<i>The Song of Hannah (L.A.B. 51:3–6).....</i>	242
Conclusions the Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Individual Israelites in L.A.B. ....	248
<b>5: CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>258</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>265</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. <i>L.A.B.</i> 3:4 and Gen 6:17–18 in Parallel Columns .....	59
Table 2.2. <i>L.A.B.</i> 3:8c–10 and Gen 8:21–22 .....	62
Table 2.3. <i>L.A.B.</i> 3:11 and Gen 9:8–11 .....	64
Table 2.4. <i>L.A.B.</i> 3:11d–g and Gen 9:1–7 .....	65
Table 2.5. <i>L.A.B.</i> 3:12 and Gen 9:12–17 .....	66
Table 2.6. <i>L.A.B.</i> 1:20 and Gen 5:28–29 .....	73
Table 2.7. <i>L.A.B.</i> 6:1 and Gen 11:4 .....	86
Table 2.8. <i>L.A.B.</i> 6:2 and Gen 11:3 .....	87
Table 2.9. <i>L.A.B.</i> 7:2–3a and Gen 11:5–7 .....	88
Table 2.10. <i>L.A.B.</i> 7:5b and Gen 11:8–9 .....	90
Table 2.11. <i>L.A.B.</i> 23:4–5, 8 and Josh 24:2–3.....	96
Table 3.1. Israel’s Arrival at Sinai ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 11:1).....	110
Table 3.2. Israel’s Preparation ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 11:2–3).....	111
Table 3.3. Celestial Signs ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 11:4–5) .....	112
Table 3.4. The Decalogue in <i>L.A.B.</i> 11:6–13 and in Exod 20 .....	114
Table 3.5. Israel’s Fear ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 11:14).....	118
Table 3.6. Moses Meets with God ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 11:15).....	119
Table 3.7. <i>L.A.B.</i> 12:4 and the Jewish Scriptures.....	138
Table 3.8. <i>L.A.B.</i> 12:2a and the Jewish Scriptures.....	145
Table 3.9. <i>L.A.B.</i> 19:2 and Parallels .....	149
Table 3.10. <i>L.A.B.</i> 19:2; 13:10; and the Jewish Scriptures .....	152
Table 3.11. <i>L.A.B.</i> 19:6–7a.....	154
Table 3.12. <i>L.A.B.</i> 12:4 and 19:6–7 .....	156



Table 4.1. Korah’s Rebellion in Numbers and in <i>L.A.B.</i> .....	187
Table 4.2. Judges 17:1–6 and <i>L.A.B.</i> 44:1–5.....	206
Table 4.3. Some Key Differences between Judg 17:1–6 and <i>L.A.B.</i> 44:1–5 .....	208
Table 4.4. The Decalogue in <i>L.A.B.</i> 44:6–7 and in Exod 20 .....	211
Table 4.5. The Speeches by the “Man of God” (1 Sam 2:27–36) and by Eli ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 52:2–4) .....	231
Table 4.6. <i>L.A.B.</i> 20:3–4 and <i>L.A.B.</i> 33:2–3 in Parallel Columns.....	241
Table 4.7. <i>L.A.B.</i> 20:3–7 and <i>L.A.B.</i> 33:1–5 .....	241
Table 4.8. Sin and punishment in <i>L.A.B.</i> .....	249
Table 4.9. The Punishment of Individual Non-Israelite Sinners in <i>L.A.B.</i> .....	251

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

Unless otherwise noted, the abbreviations and symbols in this thesis follow Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009).

The abbreviations and symbols for the *L.A.B.* manuscripts follow Daniel J. Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques. I. Introduction et texte critiques* (trans. Jacques Cazeaux; SC 229; Paris: Cerf, 1976), 16–19, 58–59.

## 1: Introduction

The concepts of reward and punishment are prominent in Second Temple period Jewish literature composed during times of crisis, turmoil, and devastation. As the Jewish people sought to understand their experiences and as they yearned for an end to their suffering, certain topics regularly surfaced. These topics included the future of the Jewish people individually and as a nation, the end of punishment, and the hope of restoration. Second Maccabees, for example, addresses the concepts of reward and (especially) punishment by revisiting one of the most troubling times in Jewish history: the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Second Maccabees shows God's intervention on Israel's behalf during a time in which its priesthood is pious (2 Macc 3:1–40), God's punishment of Israel when it sinned (2 Macc 5:17–18), and God's restoration of Israel following its time of punishment (2 Macc 10:1–9). The troubling questions surrounding the suffering of pious individuals also come to the forefront in the depiction of the martyrdom of a mother and her seven sons in 2 Macc 7:1–42. These individuals died with the hope of resurrection to life in a world to come (2 Macc 7:9; also vv. 10–14). The hope of a world to come was a refuge for Jewish people considering the concepts of reward and punishment in light of their circumstances. Written in the years following the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 C.E., the books of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch emphasized the delay of rewards and punishments until the world to come. According to the author of 4 Ezra, all humanity, including Israel, had followed Adam's evil example and, therefore, would be punished (4 Ezra 3:20, 26; 4:30; 7: [48]). Israel's restoration would take place but only in the world to come and only the small segment of humanity that was obedient to God's Law would experience this time of reward (4 Ezra 7:32, 36; 8:3; 14:34–35). Second Baruch likewise agreed that Israel's predicament was punishment for its sin and that Israel's restoration would take place only in the world to come. Unlike 4 Ezra, which restricted the experience of restoration in the world to come to a small minority, 2 Baruch offers

hope that, as long as Israel remained faithful to the Law, Israel will experience God's rewards in the world to come (2 Baruch 32:1–6; 44:12). The Apocalypse of Abraham likewise notes that Israel's hope for restoration resides in the hope of a future life with God (29:17–19), but explains the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple differently from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. According to the Apocalypse of Abraham, God permitted "heathens" (Apoc. Ab. 27:1) to burn and plunder the temple (Apoc. Ab. 27:3, 4) because of the presence and the worship of an idol within the temple along with the practice of child sacrifice (Apoc. Ab. 25:1–2; 27:8). Israel's hope, ultimately, resides in the remnant of "righteous men" from Abraham's seed whom God had "protected" (Apoc. Ab. 29:17). After the punishment of the wicked (29:15), these "righteous men" will experience life with God in a new age (29:17–19).

The themes of reward and punishment come to the forefront particularly in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*L.A.B.*),<sup>1</sup> a late first or early second century C.E. rewriting of scriptural texts and traditions. Throughout this text, almost every narrative deals in some way with issues of reward and punishment. Two themes of particular significance are "the indestructibility of Israel" and (2) Israel's "duty of faithfulness to the one God."<sup>2</sup> These two "truths" are identified by M. R. James as "foremost" among the "great truths" in *L.A.B.* and have dominated discussions of the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* Either consciously or unconsciously, most scholars who have studied the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* have emphasized one of these two "great truths" to the virtual (or complete) exclusion of the other.<sup>3</sup> The result has been sharply contrasting conclusions concerning the concepts of reward and punishment within Pseudo-Philo's ideology.

---

<sup>1</sup> Early examples of scholars highlighting these themes in the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* are Leopold Cohn, "An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria," *JQR* 10 (1898): 322-323, and M. R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (London: SPCK, 1917; repr., New York: Ktav, 1971), 34-37.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Indeed, as we shall see, scholars' dual emphases upon these themes in *L.A.B.* trace back to Cohn's introductory article at the end of the nineteenth century (Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 322).

A promising perspective from which to reconsider the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* is the view of reward and punishment, which, according to E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism, was pervasive within Judaism of the first centuries of the Common Era.<sup>4</sup> Such an investigation will be the focus of this thesis. Scholars including Heikki Räisänen, Frederick J. Murphy, and E. P. Sanders have contended that *L.A.B.* exemplifies covenantal nomism.<sup>5</sup> However, this contention has never been examined thoroughly. Sanders's now-classic synopsis of his theory of covenantal nomism in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* outlined the key elements of this theory:

The 'pattern' or 'structure' of covenantal nomism is this: (1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies both (3) God's promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God's mercy belong to the group which will be saved. An important interpretation of the first and last points is that election and ultimately salvation are considered to be by God's mercy rather than human achievement.<sup>6</sup>

Central to the view of reward and punishment within Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism is the belief that "reward is not salvation, punishment is not damnation."<sup>7</sup> As Sanders observed,

The *universal* view is that *every individual Israelite* who indicates his intention to remain in the covenant by repenting, observing the Day of Atonement and the like, will be forgiven for *all* of his transgressions. . . . The Israelite in the covenant will be punished for transgressions – by suffering, by death and even after death if necessary – but he is saved by remaining in the covenant given by God.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 426 (also pp. 75, 182, 421-423).

<sup>5</sup> Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (WUNT 29; Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 180 n. 92; Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 233 n. 18; E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 B.C.E. - 66 C. E.* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992), 263–275.

<sup>6</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 422.

<sup>7</sup> E. P. Sanders, "Covenantal Nomism Revisited," *JSQ* 16 (2009): 47.

<sup>8</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 182.

In this introductory chapter, I will introduce Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, explore the framework within which the research is located, and delineate the research question and methodology. I will then discuss the key terminology and outline the remainder of the thesis.

### ***Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum***

Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*<sup>9</sup> is an insightful and selective rewriting of scriptural texts and traditions composed by an unknown author. Early manuscripts of *L.A.B.* were circulated in conjunction with the works of Philo of Alexandria and most of the extant manuscripts of *L.A.B.* appear in Latin collections of Philo of Alexandria's writings.<sup>10</sup> Consequently, the text has been traditionally ascribed to Philo of Alexandria.<sup>11</sup> Scholars agree, nevertheless, that *L.A.B.* was not composed by Philo of Alexandria but, rather, by an unknown author. As Cohn observed, "The style and literary character" of *L.A.B.* "are absolutely different" from that of genuine Philonic compositions.<sup>12</sup> However, due to the long-term association between *L.A.B.* and Philo, scholars continue to refer to its unknown author as Pseudo-Philo.<sup>13</sup>

*L.A.B.* is extant in eighteen complete and three fragmentary medieval Latin manuscripts.<sup>14</sup> Five of these Latin manuscripts are from the eleventh century (Ad, K, L, Ph, X);<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> The Latin title by which this text is known most commonly today, the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* ("Book of Biblical Antiquities"), is not found on any extant manuscript of *L.A.B.* For discussions regarding the origins of this title and of the other titles under which this text circulated, see Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation* (2 vols.; AGJU 31; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 197–199.

<sup>10</sup> For a list of the small portion of the Latin collections of Philo of Alexandria's writings that contain *L.A.B.*, see Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus: Practice and Theory* (New Haven: Yale, 1938), 177–179. For a detailed description of the *L.A.B.* manuscripts, see Daniel J. Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques. I. Introduction et texte critiques* (trans. Jacques Cazeaux; SC 229; Paris: Cerf, 1976), 16–19.

<sup>11</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 307; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:195–196.

<sup>12</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 306–307.

<sup>13</sup> As far as I have been able to determine, Leopold Cohn (*ibid.*, 281) was the first scholar to refer to the author of the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* as Pseudo-Philo.

<sup>14</sup> Daniel J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985), 2:298; Daniel J. Harrington, "The Text Critical

five are from the twelfth century (H, P, V, Y, Z); three are from the thirteenth century (D, E, F); one is from the fourteenth century (O); and seven are from the fifteenth century (B, C, G, M, R, S, W). In addition to these twenty-one extant Latin manuscripts, Harrington also included the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (a medieval Hebrew text) in his list of *L.A.B.* manuscripts because portions of it clearly parallel *L.A.B.*<sup>16</sup>

The earliest known *definitive* allusions to or citations of *L.A.B.* are in the writings of Hrabanus Maurus (780–856 C.E), Rupert of Deutz (1075/80–1129/30 C.E), and Helinand of Froidmont (1215–1220 C.E).<sup>17</sup> Scholars found possible allusions to *L.A.B.* in pre-ninth century literature<sup>18</sup> but they did not demonstrate conclusively that any of the author(s) were citing *L.A.B.* rather than the exegetical traditions of which *L.A.B.* often was the earliest exemplar.<sup>19</sup>

---

Situation of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *RBén* 83 (1973): 383–388; Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 15–20. Not included in these twenty-one Latin manuscripts of *L.A.B.* is the Lorsch Abbey manuscript, one of two manuscripts that Johannes Sichardus used in the compilation of his sixteenth century C.E. edition of *L.A.B.* (*Philonis Iudaei Alexandrini, Libri Antiquitatum, Quaestionum et Solutionum in Genesin, De Essaeis, De Nominibus Hebraicis, De Mundo*; Basil: Adam Petri, 1527). Harrington (*Pseudo-Philon I*, 17) suggested that the Lorsch Abbey manuscript was from the eleventh century C.E. The present location (or existence!) of this manuscript is not known.

<sup>15</sup> Harrington (*Pseudo-Philo I*, 18) stated that manuscript Ph may date from the end of the eleventh century C.E. or from the start of the twelfth century C.E.

<sup>16</sup> Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 17. Harrington contended that the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* "contient en rétroversion . . . des fragments et des paraphrases du *LAB*" (ibid.). M. R. James, "Notes on Apocrypha," *JTS* VII (Old Series; 1906), 565, was the first scholar to recognize a relationship between the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. For more on the relationship, see Howard Jacobson, "Thoughts on the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, Ps-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and Their Relationship," *SPhiloA* 9 [*Wisdom and Logos. Studies in Jewish Thought in Honor of David Winston*; ed. D.T. Runia and G.E. Sterling] (1997): 239–263. For an English translation of the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, see Moses Gaster, *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel or The Hebrew Bible Historiale, Being a Collection of Apocryphal and Pseudo-Epigraphical Books Dealing with the History of the World from the Creation to the Death of Judas Maccabeus, Translated for the First Time from a Unique Manuscript in the Bodleian Library* (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899; repr., New York: Ktav, 1971). The Hebrew texts of the portions of CJ that correspond to *L.A.B.* are published in Daniel J. Harrington, *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (SBLTT 3; Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974).

<sup>17</sup> Berndt Schaller, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Ps.-philonischen *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* im Mittelalter," *JSJ* 10 (1979): 64–73. See also Edmé Renno Smits, "A contribution to the history of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* in the Middle Ages," *JSJ* 23 (1992): 197–216; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:273–277.

<sup>18</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 11–12; Louis Feldman, prolegomenon to *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*, by M. R. James (London: SPCK, 1917; repr., New York: Ktav, 1971), xi-xii. The most intriguing among

Prior to the end of the nineteenth century, *L.A.B.* was virtually unknown in modern scholarship. The most recent publication of the text at that time was the 1527 edition by Johannes Sichardus.<sup>20</sup> Sichardus's publication had temporarily raised the profile of the early Jewish text but, as is the case with many ancient texts, *L.A.B.* gradually slipped into obscurity. By the end of the nineteenth century C.E., *L.A.B.* was almost forgotten and the Latin text of *L.A.B.* was very difficult to obtain.<sup>21</sup> In 1893, M. R. James published four "unknown" Latin fragments that he had discovered in manuscript 391 of the Phillipps manuscript collection.<sup>22</sup> So forgotten

---

the possible early citations of or allusions to *L.A.B.* in pre-ninth century C.E. literature were Feldman's claim in "The Portrayal of Phinehas by Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus," *JQR* 92 (2002): 315, that Josephus "knew the works of . . . Pseudo-Philo" and James's claim in *Biblical Antiquities*, 10–11, 73, that he found allusions to *L.A.B.* in the writings of Origen (185–254 C.E.). Feldman substantiated his claim that Josephus knew Pseudo-Philo's "works" by directing his readers to the lists of parallels between Josephus and *L.A.B.* (ibid.) that Feldman had published earlier. For these lists, see Feldman, "Prolegomenon," lviii–lxvi and Feldman, "Epilogomenon to Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB)," *JJS* 25 (1974): 306–307. For the view that Pseudo-Philo knew of and was dependent upon the writings of Josephus, see Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Ideal in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah* (New York: MacMillan, 1955), 366. Feldman, "Prolegomenon," xi–xii, correctly questioned the value of the allusions such as those which James had identified in the writings of Origen and he argued that the parallel traditions that James identified are also extant in Rabbinic literature. Nevertheless, Origen's penchant for the writings of Philo of Alexandria suggests that Origen's writings merit further examination for allusions to Pseudo-Philo. For Origen's use of Philo, see David T. Runia, "Philo of Alexandria," in *The Westminster Handbook to Origen* (ed. John Anthony McGuckin; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 169–171. Runia contended that Origen's penchant for Philo of Alexandria's writings led to their preservation until the present day (ibid., 171).

<sup>19</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 314–322; Feldman, "Prolegomenon," ix–x.

<sup>20</sup> Johannes Sichardus, *Philonis Iudaei Alexandrini*. James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 8, stated that Sichardus's *editio princeps* of *L.A.B.* was reprinted in 1538, 1550, 1552, and 1599.

<sup>21</sup> Until Guido Kisch, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Publications in Mediaeval Studies 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1949), published the Latin text of *L.A.B.*, most scholars did not have access to the Latin text of *L.A.B.* For example, Erwin R. Goodenough of Yale University commented in 1935 that he had been forced to depend on James's translation of *L.A.B.* because its "Latin translation is very difficult to procure" (Erwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven: Yale, 1935), 265 n. 1.

<sup>22</sup> M. R. James, "Four Apocryphal Texts in Latin," in *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Apocryphal Books and Fragments* (ed. M. R. James; TS 2.3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893; repr., Nendeln: Kraus, 1967), 164–188. These texts were just four among the many medieval texts that James catalogued over a 40-year period. For more on James's work as a cataloguer of medieval manuscripts, see Lorenzo DiTommaso, "Pseudepigrapha Notes II: 3. The Contribution of the Manuscript Catalogues of M.R. James," *JSP* 18 (2008): 83–160 (especially 83–87).



was *L.A.B.* that only Leopold Cohn, an expert in early Jewish literature, recognized that James's "unknown" fragments were from *L.A.B.*<sup>23</sup>

Scholars widely agree that Pseudo-Philo composed *L.A.B.* between approximately 50 C.E. and 150 C.E. Only a few scholars advocate composition dates outside of this range.<sup>24</sup> In support of this broad range of dates, scholars cite four primary arguments.

First, the "style" of the Latin in *L.A.B.* "is exactly the same" as the style of the Latin in the Old Latin texts of the Jewish Scriptures (ca. fourth century C.E.)<sup>25</sup> and the vocabulary in *L.A.B.* "agrees entirely" with the Old Latin texts of the Jewish Scriptures.<sup>26</sup> This observation is not disputed and it supports the existence of the Latin text of *L.A.B.* in the fourth century C.E.

Second, Jerome's *De Philone* (i.e. *De Viris Illustribus* 11) precedes most of the extant manuscripts of *L.A.B.* and Philo of Alexandria's *Quaestiones in Genesim* follows them.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 277–279. More than two decades later, James (*Biblical Antiquities*, 9) described the collective ignorance of *L.A.B.* among scholars of the late nineteenth century. "In 1893 I came upon four detached fragments in a manuscript at Cheltenham, in the Phillipps collection, and printed them as a new discovery in a volume of *Apocrypha Anecdota* . . . No one who reviewed the book in England or abroad recognized that they were taken from a text already in print." It is now known that Phillipps 391 contains *L.A.B.* 19:14–16; 28:6–10; 40:5–8; 60:2–3. As Howard Jacobson, "Biblical Quotation and Editorial Function in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *JSP* 5 (1989), observed, James deserves much of the credit for the "revival of *L.A.B.* in modern times" (p. 48) since his English language edition of *L.A.B.* published in 1917 spurred on a generation of *L.A.B.* scholarship (ibid.).

<sup>24</sup> Harrington's suggestion that *L.A.B.* was composed "around the time of Jesus" falls only slightly outside this range of dates ("Pseudo-Philo," 299). Jean Hadot, "Le milieu d'origine du '*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,'" in *La Littérature Intertestamentaire. Colloque de Strasbourg (17–19 Octobre 1983)* (ed. A. Caquot; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985), 162–163, advocated a date within the first century BCE for *L.A.B.*; Abram Spiro, "Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 282, suggested that *L.A.B.* may be composed as early as the mid second century BCE; and Alexander Zeron, "Erwägungen zu Pseudo-Philos quellen und Zeit," *JSJ* 11 (1980): 52, suggested a date as late as the third or fourth centuries C.E.

<sup>25</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 327. For more on the Latin in which *L.A.B.* is preserved, see Daniel J. Harrington, "The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *HTR* 63 (1970): 503–504.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 329

<sup>27</sup> Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 19. Harrington described the manuscripts in detail on pages 16–19.

*Quaestiones in Genesim* was translated into Latin in the fourth century C.E.<sup>28</sup> Given the close connection between these texts, it is very possible that *L.A.B.* was translated into Latin around the same time. This, too, points to the existence of *L.A.B.* in the fourth century C.E.

Third, most scholars agree that *L.A.B.* was extant in Hebrew<sup>29</sup> and then in Greek<sup>30</sup> prior to its fourth century C.E. advent in Latin.<sup>31</sup> The acceptance of the hypothesis that the fourth century C.E. Latin text of *L.A.B.* had Hebrew and Greek antecedents places the composition of the hypothetical Hebrew original before the fourth century C.E. The strongest pieces of evidence in support of this hypothesis are the numerous difficult readings in *L.A.B.* that are explained best with an appeal to a Hebrew and/or Greek antecedent. These include the misinterpretation, the mistranslation, and the misreading of letters, words, and phrases.<sup>32</sup> However, although the many Hebraisms and Grecisms in the Latin text of *L.A.B.* (e.g. loan words, expressions, and

---

<sup>28</sup> For the translation date of *Quaestiones in Genesim* into Latin, see F. C. Conybeare (ed.), *Philo about the Contemplative Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895; repr. New York: Garland, 1987), 144–145; François Petit, *L’Ancienne Version Latine des Questions sur la Genèse de Philon d’Alexandrie* (Berlin: Berlin Akademie-Verlag, 1973), 1:12.

<sup>29</sup> Cohn, “Apocryphal Work,” 308–312; Harrington, “Original Language,” 508–514; Émile Puech, *La croyance des esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien. I. La résurrection des morts et le contexte scripturaire* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1993), 131. An early reference to the theory that *L.A.B.* was composed in Hebrew is contained in Sisto da Siena, *Bibliotheca Sancta* (Venice: Franciscum Franciscum Senensum, 1566), 455a. Cited 30 December 2011. Online: <http://www.mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn=urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10142981-4>.

<sup>30</sup> Cohn, “Apocryphal Work,” 307–308; Harrington, “Original Language,” 505–508. One of the first scholars to suggest that the Latin text of *L.A.B.* had a Greek antecedent was James, “Four Apocryphal Texts,” 166–185. James hypothesized that the four “unknown” Latin fragments he published in this article had been translated from Greek. He was so convinced of this hypothesis that he included a translation of each fragment into Greek in his article (*ibid.*, 166, 174, 180, 183). James also argued that one of the fragments, “The Prayer of Moses,” showed the possible influence of a Hebrew version of the Jewish Scriptures (*ibid.*, 170). He did not speculate whether that fragment had a Hebrew antecedent.

<sup>31</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:277. Feldman, “Prolegomenon,” xxv-xxvii, did not reject the widely-accepted theory that *L.A.B.* was extant in Hebrew and Greek prior to its advent in Latin, but he did call for further research on the matter.

<sup>32</sup> Harrington, “Original Language,” 505, 508. The first to note this was James (*Biblical Antiquities*, 28). See Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:218–219; Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (trans. Henrietta Szold and Paul Radin; 2 vols.; 2d Ed.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003), 2:856 n. 13; 2:917 n. 44; and Harrington, “Original Language,” 508–511. As Harrington observed (“Original Language,” 503–514), some difficult passages in *L.A.B.* suggest a Greek antecedent, others suggest a Hebrew antecedent, while others suggest a Greek translation of a Hebrew antecedent.

grammatical constructions) suggest that the Hebrew and/or Greek languages influenced the extant Latin text of *L.A.B.*, they do not establish definitively its prior existence in Hebrew and/or Greek.<sup>33</sup> To establish this, one would have to determine first that the apparent Hebraisms or Grecisms present in *L.A.B.* were not present normally in the Latin of the era and in the region in which its author lived. Next, one would have to determine that its author's knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, or another cognate language had not inadvertently influenced or crept into his Latin. These represent nearly impossible tasks.<sup>34</sup>

Fourth, *L.A.B.* has many themes, ideas, and terms in common with 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra, two texts that were written ca. 100 C.E.<sup>35</sup> The similarities between these texts suggest that *L.A.B.* was composed around the same time. A greater understanding of the relationship between these texts would provide further insight concerning the date of the composition of *L.A.B.* If 2 Baruch and/or 4 Ezra were dependent on *L.A.B.*, then *L.A.B.* would have been composed sometime before 100 C.E.<sup>36</sup> Thus far, however, scholars have not demonstrated conclusively that 2 Baruch and/or 4 Ezra were dependent on *L.A.B.* rather than on a common exegetical tradition.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> See also Feldman, "Prolegomenon," xxv-xxvii.

<sup>34</sup> James Davila, "(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic," *JSP* 15 (2005), 37, made a similar point (albeit without reference to *L.A.B.*) in a discussion of Greek apocryphal or pseudepigraphic literature ostensibly with a Semitic *Vorlage*. Davila wrote, "If a native speaker of Hebrew or Aramaic were to compose a text in Greek, it is entirely possible – likely, even – that the writer would produce a text containing elements of Semitic interference purely because he or she thought in a Semitic language."

<sup>35</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 46–58; Feldman, "Prolegomenon," liv-lv; Charles Perrot, Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, and Daniel J. Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques. II. Introduction littéraire, commentaire, et index* (SC 230; Paris: Cerf, 1976), 32; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:201.

<sup>36</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 58; M. Delcor, "*Philon (Pseudo-)*," *DBSup* 7:1370; Daniel J. Harrington, "Text and Biblical Text in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1969), 179; Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch: Introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire* (2 vols.; SC 144–145; Paris: Cerf, 1969), 1:246–252; Hadot, "Le milieu d'origine du '*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,'" 157.

<sup>37</sup> Feldman, "Prolegomenon," lv; A. F. J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985), 1:619–620.

Although scholars widely agree that *L.A.B.* was composed between approximately 50 C.E. and 150 C.E., they differ regarding whether the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. is the *terminus ad quem*<sup>38</sup> or the *terminus a quo*<sup>39</sup> for its composition. Bruce N. Fisk takes the middle ground between these positions by suggesting that the evidence is insufficient to make a determination.<sup>40</sup> Since scholars are confident that Pseudo-Philo composed *L.A.B.* in the first centuries of the Common Era, it is immaterial for this present study of *L.A.B.* whether 70 C.E. is the *terminus ad quem* or the *terminus a quo* for the composition of *L.A.B.*

If *L.A.B.* was composed in Hebrew between approximately 50 and 150 C.E., its author almost certainly was Jewish. There is little evidence to suggest that the non-Jewish people of this

---

<sup>38</sup> Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "La Datation," in Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 66–74; Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "Luc et les Écritures dans l'Évangile de l'Enfance à lumière des Antiquités Bibliques," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 246–250; Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:299; Frederick J. Murphy, "Retelling the Bible: Idolatry in Pseudo-Philo," *JBL* 107 (1988): 285; Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 6; and Puech, *La croyance des esséniens*, 131. These scholars' chief arguments in favour of 70 C.E. as the *terminus ad quem* are: (1) the references to the temple and sacrifices as being currently ongoing (e.g. *L.A.B.* 22:8), (2) a lack of clear references to the war (66–70 CE), (3) the author's use of "texte continue," and (4) the negative attitude toward leaders not divinely chosen.

<sup>39</sup> Cohn "Apocryphal Work," 324–327; James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 29–33; Christian Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo. *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*" (Ph.D. diss., Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 1964), 188–195; Feldman, "Prolegomenon," xxvii–xxxi; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:199–210; Klausner, *The Messianic Ideal in Israel*, 366; Christopher T. Begg, "The Transjordanian Altar (Josh 22:10–34) According to Josephus (Ant. 5.100–114) and Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.* 22.1–8)," *AUSS* 35 (Spring 1997): 18; and Manuel Vogel, "Tempel und Tempelkult in Pseudo-Philos *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community Without Temple: Zur Substituierung and Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels and seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum and frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr, 1999), 258–261. The chief arguments in favour of 70 C.E. as the *terminus a quo* are: (1) the similarities with the 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra texts composed ca. 100 C.E., (2) the statements concerning the temple's destruction in *L.A.B.* 12:4; 19:7; (3) the reference to the 17th of Tammuz as the date of the temple destruction in *L.A.B.* 19:7, and (4) the pessimism concerning the rebuilding of the temple. Klausner's argument in favour of a post-70 C.E. date of composition varies from those of the other scholars in that it centers upon his contention that "the author of the *Biblical Antiquities* was acquainted with the works of Josephus" (Klausner, *The Messianic Ideal in Israel*, 366, especially note 2). In sum, the arguments in favour of 70 C.E. as the *terminus ad quem* for its composition are much less convincing than those in favour of 70 C.E. as the *terminus a quo* for its composition.

<sup>40</sup> Bruce N. Fisk, *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story, and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 39, and Bruce N. Fisk, "Pseudo-Philo, Paul and Israel's Rolling Stone: Early Points along an Exegetical Trajectory," in *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala; TBN 10; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 118.

era communicated in written or spoken Hebrew. Even among the Jewish people of this era, the knowledge of Hebrew appears to have been limited outside of Judea.<sup>41</sup> Outside Jewish religious circles in the first centuries of the Common Era, only some early Christians used Hebrew. However, nothing in the text suggests that *L.A.B.* is of Jewish-Christian provenance so the author most likely was Jewish.<sup>42</sup>

### ***Framework for Research***

Most studies of the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.*, whether consciously or unconsciously, build upon the two “truths” that M. R. James (1917) stated were “foremost” among the “great truths” in *L.A.B.*: (1) “the indestructibility of Israel” and (2) Israel’s “duty of faithfulness to the one God.”<sup>43</sup> James did not support this statement but, rather, followed it with a catena of citations from passages in *L.A.B.* or paraphrases of them. He arranged these topically under sectional headings that highlighted major themes in *L.A.B.* and focused on Pseudo-Philo’s beliefs concerning reward and punishment. They include:

- “The Future State of Souls and the End of the World”
- “The Lot of the Wicked”
- “Punishment, long deferred, for past sins, is much in our author’s mind”
- “The Character of God and His Dealings with Men”
- “Man, especially in relation to Sin”

Despite his declaration that Israel’s indestructibility was “foremost” among the “great truths” in *L.A.B.*,<sup>44</sup> James’s treatment of it was quite brief and was contained under the heading

---

<sup>41</sup> Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (trans. John Elwolde; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 112–113; 131–134; 147–148; 166–171. For the argument that *L.A.B.* was not composed originally in Aramaic, see Harrington, “Original Language,” 512–514. The strongest arguments in this regard are the examples of “mistranslation” that support the hypothesis of a Hebrew original but that “would be impossible or at least unlikely” in Aramaic (*ibid.*, 513–514).

<sup>42</sup> Cohn, “An Apocryphal Work,” 313.

<sup>43</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

“The Greatness of Israel and of the Law.” There, James observed that, in *L.A.B.*, the nation of Israel has “greatness” and will not be “destroyed” (cf. *L.A.B.* 7:4; 9:3, 4; 12:9; 18:13; 32:9, 14, 15; 39:7).<sup>45</sup> However, James downplayed the importance of Israel’s greatness within Pseudo-Philo’s ideology by including this information within a section that primarily focuses on Pseudo-Philo’s views concerning the Law. In this regard, James noted that, in *L.A.B.*, each individual’s place in the world to come is determined individually rather than collectively.<sup>46</sup> At a final judgment in the world to come, every person will receive a reward “according to his works” (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:10).<sup>47</sup> “Wicked” Israelites, such as the sons of Korah (*L.A.B.* 16:3, 5), Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:4), and Micah (*L.A.B.* 44:10), will be punished<sup>48</sup> but “righteous Israelites” will enjoy “eternal life” (cf. *L.A.B.* 23:13).<sup>49</sup> Absent from James’s lists are references to the concept of covenant in *L.A.B.*

James’s two “great truths” (1917) were not entirely original. For the most part, they paralleled the “religious ideas” to which Leopold Cohn (1898) drew attention two decades earlier.<sup>50</sup> The “religious ideas” that Cohn briefly highlighted included the impact that Israel’s covenant relationship with God has upon the nation of Israel<sup>51</sup> and a belief in a final judgment in the world to come.<sup>52</sup> Concerning the impact that Israel’s covenant relationship has upon Israel, Cohn wrote:

In all the speeches the same idea recurs again and again: God has chosen the people of Israel and has made his covenant with them for ever; if the children of Israel depart from God's ways and forget his covenant, he delivers them for a time into the hands of their enemies; but God is ever mindful of his covenant

---

<sup>45</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 37.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 34–36.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>50</sup> Cohn, “Apocryphal Work,” 322.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 322.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 322–323.

with the patriarchs; he always delivers the Israelites through leaders of his choice, and he will never entirely abandon them.<sup>53</sup>

Cohn did not cite any evidence in support of this statement since it occurred near the end of a lengthy defence of his hypothesis. In this hypothesis, he stated that the “complete absence of all purpose other than that of religious edification” testified that *L.A.B.* was “a piece of Hagadic [sic] writing.”<sup>54</sup>

Immediately following his comments concerning the impact that Israel’s covenant relationship has upon Israel in *L.A.B.*, Cohn claimed that Pseudo-Philo’s “frequent reference” to several other “religious ideas” showed that the text was influenced by “Rabbinic Judaism as we find it in the oldest Midrashim.”<sup>55</sup> He cited three such “religious ideas”: (1) a “belief in the Resurrection,” (2) a belief “in the Day of Judgment,” and (3) a belief “in the Advent of the Messiah.”<sup>56</sup> Cohn only supported this assessment of *L.A.B.* with a citation from a passage that he deemed “specially (sic) characteristic”:

When the years of the period shall have been completed, there shall be no more light, and darkness shall be extinguished, and I shall bring the dead to life, and I shall raise up the sleeping from the earth: and Hell shall pay its debt, and destruction shall give back that which it has in charge, so that I may recompense each one according to his works, and according to the fruits of his inventions, judging between the soul and the flesh; and time shall be no more, and death shall be extinguished, and Hell shall close its mouth, and the Earth shall not be without increase, nor shall it be barren to those who dwell thereon, and no man who is justified in me shall be defiled, and there shall be a new heaven, and a new earth for an everlasting dwelling-place. (*L.A.B.* 3:10)<sup>57</sup>

James’s emphasis upon Israel’s “duty of faithfulness to the one God”<sup>58</sup> and its implications for the reward and punishment of individual Israelites<sup>59</sup> set the tone for the manner

---

<sup>53</sup> Cohn, “Apocryphal Work,” 322.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 314, 321. For Cohn’s defence of this hypothesis, see pages 314–324.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 322–323.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 323.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 322–323. The translation of *L.A.B.* 3:10 cited here is that of Cohn (*ibid.*, 323).

<sup>58</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 34–36.

in which Pseudo-Philo's ideology has been interpreted in subsequent scholarship. Scholars focus frequently on the passages in *L.A.B.* that describe the strict application of reward and punishment in the present world and in the world to come (e.g. *L.A.B.* 3:9–10). In *L.A.B.*, God shows mercy toward Israel (e.g. *L.A.B.* 35:3) but this mercy is for the nation of Israel rather than for individual Israelites.

Typical examples of James's influence upon subsequent scholarship are Paul Winter's and Michael Phillip Wadsworth's brief discussions of key themes in *L.A.B.*<sup>60</sup> In his discussion of Pseudo-Philo's belief in Israel's indestructibility and its duty to God, Winter argued that Israel's "privileged status" did not offer individual Israelites "any guarantee of salvation."<sup>61</sup> Winter did not make a connection between this "privileged status" and Israel's covenant relationship with God. Winter referred to Israel as being "ordained before creation" and "the chosen people's role in God's plan" but he did not refer to the divine-Israelite covenant.<sup>62</sup> Wadsworth argued that Pseudo-Philo had a "thoroughgoing eschatological system" that delineated the "after death" fate of the individual, whether "righteous" or "ungodly."<sup>63</sup> According to Wadsworth, Pseudo-Philo divided humanity into two groups: (1) the righteous (or the godly) and (2) the wicked (or the ungodly). At the end of the present world, there will be a "universal resurrection" and a final judgment of the dead.<sup>64</sup> At this final judgment, there will be a judgment of "the fruits of one's imaginings" and "of one's premeditated actions" (*L.A.B.* 3:10).<sup>65</sup> The righteous<sup>66</sup> will receive

---

<sup>60</sup> Paul Winter, "Philo, Biblical Antiquities of," *IDB* 3:795; Michael Phillip Wadsworth, "The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo: Doctrine and Scriptural Exegesis in a Jewish Midrash of the First Century A.D." (2 vols; DPhil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1975), 1:xvi. Wadsworth's extended examination of the "theology" of *L.A.B.* is in volume 2, pages 1–317, and his summary is in volume 2, pages 334 to 341.

<sup>61</sup> Winter, *IDB* 3:795.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> Wadsworth, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:1.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:16–21. In support, Wadsworth cited *L.A.B.* 3:10; 19:13.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:23. Wadsworth referred to the judgment of *L.A.B.* 3:10 as a "judgment according to the fruits of one's impulses" in which "God judges the body for its actions and the soul for its imaginings" (*ibid.*, 2:88).



“eternal life”<sup>67</sup> while the wicked will be relegated to Sheol.<sup>68</sup> The sinners who confess their sins in the present world will have their sins expiated by fire at this time and will be granted “eternal life.”<sup>69</sup> Wadsworth acknowledged Pseudo-Philo believes that Israel “will never die”<sup>70</sup> and that Israel has the “hope for the future” in the form of a “heavenly kingdom” in the world to come.<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, the concept of covenant is nowhere to be seen in Wadsworth’s analysis of the evidence.<sup>72</sup> In *L.A.B.*, Wadsworth contended, the “promise of the kingdom” is “reserved for the righteous.”<sup>73</sup>

James’s emphasis upon Israel’s “duty of faithfulness to the one God”<sup>74</sup> and its implications for the reward and punishment of individual Israelites<sup>75</sup> also was evident in Christian Dietzfelbinger’s use of the Law as the starting point for his discussion of the concepts of law and covenant in *L.A.B* and the focal point of this discussion.<sup>76</sup> After a brief description of the many

---

<sup>66</sup> Concerning the separation of body from soul in the afterlife, Wadsworth cited *L.A.B.* 44:10; 21:9; 32:13; 15:5; 51:5 (“Pseudo-Philo,” 1:1).

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:6–11. Wadsworth cited *L.A.B.* 23:13; 28:10; 11:4; 19:12; 32:13; 3:10 in support.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:1–5. Wadsworth cited *L.A.B.* 15:5; 51:5; 3:10; 16:3; 31:7 in support.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:90.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:341. Wadsworth cited *L.A.B.* 9:3 in support.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:342.

<sup>72</sup> Elsewhere in his thesis, Wadsworth referenced Pseudo-Philo’s concept of covenant only briefly. In the exegetical section of his dissertation (volume 1), Wadsworth briefly alluded to Pseudo-Philo’s repeated statements concerning God’s faithfulness to his covenant with Israel but he did not develop these references. An example of this was his brief mention of the covenant (“Pseudo-Philo,” 1:273) – “She [Deborah] then makes a speech rebuking them [the Israelites] for their transgression, but bids them to remember that God will maintain his covenant that he made with their fathers” (*L.A.B.* 30:5–7).

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:348. Wadsworth cited *L.A.B.* 3:10; 19:13; 23:13; 26:12; 27:10; 51:5 in support.

<sup>74</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 34–36.

<sup>76</sup> Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1964),” 115–125. Dietzfelbinger’s survey of Pseudo-Philo’s theology in the second section of his dissertation (*ibid.*, 96–166) is entitled “Die theologischen Grundlagen des *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.” He divided the survey into five parts: (1) “Israel und seine Geschichte” (pp. 96–115), (2) “Gesetz und Bund” (pp. 115–125), (3) “Sünde und Schöpfung” (pp. 125–135), (4) “Apokalyptische Elemente” (pp. 135–153), and (5) “Der Kultus” (pp. 153–166). All translations of Dietzfelbinger are my own.

names that Pseudo-Philo used for the Law and the various functions or attributes that Pseudo-Philo ascribed to the Law,<sup>77</sup> Dietzfelbinger observed that covenant and law are inseparably interwoven in *L.A.B.*<sup>78</sup> but that the Law's primary function or attribute in *L.A.B.* was that of "Heilsfaktor."<sup>79</sup> Foundational for Dietzfelbinger in his identification of the Law as the "Heilsfaktor" in *L.A.B.*<sup>80</sup> was the "fact" that the revelation of the Law at Sinai in *L.A.B.* is considered the "instrument" by which God established the covenant.<sup>81</sup> The covenant that God established with Israel at Sinai was placed at the "center of *L.A.B.*" because God ultimately had this covenant in view (see *L.A.B.* 7:4; 9:4–7) in the covenants that were established with Israel's ancestors (*L.A.B.* 3:12; 4:11; 8:3; 9:3; 10:2; 19:11).<sup>82</sup> Central to Dietzfelbinger's interpretation of the Law as the "Heilsfaktor" in *L.A.B.* was the idea that the covenant is a "covenant of this Law" (*L.A.B.* 23:2). As Dietzfelbinger observed, "The covenant was based on the Law" in *L.A.B.*<sup>83</sup>

For Dietzfelbinger, the centrality of the Law as the "Heilsfaktor" pointed to the reality that Israel could end its existence as God's covenant people by ceasing to obey the Law.<sup>84</sup> Israel received "reward or punishment" in accordance with "its obedience to the Law."<sup>85</sup> Here, with the establishment of Israel's guiltiness before this "law of retaliation" ("Vergeltungsgesetz"), Dietzfelbinger introduced a key concept within his understanding of Pseudo-Philo's theology: in *L.A.B.*, the Law is repealed ("Aufhebung") or lessened ("Einschränkung") as necessary because,

---

<sup>77</sup> Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1964)," 116–117.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 115.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 117–119. Dietzfelbinger stated that this function or attribute of Law in *L.A.B.* "gar nicht überschätzt werden kann" (*ibid.*, 117).

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 117.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 119.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

otherwise, Israel would be destroyed.<sup>86</sup> Any repealing or lessening of the Law is not based on Israel itself but on “God’s mercy” as shown to sinful Israel (*L.A.B.* 31:2; 39:6; 39:5; 49:3).<sup>87</sup>

Dietzfelbinger recited the many reasons that Pseudo-Philo showed regarding why God repealed or lessened the Law in order to prevent Israel’s destruction.<sup>88</sup> The “most important”<sup>89</sup> reasons are that:

1. “God had too much invested in Israel” to permit its destruction (*L.A.B.* 12:9; 28:5; 39:7).
2. Israel was “not created in vain” (*L.A.B.* 9:4; 12:9; 28:5).
3. God’s mercy arises from God’s “remembrance of the covenant” (*L.A.B.* 9:4; 19:2; 30:7; 32:12–14).<sup>90</sup>

Dietzfelbinger also observed that, in *L.A.B.*, “God’s forgiveness” can be brought about but “not forced” through fasting (*L.A.B.* 30:4), prayer (*L.A.B.* 15:7; 19:14; 39:11), offerings (*L.A.B.* 18:7), and the worthiness of one individual among many (*L.A.B.* 49:2).<sup>91</sup> Ultimately, however, Dietzfelbinger contended that Pseudo-Philo did not fully explore the reason for God’s intervention on Israel’s behalf. The “relationship” between retaliation and mercy will not be found for Pseudo-Philo did not “reflect on it.”<sup>92</sup> Dietzfelbinger observed that, in *L.A.B.*, these two “great” concepts “do not conflict.”<sup>93</sup> Having considered the Law and its role in the life of the nation of Israel at length, Dietzfelbinger turned his focus to the concept of the covenant itself in *L.A.B.*

---

<sup>86</sup> Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1964),” 121.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.* The passages from *L.A.B.* are referenced on pp. 121–122.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 122.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>90</sup> The citations including the verses are from Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1964),” 122. He indicates the top three reasons without the verses on p. 124.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 123.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*

Despite an overarching emphasis upon Pseudo-Philo's views concerning that which James had deemed Israel's "duty of faithfulness,"<sup>94</sup> Dietzfelbinger contended that "most lines of thought" in *L.A.B.* "run" to and are made "subservient" to "God's covenant with Israel."<sup>95</sup> This holds true even for the Law which is "strictly applied upon the covenant"<sup>96</sup> and which "serves" the covenant through its "covenant-keeping function." In this function, "the covenant is kept through the keeping of the Law."<sup>97</sup> Dietzfelbinger then returned to the Law in his discussion of the concept of covenant in *L.A.B.* and re-highlighted the aforementioned circumstances under which "the suspension of the Law" is required.<sup>98</sup> Dietzfelbinger concluded his discussion of the concept of covenant in *L.A.B.* with the observation that, in the covenant-keeping purpose of the Law, these two "seemingly conflicting" concepts of "retaliation and mercy" find meaning together.

In these discussions of the concepts of covenant and law in *L.A.B.*, Dietzfelbinger emphasized the nation of Israel as a whole. The nation's status as God's covenant people is dependent on its observance of the Law and, when required, on the temporary suspension of the Law. Dietzfelbinger's views concerning the impact of the reward and punishment of individual Israelites can be gleaned from his brief discussion of the final judgment in the world to come in *L.A.B.*<sup>99</sup>

Dietzfelbinger began his brief discussion of the final judgment with the declaration that Pseudo-Philo did not write about "the fate and the glorification of Israel in the final judgment."<sup>100</sup> Dietzfelbinger observed that Pseudo-Philo's "interest in Israel" disappeared as it

---

<sup>94</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>95</sup> Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1964)," 123.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 125.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 141–144.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 143. See also Dietzfelbinger's comment on p. 144.

pertains to the final judgment and that his focus turned to “the devout and godless individuals.”<sup>101</sup> For Dietzfelbinger, the final judgment in *L.A.B.* is a judgment “on the basis of works” (*L.A.B.* 3:10; 13:10; 64:7).<sup>102</sup> His discussion of the final judgment in *L.A.B.* highlighted the “duplicate outcomes” of this judgment: outcomes split between the “just and the unjust.”<sup>103</sup> The just will “go to life” (*L.A.B.* 3:10; 19:13) and the godless will remain in Sheol in punishment and in eternal death.<sup>104</sup> Mercy plays a role in this final judgment, albeit “Ganz am Rand” and “ohne Gerichtsverlauf zu beeinflussen.”<sup>105</sup> Dietzfelbinger did not clarify what mercy’s role might be other than to cite the “hope” given to the sinners in *L.A.B.* 25:7 that God might have mercy. This hope is confirmed in *L.A.B.* 26:1 with the declaration that the destruction of the sinners and their artefacts of sin might cause God’s wrath to cease from the sinners.<sup>106</sup> With these two exceptions, Dietzfelbinger contended that individual fate at the final judgment in *L.A.B.* is determined almost exclusively on an individual’s obedience to God’s Law. Those who return to and follow God’s Law in the present world will experience salvation while those who do not return to it will experience eternal punishment.<sup>107</sup>

Charles Perrot’s brief discussion of Pseudo-Philo’s “theology”<sup>108</sup> diverged from the tendency to emphasize Israel’s duty to obey God that had prevailed in scholarship up to this juncture. Instead, he argued that Pseudo-Philo’s religion was “a religion of the heart” (“religion

---

<sup>101</sup> Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1964),” 143.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>107</sup> “Wer sich zu dieser Umkehr bewegen läßt, gewinnt ewiges Heil; wer die Umkehr verweigert, verfällt ewigem Unheil.” Christian Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo: Antiquitates Biblicae,” (*Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 2.2.* Gütersloh, 1975), 98.

<sup>108</sup> Charles Perrot, “La pensée théologique,” in Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 39–65.

du cœur”).<sup>109</sup> Perrot cited five reasons for this claim. First, the observation of minute prescriptions of the Law was not vital to Pseudo-Philo’s religion.<sup>110</sup> Second, Pseudo-Philo’s religion was one in which conversion and repentance is emphasized (i.e. the conversion of the heart).<sup>111</sup> Third, the final judgment in *L.A.B.* was a time of hope for the just. The just will await the final judgment in peace (*L.A.B.* 21:9; 23:13; 32:13) while the remainder will await the final judgment in Sheol (*L.A.B.* 3:9–10; 16:3). There is hope for divine mercy at the final judgment (*L.A.B.* 25:7) for the repentant sinner who has confessed sin and has atoned for sin in life or death.<sup>112</sup> Fourth, in *L.A.B.*, all depends ultimately on mercy but the individual remains the master of his or her own destiny.<sup>113</sup> Regarding this point, Perrot argued that Israel could trust God’s mercy<sup>114</sup> for God would be merciful to the chosen people. Fifth, Perrot contended that Pseudo-Philo exhorted people to avoid sin and to place confidence in God’s mercy (“dans la miséricorde le Dieu”; *L.A.B.* 15:7).<sup>115</sup>

A renewed emphasis upon the concept of covenant and upon Israel’s “indestructibility”<sup>116</sup> was foundational to Perrot’s interpretation of *L.A.B.* Using Cohn’s synopsis

---

<sup>109</sup> Perrot, “La pensée théologique,” 44. Perrot (*ibid.*, 43 n. 3) contended that Pseudo-Philo was but one example of an early Jewish author who believed that the nation of Israel was God’s elect (*L.A.B.* 18:5, 6, 11; 21:4; 23:12, 13; 28:4; 30:2; 31:5; 32:1; 35:2, 5, 6; 39:7) and God’s indestructible covenant people (cf. *L.A.B.* 7:4; 9:3; 12:4, 8; 23:12; 28:5; 32:5, 15). Perrot also cited passages that speak of God’s election of Abraham (*L.A.B.* 7:4, 32:1), Moses (*L.A.B.* 53:8), and David (*L.A.B.* 59:3).

<sup>110</sup> “La minutie des prescriptions à observer” (Perrot, “La pensée théologique,” 44). Perrot theorized that Pseudo-Philo’s audience was not a group that scrupulously observed the law but Perrot did not doubt such groups existed. Rather, Perrot speculated that Pseudo-Philo was not addressing “un groupe de purs, mais . . . un monde qui est et qui se sait pécheur” (*ibid.*, 45).

<sup>111</sup> “À la conversion du cœur” (*ibid.*, 49).

<sup>112</sup> Perrot, “La pensée théologique,” 54–55.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 50–51. Key statements included, “Dieu est le maître de l’histoire...” (*ibid.*, 50); “Dans *L.A.B.*, l’individu reste maître de son destin ...” (*ibid.*, 51); and “...l’homme reste maître de son destin” (*ibid.*, 51). Perrot also wrote of “un certain accent mis sur la liberté de l’homme” in *L.A.B.* (*ibid.*, 51).

<sup>114</sup> “. . . se confie éperdument dans la miséricorde de Dieu” (Perrot, “La pensée théologique,” 44).

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 39–65.

of covenant as his starting point,<sup>117</sup> Perrot contended that the concept of covenant was the key to Pseudo-Philo's ideology. "Covenant," he argued, was "the key word" ("le mot clé") in *L.A.B.* (*L.A.B.* 3:2, 11–12; 4:5, 11; 7:4; 8:3; 9:3–15; 10:2; 11:1, 3).<sup>118</sup>

Frederick J. Murphy's series of articles and, ultimately, his monograph on Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*<sup>119</sup> emphasized Israel's covenant-based indestructibility in his discussion of the reward and punishment of the nation of Israel as a whole and Israel's responsibility to obey God's law in his discussion of the reward and punishment of individual Israelites. Concerning the nation of Israel as a whole, Murphy contended that, in *L.A.B.*, (1) the covenant promises that God gave to Israel's ancestors would be fulfilled "regardless of the actions of Israel"<sup>120</sup> and (2) the impact of God's covenant with the nation of Israel "stretches to the eschaton."<sup>121</sup> According to Murphy, Pseudo-Philo believed that God foreknew that the covenant people would sin. Therefore, in advance, God established a plan to punish and restore them. Murphy continued, "Israel's sin is always but a temporary setback to God's plan to multiply the people, give them the land, and live among them."<sup>122</sup> Israel's "unconditional relationship" with God assures that God's "blessings forever" on Abraham's chosen offspring for the covenant will "never fail" (*L.A.B.* 18:10; 30:7; 47:3).<sup>123</sup> In this regard, Murphy pointed to

---

<sup>117</sup> Perrot, "La pensée théologique," 43; cf. Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 322. As far as I have been able to determine, Perrot was the first scholar to cite Cohn's views concerning Pseudo-Philo's concept of covenant and the first scholar to quote Cohn's now famous synopsis of the concept of covenant in *L.A.B.* (ibid., 43; cf. Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 322). Perrot stated erroneously that the quote was located on page 332 of Cohn's article (Perrot, "La pensée théologique," 43 n. 1).

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 44.

<sup>119</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 245–246. Murphy wrote, "God's covenant with Israel is one of the central symbols in the *Biblical Antiquities*" (*Pseudo-Philo*, 244). For his interpretation of the concept of covenant in *L.A.B.*, see Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 244–246, and Frederick J. Murphy, "The Eternal Covenant in Pseudo-Philo," *JSP* 3 (1988): 43–57.

<sup>120</sup> Murphy, "Eternal Covenant," 44.

<sup>121</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 245.

<sup>122</sup> Murphy, "Eternal Covenant," 44–45.

<sup>123</sup> In "Divine Plan, Human Plan: A Structuring Theme in Pseudo-Philo," *JQR* 77 (1986), Murphy described God's persistent, unconditional, and merciful intervention on the behalf of a weak and confused

narratives in *L.A.B.* that depict God delivering Israel from “danger or extinction” because of the “promises made to the fathers” that “will be fulfilled, even if it be in spite of Israel.”<sup>124</sup> Murphy contended that Pseudo-Philo placed such a strong emphasis upon God’s covenant commitment not to abandon Israel forever (*L.A.B.* 30:7) that he “*borders on*” making the actions of individuals “irrelevant.”<sup>125</sup> However, he stops short of making them meaningless.<sup>126</sup> Although the actions of individuals, groups, or generations “may affect” the fate of a portion of Israel, “God’s covenant with Israel will always endure.”<sup>127</sup>

Despite his contention that the impact of God’s covenant with the nation of Israel “stretches to the eschaton,”<sup>128</sup> Murphy, in his (very!) brief discussion of personal eschatology in *L.A.B.*,<sup>129</sup> did not mention God’s covenant with Israel but, rather, highlighted the “idea of moral causality” as encountered in Pseudo-Philo’s discussion of the final judgment in *L.A.B.* 3:10.<sup>130</sup> This verse is central to Murphy’s interpretation of *L.A.B.* As Murphy argued elsewhere, the

---

(yet well-meaning) covenant people. “Pseudo-Philo has a pessimistic view of human thought and plans. Complete submission to God is the only answer” (Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 251).

<sup>124</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 54. He writes, “Pseudo-Philo is primarily concerned to stress hope based on the irrevocability of God’s commitment to Israel, a commitment that has been constant since the time of Abraham” (ibid.). Among the examples Murphy, “Eternal Covenant,” 44–53, cited are God’s deliverance of Abraham from the fiery furnace (*L.A.B.* 6–7; esp. 7:4; 8:3), God’s deliverance of Israel from the land of Egypt (*L.A.B.* 9; especially vv. 3, 7, 8, 14), and God’s preservation of Israel during the golden calf episode (*L.A.B.* 12; especially vv. 4, 6, 9, 10). He claimed that the pattern also is evident in *L.A.B.* during the following events: (1) when God did not punish Israel for its unwillingness to enter the promised land (*L.A.B.* 15; especially vv. 5, 7); (2) when God protected Israel during the Balaam episode (*L.A.B.* 18; esp. vv. 4, 5, 10, 11); (3) when God showed mercy to and protected Israel under Deborah (*L.A.B.* 30–32; especially 30:4–5, 7; 32:1), Gideon (*L.A.B.* 35:3, 4), and Jephthah (*L.A.B.* 39:4); and (4) when God preserved Israel during the Micah incident (*L.A.B.* 47).

<sup>125</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 246.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 246.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., 244, 245.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., 256–257.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., 256.



“ground rules” for the remainder of *L.A.B.* were established in *L.A.B.* 3:9–10.<sup>131</sup> “This life,” Murphy contended, “seals one’s fate” for “the next” life since individuals are judged “at death.”<sup>132</sup> After death, some “individuals” will “join their fathers and mothers” and will enjoy “afterlife bliss” while “sinners” will experience “a place of punishing fires and darkness.”<sup>133</sup> Concerning the fate of the righteous, Murphy cited *L.A.B.* 23:13, “God says that if the people obey, ‘at the end of the lot of each one of you will be life eternal . . .’ (23:13).” Although Murphy did not provide the source for his explanation that the “life eternal” promised in *L.A.B.* 23:13 was contingent upon obedience (“if you obey”), he likely derived it from the beginning of *L.A.B.* 23:12 (“And now, if you listen to your fathers . . .”).<sup>134</sup> In support of his interpretation of the fate of sinners in *L.A.B.*, Murphy cited *L.A.B.* 18:12; 23:6; 31:7; 36:4; 38:4; 63:4.

The “idea of moral causality” which Murphy referred to<sup>135</sup> is of vital importance to his interpretation of *L.A.B.* for he argued elsewhere that Pseudo-Philo “subscribes . . . completely” to “moral causality.”<sup>136</sup> The term *moral causality*<sup>137</sup> refers to the belief that, if you do good

---

<sup>131</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 256. Robert Hayward, ed., *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996), 157, similarly refers to the “divinely guaranteed” “world order” that in *L.A.B.* 3 was “established” following the flood.

<sup>132</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 256.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>134</sup> Whether Pseudo-Philo actually believed that the “life eternal” referenced in *L.A.B.* 23:13 was contingent upon the obedience referenced in the previous verse (*L.A.B.* 23:12) requires further consideration.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 246.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 247.

<sup>137</sup> The actual term *moral causality* (Fr. *causalité morale*) does not appear in the secondary literature until 1976 (Perrot in Perrot, Bogaert, Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 203). A related yet distinct principle is *lex talionis* – the law of retaliation. According to this principle, the punishment fits (or, in some cases, even mirrors) the wrong that was committed. Leviticus 21:17–21 (also Deut 19:16–21; Exod 21:23–24) illustrates this principle:

Anyone who kills a human being shall be put to death. Anyone who kills an animal shall make restitution for it, life for life. Anyone who maims another shall suffer the same injury in return: fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; the injury inflicted is the injury to be suffered. One who kills an animal shall make restitution for it; but one who kills a human being shall be put to death.”

works, you will be rewarded and, if you do evil deeds, you will be punished. Pseudo-Philo's clearest declarations regarding this concept appear in *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 and *L.A.B.* 44:10. *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 presents a two-stage process by which moral causality will take place. In the present world, humanity will be punished for its sin when it occurs (*L.A.B.* 3:9). Its punishment may include famine, violence (lit., “sword”), fire, death, earthquakes, and banishment (lit., “they will be scattered”). In the world to come, humanity can anticipate another time of reckoning. At this time, God will give to (*reddam*) each person (*unicuique*) in accordance with their “works” (*opera*, v. 10). Pseudo-Philo's declaration regarding moral causality in *L.A.B.* 44:10 likewise appears to presume a two-stage process. Sin is punished during life in the present world (v. 10a) and after death (v. 10b). Also inherent within the term moral causality is the belief that there is a moral cause for everything that has happened to a person. The negative events in a person's life are rooted in something the person has done previously. For example, Pseudo-Philo made a connection between the circumstances that led to the deaths of the tower builders (*L.A.B.* 6:17), the Levite's concubine (*L.A.B.* 45:3–4), and King Saul (*L.A.B.* 65:4) and the deeds that these individuals committed previously (*L.A.B.* 6:13, 16; 45:3b; 58:1–4; 65:4).

The centrality of *L.A.B.* 3:10 and the final judgment in Murphy's interpretation of Pseudo-Philo's views concerning the reward and punishment of individual Israelites in the world to come is confirmed in a brief discussion of Pseudo-Philo's uncomplimentary “characterization of Israel.”<sup>138</sup> The difference between the Israelites and their “Gentile neighbors,” Murphy explained, is found in “the covenants and the promises.”<sup>139</sup> As Murphy observed, “Were it not for the covenants and promises . . . , God would have given up on Israel many times in its history.”<sup>140</sup>

They [Israelites] do have Abraham, Amram, Moses, Joshua, Kenaz, and Deborah in their past and for the sake of such individuals God has chosen Israel and

---

<sup>138</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 233.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*

remains eternally faithful to the covenant. However, every sin will receive its recompense, and membership in the chosen people does not guarantee salvation, either in this world or the next.<sup>141</sup>

This declaration should be read in light of Murphy's comments elsewhere regarding humanity's precarious standing before God:

Pseudo-Philo is vividly aware of the gap between God and humanity; **humans can never be sure of their righteousness.** *If God helps them*, it is usually because of his faithfulness to his own promises and not because they are worthy.<sup>142</sup>

At this juncture, Murphy's discussion of Pseudo-Philo's uncomplimentary "characterization of Israel"<sup>143</sup> took a somewhat unexpected turn. In a footnote to his declaration that, in *L.A.B.*, "membership in the chosen people does not guarantee salvation, either in this life or the next,"<sup>144</sup> Murphy stated that "this view corresponds to what Sanders . . . calls 'covenantal nomism.'"<sup>145</sup> However, the correlation that Murphy referred to is not fully apparent because at the heart of Sanders's theory is the contention that "covenant" was early Judaism's "principal soteriological category"<sup>146</sup> with salvation (as defined by Sanders)<sup>147</sup> *guaranteed* for all individuals who remain "in" the Israelite covenant community.<sup>148</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 233.

<sup>142</sup> Frederick J. Murphy, "God in Pseudo-Philo," *JSP* 3 (1988): 9 (emphasis added).

<sup>143</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 233.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, 233 n. 18.

<sup>146</sup> E. P. Sanders, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism," in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of William David Davies* (ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 39–40.

<sup>147</sup> Despite an acknowledged dependence on social anthropology (e.g. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 17 n. 8), Sanders restricted his use of the language of social anthropology (e.g. pattern of religion) in favour of theologically loaded terms such as *soteriology* (*ibid.*, 17, 75) and *salvation* (*ibid.*, 18). Although Sanders used theological terms, he stated clearly that his readers must view them apart from their usual connotations in discussions of Christian theology. For the use of these terms in Christian theology, see Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction* (4th ed.; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 326–359. For example, Sanders's use of the term *soteriology* in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* does not imply that "all are in need of a salvation which they do not possess" or that this "salvation" will be realized in a world to come (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 17–18). Instead, according to Sanders, individuals or groups (even those with "no view concerning an afterlife at all") have soteriological concerns if they are "concerned to be 'in' rather than 'out'" of the group (*ibid.*, 75).

<sup>148</sup> Sanders, "Covenant as a Soteriological Category," 39–40.

Central to Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism as the "pervasive"<sup>149</sup> "pattern of religion"<sup>150</sup> within Judaism of the first centuries of the Common Era is the contention that an individual Israelite's "place in God's plan" was "established on the basis of the covenant."<sup>151</sup> Sanders's theory, which he substantiated with an examination of select Tannaitic, Qumranic, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphic texts,<sup>152</sup> states that most Jews living in the first centuries of the

---

<sup>149</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 426.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 16-17. Sanders defined *pattern of religion* as the "sequence from its starting point to its conclusion" as an adherent of the religion perceives it (17). The key events in this sequence are the admission into (i.e. *getting in*) and the retention of membership in (i.e. *staying in*) the religion (16-17). Sanders derived the term pattern of religion from the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss whose theory of structuralism swept through the field of social anthropology in the 1970s. For more on the influence of Lévi-Strauss's theory of structuralism, see Jonathan H. Turner, "Sociological Theory in the 21st Century," in *21st Century Sociology: A Reference Handbook* (ed. Clifton D. Bryant and Dennis L. Peck; 2 vols.; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2007), 1:55. Sanders (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 17 n. 8) cited Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf; 2 vols.; New York: Basic Books, 1963), 1:31-54, 277-323, as particularly significant for his approach. Structuralism maintains that that which is discernible empirically is a "surface manifestation of a deeper underlying system" (Turner, "Sociological Theory," 1:55). The "deep structures" or the "generative rules" guide the "formation of culture systems and social structure arrangements" (*ibid.*). In Sanders's terminology, the "deep structures" or "generative rules" of early Judaism are its "common pattern of religion" (Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 70) as well as the "principles . . . behind the discussions as a whole" (*ibid.*, 71), the "presupposition upon which all the . . . material rests" (*ibid.*, 82), the "underlying agreement" (*ibid.*, 85), the "underlying pattern" (*ibid.*, 424), the "basic common ground" (*ibid.*), and the "lowest common denominator." For the latter, see E. P. Sanders, "Comparing Judaism and Christianity: an academic autobiography," in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders* (ed. Fabian E. Udoh et al.; CJA 16; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2008), 24 n. 39.

<sup>151</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 75.

<sup>152</sup> Sanders stated that the Tannaitic texts "of primary importance" to his study were "the works which are predominantly Tannaitic: the Mishnah, the Tosefta, the Tannaitic or halakic midrashim" (*ibid.*, 59). He also observed that he "made some use of traditions which are attributed to Tannaim in the two Talmuds and the later midrashim" (*ibid.*, 60). The primary Qumranic texts that Sanders cited (*ibid.*, 239-328) are the *Rule of the Community* (1QS), *Peshar Habakkuk* (1QpHab), the *Rule of the Blessings* (1QSB), the *Damascus Document* (CD), the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa), *Thanksgiving Hymns* (1QH), 4QpPs37, the *War Scroll* (1QM), 4QM<sup>a</sup>, 1QpMic. Sanders's section on Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha (*ibid.*, 329-414) contains a study of Sirach, 1 Enoch, Jubilees, the Psalms of Solomon, and 4 Ezra. From these texts, Sanders identified only one early Jewish text that did not represent covenantal nomism: 4 Ezra. He contended that 4 Ezra represents the "legalistic perfectionism" that Weber et al. thought was pervasive in early Judaism. Sanders maintained that this text was the only early Jewish text that denied the "traditional characteristics of God" in which God "freely forgives and restores sinners and maintains the covenant despite transgression" (*ibid.*, 418). He declared that 4 Ezra was functionally (although not formally) legalistic because only the very few individuals who are "more or less perfect" will be "saved" (4 Ezra 8:1-3; *ibid.*, 415). For Sanders, the pattern in 4 Ezra is "constructively by works" but the "formal relationship" between covenant and law that remains is one in which obedience serves to maintain covenant membership (*ibid.*, 420). According to Sanders (*ibid.*, 422), "perfect obedience" replaces "basic righteousness" and constitutes the standard by which "loyalty" to God's law is measured in

Common Era shared underlying presuppositions concerning the admission into (i.e. getting in) and the retention of membership in (i.e. staying in) their religion's in-group.<sup>153</sup> the Israelite covenant community.<sup>154</sup> Admission to the covenant community is through God's merciful "election" of the nation of Israel<sup>155</sup> and retention of membership in the Israelite covenant community is by "remaining loyal" to God's Law<sup>156</sup> and by making atonement for their sins through the means that God provided.<sup>157</sup> According to Sanders, most early Jews believed that merely "basic loyalty" to God's law was required, not "perfect" obedience.<sup>158</sup> Through the demonstration of loyalty to God's law (i.e. "obedience") and "repentance and other acts of atonement,"<sup>159</sup> individual Israelites *maintained* rather than *earned* "God's grace."<sup>160</sup> In this way, they retained their membership "in the group which . . . [was] the recipient of God's grace."<sup>161</sup> Foundational to Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism is the premise that, in early Judaism, "election" and its resultant "salvation" ultimately are "by God's mercy rather than human

---

4 Ezra. Most of humanity in 4 Ezra (including Israel) existed under the "virtually inescapable power" of sin (ibid.). Sanders cited 4 Ezra 3:20 in support of this.

<sup>153</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 17

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 236, 422.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., 422. For more on Sanders's views concerning the centrality of mercy in early Jewish religion, see pp. 293-294, 334, 356, 397, 421-422

<sup>156</sup> Sanders, "Comparing Judaism and Christianity," 24. Also Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 205, 351, 362, 422.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., 422.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> E. P. Sanders, "Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison," *HTR* 66 (1973): 465. Sanders states that suffering (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 168-170), punishment for sin (ibid., 170-172), and even death (ibid., 172-174) could atone for sin in Rabbinic literature.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid., 420.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid. See also Sanders, "Covenant as a Soteriological Category," 41, where Sanders defines covenantal nomism using the language of Christian theology. Covenantal nomism is "the view according to which salvation comes by *membership* in the covenant, while obedience to the commandments *preserves* one's place in the covenant."

achievement.”<sup>162</sup> Therefore, the demonstration of “loyalty” to God’s law was Israel’s “proper response” to “God’s grace.”<sup>163</sup>

Sanders might concur with Murphy’s declaration that “membership in the chosen people does not guarantee salvation”<sup>164</sup> but only insofar as it pertains to the possibility that individual Israelites could “exclude themselves from the covenant” or “withdraw from the covenant” by “the intention to reject God and his covenant.”<sup>165</sup> In Sanders’s theory of covenantal nomism, only the denial of God and the covenant will impact an individual’s “staying in” in the Israelite covenant community for this was the only “transgression” for which atonement was not possible.<sup>166</sup> Sanders explained that “only the most unregenerate sinners” who intentionally rejected “God’s right to command” and who intentionally did not “keep the commandments” would end up outside the covenant community.<sup>167</sup> In Sanders’s assessment, this involved the cancellation of the covenant on the part of the individual Israelite, not on God’s part.<sup>168</sup> As Sanders observed, “those excluded from salvation . . . are those who exclude themselves from the covenant.”<sup>169</sup> According to Sanders’s theory, “the Jewish view” is that “reward is not salvation, punishment is not damnation.”<sup>170</sup> Both reward for obedience and punishment for sin are “intra-covenantal”<sup>171</sup> with neither reward nor punishment ultimately

---

<sup>162</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 422.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 75, 420.

<sup>164</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 233.

<sup>165</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 134, 95, 157. Although Sanders maintained this view was widespread in early Judaism (*ibid.*, 422), his clearest and best explanation of this aspect of covenantal nomism appeared in his examination of this motif in Tannaitic literature (*ibid.*, 125-157)

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, 157, 96, 95.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>170</sup> Sanders, “Covenantal Nomism Revisited,” 47. See also Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 181-182.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, 234.

having an impact upon the establishment and maintenance of the covenant relationship.<sup>172</sup> For the nation of Israel and for individual Israelites alike, “salvation” ultimately is dependent upon and results from “God’s mercy” being shown to the “chosen” covenant community: Israel.<sup>173</sup> Given Murphy’s emphasis upon moral causality and *L.A.B.* 3:10 in his discussion of Pseudo-Philo’s eschatology,<sup>174</sup> it seems unlikely that this is the scenario that Murphy envisaged when he observed that *L.A.B.* was representative of Sanders’s theory of covenantal nomism.<sup>175</sup>

Murphy was not the first scholar to suggest that Pseudo-Philo exemplified covenantal nomism. Several years after Perrot published his influential essay on Pseudo-Philo’s “theology” (1976), Finnish New Testament scholar Heikki Räisänen (1983), in a footnote to a discussion of Pauline theology, suggested that *L.A.B.* was a “prominent representative of covenantal nomism.”<sup>176</sup> Räisänen based his proposition on a reading of Perrot’s synopsis of Pseudo-Philo’s “theology” in light of *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*.<sup>177</sup> Of particular significance to Räisänen’s proposition were Perrot’s suggestions that covenant was central in *L.A.B.* and that legalism was absent from *L.A.B.*<sup>178</sup> Räisänen, however, did not develop these suggestions further.

---

<sup>172</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 180-182, 420-423.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 422.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 256.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 233 n. 18.

<sup>176</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 180 n. 92. The first edition of *Paul and the Law* was published in 1983. Although Räisänen was the first scholar who suggested that *L.A.B.* represented covenantal nomism, he was not the first scholar who cited *L.A.B.* in a discussion of covenantal nomism. This honour goes to E. P. Sanders himself! In his 1976 essay on covenant as early Judaism’s “soteriological category,” Sanders briefly mentioned *L.A.B.* as an example of the “literalists” to which Philo of Alexandria referred (Sanders, “Covenant as a Soteriological Category,” 38). In this essay, though, Sanders did not discuss whether covenant was the “soteriological category” in *L.A.B.* Also, prior to Räisänen’s footnote, Martin McNamara, review of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, *JSNT* 5 (1979): 68, noted Sanders’s omission of *L.A.B.* from *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. However, McNamara did not refer to Perrot’s essay or indicate whether he thought that *L.A.B.* affirmed Sanders’s theory.

<sup>177</sup> Perrot, “La pensée théologique” in Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 39–65.

<sup>178</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 180 n. 92, wrote concerning the concept of covenant in *L.A.B.*, “The term ‘covenant’ is indeed the key-word of the book, much more so than ‘law.’” Räisänen’s statement is taken from Perrot’s essay. Charles Perrot (“La pensée théologique” in Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 44) writes, “Mais le mot qui domine de loin tout l’œuvre du Pseudo-Philon est celui d’Alliance,

In 1992, almost a decade after Räisänen published his comments concerning *L.A.B.* and covenantal nomism, E. P. Sanders cited *L.A.B.* as an example of covenantal nomism in *Judaism: Practice and Belief*.<sup>179</sup> In order to “show the currency of the theological ideas that constitute ‘covenantal nomism’”<sup>180</sup> in pre-70 C.E. Judaism, Sanders collated citations from several early Jewish texts that were not cited in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Sanders did not outline the complete system of covenantal nomism in any one text. Instead, he grouped quotations topically under headings relevant to covenantal nomism. Sanders cited references from *L.A.B.* in support of five early Jewish beliefs: (1) God’s prior grace underlines human existence and God’s covenantal mercy preserves Israel (*L.A.B.* 15:7); (2) Israel’s covenant status ensures that God would have mercy on Israel even when sinful (*L.A.B.* 31:2 and 30:7);<sup>181</sup> (3) “God corrects transgressors temporarily and ‘not in anger’” (*L.A.B.* 19:9);<sup>182</sup> (4) all humanity (Gentiles included) were responsible to obey the law (*L.A.B.* 11:2);<sup>183</sup> and (5) Israel was set apart from the nations for the purpose of preservation (*L.A.B.* 9:5).<sup>184</sup>

Simon Gathercole’s reference to Sanders’s theory of covenantal nomism in his consideration of Pseudo-Philo’s ideology<sup>185</sup> harkened back to James’s emphasis upon Israel’s “duty of faithfulness to the one God.”<sup>186</sup> For Gathercole, *L.A.B.* is one of a few early Jewish texts

---

que l’on trouve presque dans tous les discours. C’est le mot-clé du livre, beaucoup plus que le mot Loi pourtant fort employé” (emphasis added).

<sup>179</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 263–275.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*, 263.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*, 272.

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, 275.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, 269. Sanders earlier had pointed out *L.A.B.* 11:2 as a text that taught that the Gentiles were guilty for not keeping the law (*ibid.*, 267).

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, 266.

<sup>185</sup> Simon J. Gathercole, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul’s Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002). This monograph is the published version of Gathercole’s University of Durham doctoral dissertation (2001).

<sup>186</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.



that “cause a very serious problem for the paradigm of covenantal nomism.”<sup>187</sup> Gathercole contended that *L.A.B.* is one of several texts that demonstrated “that final salvation according to works . . . is an integral part of the theology of Palestinian Judaism by the second-first century B.C.E. at the latest.”<sup>188</sup> Central to Gathercole’s interpretation of *L.A.B.* was his reading of *L.A.B.* 3:9–10.<sup>189</sup> According to Gathercole, this passage shows Pseudo-Philo’s belief that, at the end of time, *all* humanity will be resurrected to a final judgment at which time *all* humanity will be judged according to their deeds.<sup>190</sup> Gathercole found further support for his claim that *L.A.B.* is incompatible with covenantal nomism in Pseudo-Philo’s depiction of Abraham (*L.A.B.* 6:11), Joshua (*L.A.B.* 20:6), Caleb (*L.A.B.* 20:10), and David (*L.A.B.* 62:5–6). For Gathercole, each of these narratives depicts individual confidence for salvation resting upon individual obedience to God and to the Law.<sup>191</sup>

In the years following Murphy’s publication of his monograph (1993), several additional scholars studied (at least briefly) the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* and the relationship between James’s two “great truths” in *L.A.B.*: (1) Israel’s “duty of faithfulness the

---

<sup>187</sup> Gathercole, *Boasting*, 160. Also see Martinus C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5* (JSNTSup 22; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 78–80, whose brief analysis of the “apocalyptic eschatology” in *L.A.B.* focused ultimately upon *L.A.B.* 3:10 and on what he contended is Pseudo-Philo’s emphasis upon “personal accountability” (79). De Boer defended his claim (*ibid.*, 79–80) by referring to Deborah’s final exhortation of Israel (*L.A.B.* 33:2–3). He did not comment whether Pseudo-Philo’s views in this regard align with Sanders’s theory.

<sup>188</sup> Gathercole, *Boasting*, 160.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*, 79–80.

<sup>190</sup> Gathercole observed that the resurrection is “an intermediate state for all” to be followed by “reward and punishment” according to deeds in *L.A.B.* 3:10 (*ibid.*, 80). See also Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:327. Gathercole (*Boasting*, 80) noted that “the language of 3:10 is too all-encompassing and generalized to confine resurrection to the righteous and recompense to the wicked.” Gathercole (*ibid.*, 79 n. 190; 80 n. 193) specifically rejected the contention of Kent L. Yinger, *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds* (SNTSMS 105; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 80–81, that *L.A.B.* 3:10 speaks only to the resurrection of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. Gathercole (*ibid.*, 80) preceded his discussion of *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 by citing Samuel’s declaration in *L.A.B.* 64:7 in partial support of his interpretation of Pseudo-Philo’s views concerning a final post-mortem time of reckoning.

<sup>191</sup> Gathercole, *Boasting*, 177 n. 57, 179, 180. He did not explain how *L.A.B.* 30:7 (“The LORD will take pity on you [Israel], not because of you but because of his covenant that he established with your fathers and the oath that he has sworn not to abandon you forever”) correlates with his hypothesis.

one God” and (2) Israel’s “indestructibility.”<sup>192</sup> For example, in her study of the concepts of land and covenant in early Jewish literature (1994),<sup>193</sup> Betsy Halpern Amaru commented briefly on the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* Amaru contended that Pseudo-Philo was “mainly concerned” with God’s role in Israel’s history and with God’s “fidelity” to the covenant rather than Israel’s “fidelity” to the covenant.<sup>194</sup> Key in this regard was Amaru’s contention that Pseudo-Philo downplayed the “conditional aspect” of the Sinai covenant by retaining “notably little” of the scriptural connection between Israel’s fidelity to the Law and its acquisition and/or possession of the Promised Land.<sup>195</sup> She paralleled Murphy when she stated that, in *L.A.B.*, “obedience is rewarded and disobedience is punished but never is the ultimate fulfillment of the divine promises threatened.”<sup>196</sup> The “ultimate fulfillment” of the covenant promises was never put at risk by Israel’s “sins and infidelities.”<sup>197</sup> God’s mercy will sustain the covenant “in spite of Israel’s behaviour.”<sup>198</sup> For Amaru, the “continual evidence” of God’s merciful preservation of the nation of Israel “in spite of its infidelities once it is in the land”<sup>199</sup> was seen in the “rapid and highly selective review” of the events from Adam to the conquest of the land (*L.A.B.* 1–24) compared with the “extensive” rewriting of the “early prophetic material” (especially Judges; *L.A.B.* 25–65).

Amaru did not address the potential impact of reward and punishment upon individual Israelites in the world to come. Her most profound statement on this matter was her declaration

---

<sup>192</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>193</sup> Betsy Halpern Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994).

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, 69–70. Amaru states that Pseudo-Philo’s perspective contrasts with that of the book of Jubilees, which she contended emphasizes Israel’s fidelity to the covenant (*ibid.*).

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid.*, 70, 92.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.* 93.

that the covenant in *L.A.B.* was “totally unrelated to eschatology.”<sup>200</sup> Amaru’s declaration went beyond Dietzfelbinger’s contention that covenantal mercy did not influence the course of judgment at the final judgment in the world to come in *L.A.B.* but she still kept it in the picture, albeit “Ganz am Rand.”<sup>201</sup> Nevertheless, one must be cautious not to read too much into Amaru’s declaration. She also contended that Pseudo-Philo had an “underdeveloped and unsystematic” eschatology and she stated that Israel’s “end time fate is never clarified” in *L.A.B.*<sup>202</sup> Amaru left unanswered the question whether Pseudo-Philo ultimately was more or less legalistic.

Amaru’s position was paralleled somewhat by Howard Jacobson who observed that God will never abandon “His people” in *L.A.B.* and that, “in accord with His promises,” God assures the “ultimate salvation” of the Jewish people.<sup>203</sup> Jacobson argued that the belief that “God is in complete control” is central to *L.A.B.*<sup>204</sup> God has a plan and that plan for history includes the nation of Israel. God’s planned “salvation” of Israel will take place. The realization of Israel’s salvation, however, was dependent on Israel’s ceasing from “sinning” and faithful devotion “to God and to His Law” (*L.A.B.* 21:6).<sup>205</sup> A sinful Israelite was “obligated to repent of his ways and in his lifetime”<sup>206</sup> for there is no “ultimate salvation without repentance.”<sup>207</sup> Nevertheless, God’s

---

<sup>200</sup> Amaru, *Rewriting*, 124. Earlier, Amaru stated the similar concept less forcefully: the covenant in *L.A.B.* does not “seem to have much eschatological relevance” (*ibid.*, 92)

<sup>201</sup> Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1964),” 144.

<sup>202</sup> Amaru, *Rewriting*, 92. In contrast to this “underdeveloped and unsystematic” eschatology in *L.A.B.*, Amaru indicated that Pseudo-Philo’s understanding of the “nature and working of the covenant in Israel’s history” is “notably systematic and consistent” (*ibid.*).

<sup>203</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:242; also 1:244. He also wrote: “If there is a single predominant theme in *L.A.B.*, it is the following: No matter how much the Jewish people suffer, no matter how bleak the outlook appears, God will never completely abandon His people and in the end salvation will be the lot of the Jews” (*ibid.*, 1:241–242).

<sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:242, 244–245.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:242.

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:246.

devotion to his “plan” meant that “the ultimate salvation of the Jews is still guaranteed.”<sup>208</sup>

Jacobson’s observation that “the Jewish people will be eternal”<sup>209</sup> in *L.A.B.* must be read in light of his contention that “any attempt to discover a coherent and consistent view of the afterlife and eschatology in *L.A.B.* is doomed to failure.”<sup>210</sup>

John R. Levison’s brief consideration of the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* within an essay examining the relationship between Torah and covenant in *L.A.B.* (1996)<sup>211</sup> contrasted sharply with the views of scholars such as Murphy and Amaru who emphasized God’s covenant relationship with Israel. In keeping with James’s emphasis upon Israel’s “duty of faithfulness to the one God,”<sup>212</sup> Levison demonstrated that law was a central theme in *L.A.B.* According to Levison, Pseudo-Philo made this theme apparent through: (1) the insertion into his narrative of several direct divine commands “which have slender biblical precedent or none at all” (e.g. *L.A.B.* 11:3; 23:8; 26:7; 26:15; 50:3);<sup>213</sup> (2) the inclusion in his narrative of many biblical commands (e.g. *L.A.B.* 53:10, a citation of the bird’s nest law from Deut 22:6);<sup>214</sup> and (3) the repetition of the Decalogue (e.g. *L.A.B.* 11:6–13; 44:6–10).<sup>215</sup> Levison contended that, through this emphasis upon law, Pseudo-Philo demonstrated his belief that “there is . . . no hierarchy of

---

<sup>207</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:246. Jacobson stated that “*L.A.B.* is generally strict on the matter of the responsibility of an individual (or a people) for his (its) own fate” (ibid.).

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., 1:244.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., 1:245.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid., 1:249–250. Nevertheless, Jacobson acknowledges that Pseudo-Philo “firmly believed that life did not end with the death of a human’s body” (ibid., 250). For more, see Jacobson’s discussion of these issues on 1:247–250. For example, Jacobson cited *L.A.B.* 3:10. Jacobson interpreted this verse as contradicting *L.A.B.* 51:5, which he stated, “implies that sinners are not resurrected” (ibid., 248).

<sup>211</sup> John R. Levison, “Torah and Covenant in Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” in *Bund und Tora: Zur theologischen Begriffsgeschichte in alttestamentlicher, frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Tradition* (ed. Friedrich Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger; Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 111–127.

<sup>212</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>213</sup> Levison, “Torah and Covenant,” 117.

<sup>214</sup> Ibid., 118–119.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., 119–122.

laws in *L.A.B.*; even a discrete, minor injunction can become the basis of eschatological damnation.”<sup>216</sup> His declaration that God’s Law was “not a collection of unbearable injunctions” in *L.A.B.* but, rather, a way of life that one “must ‘enter’ and ‘walk in’ not unlike the covenant”<sup>217</sup> did little to mitigate this daunting prospect. Levison’s analysis ultimately placed the emphasis upon Israel’s duty to obey God’s law in its entirety.<sup>218</sup>

According to Levison, the Sinai covenant in *L.A.B.* is “the Telos” of the previous covenants with Noah and Abraham,<sup>219</sup> “the centerpiece of covenant history,” and “the focal point of God’s actions.”<sup>220</sup> Participation in God’s covenant was vital since “God saves this people throughout its existence by virtue of covenants with their ancestors.”<sup>221</sup> On this point, Levison cited Cohn’s synopsis of the concept of covenant in *L.A.B.*<sup>222</sup> In Levison’s analysis of *L.A.B.*, God’s perpetual preservation of Israel “by virtue of covenants”<sup>223</sup> did not appear to offer any special benefits to the individual Israelite except that a life in accordance with God’s Law truly was possible only for those within the covenant<sup>224</sup> (i.e. “adherents to the covenant”<sup>225</sup>). Paraphrasing *L.A.B.* 11:2, Levison wrote: “The Law by which Israel is enlightened is also the Law by which the rest of humankind is condemned.”<sup>226</sup> Levison interpreted this in light of Moses’s declaration that everyone is sinful (“who is the man who has not sinned against you,” *L.A.B.* 19:9). For Levison,

---

<sup>216</sup> Levison, “Torah and Covenant,” 119.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, 123.

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid.*, 113.

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, 114–115.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, 116.

<sup>222</sup> Levison (*ibid.*, 116 n. 16) cited Cohn, “Apocryphal Work,” 322.

<sup>223</sup> Levison, “Torah and Covenant,” 116.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*, 125–126.

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*, 124

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, 125. As Eckart Reinmuth, “Beobachtungen zum Verständnis des Gesetzes im Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (Pseudo-Philo),” *JSJ* 2 (1989): 169, observed, in *L.A.B.* “das Gesetz unteilbar, universal, und ewig gültig ist.”

this meant that even those with whom God established the covenant at Sinai and those to whom God at Sinai revealed the Law were sinful and, as such, in need of “God’s patient exercise of mercy.”<sup>227</sup> Levison did not explore how divine mercy influences the reward and (especially) the punishment of Israel but, clearly, he concluded that divine mercy somehow enabled the Israelites to live in accordance with God’s Law (something that the people in the nations outside the covenant were unable to do).

Certainly, James’s “great truths,” namely (1) “the indestructibility of Israel” and (2) Israel’s “duty of faithfulness to the one God,”<sup>228</sup> form a principle section of the framework of the research upon which this thesis seeks to build. As our survey of the state of research has shown, scholars do not dispute the validity of these “great truths.” Scholars agree that the nation of Israel cannot adversely influence its status as God’s chosen covenant community in the present world. In *L.A.B.*, God regularly punishes Israel for its sins but, according to the received view, this punishment will never include the utter destruction of Israel or the elimination of its status as God’s covenant community. In the present world (at least), the nation of Israel as a whole truly is indestructible. As Cohn observed, God’s “covenant with the patriarchs” means that God “always delivers” and that God “will never entirely abandon Israel.”<sup>229</sup> Likewise, as Murphy observed, in *L.A.B.*, God regularly (and “in spite of Israel”) “saves” Israel from “danger or extinction” because of the promises made to the fathers.<sup>230</sup> Scholars also agree that Israel has a “duty of faithfulness to the one God.”<sup>231</sup> This comes to the forefront in Pseudo-Philo’s unmistakable emphasis upon the Law,<sup>232</sup> moral causality,<sup>233</sup> and a final judgment based on works (*L.A.B.* 3:10).<sup>234</sup>

---

<sup>227</sup> Levison, “Torah and Covenant,” 125.

<sup>228</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>229</sup> Cohn, “Apocryphal Work,” 322.

<sup>230</sup> Murphy, “Eternal Covenant,” 54.

<sup>231</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>232</sup> Levison, “Torah and Covenant,” 117–122.

While affirming, at least in general, the validity of James's "great truths," our survey of the research also revealed issues pertaining to the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* that require further investigation. First, scholars have not delineated clearly the extent to which (if at all) the nation of Israel's indestructibility applies to individual Israelites or the impact that the nation of Israel's observance (or lack thereof) of its "duty of faithfulness" has had (and will have) upon its reward and punishment. Does the nation of Israel's covenant-granted indestructibility mitigate the punishment that individual Israelites receive or will receive in the future? What rewards has the nation of Israel enjoyed as a result of its national observance of God's Law? The tendency in scholarship has been to emphasize the nation of Israel as a whole in discussions of Israel's covenant-based "indestructibility" and to emphasize individual Israelites in discussions of Israel's "duty of faithfulness." The result has been sharply contrasting conclusions concerning the impact of reward and (especially) punishment upon the Israelite covenant community. According to some of the interpretations of Pseudo-Philo's ideology surveyed in this section, the status of the nation of Israel as a whole as God's covenant community is unassailable but the place of the individual Israelite within God's people seems tenuous. This scenario is illustrated by Murphy's declaration that the covenant promises to Israel would be fulfilled "regardless of the actions of Israel" and his emphasis upon moral causality and the final judgement in his (brief!) discussion of personal eschatology in *L.A.B.*<sup>235</sup>

Second, scholars have not considered the impact that reward and punishment has upon the nation of Israel and upon individual Israelites in the world to come in sufficient depth. Despite Pseudo-Philo's well-attested belief in a world to come,<sup>236</sup> the strong language that

---

<sup>233</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 247.

<sup>234</sup> Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1964)," 143.

<sup>235</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 256–257.

<sup>236</sup> Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:301.

scholars utilize to speak of Israel's covenant-based indestructibility in the present world<sup>237</sup> is not applied generally to individual Israelites or to the nation of Israel as a whole in the world to come. Scholars often conclude that the principles delineated in Pseudo-Philo's discussions of reward and punishment in the present world are either not applicable in the world to come or are of minimal significance at that time. For example, Amaru observed that covenant in *L.A.B.* was "totally unrelated to eschatology"<sup>238</sup> while Dietzfelbinger contended that covenantal mercy was of minimal significance at best (i.e. "Ganz am Rand") at the final judgement in the world to come.<sup>239</sup> Jacobson noted that God's devotion to his "plan" meant that Israel would continue until the nation realized its promised salvation.<sup>240</sup> However, Jacobson's comments concerning this must be read in light of his contention that "any attempt to discover a coherent and consistent view of the afterlife and eschatology in *L.A.B.* is doomed to failure."<sup>241</sup> Levison did not discuss whether God's perpetual covenantal preservation of Israel extended into the world to come but his observation that the covenant did not appear to offer any special benefits to individual Israelites in *L.A.B.*, either in the present world or in the world to come,<sup>242</sup> seems to negate this possibility. Indeed, for Levison, the covenant benefited individual Israelites in that a life in accordance with God's Law truly was possible only for "adherents to the covenant."<sup>243</sup> In this regard, it would appear that Levison essentially aligns with Wadsworth. Wadsworth observed that, in *L.A.B.*, Israel "will never die" (cf. *L.A.B.* 9:3)<sup>244</sup> but his analysis of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* focused almost entirely on the daunting prospect of a final judgment in the

---

<sup>237</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 322; James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34; Murphy, "Eternal Covenant," 44–45.

<sup>238</sup> Amaru, *Rewriting*, 124.

<sup>239</sup> Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1964)," 144.

<sup>240</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:244.

<sup>241</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:249–250.

<sup>242</sup> Levison, "Torah and Covenant," 125–126.

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>244</sup> Wadsworth, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:341.



world to come of “the body for its actions and the soul for its imaginings” (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:10).<sup>245</sup> Even Murphy, who stated that God’s covenantal commitment to Israel in *L.A.B.* rendered the actions of individual Israelites almost “irrelevant,”<sup>246</sup> observed that “membership in the chosen people [i.e. Israel] does not guarantee salvation, either in this world or in the next.”<sup>247</sup> As observed above, however, Murphy’s explanatory footnote that, in this regard, Pseudo-Philo is representative of covenantal nomism confuses rather than clarifies Murphy’s stance on the matter. Concerning the impact of reward and punishment upon individual Israelites in the world to come, Perrot stands essentially alone<sup>248</sup> with his emphasis upon the concept of covenant in *L.A.B.* (“le mot clé”)<sup>249</sup> and with his contention that Pseudo-Philo’s religion was a “religion of the heart” (“religion du cœur”).<sup>250</sup> According to Perrot’s interpretation of *L.A.B.*, individual Israelites who had repented of and atoned for sin would experience mercy at the final judgment in the world to come.<sup>251</sup>

Our foregoing survey of the research also suggests that E. P. Sanders’s theory of covenantal nomism<sup>252</sup> holds promise as a perspective from which to reconsider the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* We do not affirm Sanders’s hypothesis that covenantal nomism

---

<sup>245</sup> Wadsworth, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2:23. For a similar emphasis upon the final judgment in *L.A.B.*, see de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 79, and Gathercole, *Boasting*, 80.

<sup>246</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 246.

<sup>247</sup> *Ibid.*, 233.

<sup>248</sup> The primary exception, of course, is Räisänen (*Paul*, 180 n. 92) who cited Perrot’s essay on Pseudo-Philo’s “theology” in support of his view that *L.A.B.* is representative of covenantal nomism. Räisänen noted the absence of legalism in *L.A.B.* and the prominence of the concept of covenant but he did not specifically affirm Perrot’s contention that Pseudo-Philo’s religion was a “religion of the heart” (Perrot, “La pensée théologique,” 44). Sanders (*Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 263–275) and Murphy (*Pseudo-Philo*, 233 n. 18) also contended that *L.A.B.* is representative of covenantal nomism but they did not specifically depict Pseudo-Philo’s religion as a “religion of the heart.”

<sup>249</sup> Perrot, “La pensée théologique,” 44.

<sup>250</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>251</sup> *Ibid.*, 54–55.

<sup>252</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 180 n. 92; Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 233 n. 18; Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 263–275.

was “pervasive” within Judaism of the first centuries of the Common Era<sup>253</sup> but we recognize the parallels between Sanders’s theory and the prevailing scholarly interpretations of concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.*

Foremost among the possible parallels between Sanders’s theory and the prevailing scholarly interpretations of concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* is the parallel between

---

<sup>253</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 426. The validity of E. P. Sanders’s theory that covenantal nomism was pervasive in early Judaism has remained a matter of debate in early Judaism scholarship for some years following its publication. For example, John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Diaspora* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 21, accepted the possibility that “a particular interpretation of the Torah, or an understanding of Judaism derived from the Torah” could have become “normative” as Sanders had conjectured in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. He also affirmed that there was “no doubt” concerning the “major importance” for early Judaism of two principal pillars of covenantal nomism, namely “the conception of the covenant with its attendant obligations” (i.e. the Law; *ibid.*). However, Collins stopped short of affirming the validity of Sanders’s claim that covenantal nomism was pervasive in early Judaism. Collins observed that it was “not enough” for Sanders to determine that “the elements of covenantal nomism” were “present” in early Jewish literature without also ascertaining whether covenantal nomism is “the dominant pattern” within the literature under consideration (Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 21–22). Collins later affirmed that covenantal nomism “was certainly represented in the [Jewish] Diaspora” (*ibid.*, 273). Nevertheless, covenantal nomism by no means was “the only, or even the dominant, factor in the religion of Hellenistic Judaism” (*ibid.*). According to Collins, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 266 n.21, covenantal nomism is “correct on a very general level” but it is of “limited value” for the study of early Judaism. Jacob Neusner, “Comparing Judaisms: Review of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*,” *HR* 18 (1978): 180, found some validity in Sanders’s theory of covenantal nomism but, as Neusner noted in *Judaic Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: A Systematic Reply to Professor E.P. Sanders* (SFSHJ 84; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 9, ultimately he considered it “systemically trivial.” Neusner contended that the basic pattern of religion derives from the literature of Pauline Christianity (Neusner, “Comparing Judaisms,” 179–180). According to Neusner, Sanders did not “come to Rabbinic Judaism . . . to uncover the issues of Rabbinic Judaism” (*ibid.*, 180). He argued that Sanders demonstrated the presence in Rabbinic literature of “sayings of central importance to Paul (or Pauline theology)” (*ibid.*, 187) but that Sanders did not demonstrate that these sayings formed the “center and core of the Rabbinic system or even of a given Rabbinic document” (*ibid.*, 180). In a similar vein, Philip S. Alexander, “Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism, Volume 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (ed. D. A. Carson, P. T. O’Brien, and M. A. Seifrid; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), 272, 279, contended that Sanders (and George Foot Moore before him) is “in danger of distorting” early Judaism by “forcing it” into a typology derived from early Christianity. He claimed that some scholarly defences of rabbinic Judaism (i.e. Sanders and Moore) risk “turning the rabbinic Judaism into a rather pale reflection of liberal Protestantism” (*ibid.*, 279). Central in this regard is Alexander’s concern that scholars such as Sanders deny the “absolute centrality of law to Rabbinic Judaism” (*ibid.*) and regard it as “axiomatic” that “a religion of works-righteousness is inferior to a religion of grace” (*ibid.*, 272). As Alexander wrote, “The superiority of grace over law is not self evident and should not simply be assumed” (*ibid.*, 300). According to Alexander, Tannaitic Judaism is “fundamentally a religion of works-righteousness, and is none the worse for it” (*ibid.*, 272). Nonetheless, the allegation that Tannaitic Judaism was a legalistic religion is “profoundly mistaken” for the Tannaim “mitigated” the “rigors” of God’s justice by God’s mercy (*ibid.*).

the two “great truths” that James discerned in *L.A.B.* and Sanders’s theory. Does a belief in the Israel’s covenant-based “indestructibility” plus a belief in Israel’s “duty of faithfulness to the one God”<sup>254</sup> equal covenantal nomism?

Another noteworthy possible parallel between Sanders’s theory and the prevailing scholarly interpretations of concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* is the parallel between the sharply contrasting interpretations that scholars hold concerning the concepts of reward and punishment within Pseudo-Philo’s ideology and the viewpoints concerning early Jewish religion held by Sanders and by those whom he sought to counter. Sanders formulated his theory of covenantal nomism as the “pattern of religion”<sup>255</sup> within Judaism of the first centuries of the Common Era<sup>256</sup> as a response to the portrayal of early Judaism in the works of scholars such as Ferdinand Weber, Emile Schürer, Wilhelm Bousset, Paul Billerbeck, and Rudolf Bultman.<sup>257</sup> According to these scholars, early Judaism was a legalistic religion in which individual Jews sought to earn divine favour through the performance of good works. For scholars such as Gathercole, Wadsworth, Winter, and James,<sup>258</sup> the overarching principle governing reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* ultimately is Israel’s “duty of faithfulness.” According to these scholars, *L.A.B.* is a relatively legalistic text in which reward and punishment is strictly meted out. This reward and punishment includes the determination of the all-important place of the individual in the world to come. For other scholars such as Perrot and Räisänen,<sup>259</sup> the overarching

---

<sup>254</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>255</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 16–17.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, 75, 422.

<sup>257</sup> Ferdinand Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften* (ed. Franz Delitzsch and Georg Schnedermann; Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1897); Emile Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1901); Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (ed. Hugo Gressmann; 4th ed.; HNT 21; Tübingen: Mohr, 1966); Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: Beck, 1922–56); Rudolf K. Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* (Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949).

<sup>258</sup> Gathercole, *Boasting*, 79–80, 160; Wadsworth, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2:23; Winter, *IDB* 3:795; James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34–36.

principle governing reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* is that God will be merciful to the covenant community. This concept is central to Sanders's theory.

Sanders's theory holds a possible solution to the questions that remain concerning the applicability of the nation of Israel's covenant-based indestructibility to the individual Israelite and concerning the impact of reward upon the nation of Israel as a whole in *L.A.B.* First, according to Sanders's theory, the nation of Israel's covenant-based indestructibility not only applies to the individual Israelite, it is *the* focal point of an individual Israelite's soteriology. Second, any reward the nation of Israel receives from God is "intra-covenantal" and without soteriological value. Whether these two principles actually apply in *L.A.B.* remains to be seen but examining *L.A.B.* in light of Sanders's theory is merited.

Sanders's theory also holds a possible solution to the questions that remain concerning the impact that reward and punishment has upon the nation of Israel and upon individual Israelites in the world to come in *L.A.B.* According to Sanders's theory, any reward and punishment that the nation of Israel or individual Israelites receive in the present world or in the world to come (if, indeed, the authors of a given text believe in an afterlife) is "intra-covenantal" and without impact upon salvation. The examination of *L.A.B.* to see whether this may be the case within Pseudo-Philo's ideology should prove to be a helpful exercise. Even if we observe dissonance between Sanders's theory and this aspect of Pseudo-Philo's ideology (which is possible, given the evidence we have seen thus far), the process that has been followed will hopefully lead us to conjecture possible alternative hypotheses on this matter.

### ***Research Question***

The central research question for this dissertation is "Does *L.A.B.* exemplify E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel? In keeping with the chief areas of agreement and the issues that

---

<sup>259</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 263–275; Räisänen, *Paul*, 180 n. 92.

our survey of research raised, our consideration of this question will focus on Pseudo-Philo's view of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel's continued existence and perpetuation as God's covenant people, both in the present world and in the world to come. We will also focus upon the ultimate fate of some individual Israelites, upon their perpetuation within God's covenant people, and upon whether Pseudo-Philo believes there is a causal connection between the two. Sanders largely included these matters under the rubric of "staying in."<sup>260</sup>

If Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* exemplifies covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel, then reward and punishment will be applied intra-covenantally in *L.A.B.*<sup>261</sup> Consequently, neither reward nor punishment will ultimately have an impact upon the establishment and maintenance of the covenant relationship for the Israelite covenant community as a whole or for individual Israelites. In addition, in keeping with Sanders's theory, the only circumstance in which an individual Israelite would not establish or maintain the covenant relationship would be if the Israelite clearly and unequivocally denies God and denies the covenant relationship.<sup>262</sup>

Three subsidiary research questions focus on the key elements of this primary research question. First, what impact did Pseudo-Philo believe that reward and/or punishment had upon the nation of Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors as depicted in *L.A.B.* 1–8? This question deals with the possibility that, even if Pseudo-Philo's text is considered representative of covenantal nomism, his brand of covenantal nomism might be distinct from that which Sanders delineated in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. The possibility that it may be distinct emerges from Pseudo-Philo's unique introduction of a postdiluvian system of reward and punishment in his rewriting

---

<sup>260</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 16–17.

<sup>261</sup> *Ibid.*, 234.

<sup>262</sup> *Ibid.*, 422.

of God's words to Noah in Gen 8:21–22 (*L.A.B.* 3:9–10). This is preceded immediately by Pseudo-Philo's reworking of the Noahic covenant (*L.A.B.* 3:9–12).

Sanders gave the pre-Sinaitic era little more than a passing mention in his development of covenantal nomism<sup>263</sup> but *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 is the principal passage for most of the essentially legalistic interpretations of *L.A.B.* These verses immediately precede Pseudo-Philo's reworked postdiluvian Noahic covenant (*L.A.B.* 3:11–12). They state that all sin will be punished severely in the present world (*L.A.B.* 3:9) and that all people will experience a final reckoning in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 3:10). No parallel exists in the Jewish Scriptures or in early Jewish literature for the inclusion of this material within the Noahic covenant. From the time of Cohn onward,<sup>264</sup> scholars have identified *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 as being central to Pseudo-Philo's views concerning reward and punishment. The verses were foundational for James's influential contention that Israel has a "duty of faithfulness to the one God,"<sup>265</sup> vital to Wadsworth's essentially legalistic interpretation of Pseudo-Philo's views concerning reward and punishment,<sup>266</sup> and crucial to Gathercole's hypothesis that *L.A.B.* is an early Jewish text that causes "a very serious problem" for Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism.<sup>267</sup> Even scholars who suggested that *L.A.B.* represents covenantal nomism (such as Murphy) have identified these verses as being central in *L.A.B.*

*L.A.B.* 3:9–10 is one of the key passages that support the well-received view that Pseudo-Philo believed in the strict application of 'moral causality.'<sup>268</sup> According to this

---

<sup>263</sup> Sanders briefly mentioned this portion of the Jewish Scriptures in his consideration of the Tannaitic explanations of the reason that God chose to establish the covenant with Israel (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 87–101). Sanders's decision to focus on Sinai is not without merit for the Jewish Scriptures depict God's meeting with the Israelites at Sinai as *the* event that established the nation of Israel as God's covenant people. Early Jews believed that it was at Sinai that God chose the children of Israel from all the nations of the earth and that it was there that God revealed the Law to the Jews alone.

<sup>264</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 322.

<sup>265</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34–41.

<sup>266</sup> Wadsworth, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:1–5, 16–21, 88.

<sup>267</sup> Gathercole, *Boasting*, 160.

<sup>268</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 256.

hypothesis, Pseudo-Philo believed that every sin would be punished either in this world or in the next. For James et al., *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 did not present a problem since an Israelite's *duty of faithfulness* prevailed over any benefit that the nation of Israel's indestructibility offered to him or to her. For Murphy, however, *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 might present a problem since the strict application of moral causality is difficult if Israel's covenantally-guaranteed indestructibility extends to the individual Israelite.

Second, what impact did Pseudo-Philo believe that reward and/or punishment had upon the nation of Israel's establishment as God's covenant people and on the nation of Israel's continuance as God's covenant people? This question addresses Pseudo-Philo's views concerning the nation of Israel's acquisition and the maintenance of its covenant-based indestructibility.

Third, what impact did Pseudo-Philo believe that reward and/or punishment had upon the acquisition ("getting in") and retention ("staying in") of membership in the Israelite covenant community by individual Israelites? This question addresses Pseudo-Philo's views concerning (1) whether membership in the Israelite covenant community is a reward for behaviours exhibited, for beliefs held, or for actions completed and (2) the extent to which Israel's covenant-based indestructibility applies to individual Israelites.

### ***A Preliminary Discussion of Key Terminology***

At the outset of our study, we need to consider how Pseudo-Philo used and/or understood several terms and concepts that are central to our research question. A brief discussion of these terms and/or concepts will form the framework for our use of them. As we progress through the study, we will refine our understanding of these terms and/or concepts where necessary. The three terms that we will consider in this section are *Israel*, *covenant*, and *salvation* and the three concepts are *present world*, *world to come*, and *covenant community*.

According to Pseudo-Philo's usage, *Israel* refers to a socio-political-ethnic entity that traced its origins to the patriarch Jacob. In *L.A.B.*, the proper noun "Israel" appears first in

conjunction with the migration of Jacob's large family from Canaan to Egypt: "And these are the names of the children of Israel (*filiorum Israel*) who went down to Egypt with Jacob . . . ." (*L.A.B.* 8:11; cf. cf. Gen 32:29 [ET 32:28]).<sup>269</sup> Throughout *L.A.B.*, the term *children of Israel* is Pseudo-Philo's preferred designation for Israel.<sup>270</sup> Other popular designations for Israel in *L.A.B.* are *people of Israel*<sup>271</sup> and *house of Israel*.<sup>272</sup> The children of Israel in *L.A.B.* are the descendants of a seemingly unbroken line of god-fearing individuals that extends as far back as the first humans. For Pseudo-Philo, the key individuals in the children of Israel's seemingly unbroken heritage of god-fearing individuals are Noah (*L.A.B.* 1:20–22; 3:4–12), Serug (*L.A.B.* 4:11, 16), Abraham (*L.A.B.* 4:11; 7:4; 8:3; 23:4–5), Isaac (*L.A.B.* 8:3; 23:8–9; 32:5–6), and Jacob (*L.A.B.* 8:4, 11; 23:9–10; 32:5–6).

In *L.A.B.*, the term *covenant* and the concept of a *covenant community* are closely related to the proper noun Israel. The children of Israel in *L.A.B.* are, in any sense of the concept, a *covenant community*. Although Pseudo-Philo traced the roots of the children of Israel back to a common ancestry, all Israelites in *L.A.B.* are the heirs of three major *covenants*: the Noahic covenant (*L.A.B.* 3:11–12), the Abrahamic covenant (*L.A.B.* 4:11; 7:4; 8:3), and the Mosaic covenant (*L.A.B.* 11:1–15). The first two covenants were not established with Israel *per se* but with two of their god-fearing ancestors: Noah and Abraham. As the descendants of Noah and Abraham, the children of Israel in *L.A.B.* are depicted as the beneficiaries of certain covenant promises given in the earlier covenants. For example, Israel's establishment in the land of

---

<sup>269</sup> Translation adapted slightly from that of Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:314, which reads "sons of Israel" rather than "children of Israel."

<sup>270</sup> For "children of Israel" (*filiorum/filiis/filii/filios Israel*), see *L.A.B.* 8:11; 9:1,3,5,11,16; 10:2, 3; 11:1,5,15; 12:1; 14:3; 19:3; 20:8; 22:8; 25:1; 28:4; 30:1,4; 32:8; 40:8–9; 41:1; 44:6; 46:2; 47:10; 48:3–4; 49:1; 54:1,3.

<sup>271</sup> For "people of Israel" (*populum/populus/populo Israel*), see *L.A.B.* 10:1; 22:3,7; 34:5; 36:3; 39:8; 44:8; 46:1, 2; 54:1; 64:3. See also "race of Israel" (*genus Israel*) in *L.A.B.* 9:4; 35:3.

<sup>272</sup> For "house of Israel" (*domus Israel*), see *L.A.B.* 21:6, 9; 26:12; 53:8.



Canaan in the time of Joshua is stated as being the fulfillment of promises given to Abraham (*L.A.B.* 23:11). In addition, God establishes a covenant with the children of Israel themselves at Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11:1–15). The focal point of Pseudo-Philo's account of this event is the revelation of "the law" of God's "eternal covenant" (*L.A.B.* 11:5; cf. 9:8; 11:1).

As discussed previously in this chapter, the concepts of *reward* and *punishment* have a central place within Pseudo-Philo's narrative. Almost every narrative in *L.A.B.* concerns itself, in one way or another, with the reward and/or (especially) the punishment of at least one segment of humanity. Therefore, it appears that the principles that guide reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* are contained within some or all of the following passages:

- *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 (a statement concerning the reward and punishment of humanity appended to the Noahic covenant)
- *L.A.B.* 11:6–13 (the revelation of the Decalogue at Sinai)
- *L.A.B.* 13:10 (a summary statement concerning "the salvation of the souls of the people")
- *L.A.B.* 19:2–5 (Moses's final exhortation of Israel)
- *L.A.B.* 23:12–13 (Joshua's final exhortation of Israel)
- *L.A.B.* 33:1–5 (Deborah's final exhortation of Israel)
- *L.A.B.* 44:6–10 (a flashback to and application of the Decalogue in Micah's era)
- *L.A.B.* 51:5 (a statement concerning the fates of "the wicked" and "the just" within the Song of Hannah)

Inherent within some of these and other passages in *L.A.B.* is a division of human history into two ages: (1) the *present world* and (2) the *world to come* (*L.A.B.* 3:9–10; 16:3; 19:12–13; 28:8–9; 33:2–3; 62:9). According to Pseudo-Philo, humanity will experience one of at least two possible realms of existence at the end of the present world. The preferred realm(s) of post-mortem existence in *L.A.B.* is termed "paradise" (*L.A.B.* 19:10), "the immortal dwelling place that is not subject to time" (*L.A.B.* 19:12), and "the place of sanctification" (*L.A.B.* 19:13). In addition, in its description of the world to come, *L.A.B.* 3:10 refers to both "another earth and another

heaven, an eternal dwelling place.” The feared realm(s) of post-mortem existence in *L.A.B.* is termed “hell” or “Sheol” (*inferno*; *L.A.B.* 3:10; 16:3; 21:4; 33:3), “the place of perdition” (*L.A.B.* 3:10), “dwelling place in darkness and the place of destruction” (*L.A.B.* 16:3), and “the inextinguishable fire” (*L.A.B.* 63:4; cf. *L.A.B.* 38:4). To complicate matters further, Pseudo-Philo also referred to other post-mortem locations. These include “the place of fire where the deeds of those doing wickedness against me will be expiated” (*L.A.B.* 23:6) and the place where God stores “the souls” of the Israelite people “in peace until the time allotted the world be complete” (*L.A.B.* 23:13; see also *L.A.B.* 19:12; 28:10; 51:5). Pseudo-Philo clearly believed that God meted out reward and punishment in the present world (*L.A.B.* 3:9) and after death in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 3:10). Later, we will discuss how Pseudo-Philo believed individuals could end up in either the preferred realm or the feared realm of post-mortem existence.

In view of the evidence that Pseudo-Philo believed in a world to come that has at least two possible realms of existence, we will consider Pseudo-Philo’s views concerning that which Sanders deemed “salvation” or “soteriology.”<sup>273</sup> Sanders carefully couched his use of the terms *salvation* and *soteriology* in order to include those individuals or groups without a view concerning the afterlife. Anyone who was “concerned to be ‘in’ rather than ‘out’ of the group was deemed to have soteriological concerns.”<sup>274</sup> Pseudo-Philo, however, clearly believed in an afterlife. Therefore, any consideration of his soteriology (to use Sanders’s term) within our examination of his view concerning the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel must have the prospect of an afterlife with two possible realms of existence in view. Within Pseudo-Philo’s ideology, it would appear that this is where salvation ultimately resides. Within this type of worldview, any consequences of sin that might occur in the present world pale in comparison to any possible consequences of sin that might occur in the world to come.

---

<sup>273</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 17–18, 75.

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

### **Methodology**

The recognition that *L.A.B.* is not a freestanding composition is foundational to the methodology that we will use to determine whether *L.A.B.* exemplifies E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel. *L.A.B.* is a late Second Temple period rewriting of scriptural texts and traditions<sup>275</sup> and the text

---

<sup>275</sup> Scholars commonly classify *L.A.B.* as *rewritten Bible*, a term first used by Geza Vermes in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (2d ed.; StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 67–68, 95. The first edition of Vermes's book was published in 1961. In recent years, however, an increasing segment of scholarship has begun to question the continued appropriateness of the term *rewritten Bible*. Representative is Jonathan G. Campbell, "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique," in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003* (ed. Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons, and Lloyd K. Pietersen; LSTS 52; London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 43–68 (especially 49–50). Central to Campbell's concerns over the use of terms such as *rewritten Bible* were the contentions (1) that the tripartite canon did not develop until well after the end of the Second Temple period since "late Second Temple Jews" only "had a twofold scripture of the Law and the Prophets" (*ibid.*, 46), and (2) that, at this time, the contents of these two groups of scriptural texts were "open-ended" (*ibid.*, 46, 47). In this regard, Campbell (*ibid.*, 46 n. 19) cited his dependence upon (and adaptation of) John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 75–79. For a concise overview of the arguments in favour of a tripartite canon in late Second Temple period Judaism, see Craig A. Evans, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Canon of Scripture in the Time of Jesus," in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. Peter W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 67–76. Despite these questions, scholars are confident that at least some Second Temple Jews rewrote their scriptural texts and traditions. As Daniel A. Machiela observed in *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009), most scholars agree that "the authors of works typically considered *rewritten Bible*" based their compositions "on a relatively fixed, received scriptural tradition" (p. 5). Today, scholars who utilize the term *rewritten Bible* (or one of the more or less cognate terms such as *retold Bible* or *rewritten Scripture*) utilize it in one of two ways. For some scholars, *rewritten Bible* is a narrowly defined narrative-based literary genre. See Moshe J. Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness," *Text* 22 (2005): 169–196; Philip Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 99–121. For other scholars, *rewritten Bible* refers to a technique/strategy rather than a genre—an approach to the use of the scriptures that is found in a variety of literary genres. See George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; CRINT 2/2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 89–90; and Daniel J. Harrington, "The Bible Rewritten (Narratives)," in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 239–247. The issues mentioned here are but representative and (admittedly) cursory in nature. The list of secondary literature on *rewritten Bible* has grown exponentially in recent years and it is neither feasible within the constraints of this footnote nor is it profitable for this present study to deal with these issues in any depth. In addition to the aforementioned studies, see Michael Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–28; Anders Klostergaard Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJSupp 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–306; Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–18; Daniel

was crafted by an individual with a “truly profound” scriptural “knowledge.”<sup>276</sup> Consequently, a reader of *L.A.B.* who is well versed in the Jewish Scriptures will recognize much of its content.

Pseudo-Philo’s narrative begins with the creation of the world (*L.A.B.* 1:1; cf. Gen 5:1–2) and ends with the death of King Saul (*L.A.B.* 65:1–5; cf. 1 Sam 31:1–4; 2 Sam 1:6–10, 13). Between these bounds, Pseudo-Philo follows the basic narrative framework of the Jewish Scriptures. *L.A.B.* 1–19 is a selective rewriting of the Torah (i.e. Genesis through Deuteronomy) and *L.A.B.* 20–65 is a selective rewriting of much of the former Prophets (i.e. Joshua through the first half of Samuel). As is the case with any early Jewish rewriter of the Jewish scriptural texts, the decision concerning which scriptural passages to include and which to exclude constitutes a key editorial decision. Pseudo-Philo was highly selective in the scriptural content that he chose to retain from any given section of the Jewish Scriptures. He often heavily edited, greatly condensed, or somewhat altered the scriptural material that he retained. Pseudo-Philo interwove his heavily redacted base scriptural text with flashbacks to, quotations of, or allusions to other portions of the Jewish Scriptures.<sup>277</sup> He added in details<sup>278</sup> and narrative and didactic

---

K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007); and George J. Brooke, “Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 361–386, for more on these matters. Petersen, “Rewritten Bible,” 303, provided some perspective to the contemporary debate concerning rewritten Bible when he observed, “The ancient author(s) or editor(s) did not conceive of their works in terms of our particular analytical focus on how their textual creations intertextually relate to the scriptural writings proper.” Petersen did not defend this statement but, rather, referred his readers to the discrepancy between “the modern genre designation” (i.e. rewritten Bible), how Josephus presented his *Antiquities* (history, see *Ant.* 1.5), and how the book of Jubilees presents itself (divine revelation given at Sinai, see Jub 1:3–26).

<sup>276</sup> Howard Jacobson, “Biblical Interpretation in Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2012), 181.

<sup>277</sup> For excellent discussions of biblical interpretation in *L.A.B.*, see Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:224–241 and “Biblical Interpretation,” 180–199. He wrote one of the best concise summaries of the relationship between *L.A.B.* and scriptural texts and traditions:

*L.A.B.* . . . is interpretive, is problem-solving, and is literarily creative. It fills gaps, clarifies ambiguities, resolves difficulties and contradictions, provides connections, responds to the reader’s curiosity, expands or subtracts for tendentious purposes, makes changes to enhance the reputation of a biblical hero or worsen that of a villain, and answers questions that are raised implicitly by the Bible’s narrative. (ibid., 180–181)

<sup>278</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:236–237.

material not contained in the parallel portion of the Jewish Scriptures or in any extant ancient version of the Scriptures.<sup>279</sup> As Cohn observed,

The narrative follows closely that of the Old Testament, but passes rapidly over many incidents, and omits many sections, while, on the other hand, it elaborates certain portions, and furnishes many quite novel additions to the narrative of the Bible. The author shows a great love for altering and enlarging the speeches in the Bible, and even for composing new speeches.<sup>280</sup>

In the resultant text, Pseudo-Philo integrated Scripture and its interpretation so smoothly and seamlessly that any reader of *L.A.B.* who does not share Pseudo-Philo's "profound knowledge" of the scriptural texts and traditions<sup>281</sup> will not discern the boundaries between the text of Scripture and the *editorial layer* that is unique to Pseudo-Philo's *Rewritten Bible*. By identifying the changes that Pseudo-Philo made to the scriptural account, this thesis will extract Pseudo-Philo's ideology.

The base text of *L.A.B.* utilized for this side-by-side analysis of *L.A.B.* and scriptural texts and traditions is Daniel J. Harrington's critical Latin text.<sup>282</sup> Harrington's text is the only critical text of *L.A.B.* that takes into consideration all of the extant manuscripts. Harrington's critical text is a reconstruction of the hypothetical archetype Latin manuscript  $\Omega$  or, more realistically, the hypothetical sub-archetype manuscript  $\Phi$ .<sup>283</sup> Quotations from Harrington's critical text will be

---

<sup>279</sup> Feldman, "Prolegomenon," ix-x. Ginzberg frequently cited *L.A.B.* in his classic retelling of Jewish traditions, *Legends of the Jews*, making him the first modern scholar to utilize *L.A.B.* in this regard. For a listing of the references to *L.A.B.* in Ginzberg's *Legends of the Jews*, consult the index s.v. "Ps.-Philo" (Ginzberg, *Legends*, 2:1446–1447).

<sup>280</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 279–280.

<sup>281</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 224–225. See also Jacobson, "Biblical Interpretation," 181, 183.

<sup>282</sup> Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 60–387. Unless otherwise noted, all English language citations from *L.A.B.* are from Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:297–377.

<sup>283</sup> Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 53. Harrington created a *stemma* of the Latin manuscripts of *L.A.B.* (ibid., 54). According to his *stemma*, all of the extant manuscripts of *L.A.B.* descended from the hypothetical sub-archetype manuscript  $\Phi$ . Harrington concluded that the now missing Lorsch manuscript (mss. L), which Sichardus utilized in the creation of his *editio princeps* along with the Fulda manuscript (mss. K), was the sole representative of the hypothetical archetype Latin manuscript  $\Omega$  that did not descend from the sub-archetype manuscript  $\Phi$ . Although Harrington's stated goal was to reconstruct the hypothetical archetype Latin manuscript  $\Omega$ , he acknowledged "pratiquement nous ne pouvons espérer un texte valable que du subarchetype  $\Phi$ " (ibid., 56). For Harrington's reconstruction of the *stemma* of the Latin manuscripts of *L.A.B.*, see Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 15–57.

supplemented with readings suggested by Howard Jacobson in *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Commentary*. Jacobson focused more on the reconstruction (as much as it is possible) of a hypothetical, first century C.E. Hebrew original<sup>284</sup> than on the reconstruction of a hypothetical fourth century C.E.<sup>285</sup> Latin archetype or sub-archetype manuscript.

Our choice of a base scriptural text to utilize in our side-by-side analysis of *L.A.B.* and the Jewish Scriptures requires explanation. Several attempts have been made to ascertain which scriptural text(s) were used in the composition of the Hebrew language original text *L.A.B.* and even (for some scholars) in the creation of the subsequent Greek and Latin translations. In 1898, Cohn mentioned the “Hebrew Bible” that he seemingly presupposed Pseudo-Philo utilized in the composition of *L.A.B.* and referred to the “Septuagint” and “other Greek versions” which he suggested were used in the translation of Pseudo-Philo’s text into Greek.<sup>286</sup> However, the advances in the knowledge of the state of the scriptural text in the late Second Temple period have rendered Cohn’s observations concerning the scriptural text behind the extant text of *L.A.B.* somewhat simplistic. Key in this regard has been the discovery of many Hebrew language scriptural texts at Qumran and in nearby areas. Scholars now commonly emphasize plurality in the scriptural texts of the late Second Temple period.<sup>287</sup> Even Harrington’s attempt to ascertain

---

<sup>284</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1: ix-x. However, in most cases, transmission and translation has taken its toll on the text such that it is not possible to make more than reasonable conjectures concerning the precise wording of the original Hebrew text.

<sup>285</sup> Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 57.

<sup>286</sup> Cohn, “Apocryphal Work,” 311–312.

<sup>287</sup> Emanuel Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts,” in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (ed. Emanuel Tov; TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr, 2008), 143–151, classified the biblical texts from Qumran into five textual groups: “texts written in the Qumran scribal practice,” “proto-Masoretic (proto-Rabbinic) texts,” “texts close to the presumed Hebrew source of the LXX,” “pre-Samaritan,” and “non-aligned (independent) texts.” For a brief overview of individual scriptural texts as found at Qumran, see Eugene Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. Peter W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 57–64.

the scriptural text that Pseudo-Philo used in the composition of *L.A.B.*<sup>288</sup> was, to quote Jacobson, “almost inevitably destined for failure.”<sup>289</sup> According to Jacobson, the chief difficulties reside (1) in Pseudo-Philo’s tendency to paraphrase Scripture or to cite it from memory and (2) in the apparent lack of “consistency” in the choice of scriptural text cited when the citations in *L.A.B.* appear to align with text types not within the Masoretic tradition.<sup>290</sup> Even so, Jacobson observed, examples that may be cited as aligning with “other text-types” (i.e. not proto-Masoretic) either have “little cogency” or they “are too inconsequential to prove anything.”<sup>291</sup> A comment should be added to Jacobson’s observations: *L.A.B.* is extant only in translation. This fact renders any extant quotations of or allusions to Hebrew scriptural texts themselves interpretations since the very act of translation is an act of interpretation.

Therefore, given the difficulty (impossibility?) of determining the precise scriptural text that Pseudo-Philo used in the composition of *L.A.B.* with any certainty, we will need to consult more than one ancient scriptural text. Since, according to the well-received hypothesis, *L.A.B.* was composed in Hebrew, the primary consideration in this side-by-side analysis of *L.A.B.* and scriptural texts and traditions will be given to the standard critical Hebrew text of the Jewish Scriptures, the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. While Pseudo-Philo most certainly did not have the Masoretic text of the Jewish Scriptures in front of him when he composed *L.A.B.*, Jacobson observed that “There is no compelling evidence that his text was very different from MT.”<sup>292</sup> In recognition of the uncertainty surrounding the scriptural text that Pseudo-Philo used, we also will consult regularly with ancient Greek scriptural texts (i.e. the “Septuagint”)<sup>293</sup> and with the

---

<sup>288</sup> Daniel J. Harrington, “The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” *CBQ* 33 (1971): 1–17.

<sup>289</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:255.

<sup>290</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:255.

<sup>291</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>292</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>293</sup> The text of the Septuagint cited in this study is Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta*. Unless otherwise noted, all English language citations of the Septuagint are from Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright,

scriptural texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>294</sup> In addition, citations from the Jewish Scriptures and references to the Jewish Scriptures in other early Jewish texts (e.g. Jewish pseudepigrapha, the Qumran texts, Josephus, Philo) will be consulted.<sup>295</sup> In addition, we will consult regularly with the Vulgate, which is the late fourth century C.E. translation of the Scriptures that was translated into Latin around the same time that *L.A.B.* was translated.<sup>296</sup> Finally, since we are not completely certain which scriptural text Pseudo-Philo used in the composition of *L.A.B.*, we will weigh any conclusions concerning Pseudo-Philo's ideology that are supported by broad-ranging observations regarding Pseudo-Philo's adaptations of the scriptural text(s) and traditions more heavily than conclusions based on detailed linguistic and/or textual arguments.

### **Outline of Thesis**

The remainder of this thesis is divided into four chapters. In Chapter 2, we will examine Pseudo-Philo's depiction of the reward and punishment of *Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors* in *L.A.B.* 1–8 for signs of covenantal nomism. In Chapter 3, we will examine Pseudo-Philo's depiction of the reward and punishment of *Israelite covenant community as a whole* in *L.A.B.* 9–65 for signs of covenantal nomism. In Chapter 4, we will examine Pseudo-Philo's depiction of the reward and

---

eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>294</sup> The Qumran texts are published in the *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* series (40 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955–2009). Accessible English translations the Qumran texts are Martin Abegg Jr., Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (New York: Harper Collins, 1999) and Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg, Jr., and Edward M. Cook, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper Collins, 2005).

<sup>295</sup> For the original language versions of the pseudepigrapha, see the bibliographies in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985). Unless otherwise noted, English translations of the Jewish pseudepigrapha will be from Charlesworth, ed., *OTP*. The original language (i.e. Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek) versions of the Dead Sea Scrolls are published in *DJD*. The Greek texts and English translations of Josephus and Philo cited are, respectively, Henry St. John Thackeray et al., eds., *Josephus* (10 vols.; LCL; London: Heinemann, 1926–1965) and Francis Henry Colson and George Herbert Whitaker, eds., *Philo* (10 vols.; LCL; London: Heinemann, 1929–1962). A more up-to-date (albeit incomplete) edition of Josephus is Steve Mason, ed., *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary* (10 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2000-).

<sup>296</sup> Cohn, "Apocryphal Work," 327. All citations from the Vulgate will be from Weber, *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*.



punishment of *individual Israelites* in *L.A.B.* 9–65 for signs of covenantal nomism. Finally, in Chapter 5, we will determine whether *L.A.B.* exemplifies E. P. Sanders’s theory of covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel by synthesizing the previous three sections of the study.

## 2: The Reward and Punishment of Israel's Pre-Sinaitic Ancestors in *L.A.B.* 1–8

In this chapter, the quest to test whether *L.A.B.* exemplifies E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel commences with a comparative analysis of the impact of reward and punishment upon Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors as depicted in *L.A.B.* 1–8 and in scriptural texts and traditions. Did Pseudo-Philo make omissions, additions, changes, and adaptations to the scriptural primeval history (Gen 1–11) that suggest he was representative of (or at least influenced by) covenantal nomism? We will focus (1) on the impact of reward and punishment upon the establishment and maintenance of God's covenants with Noah and Abraham and (2) on the impact of reward and punishment upon humanity in the years immediately following the establishment of these divine-human covenants.

Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of the scriptural primeval history (*L.A.B.* 1–8; cf. Gen 1–11) depicted the establishment of a covenant between God and Noah in *L.A.B.* 3:4 (cf. Gen 6:17–18) and in *L.A.B.* 3:11–12 (cf. Gen 9:8–17),<sup>1</sup> and it depicted the establishment of a covenant between God and Abraham in *L.A.B.* 8:3.<sup>2</sup> These two covenants are focal points within Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of scriptural primeval history.

For the purpose of our consideration in this chapter of the impact that reward and punishment had upon Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors, these two covenant narratives will be considered in the manner in which Pseudo-Philo depicted them: self-contained. *L.A.B.* 1–5 is

---

<sup>1</sup> Pseudo-Philo also included a brief flashback to the establishment of the Noachic covenant in God's final revelations to Moses (*L.A.B.* 19:11).

<sup>2</sup> In addition, the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant is the focus of a flashback in *L.A.B.* 23:3–8 (cf. Josh 24:2–3). In Pseudo-Philo's other flashbacks to Abraham, his focus is on the Gen 22:1–19, a narrative in which God commands Abraham to offer his son Isaac as a burnt offering (*L.A.B.* 18:5; 32:2–4; 40:2).

Noah's story, the boundaries of which are formed by a genealogy in *L.A.B.* 1 that culminates with Noah's birth and by a census in *L.A.B.* 5 that culminates in Noah's death. Between these boundaries, Pseudo-Philo related the story of the events that led up to the establishment of the Noahic Covenant (*L.A.B.* 2:1–3:12) and briefly highlighted a few key events within its history (*L.A.B.* 4:1–17). *L.A.B.* 6–8 is the story of Abraham and his offspring. The events that led up to the Abrahamic covenant's establishment are related in *L.A.B.* 6:1–7:5, with actual establishment of the Abrahamic covenant noted in *L.A.B.* 8:3. A few key events and people from the history of Abraham's offspring are related in *L.A.B.* 8:4–10, and then the passage closes with a partial list Abraham's offspring (via his grandson Jacob) at the time of their migration to Egypt (*L.A.B.* 8:11–14).

Pseudo-Philo connected these two more-or-less self-contained narratives with a brief (and otherwise unknown) prognostication concerning Abraham's coming given four generations prior to his birth (*L.A.B.* 4:11). In turn, Pseudo-Philo tied Abraham's story into the story of Israel with notice that some of Abraham's offspring migrated to Egypt and sojourned there for many years (*L.A.B.* 8:11–14). This, then, sets the scene for the story of Israel in *L.A.B.* 9:1 and following.

Some consideration will be given to the implications for Israel's story of the events recorded in *L.A.B.* 1–8 but our focus will remain on the Noahic and the Abrahamic covenants. Questions concerning the impact of these covenants upon Israel will be left until Chapter 3 along with questions concerning the establishment of the Israelite covenant community itself.

### ***The Noahic Covenant in L.A.B. 1–5***

Reward and punishment is at the heart of the Noahic covenant in *L.A.B.* Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of the antediluvian establishment of a covenant between God and Noah in *L.A.B.* 3:4 (cf. Gen 6:17–18) highlights these themes through the reversal of the order of key phrases in Gen 6:17–18 (Table 2.1, rows 1–2, 4)<sup>3</sup> and through the omission of specific references to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 87, regarding *L.A.B.* 3:4 (. . . *disponam testamentum meum ad te ut disperdam . . .*), note "l'idée est originale" but they did not recognize that Pseudo-Philo created this "original idea" by reversing the order of key phrases in Gen 6:17–18.

flood in Gen 6:17a (Table 2.1, row 5) and the destruction of life on earth in Gen 6:17c (Table 2.1, row 3). The resulting sequence in *L.A.B.* 3:4 is:

1. God's command for Noah's family to enter the ark (Gen 6:18b; Table 2.1, row 1)<sup>4</sup>
2. God's declaration of intent to establish a covenant relationship with Noah (Gen 6:18a; Table 2.1, row 2)
3. God's declaration that "all the inhabitants of the earth" (*omnes habitantes terram*, *L.A.B.* 3:4) will be destroyed (Gen 6:17b; Table 2.1, row 4)

A key change in wording is Pseudo-Philo's replacement of *כָּל־בְּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר־בוּ רוּחַ חַיִּים* ("all flesh in which is the breath of life," Gen 6:17b) with *omnes habitantes terram* ("all inhabitants of the earth," *L.A.B.* 3:4). The term *habitantes terram* ("inhabitants of the earth," Heb. *יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ*) in *L.A.B.* 1–5 consistently refers to sinful humanity.<sup>5</sup> Pseudo-Philo's declaration in *L.A.B.* 3:4 that

---

Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1975)," 106 n. 4b, recognized that Pseudo-Philo reversed the two halves of Gen 6:18 in *L.A.B.* 3:4 ("Die zwei Teile von Gen 6:18 sind hier umgestellt") but did not mention that Pseudo-Philo also reversed the order of Gen 6:17 and Gen 6:18. Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:315, likewise noted that Pseudo-Philo reversed the clauses in Gen 6:18 and noted that *ut disperdam omnes habitantes terram* (or "at least *ut disperdam*") in *L.A.B.* 3:4 echoes Gen 6:17 (ibid.).

<sup>4</sup> *L.A.B.* 3:4 also reverses the order in which Noah's sons and his wife are mentioned. In Gen 6:18b, Noah's sons are mentioned before his wife (MT *וּבְנֵי וְאִשְׁתּוֹ*; LXX *οἱ υἱοὶ σου καὶ ἡ γυνή σου*; Vulg. *et filii tui uxor tua*) but, in *L.A.B.* 3:4, his wife is mentioned first (*et mulier tua, et filii tui*).

<sup>5</sup> The *habitantes terram* commit adultery when Jobal provides music instruction (*L.A.B.* 2:7–8), they make and worship idols when Tubal provides instruction in metallurgy (*L.A.B.* 2:9), and they are those whom Lamech desires to instruct in wickedness (*L.A.B.* 2:10). Pseudo-Philo's flood narrative commences with God's declarations that the deeds (*opera*) of the *habitantium super terram* are wicked ( *pessima*; *L.A.B.* 3:4). The destruction (*disperdam*) of the *habitantes terram* is promised (*L.A.B.* 3:4). The *terra cum habitantibus* is destroyed (*corrupta est*) during the flood (*L.A.B.* 3:6; cf. 7:4). The continued punishment of the *inhabitantes terram* is promised (*L.A.B.* 3:9). After the flood, "those who inhabited the earth" (*qui habitabant in terra*) committed many sins (*L.A.B.* 4:16) and, after Noah's death, the *habitantes terram* gathered and planned the construction of Babel (*L.A.B.* 6:1–2). These builders of Babel are punished severely by God (*L.A.B.* 6:17; 7:3, 5). After the time of Abraham, the term *habitantes terram* (or a variant thereof) is reserved normally for Israel's rival nations in the land of Canaan (cf. *habitabant terram*, *L.A.B.* 20:9; *habitantibus terram*, *L.A.B.* 21:1; *habitantium terram*, *L.A.B.* 25:9; *habitantium terram*, *L.A.B.* 41:3). Likewise, in the Jewish Scriptures, *יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ* most often refers to the rivals of the nation of Israel (cf. Exod 23:31; Num 32:17; 33:52, 55; Josh 2:9, 24; 7:9; 9:24; 13:21; Judg 1:32; 1 Chr 11:4; 22:18; 2 Chr 20:7; Neh 9:24). In the Prophets, however, *יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ* is used more generally and refers to all who are under divine judgment, whether Jew or Gentile (cf. Jer 1:14; 6:12; 13:13; 25:29; Joel 1:14; 2:1; Zeph 1:18; Zech 11:6). Only rarely is *יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ* used positively with reference to humanity (cf. "From where he sits enthroned he watches all the inhabitants of the earth [כָּל־יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ] – he who fashions the hearts of them all, and observes all their deeds," Ps 33:14–15).

God will destroy *omnes habitantes terram* (i.e. sinful humanity) rather than “all flesh” (Gen 6:17c) parallels Pseudo-Philo’s statement that God established the postdiluvian Noahic covenant with Noah and his offspring (i.e. postdiluvian humanity; *L.A.B.* 3:11) rather than with all living beings on the postdiluvian earth (Gen 9:8–10).

Table 2.1. *L.A.B.* 3:4 and Gen 6:17–18 in Parallel Columns

<i>L.A.B.</i> 3:4	Gen 6:17–18
“And you will enter the ark, you and your wife and your sons and the wives of your sons with you.	“and you shall come into the ark, you, your sons, your wife, and your sons’ wives with you. (18b)
And I will establish ( <i>et disponam</i> ) my covenant with you,	But I will establish (וְהִקְמַתִּי) my covenant with you; (18a)
<i>Omitted</i>	everything that is on the earth shall die. (17c)
to destroy ( <i>ut disperdam</i> ) all those inhabiting the earth.”	to destroy (לְשַׁחֵת) from under heaven all flesh in which is the breath of life ( כָּל־בֶּשֶׂר אֲשֶׁר־בוֹ רוּחַ ) (וַיְחַיִּים); (17b)
<i>Omitted</i>	For my part, I am going to bring a flood of waters on the earth” (17a)

Pseudo-Philo’s retelling of the establishment of a postdiluvian covenant between God and Noah began in *L.A.B.* 3:11 with a selective reworking of Gen 9:8–11. The introductory formula (“And the Lord spoke again [*adiecit*] . . . saying [*dicens*],”<sup>6</sup> *L.A.B.* 3:11), derived primarily from Gen 9:8,<sup>7</sup> simultaneously establishes a link with and a boundary between Pseudo-Philo’s account of the formal establishment of the postdiluvian Noahic covenant in *L.A.B.* 3:11–12 and God’s initial postdiluvian speech to Noah in *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 (cf. Gen 8:21–22; see Table 2.2). Through the retention of the introductory formula from Gen 9:8 in *L.A.B.* 3:11a, Pseudo-Philo

<sup>6</sup> For *adiecit* followed by a participle (e.g., *dicens*; *Et adiecit Dominus ad Noe et ad filios eius dicens*, *L.A.B.* 3:11). Also cf. *Et adiecit dicens Samson* (*L.A.B.* 43:7) and *et adiecit Dominus loqui ad Ahaz dicens* (Isa 7:10 Vulg.; וַיֹּסֶף יְהוָה דְּבַר אֱלֹהִים לְאָחָז לֵאמֹר).

<sup>7</sup> See also the opening phrase of Gen 9:1, “God blessed (וַיְבָרֵךְ) . . . and said to them.”

differentiated between God's two postdiluvian speeches to Noah (i.e. *L.A.B.* 3:8–10; *L.A.B.* 3:11–12). Through the inclusion of *adiecit* (“again”), Pseudo-Philo indicated that God's initial postdiluvian speech to Noah (*L.A.B.* 3:8–10) is the context in which the postdiluvian Noahic covenant (*L.A.B.* 3:11–12) is to be interpreted.

With the exception of two extra blocks of material that qualify the promise that the earth and its inhabitants will never be destroyed again (*L.A.B.* 3:9b, 10; see Table 2.2), God's initial postdiluvian speech to Noah in *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 (see Table 2.2, rows 2–5) differs little from its scriptural counterpart (Gen 8:21–22). After Noah's postdiluvian burnt offering (*L.A.B.* 3:8; cf. Gen 8:13–21a),<sup>8</sup> God promised never again (*adiciam*, *L.A.B.* 3:9; cf. עוֹד . . . לְאֲדֹסָף, Gen 8:21) to curse (*maledicere*; cf. לְקַלֵּל, Gen 8:21) the earth “on man's account” (*pro homine*; cf. בְּעִבּוֹר הָאָדָם, Gen 8:21) because the “shape” (*figura*, tendency; cf. יֵצֵר, Gen 8:21) of the human heart is “degenerate from his youth” (*desipit a iuventute sua*).<sup>9</sup> In *L.A.B.* 3:9, God also promised never to

---

<sup>8</sup> *L.A.B.* states that, after God dried up the land (*siccavit Deus terram*) on the ninetieth day (*in die nonagesimo*; cf. Gen 8:13–14), God told Noah and those with him to exit the ark (cf. Gen 8:16–17a) and to “increase (*crescite*) and multiply (*multiplicamini*) upon the earth” (cf. Gen 8:17b). *L.A.B.* 3:8 parallels Gen 1:28; 9:1,7 with the use of second person masculine imperatives (*crescite* and *multiplicamini*; Heb. פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ; also פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ, Gen 1:22) instead of Gen 8:17 which utilizes third person masculine singulars (פָּרוּ and רְבוּ). The wording of *L.A.B.* 3:8 parallels Gen 8:17 (“and be fruitful and multiply on the earth”) rather than Gen 9:1 (“Be fruitful and multiply, and fill [וּמְלֵאוּ] the earth.”). After Noah and those with him exited the ark (cf. Gen 8:18–19), he built an altar to God (*aram Domino*) upon which he offered burnt offerings (*holocaustomata*) of some of the clean animals (*pecoribus mundis*) and birds (*volatilibus mundis*) that were on the ark (cf. Gen 8:20). *L.A.B.* 3:8 concludes with the notice that God “accepted” (*acceptum*) the “restful scent” (*odor requietionis*; cf. Gen 8:21a). רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ regularly appears in the Torah and often presupposes the divine acceptance of the sacrifices and offerings (e.g. Exod 29:18, 25, 41). In Ezekiel, however, the רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ generally are not pleasing to God because usually they are linked to Israel's worship of other gods (Ezek 6:13; 16:19; 20:28). The only positive use of רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ in Ezekiel is in 20:41 where it depicts the nation of Israel as a רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ. The origin and the significance of the “ninetieth day” on which God dried up the land (*L.A.B.* 3:8) remains unknown. Dietzfelbinger speculated that it might derive from the reference in Gen 8:14 to the twenty-seventh day of the second month (i.e. two months plus 27 days; “Pseudo-Philo,” 4). See also Louis Feldman, “Prolegomenon,” lxxxv. Two months plus 27 days is still a few days short of the required 90 days. The only other 90 day periods mentioned in *L.A.B.* are the three months during which Tamar and Jochebed's pregnancies were hidden (*L.A.B.* 9:5). However, there is no clear connection between the ninety days of *L.A.B.* 3:8 and the three months of *L.A.B.* 9:5.

<sup>9</sup> All manuscripts of *L.A.B.* here read *desiit* (leave off). Leopold Cohn, “Apocryphal Work,” 310, suggested it could be emended to *desipit* (be foolish). James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 81, and Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1975),” 107 n. 9c, noted but did not adopt Cohn's emendation while Harrington (*Pseudo-Philon I*, 70) adopted Cohn's emendation. Cazeaux's translation (“Le penchant du coeur humain s'est fourvoyé dès sa jeunesse,” in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 71) did not reflect Harrington's emendation.

destroy (*disperdere*, cf. לְהַבֹּת, Gen 8:21) all life (*omnes viventes*, cf. אֶת-כָּל-חַיִּי, Gen 8:21) at the same time (*simul*) as God had done in the flood. The word *simul* (“at the same time”) is the key word here. Following this last phrase, Pseudo-Philo inserted two major sections of material outlining how God will punish sinners in the present world (*L.A.B.* 3:9) and in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 3:10). The language utilized in *L.A.B.* 3:9 to describe the present-world punishment for sin has parallels in the Jewish Scriptures<sup>10</sup> and in early Jewish literature.<sup>11</sup> *L.A.B.* 3:10 contains the promise that the dead will be raised up from their intermediary post-mortem states (“And I will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth, *L.A.B.* 3:10).<sup>12</sup> At this time, there will be a final judgment and “another earth and another heaven” (*L.A.B.* 3:10).<sup>13</sup>

---

Jacobson (*Commentary*, 1:92, 321) alternatively emended *desiit* to *desciit* (degenerate). Jacobson based his emendation on a citation of the passage in Helinand’s *Chronicon*, a thirteenth century text.

<sup>10</sup> Jer 14:12, “. . . by the **sword**, by **famine**, and by **pestilence** I consume them”; Jer 27:8, “‘I will punish,’ says the LORD, ‘with the **sword**, the **famine**, and the **pestilence**, until I have consumed them by his hand’”; Isa 66:16, “For by fire will the LORD execute judgment, and by his **sword**, on all flesh; and those slain by the LORD shall be many”; Isaiah 29:6, “You will be visited by the LORD of hosts with thunder and **earthquake** and great noise, with whirlwind and tempest, and the **flame** of a devouring **fire**”; Ezek 5:12, “One third of you shall die of **pestilence**, or be consumed with **famine** among you; and one third shall fall by the **sword** around you; and one third I will scatter to every wind and will unsheathe the **sword** after them”; Jer 21:9–10, “Those who stay in this city shall die by the sword, by **famine**, and by **pestilence** . . . For I have set my face against this city for evil and not for good,’ says the LORD: It shall be given into the hands of the king of Babylon, and he shall burn it with **fire**. . . .” Emphasis added.

<sup>11</sup> A similar sequence of punishment is in 2 Baruch 27 (death, v. 3; sword, famine, and a lack of rain, v. 5; earthquakes and terrors, v. 7; fire, v. 8; confusion, v. 13) and 70 (death in battle, v. 6; earthquakes and fire, v. 8), in Syb. Or. 3 (war and sword, v. 689; fire and rain, v. 690); Ps. Sol 15:7 (righteous will avoid punishments of famine, sword, and pestilence), Jub 23:13–18 (famine, death, sword, captivity, v. 13) and T. Judah 23:3 (famine, death, sword, and enslavement among Gentiles).

<sup>12</sup> For death as sleep, see Deut 31:16; Job 7:21; Jer 51:39; Dan 12:2; *L.A.B.* 11:6; 19:2, 6, 12, 13; 28:10; 33:6; 35:5; 51:5. See also 4 Ezra 7:30–38. Perhaps the strongest scriptural parallel to *L.A.B.* 3:10 is Job 14:10–14. While Job 14 lacks a resounding affirmation of a post-mortem resurrection, we clearly see the question raised, “If mortals die, shall they live again?” (Job 14:14). Job 14:12 also declares concerning the dead, “So mortals lie down and do not rise again; until the heavens are no more, they will not awake or be roused out of their sleep.” Elsewhere in *L.A.B.*, affirmations of a resurrection utilize the language of sleep (as in *L.A.B.* 3:10). Concerning Moses’s place of post-mortem rest, *L.A.B.* 19:12 states, “You will rest in it until I [God] visit the world. I will raise up you and your fathers from the earth in which you sleep” (*dormietis*). The next verse (*L.A.B.* 19:13) speaks of God at the end of time drawing near “to visit the world” and hastening “to raise up you who are sleeping (*dormientes*) in order that all who will be restored to life will dwell in the place of sanctification that I showed you” [Moses].

<sup>13</sup> Isaiah 65:17, “For I am about to create new heavens and a new earth (שָׁמַיִם חֲדָשִׁים וָאָרֶץ חֲדָשָׁה); the former things shall not be remembered or come to mind”; Isa 66:22, “For as the new heavens and the

After this final judgment, death “will be abolished,”<sup>14</sup> “hell will shut its mouth,”<sup>15</sup> and those “pardoned (*iustificatus est*)” by God will never again be tainted (*non coinquinabitur*, *L.A.B.* 3:10).

Table 2.2. *L.A.B.* 3:8c–10 and Gen 8:21–22

<b>L.A.B. 3:8c–10</b>	<b>Gen 8:21–22</b>
and it was accepted ( <i>et acceptum est</i> ) by the LORD as a restful scent ( <i>odor requietionis</i> ). (8)	And when the LORD smelled (וַיִּרַח) the pleasing odor (אֶת־רִיחַ הַנְּיַחֵחַ), (21a)
And God said, “I will never again ( <i>adiciam</i> ) curse ( <i>maledicere</i> ) the earth on man's account ( <i>pro homine</i> ), for the tendency ( <i>figura</i> ) of man's heart is foolish [or ‘degenerate’?] from his youth ( <i>desipit</i> [or <i>desciit</i> ?] <i>a iuventute sua</i> ); and so I will never destroy all living creatures ( <i>omnes viventes</i> ) at one time ( <i>simul</i> ) as I have done. (9a)	the LORD said in his heart, “I will never again (עוֹד . . . לֹא־אֶסֶף) curse (לְקַלֵּל) the ground because of humankind (בְּעִבּוֹר בְּהָאָדָם), for the inclination (יִצָּר) of the human heart is evil from youth; nor will I ever again destroy (לְהַכּוֹת) every living creature (אֶת־כָּל־חַי) as I have done.(21b–d)
But when those inhabiting the earth sin, I will judge them by famine or by the sword or by fire or by death; and there will be earthquakes, and they will be scattered to uninhabited places. But no more will I destroy the earth by the water of the flood. (9b)	n/a
And in all the days of the earth, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, spring and fall will not cease	As long as the earth endures, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and

new earth (הַשָּׁמַיִם הַחֲדָשִׁים וְהָאָרֶץ הַחֲדָשָׁה), which I will make, shall remain before me, says the LORD; so shall your descendants and your name remain”; 1 En. 91:16, “And the first heaven shall depart and pass away, And a new heaven shall appear, And all the powers of the heavens shall give sevenfold light.”

<sup>14</sup> “And death will be abolished (*extinguetur mors*)” (*L.A.B.* 3:10). According to *L.A.B.* 13:8, “death was ordained for the generations of men” because the first “man transgressed my [God’s] ways” when he “was persuaded by his wife” after she had been “deceived by the serpent.” As John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Jewish Literature* (JSPSup 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 156–159, observes, this view is not common in early Jewish literature. See also 4 Ezra 3:7 which states, “And you laid upon him [Adam] one commandment of yours; but he transgressed it, and immediately you appointed death for him and for his descendants.” In a similar vein of thought, 4 Ezra 7:116–118 speaks to the effects of the events of Gen 3 upon humanity as a whole: “It would have been better if the earth had not produced Adam, or else, when it had produced him, had restrained him from sinning. For what good is it to all that they live in sorrow now and expect punishment after death? O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants.” Nevertheless, 4 Ezra is clear that those who came after Adam deserved their own punishments. They were not killed merely because of Adam’s sin (4 Ezra 3:8–9; 7:119–126; cf. 2 Bar 17:3; 23:4).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. 2 Bar. 21:23, “Let the realm of death be sealed so that it may not receive the dead from this time.”



<i>L.A.B. 3:8c–10</i>	<i>Gen 8:21–22</i>
<p>day and night until I remember those who inhabit the earth, until the appointed times have been fulfilled. (9c)</p> <p>But when the years appointed for the world have been fulfilled, then the light will cease and the darkness will fade away. And I will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth. And hell will pay back its debt and the place of perdition will return its deposit so that I may render to each according to his works and according to the fruits of his own devices, until I judge between soul and flesh. And the world will cease, and death will be abolished (<i>extinguetur mors</i>), and hell will shut its mouth. And the earth will not be without progeny or sterile for those inhabiting it; and no one who has been pardoned (<i>iustificatus est</i>) by me will be tainted (<i>non coinquinabitur</i>). And there will be another earth and another heaven, an everlasting dwelling place.” (10)</p>	<p>winter, day and night, shall not cease.” (22)</p>

At this point in *L.A.B.*, Pseudo-Philo did not develop the link between God’s postdiluvian speeches to Noah in *L.A.B. 3:8–10* and *L.A.B. 3:11–12* that he established through the inclusion of the word *adiecit* (“again”) in the introductory formula in *L.A.B. 3:11* (“And the Lord spoke again [*adiecit*] . . . saying [*dicens*]). The daunting prospect of an inclusive system of reward and punishment central to God’s initial postdiluvian speech to Noah (*L.A.B. 3:8–10*) fades to the background and the promise that God will favour postdiluvian humanity comes to the foreground. As in Gen 9, the promised covenant in *L.A.B. 3:11* underscores the pledge that God never again would use a flood to destroy (*corrumpere*; Gen 9:11, לְשִׁחָתָהּ) life on earth.<sup>16</sup> The anthropocentric focus of the system of reward and punishment proposed in *L.A.B. 3:9–10*, however, is retained in Pseudo-Philo’s rewriting of the postdiluvian Noahic covenant in *L.A.B. 3:11–12*. While the scriptural Noahic covenant extends benefits to the birds and to the animals with which Noah shared the ark, Pseudo-Philo’s rewritten postdiluvian Noahic covenant extends

<sup>16</sup> *Aqua diluvii* in *L.A.B. 3:11* is language borrowed from the omitted portion of Gen 9:11, “. . . that never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of a flood” (מִיַּי הַמַּבּוּל).

benefits only to Noah and his offspring (see Table 2.3, rows 3–4). Pseudo-Philo omitted the portions of the scriptural postdiluvian Noahic covenant that extend its benefits to the birds and to the animals with which Noah shared the ark from *L.A.B.* 3:11–12. He omitted material from Gen 9:11b that contains the promise that “all flesh” (כָּל־בְּשָׂר) would never again be cut off by floodwaters. He also omitted material from Gen 9:10 that expands the covenant to include non-human life forms: “. . . and with every living creature that is with you, the birds, the domestic animals, and every animal of the earth with you, as many as came out of the ark” (Gen 9:10).

Table 2.3. *L.A.B.* 3:11 and Gen 9:8–11

<i>L.A.B.</i> 3:11a–c	Gen 9:8–11
And the LORD spoke again ( <i>adiecit</i> ) to Noah and his sons, saying ( <i>dicens</i> ), (3:11a)	Then God said to Noah and to his sons with him (8)
“Behold I will establish ( <i>disponam</i> ) my covenant with you and your seed after you, (3:11b)	“As for me, I am establishing my covenant with you and your descendants after you, (9)
<i>omitted</i>	and with every living creature that is with you, the birds, the domestic animals, and every animal of the earth with you, as many as came out of the ark. (10)
<i>see 11b (above)</i>	I establish my covenant with you, (11a)
and no more ( <i>non adiciam</i> ) will I destroy ( <i>corrumpere</i> ) the earth by the water of a flood ( <i>aqua diluvii</i> ).” (3:11c)	that never again shall all flesh (כָּל־בְּשָׂר) be cut off by the waters of a flood, and never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth.” (11a-b)

Pseudo-Philo’s reworking of the postdiluvian Noahic covenant continued with material derived from Gen 9:1–7 (see Table 2.4). After brief prescriptions against the consumption of meat with its life-blood in it (cf. Gen 9:4) and against the shedding of human blood (i.e. murder) (cf. Gen 9:6),<sup>17</sup> humanity is commanded to be fruitful and to multiply (cf. Gen 9:7).

<sup>17</sup> Pseudo-Philo omitted a flashback to the creation account (Gen 9:3b; see Table 2.4, row 5) and omitted a more detailed description of the murder prohibition (Gen 9:5; see Table 2.4, row 7).

Table 2.4. *L.A.B.* 3:11d–g and Gen 9:1–7

<i>L.A.B.</i> 3:11d–g	Gen 9:1–7
<i>Omitted</i>	God blessed Noah and his sons, and said to them, (1a)
<i>See row 9 below</i>	“Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth. (1b)
<i>Omitted</i>	The fear and dread of you shall rest on every animal of the earth, and on every bird of the air, on everything that creeps on the ground, and on all the fish of the sea; into your hand they are delivered.” (2)
“And everything that moves and lives will be food for you. (3:11d)	“Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you; (3a)
<i>Omitted</i>	and just as I gave you the green plants, I give you everything. (3b)
But meat with its lifeblood you may not eat. (3:11e)	Only, you shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood. (4)
<i>Omitted</i>	For your own lifeblood I will surely require a reckoning: from every animal I will require it and from human beings, each one for the blood of another, I will require a reckoning for human life. (5)
For whoever will shed the blood of a man, his own blood will be shed, because man was made after the image of God. (3:11f)	Whoever sheds the blood of a human, by a human shall that person's blood be shed; for in his own image God made humankind. (6)
But you, increase and multiply and fill the earth, like a school of fish multiplying in the waves.” (3:11g)	And you, be fruitful and multiply, abound on the earth and multiply in it (פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ שֶׂרָצוּ בָאָרֶץ).” (7)
	“Let the waters bring forth swarms of living creatures (יִשְׂרְצוּ הַמַּיִם שֶׂרָץ גֹּפֶשׁ חַיָּה) (Gen 1:20)

Pseudo-Philo concluded his account of the establishment of the postdiluvian Noahic covenant with a simplified explanation of the sign of the covenant: the rainbow (*L.A.B.* 3:12; cf. Gen 9:12–17; see Table 2.5). The scriptural account states that the rainbow is given as a sign to remind humanity that God will remember the covenant (Gen 9:16) but *L.A.B.* 3:12 states merely that the rainbow will be a “memorial of the covenant” (*L.A.B.* 3:12). Whether the rainbow will

serve to remind humanity, God, or both of the covenant is not discussed in *L.A.B.* 3:12. However, Pseudo-Philo continued his anthropocentric focus in his rewriting of the Noahic covenant. As he did in *L.A.B.* 3:11, Pseudo-Philo in *L.A.B.* 3:12 removed the reference to non-human participants in the Noahic covenant (cf. “. . . and every living creature that is with you,” Gen 9:12).

Table 2.5. *L.A.B.* 3:12 and Gen 9:12–17

<b><i>L.A.B.</i> 3:12</b>	<b>Gen 9:12–17</b>
And God said, “This is the covenant that I have established between me and you.	God said, “This is the sign of the covenant that I make between me and you (12a)
<i>Omitted</i>	and every living creature that is with you, for all future generations: (12b)
<i>Omitted</i>	I have set my bow in the clouds, (13a)
And it will happen that when I cover the heaven with clouds, my bow will appear in the cloud;	When I bring clouds over the earth and the bow is seen in the clouds, (14)
and it will be a memorial of the covenant between me and you and all those inhabiting the earth.”	and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and the earth. (13b)
<i>Omitted</i>	I will remember my covenant that is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall never again become a flood to destroy all flesh. When the bow is in the clouds, I will see it and remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is on the earth.” (15–16)
<i>See row 5 above</i>	God said to Noah, “This is the sign of the covenant that I have established between me and all flesh that is on the earth.” (17)

*The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon the Establishment of the Noahic Covenant in L.A.B. 1–3*

Pseudo-Philo’s subordination of the scriptural primeval history to the story of Noah draws into closer focus the relationship between antediluvian primeval history (Genesis 1–5;

*L.A.B.* 1–2) and the cataclysm (Gen 6–9; *L.A.B.* 3). Key in this regard Pseudo-Philo’s envelopment of Cain’s story (*L.A.B.* 2:1–10; cf. Gen 4:1–24) within the story of Noah. Pseudo-Philo’s Noah narrative (*L.A.B.* 1–5) begins in *L.A.B.* 1:1–22 with Noah’s genealogy (cf. Gen 5:1–34) and ends in *L.A.B.* 5:8 with the notice of Noah’s death (cf. Gen 9:28–29). Pseudo-Philo encapsulated the first two chapters of Genesis in two words at the start of his genealogy (*Initio mundi*, *L.A.B.* 1:1a; cf. Gen 1:1–2:25; 5:1–2)<sup>18</sup> and he omitted any mention of humanity’s expulsion from the garden (Gen 3:1–24).<sup>19</sup> Following Noah’s genealogy (*L.A.B.* 1:1–22), Pseudo-Philo set the context for the flood narrative with a reworked version of Cain’s history (*L.A.B.* 2:1–10; cf. Gen 4:1–24). He noted Cain’s murder of Abel in passing (*L.A.B.* 2:1; cf. Gen 4:1–16), and then noted the geographical and numerical expansion of Cain’s line and its pedagogical contribution to humanity’s wickedness in some detail (*L.A.B.* 2:2–10; cf. Gen 4:17–24). After an abbreviated account of the flood and Noahic covenant (*L.A.B.* 3:1–15; cf. Gen 6:1–9:17), Pseudo-Philo cataloged Noah’s descendants from the flood until the birth of Abraham and his sons (*L.A.B.* 4:1–17; cf. Gen 10:1–32; 11:10–32). Pseudo-Philo then concluded his rewritten primeval history with an otherwise unknown census of Noah’s descendants taken ten years before Noah’s death (*L.A.B.* 5:1–8b; cf. Gen 10:1–32; 11:10–32) and with the notice of Noah’s death (*L.A.B.* 5:8c; cf. Gen 9:28–29). By doing this, Pseudo-Philo juxtaposed the stories of Cain’s line to the stories of the flood generation (Gen 6:1–7; cf. *L.A.B.* 3:1–3). Pseudo-Philo developed this new relationship in two ways. He highlighted the role played by Cain in the rapid expansion of humanity upon the earth and he highlighted the roles played by Cain’s descendants in the expansion of wickedness upon the earth.

---

<sup>18</sup> Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 60, observed that in addition to the reading *initio mundi*, some manuscripts omit this phrase (mss. P, mss. D) while other manuscripts (mss. K; all of the  $\pi$  group mss, with the exception of mss. D) read *Initium mundi*. For the list of manuscripts that Harrington includes in the  $\pi$  group of manuscripts, see Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 59. Jacobson (*Commentary*, 1:281) suggests that *Initio mundi* was part of a heading that some scribes omitted.

<sup>19</sup> Although omitted from his rewritten primeval history, Pseudo-Philo included flashbacks to Gen 3 in *L.A.B.* 13:8; 26:6; 37:3.

The role Cain played in the rapid expansion of humanity upon the earth comes to the forefront in *L.A.B.* 2:2–4 (cf. Gen 4:17). Genesis 4:17 states that Cain had one child, Enoch, and established one city which he named after his son (וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם הָעִיר כְּשֵׁם בְּנוֹ הַנּוֹדֵד) but *L.A.B.* 2:2–4 states that Cain had several children and established seven cities. Pseudo-Philo's depiction of Cain in *L.A.B.* 2:2–4 attempted to resolve apparent incongruities in the portrayal of Cain in Gen 4. If Cain was a “fugitive and a wanderer (וְנֹעַ וְנָדָד)” (Gen 4:12), how then did he reside in one place long enough to establish a city (Gen 4:17)?<sup>20</sup> Pseudo-Philo's solution was simple: Cain was a wandering founder of cities.

For his account of the spread of wickedness upon the antediluvian earth (*L.A.B.* 2:6–10; cf. Gen 4:19–24), Pseudo-Philo focused upon Cain's descendant, Lamech, and two of his sons, Jubal and Tubal-Cain.<sup>21</sup> The scriptural account gives a favourable (or at least neutral) account of Jubal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain. Jubal is the “ancestor (אֲבִי) of those who dwell in tents and have livestock” (Gen 4:20), Jubal is the “ancestor (אֲבִי) of all those who play the lyre and pipe” (Gen 4:21), and Tubal-Cain “made (lit. “forged,” לָטַעַשׁ) all kinds of bronze and iron tools” (Gen 4:22). The scriptural account reports nothing else concerning the three brothers.

In Pseudo-Philo's account, Jubal is still a nomadic herdsman (*L.A.B.* 2:7), Jubal is still a musician (*L.A.B.* 2:7), and Tubal-Cain is still a metalworker (*L.A.B.* 2:9). However, Pseudo-Philo's account differs from the scriptural account in that it makes a direct connection between Jubal's

---

<sup>20</sup> Some scholars, recognizing this apparent incongruity, have suggested that Enoch and not Cain was the city builder in Gen 4:17. This is accomplished by taking הַנּוֹדֵד, the last word of Gen 4:17, as the subject of וַיִּקְרָא and, hence, the presumed subject of וַיְהִי. For this reading, it is necessary to emend כְּשֵׁם בְּנוֹ to כְּשֵׁמוֹ (i.e. Enoch named the city after himself; see Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary* [trans. John J. Scullion; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984], 326–327) or emend the final הַנּוֹדֵד in Gen 4:17 to עֵירָד (i.e. Enoch named the city after his son, Irad; see Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis בראשית: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* [Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989], 36).

<sup>21</sup> Lamech had a third son, Jubal (*L.A.B.* 2:7; cf. Gen 4:20), but Pseudo-Philo did not give him a role in the spread of wickedness on the earth. The names of Lamech's sons differ slightly in the various textual traditions of the Jewish Scriptures and in *L.A.B.*: Jubal (Gen 4:20 MT - יוֹבָל; LXX - Ἰωβελ; Vulg - Iobab; *L.A.B.* 2:7 - Iobab); Jubal (Gen 4:21 MT - יוֹבָל; LXX - Ἰουβαλ; Vulg - Iubal; *L.A.B.* 2:7 - Iobal); Tubal-Cain (Gen 4:22 MT - תּוּבַל קַיִן; LXX - Θουβαλ; Vulg. - Thubalcain; *L.A.B.* 2:9 - Tobel). To avoid confusion, the traditional Anglicized form of their names as they appear in the MT will be used in this section.

music and the rise of adultery among antediluvian humanity (*L.A.B.* 2:7–8) and between Tubal-Cain’s metalworking and the rise of idolatry among antediluvian humanity (*L.A.B.* 2:9). Humanity’s descent into sexual immorality (*L.A.B.* 2:8) was preceded by the music that Jubal taught humanity and humanity’s penchant for idolatry has its roots in the metallurgical skills that Tubal taught humanity (*L.A.B.* 2:9).<sup>22</sup> Nothing in *L.A.B.* 2:8–9 suggests that Jubal and Tubal-Cain taught music and metallurgy, respectively, for the purpose of increasing humanity’s wickedness.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, Pseudo-Philo’s unparalleled insertion of this material suggests that he must have held these brothers at least partially responsible for the increase of humanity’s wickedness (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:2).

Jubal and Tubal-Cain played unintentional roles in the increase of humanity’s wickedness in Pseudo-Philo’s account but the same cannot be said of their father, Lamech (*L.A.B.* 2:10). Pseudo-Philo transformed Lamech’s vengeful boast (Gen 4:23–24) into a brash declaration of his intent to disseminate evil within society. The key to this transformation is Lamech’s ambition “to show (*ostenderem*) my sons and those inhabiting the earth how to do evil deeds (*iniqua operari*)” (*L.A.B.* 2:10). This declaration does not appear in the scriptural version.<sup>24</sup> By juxtaposing his reworked account of Cain’s line (*L.A.B.* 2:1–10; cf. Gen 4:1–24) and the flood narrative, Pseudo-Philo took his readers directly from Lamech, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain’s pedagogy (*L.A.B.* 2:6–10; cf. Gen 4:19–24) to the account of the wickedness of antediluvian humanity (*L.A.B.* 3:1–3; cf. Gen 6:1–7).

---

<sup>22</sup> In Gen 4:22, Tubal-Cain is a skilled metalworker (Gen 4:22). In *L.A.B.* 2:9, he is an instructor in metallurgy (*qui ostendit hominibus artes . . .*). This change also appears in *Tg. Onq.* Gen 4:19–22.

<sup>23</sup> For the view that Pseudo-Philo considered music to be erotic, see Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 85; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 301–303. If *L.A.B.* 2:8 is a negative reference to music, it stands alone in *L.A.B.* The other references in *L.A.B.* to music are unequivocally positive (e.g. *L.A.B.* 60:1).

<sup>24</sup> The language encountered here parallels the language in *L.A.B.* 2:8. Tubal-Cain’s metalworking lessons lead to idolatry (*qui ostendit hominibus artes in plumbo . . .*).

Pseudo-Philo did not depict Cain as a disseminator of wickedness upon the earth in *L.A.B.* 2.<sup>25</sup> In his rewriting of scriptural primeval history (*L.A.B.* 1–5), Pseudo-Philo reduced Cain’s murder of Abel (Gen 4:8–16) to a brief passing comment: “Now Cain lived in the land trembling (*in terra tremens*) as God had appointed (*secundum quod constituit ei Deus*) after he had killed Abel his brother” (*L.A.B.* 2:1).<sup>26</sup> This is somewhat unexpected given the propensity of Jewish scriptural exegetes to highlight the wickedness they perceived in Cain’s character. Josephus, for example, depicted Cain as a wicked and self-serving man (*Ant.* 1.53) while the Wisdom of Solomon 10:3–4 suggests that the flood came upon the earth because of Cain’s sin (cf. Testament of Adam 3:5; 1 En. 22:7).<sup>27</sup> Absent from the brief statement in *L.A.B.* 2:1 concerning Abel’s murder is any mention of God’s acceptance of Abel’s offering (Gen 4:11), any mention of God’s rejection of Cain’s sacrifice (lit. ‘not look at’- לֹא שָׁעָה; 5), and any mention of Cain’s anger (וַיִּחַר לְקַיִן מְאֹד וַיִּפְּלוּ פָּנָיו; Gen 4:5) that preceded Cain’s murder of Abel (Gen 4:8). Pseudo-Philo also omitted Gen 4:25–26 in which Seth is portrayed as the divinely granted replacement for the murdered Abel (Gen 4:25–26). As in the scriptural account, Seth is the lynchpin in Pseudo-Philo’s

---

<sup>25</sup> In this regard, Alexander Zeron, “The Swansong of Edom,” *JJS* 31 (1980): 194, interpreted the declaration in *L.A.B.* 2:3 that “Cain was fifteen years old when he did these things” as a possible attempt to “diminish Cain’s responsibility for his act.” While this may be the case, Pseudo-Philo’s very straightforward (though brief) recollection of these events in *L.A.B.* 59:4 makes no attempt to downplay Cain’s culpability: Given our lack of evidence, perhaps it is better in this regard to side with Jacobson (*Commentary*, 1:295) who, concerning Cain’s age as recorded in *L.A.B.* 2:3, observed, “we have no sense what might have motivated *L.A.B.* here.”

<sup>26</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s failure to depict Cain as a disseminator of wickedness upon the earth stands out because he painted a negative portrait of Cain in *L.A.B.* 59:4 and 16:2. In a flashback to the story in *L.A.B.* 59:4, he wrote more concerning the events than he did in his primary narrative: “When Abel first shepherded flocks, his sacrifice was more acceptable than that of his brother, and his brother was jealous of him and killed him.” Pseudo-Philo also cited Cain’s murder of Abel in his Korah narrative: “I commanded the earth and it gave me man; and to him two sons were born first of all, and the older rose up and killed the younger, and the earth quickly swallowed up his blood; But I drove Cain out and cursed the earth and spoke to the parched land.’ saying, ‘You will swallow up blood no more” (*L.A.B.* 16:2). For an insightful analysis of Pseudo-Philo’s depiction of Cain in *L.A.B.* 16:2, see Bruce N. Fisk, “Gaps in the Story, Cracks in the Earth: The Exile of Cain and the Destruction of Korah in Pseudo-Philo (*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 16),” in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture; Volume 2: Later Versions and Traditions* (ed. Craig A. Evans; LSTS 51; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004), 20–33.

<sup>27</sup> Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 4:1 even goes so far as to state that Cain is a descendant of the evil one (*Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 4:1) while *Pirqe R. El.* 21 credits Cain’s paternity to “the serpent” or to a descendent of “the serpent.”



genealogy linking Adam and Noah (cf. *L.A.B.* 1:2–5) but Pseudo-Philo stated nothing concerning the circumstances of Seth’s birth and the return to God by the humans who followed (Gen 4:25–26).

Pseudo-Philo’s description of the wickedness of antediluvian humanity in *L.A.B.* 3:1–3 differs little from the scriptural account. Unspecified sexual liaisons between the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men” (*L.A.B.* 3:1; Gen 6:1–2) prompt God’s first proclamation against antediluvian humanity (*L.A.B.* 3:2; cf. Gen 6:3). Through the addition of a phrase (“For them he set the limits of life, but the crimes done by their hands did not cease,” *L.A.B.* 3:2), Pseudo-Philo specifically tailored Gen 6:3 to the context of pending divine judgment on wicked antediluvian humanity. Here, he transformed the 120-year lifespan limit specified in Gen 6:3 into a divinely granted period for humanity to change its ways! Elsewhere in *L.A.B.*, however, the 120 years of Gen 6:3 represent a divinely established cap on humanity’s lifespan (*L.A.B.* 9:8; 19:8; 48:1).<sup>28</sup> Foremost among the adaptations that Pseudo-Philo made to the Jewish Scriptures in *L.A.B.* 3:1–3 is his omission of Gen 6:4. Through the omission of this verse, Pseudo-Philo helped to maintain his readers’ focus on human explanations for the flood (i.e. the wickedness that arose because of the instruction cited in *L.A.B.* 2) rather than on superhuman explanations.

Early Jewish interpreters of the Jewish Scriptures widely agreed that the depravity of the fallen angels brought about the flood.<sup>29</sup> One version of this tradition held that antediluvian humanity suffered because of the sins of these fallen angels (1 En. 86:4–5; Jub 7:21–25; Josephus *Ant.* 1:73–74). Another version of this tradition stated that the fallen angels (or one angel, 1 En. 8:1–2; 88) corrupted humanity through instruction in wickedness (1 En. 7:1; 65:6).

---

<sup>28</sup> Josephus (*Ant.* 1.75) likewise interpreted the 120 years referenced in Gen 6:3.

<sup>29</sup> Devorah Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 126–127. Examples of this in early Jewish literature include CD 2:18; 4Q180 1 7–10; 1QapGen 2:2, 16; 1 En. 6–16; 86–88; 106–107; Jub 4:22; 5:1; 7:21; and Josephus, *Ant.* 1.73.

The key verse for this tradition is Gen 6:4 with its reference to the “Nephilim” (הַנְּפִלִים)<sup>30</sup> who were “mighty men who were of old (הַגִּבּוֹרִים אֲשֶׁר מֵעוֹלָם), men of renown (אֲנָשֵׁי הַשָּׁם)” on the earth at the time of the flood. According to the proponents of this tradition, the Nephilim of Gen 6:4 were the offspring of the relationships mentioned in Gen 6:2 between the “sons of God” (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) and the “daughters of men” (אֶת־בָּנוֹת הָאָדָם).<sup>31</sup> It must be noted that although this tradition, the so-called “Watchers” tradition, is absent from *L.A.B.* 3,<sup>32</sup> Pseudo-Philo elsewhere implicitly affirmed it. Pseudo-Philo’s clearest reference to the Watcher’s tradition appears in *L.A.B.* 34:3 where he noted that angels were judged for revealing “magic” to humanity (cf. 1 En. 7–10).<sup>33</sup>

Pseudo-Philo’s clearest explanation for the destruction of wicked antediluvian humanity appears in *L.A.B.* 1:20 (cf. Gen 5:28–29). The etymology of Noah’s name given in *L.A.B.* 1:20 provides the readers of *L.A.B.* with an interpretive framework for Pseudo-Philo’s flood narrative (see Table 2.6). In *L.A.B.* 1:20, Lamech named his son “Noah” (*Noe*, *L.A.B.* 1:20; cf. Gen 5:29 LXX, Νωε, Vulg. *Noe*, MT נֹחַ) in anticipation of the rest (*requiem dabit*; cf. Gen 5:29 LXX, διαναπαύσει; prob. Heb. וַיִּנְיַחֵנוּ)<sup>34</sup> from wickedness which he believed would be realized during Noah’s lifetime

---

<sup>30</sup> The word “Nephilim” is a transliteration of נְפִילִים. Targum Onqelos Gen 6:4 refers to the Nephilim as “the strong men” (גִּבּוֹרִים) while Gen 6:4 (LXX) and Gen 6:4 (Vulg) call them “giants” (γίγαντες; *gigantes*).

<sup>31</sup> First Enoch 6:1–7:6; Jub 7:21–22.

<sup>32</sup> The term “Watchers” derives from the Aramaic word עִירִין (Aramaic, sg. עִיר, pl. עִירִין; Hebrew, עִירִים). The watcher angels were the angels who had come down and, ultimately, brought about the flood. See 1 En. 1:5; 10:6, 9, 15; 12:2–4; 13:10; 14:1, 3; 15:2, 9; 16:1–2; *T. Reub.* 5:6–7; *T. Naph.* 3:5; Jub. 4:15, 22; 7:21; 8:3; 10:5.

<sup>33</sup> There are difficulties with the suggestion that the words *prospeculatoribus vestris* (*L.A.B.* 13:6) should be translated “for your watchers” (i.e. *pro speculatoribus*; James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 114; Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2:321) or “für eure Hüter” (Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1975),” 137). First, it is highly unlikely that Pseudo-Philo would advocate the making of offerings (*Nam festività psalpingarum in oblationem erit . . .*) to the watcher angels because the unanimous witness of early Jewish tradition is that the watcher angels were condemned and angels were not to be worshipped (cf. Aod in *L.A.B.* 34:2; Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 117). Second, the suggestion that a festival is an offering “seems impossible” (Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:512).

<sup>34</sup> Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 83. Also see Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” 124 n. 9.

(i.e. the flood; *L.A.B.* 3:4–7; cf. Gen 6:9–8:21).<sup>35</sup> In Gen 5:28–29, Lamech named his son Noah (נֹחַ, from נָח, to rest) in expectation of comfort (יִנְחַמְנוּ; from נָחַם, to comfort, regret, be sorry) from the curse God placed upon the earth (i.e. agricultural endeavors; Gen 3:18; cf. Jub. 4:28).<sup>36</sup> However, unlike *L.A.B.* 1:20, Gen 5:28–29 contains no overt foreshadowing of the flood narrative (Gen 6:1–9:17).

Table 2.6. *L.A.B.* 1:20 and Gen 5:28–29

<i>L.A.B.</i> 1:20	Gen 5:28–29	
And Lamech lived 182 years	When Lamech had lived one hundred eighty-two years, (28a)	28a
and became the father of a son	he became the father of a son (28b)	28b
and called him after his birth ( <i>secundum nativitatem</i> ) “Noah,”	he named him Noah (29a)	29a
saying, “This one will give rest ( <i>Hic requiem dabit</i> ) to us and to the earth ( <i>nobis et terre</i> ) from those who dwell on it ( <i>ab his qui sunt in ea</i> )— on account of ( <i>propter</i> ) the wickedness of whose evil deeds ( <i>iniquitatem operum malorum</i> ) the earth will be visited ( <i>visitabitur</i> ).”	saying, “Out of the ground that the LORD has cursed ( מְזֵה אֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר ( אֲרָרָה יְהוָה ) this one shall bring us relief (זֶה יִנְחַמְנוּ) from our work (מַמְעֵשָׁנוּ) and from the toil (וּמַעֲבֹדוֹן) of our hands (יָדֵינוּ).” (29b)	29b

Pseudo-Philo utilized the references in Gen 5:29 to “work” (מַמְעֵשָׁנוּ) and “toil” (וּמַעֲבֹדוֹן) to foreshadow the events of Noah’s lifetime. In *L.A.B.* 1:20, they became references to

<sup>35</sup> First Enoch 106–107 likewise links Noah’s birth and naming with the coming flood rather than with the prior curse. See note 50 for more. An even stronger parallel with *L.A.B.* 1:20 appears in the writings of Jerome, a fourth century CE Christian scholar. In his discussion of Gen 5:29, Jerome noted that Noah was named “rest” because, in his lifetime, “all former works ceased as a result of the flood” (*Questions on Genesis* 5:29). Cited from C. T. R. Hayward, *Saint Jerome’s Hebrew Questions on Genesis: Translated with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 36.

<sup>36</sup> As *Gen. Rab.* 25:2 (on 5:29) notes, “The name does not correspond to the explanation and the explanation does not correspond to the name.” A play on words with the verb works best if the name and the explanation are derived from the same root, which is not the case in Gen 5:29. The connection between Noah’s name and its given explanation in Gen 5:29 is one of assonance – the first two radicals in the stem of יִנְחַמְנוּ are the same as the radicals in נָח. Possible alternate names for Noah derived from the verb נָחַם include נַחֲמָן (Gen. Rab. 28:2) or מִנְחָם (*Yashar Bereshit* 13b).

humanity's "wicked deeds" (*iniquitatem operum malorum*, *L.A.B.* 1:20).<sup>37</sup> מַעֲשֵׂה is used to refer to wicked deeds in Eccl 4:3, 8:11, 8:14 and a cognate of עֲצָבוֹן is used to refer to wicked deeds in Ps 139:24 (עֲצָב). A final switch of referents makes wicked humanity (i.e. those doing the wicked deeds) the focus of the divine curse rather than the earth, which became a co-appellant with Lamech.<sup>38</sup>

In *L.A.B.* 1:20, Pseudo-Philo divided the antediluvian world into two groups: (1) those who seek rest and (2) those who commit wicked deeds. Those who seek rest are identified as *nobis et terre* ("to us and the earth"). It appears that *nobis* should include at least the speaker (i.e. Lamech) and his newborn son (i.e. Noah) but Lamech does not live to see the postdiluvian world that he anticipated.<sup>39</sup> Those who commit the wicked deeds are identified as *qui sunt in ea* ("those who are in it," prob. Heb. אֲשֶׁר עִלְיָהּ or אֲשֶׁר-יָבָה).<sup>40</sup> James translated *qui sunt in ea* as "those who are therein"<sup>41</sup> but most translators adopt a less literal translation that is better suited to the phrase *qui habitaverunt in ea* than to the phrase in question.<sup>42</sup>

Pseudo-Philo's description of the man whose family God preserved from the flood and with whom God established the Noahic covenant differs little from its scriptural counterpart. In

---

<sup>37</sup> Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Genesis 5:29 contains a similar phrase ("the guilt of the sons of men") in addition to (rather than in place of) the description of humanity's work and toil. Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1964)," 2, contended that Pseudo-Philo was unable to link his rewriting of Gen 5:29 to its original referent, Gen 3:17–19, because he had omitted Gen 3:17–19 from his narrative. See also Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1975)," 103. This logic does not work in *L.A.B.*, however, because, in *L.A.B.*, Pseudo-Philo frequently alluded to material omitted from his primary narrative.

<sup>38</sup> For the land receiving rest after the destruction of its wicked inhabitants, see Lev 26:34–35, "Then the land (הָאָרֶץ) shall enjoy its Sabbath years (אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתֶיהָ) as long as it lies desolate, while you are in the land of your enemies; then the land (הָאָרֶץ) shall rest (תִּשְׁבֹּת) and enjoy its Sabbath years (אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתֶיהָ). As long as it lies desolate, it shall have the rest (תִּשְׁבֹּת) it did not have on your Sabbaths when you were living on it."

<sup>39</sup> According to the genealogies in *L.A.B.* and in Genesis, Lamech died a few years before the flood (*L.A.B.* 1:21; Gen 5:30; 7:6; 9:28–29) and his father Methuselah died the year of the flood (cf. *L.A.B.* 1:18, 20; 5:8; Gen 5:26, 28; 7:6). No explanations for their deaths are given in *L.A.B.* or in the Jewish Scriptures.

<sup>40</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:291.

<sup>41</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 77.

<sup>42</sup> See Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:305 ("those who dwell on it"), Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:90 ("those who dwell on it"), and J. Cazeaux in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 65 ("de ceux qui l'habitent").

Gen 6, Noah is a “righteous man (אִישׁ צַדִּיק), blameless in his generation (תָּמִים הָיָה בְּדִרְתָּיו)” who “walked with God (אָתֵּרְהָאֱלֹהִים הִתְהַלֵּךְ)” (v. 9) and who “found favor (חַן) in the sight of the LORD” (v. 8). In *L.A.B.* 3:4, Noah is a “righteous man” (*homo iustus*), “blameless in his offspring” (*inmaculatus in progenie sua*),<sup>43</sup> who “pleased the Lord” (*placuit Domino*) and who “found favor and mercy” (*invenit gratiam et misericordiam*) before the Lord.

Nothing in *L.A.B.* 3:4 suggests that Noah required copious amounts of mercy.<sup>44</sup> The three words “favor and mercy” in *L.A.B.* 3:4 (*gratiam et misericordiam*) do not place a greater emphasis upon mercy than does the single noun “favor” in Gen 6:8 (חַן).<sup>45</sup> Had Pseudo-Philo desired to depict Noah as a man in great need of mercy, it is unlikely that he would have omitted the Gen 9:18–27 account of Noah’s drunkenness from his narrative.<sup>46</sup> *L.A.B.* 3:4a also states,

---

<sup>43</sup> The declaration that Noah was “blameless in his offspring” (*inmaculatus in progenie sua*, *L.A.B.* 3:4) seems to have come about because of textual corruption during the translation process. In Hebrew, Pseudo-Philo likely wrote תָּמִים הָיָה בְּדִרְתָּיו. This became τέλειος ὢν ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ in Greek and then *inmaculatus in progenie sua* in Latin. See Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:314. Cf. LXX Gen 43:7, καὶ τὴν γενεάν ἡμῶν (MT, וְלִמְוֹלָדָתָנוּ) which in the Vulgate becomes *nostram progeniem*. LXX Lev 21:17 reads ἐκ τοῦ γένους σου εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ἡμῶν and the Vulgate reads *homo de semine tuo per familias*. Some early Jews interpreted בְּדִרְתָּיו (“in his generation,” Gen 6:9) as a qualification upon the preceding declaration that Noah was “blameless” (תָּמִים הָיָה). A similar wording is found in Gen 7:1 which qualifies the declaration that Noah is “righteous” before God “in this generation” (בְּדֹר הָיָה). The closest early Jewish parallel to the declaration in *L.A.B.* 3:4 that Noah was *inmaculatus in progenie sua* is Jub 5:19, which states that God showed “partiality” to Noah “for the sake of his sons.” Jubilees 5:19 also declares Noah “righteous in all of his ways,” a man who “did not transgress anything which was ordained for him” (cf. Jub 10:17). The latter is reserved for Noah alone: Jubilees 5 does not declare Noah’s sons blameless or righteous.

<sup>44</sup> Was Noah “blameless” only in comparison to his wicked contemporaries (Philo, *Abr.* 36; R. Judah in Gen. Rab. 30:9) or was Noah “blameless” in comparison to all generations (R. Nehemiah in Gen. Rab. 30:9)?

<sup>45</sup> For the combination of “favor and mercy” (*L.A.B.* 3:4), see also the explanation in Esth 2:17 for King Ahasuerus’s choice of Esther as queen in place of Vashti: “The king loved Esther more than all the other women; of all the virgins she won his **favor and devotion** (וְתִשָּׂא חֵן וְחֶסֶד)” (emphasis added). Contra Louis H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus’ Rewritten Bible* (JSJSup 58; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 26–27, who contended that *L.A.B.* “by saying that Noah found grace and mercy” implied “that Noah did not really deserve all the kindness and concern show him by G-d.” According to Feldman, the scriptural declaration that Noah found “favor” (Gen 6:8) “speaks more positively about Noah” than does *L.A.B.* (*ibid.*, 27). Feldman’s observations concerning Pseudo-Philo’s rewriting of Gen 6:8 appear to contradict his contention in “Questions about the Great Flood, as Viewed by Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and the Rabbis,” *ZAW* 115 (2003), 418, that Pseudo-Philo omitted Gen 9:18–27 because he was “disturbed by the idea that Noah, the perfect man, could have descended to such a low level.”

<sup>46</sup> Undoubtedly, Pseudo-Philo’s scripturally literate readers would have been aware of this episode. Jewish writers often focused on Gen 9:20–25 and attempted to either excuse Noah’s drunkenness or use Noah’s drunkenness in Gen 9 to vilify him further. For example, the author(s) of

“Noah . . . pleased the Lord” (*Noe . . . placuit Domino*) while the Masoretic Text of the Jewish Scriptures states, “Noah walked with God” (וַיֵּלֶךְ נֹחַ אִתְּהוָה). The difference between the two versions is minimal since “walking with God” connotes living a life that pleases God.<sup>47</sup>

Pseudo-Philo’s version parallels the tradition reflected in the Septuagint (τῷ θεῷ εὐηρέστησεν Νῶε, LXX Gen 6:9) where the Hebrew verb יָלַךְ (go, come, walk) is often translated with the Greek verb εὐαρεστέω (to be pleasing).<sup>48</sup>

Pseudo-Philo did not depict Noah as a man in need of great mercy. Nevertheless, Pseudo-Philo did not depict Noah as “the prototype of the righteous individual living amidst corruption” as he is depicted elsewhere in early Jewish literature.<sup>49</sup> Unlike the author(s) of 1 En. 106–107, Pseudo-Philo did not depict Noah at birth as god-like.<sup>50</sup> Unlike the author(s) of Jubilees, Pseudo-Philo did not depict Noah as the possessor and transmitter of supernatural revelation concerning demons (Jub 10:12–14), the sacrificial system (Jub 21:10), and other divine commands (Jub 7:39); as a priest capable of making atonement on behalf of the earth (Jub 6:1–3; cf. 1QapGen X, 13–17); or as a pious adherent to the Mosaic Torah. In Jubilees, even Noah’s episode of drunkenness (Gen 9:18–27) becomes emblematic of his piety and adherence to the

---

Jubilees justified Noah’s drunkenness by placing it in a cultic setting (cf. Jub. 7:1–9; Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” 136–140).

<sup>47</sup> See also *L.A.B.* 1:16 where it is written that “Enoch pleased God.” Genesis 5:24 LXX states that “Enoch pleased God” but Gen 5:24 MT states that “Enoch walked with God.”

<sup>48</sup> Genesis 5:22, 24; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15; Ps 26:3; 35:14; 56:14 (LXX 56:13); 116:9 (LXX 114:9).

<sup>49</sup> Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” 140.

<sup>50</sup> In 1 Enoch, Noah’s appearance at birth is so astonishing (1 En. 106:1–3) that his father, Lamech, fears that his son might be the offspring of angelic beings (1 En. 106:4–5). Lamech learns from Enoch (via his father Methuselah) that, because of sin and unrighteousness (1 En. 106:18), there will be a great flood during Noah’s lifetime (1 En. 106:15–17) that will cleanse the earth (1 En. 106:17). Upon hearing this, Lamech names his son Noah “for he will comfort the earth after all the destruction” (1 En. 107:3). A similar (albeit, fragmentary) framework of events emerges in *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen). Lamech is concerned that the conception of his newborn son “was at the hands of the Watchers, that the seed had been planted by Holy Ones or Nephil[im]” (1QapGen II, 1). When Bitenosh, his wife, assures him that the child truly is his (1QapGen II, 5–18), Lamech learns from Enoch (via his father Methuselah) of that which will take place during Noah’s lifetime (1QapGen V, 2–26). The text is too fragmented to ascertain much concerning Enoch’s reply.

Torah.<sup>51</sup> When the vines that Noah planted on Mount Lubar shortly after the flood (Jub 7:1) produced fruit in their fourth year, Noah showed himself to be obedient to the Torah<sup>52</sup> when he gathered and guarded the fruit of vine and used it in a feast (Jub 7:2–6).<sup>53</sup>

Pseudo-Philo's reworking of the actual flood narrative (*L.A.B.* 3:4–7) is a selective abridgment of Gen 6:8–8:1. Although significant portions of the scriptural account are omitted from Pseudo-Philo's version, *L.A.B.* 3:4–7 captures the essence of its scriptural counterpart. A clear connection between wickedness and punishment is highlighted through extra statements such as "the earth along with those inhabiting it was destroyed on account of the wickedness of their deeds" (*L.A.B.* 3:6). Through the omission of such details in his accounts of Noah's preparations for the coming flood (*L.A.B.* 3:4; cf. Gen 6:8–7:3)<sup>54</sup> and of the flood itself (*L.A.B.* 3:5–7; cf. Gen 6:22–8:1),<sup>55</sup> Pseudo-Philo made a quick transition from his account of antediluvian

---

<sup>51</sup> Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," 137 contended that, in Jubilees, the Noahic covenant "is transformed into a paradigm of the covenant with Israel on Mount Sinai." In support of this claim, Dimant cited Noah's functioning as a priest in the postdiluvian world (Jub 6:4), the analogy made between the blood laws in Gen 9:4–6 (cf. Lev 17:10) and the ritualistic sprinkling of sacrificial blood in Exod 24:8 (Jub 6:6–14), and Noah's celebration of Shavuot (Jub 6:18–22), a feast that "celebrates the giving of the Torah," following the establishment of the Noahic covenant.

<sup>52</sup> According to Lev 19:23–25, the fruit of a plant cannot be eaten for its first three years and, in the fourth year, it must be "set apart for rejoicing in the Lord" (v. 24).

<sup>53</sup> For more on the depiction of Noah in Jubilees, in *Genesis Apocryphon*, and in 1 En. 106–107, see Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," 123–150; James C. Vanderkam, "The Righteousness of Noah," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980), 13–32; Moshe J. Bernstein, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 199–231.

<sup>54</sup> *L.A.B.* 3:4a (*Noe vero invenit gratiam . . . sua placuit Domino*) is a reworking of Gen 6:8–9. *L.A.B.* 3:4b (*Ad quem dixit Deus . . . opera eorum*) is a reworking of Gen 6:13. *L.A.B.* 3:4c (*Et nunc facito . . . triginta cubitorum altitudo*) is a reworking of Gen 3:14. *L.A.B.* 3:4d (*Et ingredieris . . . omnes habitantes terram*) is a reworking of Gen 6:17–18. *L.A.B.* 3:4e (*De animalibus autem . . . masculum et feminam*) is a reworking of Gen 7:2–3. *L.A.B.* 3:4f (*Simulque accipies tibi et illis in escam*) is a reworking of Gen 6:21.

<sup>55</sup> *L.A.B.* 3:5 combines phrases from Gen 6:22; 7:5, 7, 10, 11, 12. The reader is informed that Noah did what God commanded (cf. Gen 6:22; 7:5), that Noah and his family entered the ark (cf. Gen 7:7), and that the flood came upon the earth after seven days (cf. Gen 7:10) when "all the deeps and the great spring and the floodgates of heaven" were opened (Gen 7:11) and when it rained for forty days and nights (Gen 7:12) causing a deluge that lasted for one hundred and fifty days. *Et perseverante centum quinquaginta diebus cataclismo in terra* (*L.A.B.* 3:7) is a slight reworking of Gen 7:24. *L.A.B.* 3:7 reads *et perseverante . . . cataclismo* (and the flood/deluge prevailed) while Gen 7:24 reads וַיִּגְבְּרוּ הַמַּיִם ("and the

humanity's wickedness (*L.A.B.* 2:6–3:3) to his account of the postdiluvian Noahic covenant (*L.A.B.* 3:8–12; cf. Gen 8:22–9:16).

#### SYNOPSIS

What impact did reward and punishment have upon the establishment of the Noahic covenant in *L.A.B.* 1–3? Reward has a limited impact upon the establishment of the Noahic covenant in *L.A.B.* 1–3. Pseudo-Philo depicted Noah and his family in essentially the same manner as their scriptural counterparts did. As in the scriptural account, Noah is depicted as the “righteous” and “blameless” recipient of divine mercy in *L.A.B.* (*L.A.B.* 3:4; cf. Gen 6:8–9). For Pseudo-Philo, it mattered less whether Noah was a *sot* or a *saint*<sup>56</sup> than it mattered that Noah was Israel's ancestor. As this study shows later (e.g. *L.A.B.* 12:8–9), Israel's existence is *the* key to human history.

Punishment has a greater impact upon the establishment of the Noahic covenant than reward does. Although Pseudo-Philo's depiction of antediluvian humanity (esp. Cain's line) is surprisingly positive, he revealed enough concerning their wickedness to assure his readers of God's justice. Those whom God destroyed in the flood deserved their fate. Pseudo-Philo likewise downplayed any impact that angelic beings might have had upon the sequence of events. Any sins that they might have committed are omitted along with any punishments that they might have received (cf. 1 En. 1–36). Pseudo-Philo did not deny the Watchers a place within the flood

---

waters swelled”). For *cataclismo* (Gk κατακλυσμός; Heb. מַבּוּל), see Gen 6:17, 7:6, 7, 10, 17, 9:11, 15, 28. *L.A.B.* 3:6–7 reworks portions of Gen 7:21–24; 8:1. The reader is informed that the flood came 1,652 years after the creation of the world (*L.A.B.* 3:6), that God destroyed all life on earth except Noah and those with him on the ark (*L.A.B.* 7:6b, 7b), that this destruction came about because of wickedness (*L.A.B.* 3:7a; cf. Gen 6:11–13, 17), and that God remembered Noah and caused the flood waters to recede (*L.A.B.* 3:7c; Gen 8:1). Pseudo-Philo's declaration that the flood occurred 1,652 years after creation does not align with known traditions. If the numbers in Gen 5:1–28; 7:11 are taken at face value, the SP places the flood 1,307 years after creation, the MT places the flood 1,656 years after creation, and the LXX places the flood 2,242 years after creation.

<sup>56</sup> This term was aptly coined by Walter E. Brown in the title of his article “Noah: Sot or Saint? Genesis 9:20–27” which was published in *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke* (ed. J. I. Packer and Sven K. Soderlund; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2000), 36–60.



narrative. He merely focused attention away from them and onto Israel's ancestors (i.e. Noah and his family) and the wicked culture in which they lived.

*The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Life in the Noahic Covenant in L.A.B. 4–5*

And God said, "I will never again curse the earth on man's account, for the tendency of man's heart is foolish from his youth; and so I will never destroy all living creatures at one time as I have done. But when those inhabiting the earth sin, I will judge them by famine or by the sword or by fire or by death; and there will be earthquakes, and they will be scattered to uninhabited places. But no more will I destroy the earth by the water of the flood. And in all the days of the earth, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, spring and fall will not cease day and night until I remember those who inhabit the earth, until the appointed times have been fulfilled. But when the years appointed for the world have been fulfilled, then the light will cease and the darkness will fade away. And I will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth. And hell will pay back its debt and the place of perdition will return its deposit so that I may render to each according to his works and according to the fruits of his own devices, until I judge between soul and flesh. And the world will cease, and death will be abolished, and hell will shut its mouth. And the earth will not be without progeny or sterile for those inhabiting it; and no one who has been pardoned by me will be tainted. And there will be another earth and another heaven, an everlasting dwelling place."

—*L.A.B. 3:9–10*

The appending of *L.A.B. 3:9–10* (cf. Gen 8:21–22) to Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of the Noahic covenant seems to imply that reward and punishment will be the central motif of life in the Noahic covenant. *L.A.B. 3:9* states that postdiluvian life on earth will be marked by strictly enforced punishments for sin. *L.A.B. 3:10a* states that life in the world to come will commence with a time of reward and punishment. This time of reward and punishment in the world to come will conclude with a lasting relief from the effects of living in a sinful world (*L.A.B. 3:10b*).

*L.A.B. 3:9–10* proclaims that life after the flood will be manifestly different from the life in the antediluvian world from which Noah's family had come. As Murphy noted concerning *L.A.B. 3:9–10*, "delineated" is a "principle" applicable throughout the remainder of *L.A.B.* "Sin will inevitably result in punishment in this life, the life hereafter, or both."<sup>57</sup> However, with the exception of the flood narrative (*L.A.B. 3:4–7*), there is no punishment for sin in this portion of

---

<sup>57</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 34.

*L.A.B.*, either before the flood or after it.<sup>58</sup> In fact, despite the strong language utilized in the promises of *L.A.B.* 3:9, humanity continues to sin with impunity. In *L.A.B.*, sin is not punished in the postdiluvian world in which Noah and his descendants lived!

The only possible example of divinely administered reward or punishment in *L.A.B.* 4–5 is the rain in *L.A.B.* 4:5 which Murphy contended was a “reward for obedience and proper worship.”<sup>59</sup> However, there is no support for this suggestion. In *L.A.B.* 4:5 the worship occurs *after* God’s provision of rain. Humanity “cried to the Lord” because the postdiluvian earth was dry (*Et cum sitiret terra*), seemingly not having received rain since God decreased (*minuit*, *L.A.B.* 3:7) and dried up (*siccavit*) the earth (*L.A.B.* 3:8).<sup>60</sup> The appearance of a rainbow accompanies God’s provision of rain (*descenderet pluvia super terram*) and assures humanity (i.e. “those inhabiting the earth,” *L.A.B.* 4:5) of their future agricultural success through God’s continued provision of rain.<sup>61</sup> The events described in *L.A.B.* 4:5, unparalleled in the Jewish Scriptures and in early Jewish literature, are an example of God keeping the Noahic covenant promise not to destroy the earth again (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:9–12). The worship in *L.A.B.* 4:5 is humanity’s response to the provision of rain and to the first appearance of the sign of the covenant (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:12) rather than the reason for God’s provision of rain.

---

<sup>58</sup> God’s punishment of the serpent (Gen 3:14–15), the woman (Gen 3:16), and the man (Gen 3:17–19) is not included in *L.A.B.* 1–5. The curse that God placed upon Cain to live as a “fugitive and a wanderer on the earth” (Gen 4:12) is replaced with the innocuous declaration that Cain lived in the land “trembling as God has appointed for him” (*L.A.B.* 2:1).

<sup>59</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 36.

<sup>60</sup> “And God made a wind blow over the earth, and the waters subsided; the fountains of the deep and the windows of the heavens were closed, the rain from the heavens was restrained, and the waters gradually receded from the earth” (Gen 8:1–3). Pseudo-Philo omitted any mention of the raven and the dove that Noah sent out to check the progress of the earth’s drying up. The raven found nowhere to rest (Gen 8:7) as did the dove the first time it was sent out (Gen 8:8–9). The second time the dove was sent out, it brought back the leaf of an olive tree (Gen 8:11). The third time the dove was sent out, it did not return (Gen 8:12).

<sup>61</sup> This also appears to be how James Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 221–222, read *L.A.B.* 4:5. He reasoned that, for Pseudo-Philo, the promise of a rainbow was not a “general pronouncement” but, rather, a “specific prediction.” Kugel’s translation of *L.A.B.* 4:5 reads, “[They] began to work the land and sow upon it. But since the earth was dry, its inhabitants cried out to God . . . .”

The worship described in *L.A.B.* 4:5 is one of the few signs in *L.A.B.* 4–5 that postdiluvian humanity was different from its antediluvian predecessors. The signs that postdiluvian humanity was just as wicked as its antediluvian predecessors include Pseudo-Philo’s depiction of Nimrod’s arrogance (*L.A.B.* 4:7) and his declaration concerning the pervasiveness of wickedness among postdiluvian humanity (*L.A.B.* 4:16).

In Gen 10:8 MT, Nimrod (נִמְרוֹד) becomes “great” (lit. he “began to be great on the earth,” הוּא הֵחֵל לְהִיּוֹת גִּבּוֹר בְּאֶרֶץ).<sup>62</sup> However, in *L.A.B.* 4:7, Nimrod becomes “arrogant” (lit. he “began to be arrogant before the Lord,” *L.A.B.* 4:7). Pseudo-Philo later depicted Nimrod as the leader of his clan (i.e. Ham, *L.A.B.* 5:1),<sup>63</sup> one of the leaders behind the construction of Babel (*L.A.B.* 6:14), and one of “seven sinful men” (*septem viri peccatores*) who participated in postdiluvian idolatry (*L.A.B.* 25:11). In this, Pseudo-Philo paralleled a tradition in which Nimrod is one of the leading antediluvian wicked men.<sup>64</sup>

The pre-eminence of wickedness in *L.A.B.* 4–5 (cf. Gen 10:1–32; 11:10–32)<sup>65</sup> is seen clearly in the description of postdiluvian humanity’s depravity in *L.A.B.* 4:16. Out of all humanity,

---

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Gen 10:8 LXX, *potens* (“mighty”). In Gen 10:8 LXX, however, Nimrod “was the first on earth to be a giant” (γίγας). This theme continues in Gen 10:9 where, in the Masoretic Text and in the Vulgate, Nimrod is called a “mighty hunter” (MT, גִּבּוֹר-צֹדֵד; Vulg. *robustus venator*) but, in the Septuagint, he is called a “giant hunter” (γίγας κυνηγός).

<sup>63</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s depiction of Nimrod as a leader in postdiluvian humanity is seen also in his depiction of Nimrod as a great postdiluvian city-builder. In the scriptural account, Nimrod built seven cities: Babel, Erech, Accad, Nineveh, Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen (Gen 10:10–12). In Pseudo-Philo’s account, Nimrod built thirteen cities: Resen (*Resun*), Beoso and Gaza (*Beosmaza*), Gerar (*Geras*), Calon, Dabir and Camo (*Dabircamo*), Tellun, Lachish (*Lachis*), Sodom (*Sodoma*) and Gomorrah (*Gomorra*), Admah and Seboim. This list of names in English is based upon Jacobson’s translation (*Commentary*, 1:95). Other translations interpret differently the corrupted Latin list of names. For a discussion of the city names in *L.A.B.* 4:8, see James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 244; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:340–341.

<sup>64</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 1.113–121, 135; Philo, *Gig.* 65–66; *QG* 2.82.

<sup>65</sup> *L.A.B.* 4 delineates Noah’s descendants in three sections: Japheth’s line (*L.A.B.* 4:2–5; cf. Gen 10:2–5), Ham’s line (*L.A.B.* 4:6–8; cf. Gen 10:6–20), and Shem’s line (*L.A.B.* 4:9–16; cf. Gen 10:21–31; 11:10–32). The Japheth section concludes with an account of the postdiluvian agricultural endeavors (*L.A.B.* 4:5), the Ham section concludes with an account of the postdiluvian construction of cities (*L.A.B.* 4:8), and the Shem section concludes with an account of the postdiluvian astrology (*L.A.B.* 4:16). Much of the genealogical material in *L.A.B.* has suffered greatly in transmission. Attempts to restore and/or reconstruct the names in *L.A.B.* 4 have met with limited success. See James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 244–246; Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 90–92; Paul Reissler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Augsburg: B.

only Serug and his family did not practice the forbidden sins of astrology, divination, and making children “pass through the fire” (*L.A.B.* 4:16).<sup>66</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s Noahic-like depiction of Serug as the patriarch of humanity’s sole sin-free family (*L.A.B.* 4:16) in the midst of a sea of wickedness<sup>67</sup> highlights the parallels that Pseudo-Philo sees between Serug’s generation and Noah’s generation. Several generations after the flood, Serug’s family was encountering more or less the same scenarios as Noah’s family had and they were still waiting for the rest from wickedness of which Noah’s father, Lamech, spoke in *L.A.B.* 1:20.

The parallels between Noah and Serug are developed further in another passage that is unique to *L.A.B.*: *L.A.B.* 4:11.<sup>68</sup> As Lamech did at his son Noah’s birth (*L.A.B.* 1:20), Melcha spoke concerning the future at her son Serug’s birth. Lamech’s oration in *L.A.B.* 1:20 focused on the hope for a coming divine visitation that would bring rest from wickedness. Melcha’s oration in *L.A.B.* 4:11 focused on the hope for a coming “perfect and blameless” one who would have an unbroken covenant (*non dissolvetur testamentum eius*),<sup>69</sup> and whose offspring (*semen*) would be “multiplied forever” (*in seculum multiplicabitur*). This coming one would arrive in the “fourth generation” (*in quarta generatione*) and he would “set his dwelling on high” (*ponat*

---

Filsler, 1928; repr., Heidelberg: F.H. Kerle Verlag, 1966), 1315–1317; and Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:331–345.

<sup>66</sup> Deuteronomy 18:9–12 includes divination (קִסָּם קִסָּמִים) and making children pass through fire (לֹא־יִמָּצֵא בְּךָ מַעֲבִיר בְּנֹוֹיָבְתוֹ בְּאֵשׁ) (v. 10) on a list of forbidden practices that are “abhorrent to the Lord” (v. 12). Making children “pass through fire” (הַעֲבִיר בְּאֵשׁ) also is cited as an example of the abominable practices (כְּתַעֲבוֹת) done by King Ahaz of Judah (2 Kgs 16:2–3; 2 Chr 28:3), King Manasseh of Judah (2 Kgs 21:6; 2 Chr 33:6), and by the Kings of Israel (2 Kgs 17:17). King Josiah of Judah enacted reforms to prevent this practice (2 Kgs 23:10). Making children pass through fire also is among the practices condemned in Ezek 20:31 and in Jer 7:30–31. Astrology is condemned in Isa 47:13 and Deut 4:19.

<sup>67</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s unparalleled depiction of Serug as the exception to humanity’s sinful ways (*L.A.B.* 4:16) stands in contrast to the depiction of Serug as an idolater in Jub 11:5–7.

<sup>68</sup> There is no parallel in the Jewish Scriptures or in early Jewish literature to Melcha’s prophecy concerning the coming of Abraham and the Abrahamic covenant.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. “. . . I will hide my face from them; they shall be fodder and prey and spoil, and no-one will save them owing to their sins – for they broke my covenant (הִפְרוּ בְרִיתִי)” (11Q19 59.7–8); “. . . But in spite of all this you did not reject the descendants of Jacob and did not hurl Israel to destruction, breaking the covenant (לְהַפֵּר בְּרִיתְכֶם) with them (אִתְּכֶם)” (4Q504 f. 1–2 v 7–9); “. . . and break the covenant (בְּרִית) which he established with you” (4Q381 f69 8).

*habitationem super excelsa*) and would be the “father of nations” (*pater gentium erit*). Abraham, who came from Serug’s line in the fourth generation (*L.A.B.* 4:11, 13–15; cf. Gen 11:20–27),<sup>70</sup> is not mentioned by name in *L.A.B.* 4:11 but Pseudo-Philo most certainly had him in mind.

The Jewish Scriptures depict Abraham as: the father of many future nations (Gen 17:4, (לְאָב הַמּוֹן גּוֹיִם),<sup>71</sup> the possessor of an “eternal covenant” (לְבְרִית עוֹלָם) with God (Gen 17:7), one whose offspring would be greatly multiplied (Gen 13:16; 15:5; 17:2),<sup>72</sup> and one commanded by God to “walk before me (הִתְהַלֵּךְ לִפְנֵי), and be blameless (וְהָיָה תָמִים)” (Gen 17:1).<sup>73</sup> An aspect of Melcha’s hope in *L.A.B.* 4:11 that does not readily align with Abraham is the description of her son as one who would “set his dwelling on high” (*ponat habitationem super excelsa*). Many scholars have attempted to correlate this phrase with the extant Abraham traditions, but none of them are entirely convincing. One option is that this phrase might be a reference to Mount Moriah, the place where Abraham almost sacrificed Isaac (Gen 22:1-19; cf. *L.A.B.* 18:5; 32:2–4; 40:2).<sup>74</sup> Another option is that it might be a word play on Abraham’s name (אַבְרָם; i.e. אָב,

---

<sup>70</sup> The four generations: (1) Reu (and his wife Melcha) begat Serug (*L.A.B.* 4:11; cf. Gen 11:20–21), (2) Serug begat Nahor (*L.A.B.* 4:13; cf. Gen 11:22–23), (3) Nahor begat Terah (*L.A.B.* 4:14; cf. Gen 11:24–25), and (4) Terah begat Abram (*L.A.B.* 4:15; cf. Gen 11:26–27).

<sup>71</sup> In *L.A.B.* 4:11, Pseudo-Philo cited the scriptural promise that Abraham would be the father of many nations but he omitted the scriptural distinction between Isaac’s and Ishmael’s lines (Gen 17:15–21). In the scriptural account, Ishmael’s line will be greatly blessed (Gen 17:20) but Isaac’s line will be the covenant line (Gen 17:19, 21). Pseudo-Philo made this distinction only later in *L.A.B.* 8:1–3. Here, Pseudo-Philo dealt with Ishmael’s birth and future before he commenced an abbreviated discussion of the birth of the son of the promise, Isaac.

<sup>72</sup> Abraham is promised that his offspring (זָרַע) will be as innumerable as the “dust of the earth” (כְּעֶפֶר הָאָרֶץ); Gen 13:16) and as innumerable as the “stars” (הַכּוֹכָבִים; Gen 15:5). His offspring will be “exceedingly numerous” (וְאַרְבֵּה אוֹתָךְ בְּמֵאֵד מְאֹד) (Gen 17:2).

<sup>73</sup> The declaration in *L.A.B.* 4:11 that Abraham would be perfect and blameless is based upon Gen 17:1, “Walk before Me (הִתְהַלֵּךְ לִפְנֵי) and be blameless (וְהָיָה תָמִים).” It also recalls Gen 6:9 which states, “Noah was a just man (אִישׁ צַדִּיק), perfect in his generation (וְהָיָה בְּדֹרֹתָיו).” Cf. CJ 27:6 where the prediction is that Abraham “will be called perfect (תָּמִים), just (צַדִּיק) . . . .”. It is possible that Pseudo-Philo wrote something like Isa 4:3, “Whoever is left in Zion and remains in Jerusalem will be called holy (קָדוֹשׁ יֵאָמָר לוֹ; Vulg. - *sanctus vocabitur*), everyone who has been recorded for life in Jerusalem” since Pseudo-Philo’s Abraham narrative is sanitized and omits many details of Abraham’s life.

<sup>74</sup> Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 91–92, suggested that the phrase *habitationem super excelsa* (*L.A.B.* 4:11) is dependent on Gen 12:6 (LXX), Gen 22:2 (LXX); Deut 11:30 (LXX) in which the noun ὑψηλός (“high”) translates מוֹרֶה (Gen 12:6; Deut 11:30) and מְרִיָּה (Gen 22:2). According to this argument, therefore, *habitationem super excelsa* (*L.A.B.* 4:11) is either a reference to “hauteurs

“father,” plus אָב, “exalted”).<sup>75</sup> Yet another option is that it might be a reference to early Jewish traditions that emphasize patriarchal piety and devotion to divine law.<sup>76</sup> A final, and perhaps the most suitable option, is that the phrase refers to Abraham’s celestial journey, to which Pseudo-Philo alluded in *L.A.B.* 18:5.<sup>77</sup>

*L.A.B.* 4 reveals that the rest anticipated in *L.A.B.* 1:20 had not come to fruition and that the system of reward and punishment promised in *L.A.B.* 3:9 had not been established. Pseudo-Philo in *L.A.B.* 4:11 re-directed his readers’ focus from Noah, the one whom Lamech’s generation anticipated would usher in an era of rest from wickedness, to Abraham, the one whom Melcha’s generation anticipated would usher in an era of rest. In due time, however, Pseudo-Philo’s readers would realize that the idealized portrait of Abraham and his generation that Melcha

---

célestes” or “paradis” (ibid.; cf. *T. Ab.* 20). This correlates with Harrington’s statement that *habitationem super excelsa* is “in heaven or perhaps even on Mount Moriah” (“Pseudo-Philo,” 2:309). A similar interpretation of this phrase is that of Hans C. C. Cavallin, *Life After Death: Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor. 15. Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background* (ConBNT 7:1; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974), 75–76; who stated that it “refers to some sort of glorification . . . after death . . . in a heavenly, transcendent existence.”

<sup>75</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:343.

<sup>76</sup> For example, Sirach 44:20 states, “He [Abraham] kept the law of the Most High, and entered into a covenant with him.” For more on this motif in early Judaism, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Abraham the Convert: A Jewish Tradition and Its Use by the Apostle Paul,” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 156 n 15. In *L.A.B.*, the word *excelsus* twice refers to the Law revealed at Sinai. When the Israelites reached Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11:1), God declared, “I will bring out (*eiciam*) the eternal statutes [*excelsa sempiterna*] that are for those in the light.” A subsequent reference to Sinai generations later utilizes similar language: “I established (*ponerem*) laws (*excelsa*) on Mount Sinai” (*L.A.B.* 44:6). Pseudo-Philo also referred to the Law using the related term, *superexcellantia*. Before Moses’s birth, God declared concerning Moses, “I will reveal to him my Law (*superexcellantiam meam*) and statutes (*iusticias*) and judgments (*iudicia*).” In addition, through the prophetess Deborah, God refers to the law revealed at Sinai as “my laws (*superexcellantiam meam*) and statutes (*iusticias*)” (*L.A.B.* 30:2). Finally, at Sinai, Aaron appeals for Israel not to fall into sin by explaining that Moses soon will come and “will illumine the Law (*legem*) for us and will explain from his own mouth the Law of God (*superexcellantiam Dei*) and set up rules for our race” (*L.A.B.* 12:2). The problem with this interpretation is that Pseudo-Philo elsewhere does not depict Abraham as one devoted to divine revelation or, more specifically, to the Law.

<sup>77</sup> “And he said to him, ‘Is it not regarding this people that I spoke to Abraham in a vision saying, “Your seed will be like the stars of the heaven,” **when I lifted him (*quando levavi eum*) above the firmament (*super firmamentum*) and showed him (*ostendi ei*) the arrangements of all the stars (*omnium astrorum dispositionis*)?’” (*L.A.B.* 18:5, emphasis added). See *T. Ab.* 10 where Abraham is given a partial tour of the created realm.**

anticipated will not conform to the reality of the Abrahamic era as depicted in *L.A.B.* 6:1–8:3. Humanity’s future in his era does not involve unity and peace as anticipated in *L.A.B.* 4:11 but, rather, division and trouble.

### ***The Abrahamic Covenant in L.A.B. 6–8***

Immediately following the notice of Noah’s death (*L.A.B.* 5:8), Pseudo-Philo’s narrative turns its focus to the Abrahamic covenant.<sup>78</sup> *L.A.B.* 6:1–7:5, Pseudo-Philo’s primary account of Abraham’s emergence as the one with whom God would establish a covenant is a reworking of the scriptural Babel narrative (Gen 11:1–9). Pseudo-Philo divided the scriptural Babel narrative into three sections: (1) Gen 11:1–4 (*L.A.B.* 6:1–2), (2) Gen 11:5–7 (*L.A.B.* 7:2–3a), and (3) Gen 11:8–9 (*L.A.B.* 7:5b). Pseudo-Philo’s primary narrative begins in *L.A.B.* 6:1–2 with a reworking of Gen 11:1–4. Some differences between *L.A.B.* 6:1–2 and Gen 11:1–4 pertain primarily to interpretive issues within the scriptural text.<sup>79</sup> However, the clues that Pseudo-Philo gives concerning the motivation behind the construction of Babel in *L.A.B.* 6:1 (cf. Gen 11:4) are more significant for this study. In the scriptural account, the tower builders (Gen 11:4) cite three reasons for undertaking the construction project: (1) an ambition to reach the heavens (“Let us build ourselves a city, and a tower with its top in the heavens”); (2) an ambition for fame and recognition (“let us make a name for ourselves”); and (3) a fear of being scattered (“otherwise we shall be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth”). The apparent plausibility of their audacious plan is affirmed by God’s response: if humanity remains as “one people” who

---

<sup>78</sup> In the scriptural account, two chapters separate the notice of Noah’s death (Gen 9:28–29) from the notice of Abraham’s birth (Gen 11:27).

<sup>79</sup> One such issue is an apparent contradiction between Gen 10:1–32, which details postdiluvian humanity’s geographical dispersion and linguistic diversity (Gen 10:5, 20, 31), and Gen 11:1–9, which presupposes that postdiluvian humanity still resided together (Gen 11:2) and spoke a common language (Gen 11:1). Pseudo-Philo resolved this apparent contradiction by omitting the statement that humanity had a common language and stating that those who had dispersed across the earth (*hi omnes qui divisi erant habitantes terram*) once again resided in one place (*postea congregati habitaverunt simul*, *L.A.B.* 6:1a).

share “one language,” then “nothing that they propose will now be impossible for them” (Gen 11:6).

Pseudo-Philo’s reworking of the tower builders’ words from Gen 11:4 in *L.A.B.* 6:1 (see Table 2.7) retains the same basic components. However, Pseudo-Philo subordinated the reasons cited in the scriptural account (Gen 11:4) to a stated desire to avoid inter-tribal conflict in a future era when the people are scattered.<sup>80</sup> The scriptural account contains no precedent for this hope that the tower will help prevent future war.<sup>81</sup>

Table 2.7. *L.A.B.* 6:1 and Gen 11:4

<i>L.A.B.</i> 6:1	Gen 11:4	
each one said to his neighbor,	And they said to one another ( וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ; Gen 11:3a)	
	Then they said (וַיֹּאמְרוּ),	4a
“Behold it will happen that we will be scattered ( <i>dispergamur</i> )	“otherwise (כִּי) we shall be scattered (נִפְּוֶזֶן)	4e
every man from his own brother	abroad upon the face of the whole earth.	11:4f

<sup>80</sup> See Gen 11:4 (LXX) for the view that the tower builders knew beforehand that they would be scattered: “And they said, ‘Come, let us build ourselves a city and a tower whose top shall be as far as heaven, and let us make a name for ourselves **before** (πρὸς, cf. MT “lest,” כִּי) we are scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.”

Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 42, suggested that Pseudo-Philo in *L.A.B.* 6 “has merely taken over” the “interpretation of the builders’ actions and motivations” contained in Gen 11. According to Murphy, this interpretation is that Babel’s construction of “the building of the tower . . . is an action of rebellion against God” (ibid.). The scriptural Babel narrative, however, does not explicitly state this. As Kugel, *Traditions*, 228, observed concerning the builder’s plans in Gen 11:4, “Their plans did not seem to have anything particularly wicked about them.” For interpreters of Gen 11:1–9, the best sign that there was something wrong with the plans to construct “a city and tower” (v. 4) was God’s reaction to their plans (vv. 5–9) and even that has been open to interpretation! For the view that God’s reaction to the builders in Gen 11:5–9 should not be viewed as an act of divine judgment against the tower builders, see Ellen J. van Wolde, *Words Became Worlds: Semantic Studies of Genesis 1–11* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 102–104.

<sup>81</sup> The stated motivation in Josephus, *Ant.* 1:112, differed from that stated in *L.A.B.* 6:1–2. Josephus attributed to the tower builders the desire that the tower would help them from being divided and subsequently conquered by God. In *L.A.B.*, God does not become the tower builders’ focus until the project is resumed in *L.A.B.* 7:2.



<b>L.A.B. 6:1</b>	<b>Gen 11:4</b>	
and in the last days we will be fighting one another.	n/a	
Now come, let us build for ourselves a tower ( <i>edificemus nobismetipsis turrim</i> )	Come, let us build ourselves (נְבִנֶה-לָנוּ) a city, and a tower (עִיר וּמְגִדֵל)	11:4b
whose top ( <i>caput</i> ) will reach the heavens ( <i>ad celum</i> ),	with its top in the heavens (וְרֵאשׁוֹ בְּשָׁמַיִם)	11:4c
and we will make ( <i>et faciemus</i> ) a name for ourselves ( <i>nobis nomen</i> )	and let us make a name for ourselves (וְנַעֲשֶׂה-לָנוּ שֵׁם)	11:4d
and a glory upon the earth ( <i>super terram</i> )."	abroad <i>upon</i> the face of <i>the</i> whole earth."	11:4f

The symbolic unity in the peace project is represented through the inscription of the tower builders' names on the bricks ("let each of us write our names on the bricks and burn them with fire," *L.A.B.* 6:2; see Table 2.8). As long as the project stands, it will be a reminder of their unity.<sup>82</sup> No good evidence supports the commonly cited claim that the writing of the names on the bricks was an act of idolatry.<sup>83</sup>

Table 2.8. *L.A.B.* 6:2 and Gen 11:3

<b>L.A.B. 6:2</b>	<b>Gen 11:3</b>
And they said, each to his neighbor ( <i>unusquisque ad proximum suum</i> )	And they said to one another (lit. "man to his friend"; אִישׁ אֶל-רֵעֵהוּ)
"Let us take ( <i>Accipiamus</i> ) bricks"	"Come (הִבֵּה), let us make bricks

<sup>82</sup> See also Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:356.

<sup>83</sup> Vermes (*Scripture and Tradition*, 77) contended that the phrase "let each of us write our names (*nomina nostra*) on the bricks" (*L.A.B.* 6:2) is "incomprehensible unless *nomina nostra* is taken to mean 'our gods'." Vermes based this interpretation on the reason given by the twelve who refused to take part in the project ("We know the one Lord and him we worship," *L.A.B.* 6:4) and on Gen. 38:8 and *b. Sanh.* 190a which interpret the word name (שֵׁם) in Gen 11:4 as a reference to idolatry. Similarly, Perrot and Bogaert contended that the names written on the bricks in *L.A.B.* 6:2 are the names of their idols (Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 94). They cited Dedila's instructions to her son Micah that he "make a name" for himself through the construction of idols (*L.A.B.* 44:2) in support of their interpretation.

<b>L.A.B. 6:2</b>	<b>Gen 11:3</b>
	(וְנִלְבְּנָה לְבִנָּיִם)”
“ <u>and let each of us write our names</u> ( <i>scribamus . . . nomina nostra</i> ) <u>on the bricks</u> ”	n/a
“and burn them with fire ( <i>igne</i> )”	“and burn them thoroughly (וּנְשַׂרְפָה לְשַׂרְפָּה)”
“and ( <i>et</i> ) <u>whatever will be</u> ( <i>erit</i> ) <u>burned through and through</u> ( <i>perustum fuerit</i> ) <u>will be used</u> for mortar and brick”	“And <u>they had</u> (וְתָהִי לָהֶם) <u>brick for stone</u> , and <u>bitumen</u> for mortar”

Pseudo-Philo’s reworking of Gen 11:1–9 resumes in *L.A.B.* 7:2–3a with God’s response (cf. Gen 11:5–7; see Table 2.9). His version differs from its scriptural counterpart in minor ways. Pseudo-Philo included a formal notice that the project had begun (“And when they had begun to build,” *L.A.B.* 7:2),<sup>84</sup> and he transformed God’s response into a declaration that the project will have dire (unexplained) implications for the created realm – “neither the earth will put up with it nor will the heavens bear to behold it” (*L.A.B.* 7:2). Pseudo-Philo also added a notice to the declaration concerning the division of languages. The notice mentioned God’s intent to disperse humanity across the earth and to change their appearances.<sup>85</sup>

Table 2.9. *L.A.B.* 7:2–3a and Gen 11:5–7

<b>L.A.B. 7:2–3a</b>	<b>Gen 11:5–7</b>
7:2 <u>And when they had begun to build</u>	n/a
<u>God</u> ( <i>Deus</i> ) saw the city and the tower that the sons of men ( <i>filii hominum</i> ) were building	<u>The LORD</u> (יְהוָה) <u>came down</u> (וַיֵּרֵד) to see the city and the tower, which mortals (lit. “the sons of men”; בְּנֵי הָאָדָם) had built.

<sup>84</sup> The scriptural account jumps directly from the project proposal (Gen 11:3–4) to the declaration that God saw what had been built (Gen 11:5).

<sup>85</sup> Humanity’s dispersal is described in Gen 11:8. There is no scriptural parallel to Pseudo-Philo’s declaration that the builders’ appearances were changed.

	<b>L.A.B. 7:2–3a</b>	<b>Gen 11:5–7</b>	
	and <u>he</u> said ( <i>dixit</i> )	And <u>the LORD</u> said (וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה)	11:6a
	“Behold they are one people and have one language for all”	“Look, they are one people, and they have all one language”	11:6b
	“but what they have begun to make ( <i>ceperunt facere</i> )”	“and this is only the beginning of what they will do (הַהֲחִלִּים לַעֲשׂוֹת)”	11:6c
	“neither the earth will put up with it nor will the heavens bear to behold it”	n/a	
	And ( <i>et</i> ) if they are not stopped now ( <i>modo</i> ), they will be daring in all the things ( <i>in omnia</i> ) they propose to do ( <i>presumpserint facere</i> )”	“and now (וְעַתָּה) nothing that they propose to do will now be impossible for them (lit. “all that they propose to do [ כל [אֲשֶׁר יִזְמוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת] will not be withheld from them [לֹא יִבְצָר מֵהֶם])”	11:6d
7:3a	“And <u>behold now</u> I will divide up ( <i>dividam</i> ) their languages”	“Come (הִבֵּה), let us go down (וְנִרְדָּה), and confuse (וְנִבְלָה) their language <u>there</u> ”	11:7a
	“and scatter them in all regions so that a man will not understand his own brother”	n/a	
	“and no one will hear ( <i>nec audiant singuli</i> ) the language of his neighbor.”	“so that (אֲשֶׁר) they will not understand (לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ) one another's speech (אִישׁ שְׁפֹת רֵעֵהוּ)”	11:7b

The primary narrative concludes in L.A.B. 7:5b with a brief description of God’s actions against the tower builders (cf. Gen 11:8–9; see Table 2.10). Most of the differences between the two passages are slight and they do not influence this present study. The two biggest differences are that (1) Gen 11:8b (“and they left off building the city”) is rewritten before Gen 11:8a (“So the LORD scattered them abroad from there over the face of all the earth”) and (2) the city is called “Confusion” (*Confusio*) rather than “Babel” (בְּבֶל; MT Gen 11:9).<sup>86</sup>

<sup>86</sup> The Hebrew text of the Jewish Scriptures states that the city was named “Babel” (בְּבֶל) because it was there that God confused (בָּלַל) the languages (MT Gen 11:9). The Vulgate transliterates the word בְּבֶל into Latin (*Babel*) but the Septuagint names the city “Confusion” (Σύγχυσις) in keeping with the etymology of בְּבֶל given in Gen 11:9.

Table 2.10. *L.A.B.* 7:5b and Gen 11:8–9

	<i>L.A.B. 7:5b</i>	<i>Gen 11:8–9</i>	
7:5b	<i>and they stopped (cessaverunt) building the city</i>	and they left off (וַיַּחֲדִילוּ) building the city	8b
	And the LORD scattered ( <i>Et dispersit . . . Dominus</i> ) them from there over the face of all the earth.	So the LORD scattered (וַיִּפֶּץ יְהוָה) them abroad from there over the face of all the earth	8a
	And therefore the name of that place was called “Confusion” ( <i>Confusio</i> )	Therefore it (lit. “the name of it”; שְׁמָהּ) was called Babel (בְּבֶל)	9a
	because there <u>God</u> ( <i>Deus</i> ) confused <u>their languages</u> ( <i>linguas eorum</i> ) and from there he scattered them ( <i>dispersit eos</i> ) over the face of all the earth	because there <u>the LORD</u> (יְהוָה) confused <u>the language of all the earth</u> (שֵׁפֶת כָּל-הָאָרֶץ); and from there <u>the LORD</u> (יְהוָה) scattered them (וַיִּפֶּצֵם) <i>abroad</i> over the face of all the earth	9b

*L.A.B.* 6:1–2 and *L.A.B.* 7:2–3a, 5b, Pseudo-Philo’s primary Babel narrative, is a straightforward retelling of Gen 11:1–9 that rarely ventures beyond the scope of the scriptural narrative. God responds swiftly to the tower builders’ seemingly innocuous project with sweeping punishment. Pseudo-Philo’s interpretation of this narrative is contained in two sections of Abrahamic material that he inserted into the primary narrative: *L.A.B.* 6:3–7:1 and 7:3b–5a. With these insertions, the tower builders’ actions became the milieu in which the Abrahamic covenant was established. This interweaving of the story of Abraham’s early years and the Babel narrative provided Pseudo-Philo with an explanation for God’s actions in Gen 11:1–9 and also provided him with an explanation for God’s decision to establish a covenant with Abrahamic.

The basic Abrahamic narrative in the inserted material tells the story of a pious individual (i.e. Abraham)<sup>87</sup> who chose (*L.A.B.* 6:4, 11) to be thrown into a fiery furnace (*L.A.B.*

<sup>87</sup> In *L.A.B.* and in the Jewish Scriptures, God changes the name of Terah’s son Abram (*Abram*, *L.A.B.* 4:15; אַבְרָם, Gen 11:26–27) to Abraham (*Abraham*, *L.A.B.* 8:13; אַבְרָהָם, Gen 17:5) and changes the name of Abram’s wife Sarai (*Sarai*, *L.A.B.* 8:3; שָׂרַי, Gen 11:29) to Sarah (*Sara*, *L.A.B.* 8:3; שָׂרָה, Gen 17:15). To avoid confusion, their later names (i.e. Abraham and Sarah) will be used in all references to them.

6:17) rather than take part in the construction of Babel. Through divine intervention, Abraham survives being thrown into the fiery furnace (*L.A.B.* 6:18). An earthquake causes the flames to come out of the furnace (*L.A.B.* 6:17). The furnace collapses (*L.A.B.* 6:18) and many bystanders are killed but Abraham is not hurt (*L.A.B.* 6:17).<sup>88</sup> God punishes the tower builders (*L.A.B.* 7:3b, 5a). Abraham is spared this punishment and is given the promise that he will be God's covenant partner (*L.A.B.* 7:4).

This narrative has no parallel in the scriptural Abraham narratives. However, *L.A.B.* 6:3–7:1; 3b–5a contains elements of the story of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in Daniel 3. In both narratives, a small group of devout individuals are taken to the leader(s) who threaten(s) the individuals with severe punishment for their refusal to take part in an activity incompatible with their religious beliefs (Dan 3:1–18; *L.A.B.* 6:3–5). In Daniel 3, three men named Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego are thrown into a fiery furnace (Dan 3:21) because they refuse to “serve” the foreign gods and “worship” a golden image (Dan 3:18). In *L.A.B.* 6, twelve men refuse to take part in the construction of Babel (*L.A.B.* 6:4), but only one man, Abraham, is thrown into a fiery furnace (*L.A.B.* 6:17). In both narratives, the main protagonists are given another chance to take part in the activity and, thus, save their lives (Dan 3:13–15; *L.A.B.* 6:11).

Both the men in Daniel 3 (Dan 3:16–18) and the man in *L.A.B.* 6 turn down the offer of a second chance and both narratives conclude with God intervening in a miraculous manner that saves and vindicates their lives (Dan 3:23–30; *L.A.B.* 6:16–18). The men thrown into the fiery furnace survive the fire while some bystanders are killed by the fire (Dan 3:22, 24–27; *L.A.B.* 6:17). In addition, in both narratives, the men thrown into the fire receive great rewards. The men in Daniel 3 receive promotions from the king (Dan 3:30) while Abraham is given the promise of an eternal covenant relationship with God (*L.A.B.* 7:4).

---

<sup>88</sup> A partial parallel to *L.A.B.* 6:17 is Daniel 3 where “raging flames” (שְׂרִיפָה דֵי נֹרָא) from the furnace kill the men who cast Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego into the furnace (v. 22), but the three men are unharmed (v. 23–27).

The parallels between *L.A.B.* 6–7 and Daniel 3 are extensive but are not complete. Four significant differences exist between the two passages. First, in Daniel 3, all three of the young men who refused to worship the golden image (Dan 3:12–18) are cast into the fiery furnace (Dan 3:19–21). In *L.A.B.* 6, twelve men refuse to take part in the construction of Babel (*L.A.B.* 6:4) but only one man is thrown into the fiery furnace (*L.A.B.* 6:17). Second, in Daniel 3, all three young men who refused to worship the golden image (vv. 12–18) receive great rewards (v. 30). In *L.A.B.* 7, only one of the twelve men who refuse to take part in the construction of Babel receives the promise of a great reward: the covenant relationship (v. 4). In both narratives, however, all of the men who are thrown into the fiery furnace are greatly blessed. Third, in Daniel 3, the king is “filled with rage” toward the three men and he orders the furnace heated up seven times hotter than normal (v. 19). In *L.A.B.* 6, the leaders (presumably including Joktan, the chief of the leaders) are “angered” (v. 5) by the refusal of the twelve men to take part in the construction of Babel (v. 4). Joktan personally pronounces punishment upon the dissenters (v. 4) and casts Abraham into the furnace (v. 16). Unlike Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 3, Joktan’s antagonism is a façade since Joktan “served God” (v. 6). He arranges for the twelve men to escape to a place of refuge (vv. 6–12). Closer parallels to Joktan in *L.A.B.* 6 are King Darius in Dan 6:14–20 and Reuben in Gen 37:22.<sup>89</sup> Fourth, in Daniel 3, after the three men survive the furnace, no attempts are made to resume the project. In Gen 11:1–9, there is only one attempt to construct Babel.<sup>90</sup> In *L.A.B.* 6, the project is resumed with renewed vigor (*L.A.B.* 7:1) after the furnace bursts open and kills many people (*L.A.B.* 6:17–19). Only after this second attempt to build Babel does God

---

<sup>89</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:359–360.

<sup>90</sup> Modern scholars of the Jewish Scriptures often conclude that the Babel narrative in Gen 11:1–9 is a composite of two or more narratives. For a survey of this view, see Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 534–540. I am not aware of any other scholar, either ancient or modern, who divides Gen 11:1–9 as does Pseudo-Philo. Although still vastly different, the closest to Pseudo-Philo’s version is Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (trans. Mark E. Biddle; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1997), 94–102, who conjectured that Gen 11:1–9 combines a city narrative (vv. 1, 3a, part of 4, 5, 6a, 7, 8b, 9a) and a tower narrative (vv. 2, 3b, part of 4, 5, 6b, 8a, 9b).

choose Abraham (*L.A.B.* 7:4). Furthermore, he is chosen over the tower builders (*L.A.B.* 7:3), not over the eleven other dissenters, or over Joktan in *L.A.B.* 6.

The closest Abrahamic parallels for this narrative are in the early Jewish traditions concerning Abraham's life in Mesopotamia. In early Jewish literature, young Abraham (i.e. before Gen 12:1–3) is depicted commonly as a beacon of monotheism in the midst of an idolatrous people.<sup>91</sup> In these traditions, Abraham's pious rejection of idolatry created tensions with his idolatrous peers.<sup>92</sup> The type of duress that preceded Abraham's departure from his homeland varies, but it sometimes includes an impending fiery demise and/or tragedy.<sup>93</sup> The tradition that God delivered Abraham from a fire is based on the scriptural statements that Abraham came from "Ur (אֹּר) of the Chaldeans" (Gen 11:28, 31; 15:7; Neh 9:7). The name "Ur" (אֹּר) can mean "fire" (e.g. Isa 31:9; 50:11).

Within Pseudo-Philo's reworking of the scriptural patriarchal narratives (Gen 12–50; cf. *L.A.B.* 6–8), the actual establishment of the covenant relationship between God and Abraham that was promised in *L.A.B.* 7:4 is found only in God's words to Abraham in *L.A.B.* 8:3, a highly abbreviated reworking of the Gen 17 account of the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Jubilees 11:15–17; 12:1–7; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.154–157; Philo, *Abr.* 69–71; Apoc. Ab. 1:1–8:6. The tradition that Abraham grew up in the midst of idolatry likely developed from a statement attributed to Joshua in Josh 24:2 – "Long ago your ancestors – Terah and his sons Abraham and Nahor – lived beyond the Euphrates and served other gods (וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ)."

<sup>92</sup> In Jdt 5:6–8, Abraham's family "fled" their homeland because "their ancestors drove them out from the presence of their gods" (v. 8) whom they had refused "to follow" (v. 7). Josephus (*Ant.* 1.154–157) likewise set Abraham's departure in the context of duress, observing that the people of his land "rose up against him" (157) because of his ardent monotheism (154–156). Kugel contended (*Traditions*, 251–252) that the tradition that Abraham's departure from his homeland came under duress is based at least in part on the declaration in Isa 29:22 that God "redeemed" (פָּדָה) Abraham.

<sup>93</sup> In the book of Jubilees, Abraham's father Terah, in response Abraham's urging, expresses to Abraham the fear that the people in his ancestral homeland would kill him (Jub 12:6–7) if he was to instruct them to "worship the God of heaven" (v. 4) rather than idols (v. 5). Eventually, Terah and his family leave Ur (v. 15) following a tragic fire that claimed the life of his son Haran (Jub 12:14). Haran had been trying to rescue their idols (v. 14) from a fire set by Abraham (v. 12).

<sup>94</sup> James (*Biblical Antiquities*, 96) was the first to note the dependence of *L.A.B.* 8:3 on the Gen 17 account of the Abrahamic covenant. See also Feldman, "Prolegomenon," xc; Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 101; Murphy, "Eternal Covenant," 45; Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 50–51; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:387–388; Amaru, *Rewriting*, 72–73. Other flashbacks to the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant include *L.A.B.* 18:5; 23:4–7; 32:1.

*L.A.B.* 8:3 highlights three themes:<sup>95</sup> (1) the promise of “an everlasting seed” for Abraham and Sarah (“And I will give to you from her an everlasting seed”),<sup>96</sup> (2) the promise of “land” for Abraham and Sarah’s “seed” (“To your seed I will give this land”),<sup>97</sup> and (3) the name change for Abraham and Sarah (“and your name will be called Abraham, and Sarai, your wife, will be called Sarah”).<sup>98</sup> The promise of the covenant is an unheralded afterthought to these themes: “. . . and I will establish my covenant with you” (*L.A.B.* 8:3).

Pseudo-Philo’s reworking of the “seed” promise in *L.A.B.* 8:1–3 removes any initial uncertainty found in the book of Genesis concerning the identity of Abraham’s chosen seed. According to Gen 17, Abraham thought that the covenant line would go through Ishmael (Gen 17:15–18), his son via Hagar (Gen 16:15–16). The identity of Abraham’s chosen heir is revealed slowly to Abraham in Gen 15–17. God revealed to Abraham in the first Abrahamic covenant (Gen 15) that his heir would not be his servant (Gen 15:2–3), but that it would be one of his own offspring (v. 4). After Abraham had Ishmael with his wife’s servant, Hagar (Gen 16:15–16), God revealed to Abraham in the second Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17) that Ishmael would be blessed greatly (Gen 17:20), but that a child from the womb of the aged and barren Sarah would be his heir (Gen 17:18–21). God’s promise of a coming Abrahamic covenant (*L.A.B.* 7:4) replaces the

---

<sup>95</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:387–388.

<sup>96</sup> The promise of “seed” is also evident in *L.A.B.* 23:6–7 where the three-year old calf (*vitulum trimum*; MT Gen 15:9, מִשְׁלֵשָׁתָּה עֵגְלָה) becomes a symbol of the vast number of Abraham’s future descendants (“I will liken the calf to the multitude of peoples, which are made many through you,” *L.A.B.* 23:7). The promise that Abraham’s offspring will be numerous is also seen in *L.A.B.* 49:6 where the only covenant promise that Elkanah cites is “I will multiply your seed” (*semen vestrum amplificabo*, cf. Gen 16:10, אֶת־זַרְעֶךָ אֶת־רַבָּה). We also encounter the scriptural promise that Abraham’s offspring will be numerous in *L.A.B.* 14:2 where God recalls the Abrahamic covenant promise, “Your seed will be like the stars of heaven in multitude” (cf. Gen. 22:17; 26:4; Exod 32:13).

<sup>97</sup> Throughout *L.A.B.*, we see the Abrahamic covenant promise of land recalled – “To your seed I will give this land” (*L.A.B.* 23:5; cf. *L.A.B.* 10:2; 12:4; 19:10; 21:9; 39:7). According to *L.A.B.* 21:9, the common scriptural promise that Israel’s Promised Land would be the epitome of fertility (i.e. “flowing with milk and honey”) was anchored in the Abrahamic covenant. The promise that Israel’s future land would be one flowing with milk and honey is common in the Jewish Scriptures (e.g. Exod 3:8, 17; 13:5; 33:3; Lev 20:24; Num 13:27; 14:8; 16:13; Deut 6:3; 11:9; 26:9, 15; 27:3; 31:20; Josh 5:6; Jer 11:5; 32:22; Ezek 20:6, 15), but it is not found within the scriptural patriarchal narratives.

<sup>98</sup> The only other reference in the Jewish Scriptures to Abraham’s name change is Neh 9:7.



first Abrahamic covenant (Gen 15), but there is no indication in *L.A.B.* 7 that Abraham was aware of the promise. There is also no indication in *L.A.B.* 6–8 that Abraham (or anyone else in his generation) was aware of Melcha’s prophecy concerning the Abrahamic covenant (*L.A.B.* 4:11). It is not until *after* the birth of Ishmael (*L.A.B.* 8:1; cf. Gen 16:15–16) that God reveals the covenant promise to Abraham.<sup>99</sup>

An additional account of the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant is included in Pseudo-Philo’s reworking of the covenant renewal ceremony at the end of Joshua’s life (*L.A.B.* 23:1–14; cf. Josh 24:1–24). The basic framework for this flashback to the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant in *L.A.B.* 23:3–8 comes from Josh 24:2–3 (see Table 2.11). According to the basic framework, Joshua relayed to Israel a word from “the Lord” (Table 2.11, row 1) that described how Abraham lived among wayward people (Table 2.11, row 2) before God took him to Canaan (Table 2.11, row 6) and gave Isaac to him (Table 2.11, row 8). Pseudo-Philo’s noteworthy adaptations to this basic framework are the expanded description of God’s interaction with Abraham’s family in this land (Table 2.11, row 2), the added declaration that Abraham believed God (cf. Gen 15:6) and was not led astray (Table 2.11, rows 3-5), and the transformation of the statement that God “took” Abraham “from beyond the river” (Josh 24:3a) into the statement that God “rescued” Abraham “from the fire” (*L.A.B.* 23:5c; cf. Neh 9:7; *L.A.B.* 6:17–18; Table 2.11, row 6). In *L.A.B.* 23, Pseudo-Philo’s appropriation of the Gen 15 declaration that Abraham “believed” God (*L.A.B.* 23:5b) facilitated his insertion of a brief rewritten version of the Gen 15 account of the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant.

---

<sup>99</sup> This belief that God’s covenant with Abraham included the promise that the covenant line will go through Isaac is also found in Pseudo-Philo’s flashback to the Abrahamic covenant in *L.A.B.* 23. As proof of the veracity of God’s covenant promises, Isaac is given to Abraham and Sarah (*L.A.B.* 23:8). Abraham, who “believed in me [God] and was not led astray with them” (*L.A.B.* 23:5), was promised the land of Canaan (“To your seed I will give this land,” *L.A.B.* 23:5) following his rescue “from the flame” (*L.A.B.* 23:5). This occurred during when “all those inhabiting the earth were being led astray after their own devices” (*L.A.B.* 23:5; cf. *L.A.B.* 6–7). Abraham’s response in *L.A.B.* 23, however, clearly indicates that he already knows that the covenant line must go through Sarah. He states: “Behold now you have given me a wife, and she is sterile. And how will I have offspring from that rock of mine that is closed up” (*L.A.B.* 23:5). No consideration is given in *L.A.B.* 23 to the possibility that the covenant line may not be from Sarah’s womb (cf. Gen 16).

Table 2.11. *L.A.B.* 23:4–5, 8 and Josh 24:2–3

<i>L.A.B.</i> 23:4–5c, 8	Josh 24:2–3
And Joshua rose up in the morning and gathered all the people and said to them, “The Lord says this . . . .( <i>L.A.B.</i> 23:4a)	And Joshua said to all the people, “Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel. . . . (Josh 24:2a)
There was one rock from which I quarried out your father. And the cutting of that rock bore two men whose names are Abraham and Nahor, and out of the chiseling of that place were born two women whose names are Sarah and Melcha, and they lived together across the river. And Abraham took Sarah as a wife, and Nahor took Melcha. And when all those inhabiting the land were being led astray after their own devices, ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 23:4b–5a)	Long ago your ancestors-- Terah and his sons Abraham and Nahor-- lived beyond the Euphrates and served other gods.” (Josh 24:2b)
Abraham believed in me ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 23:5b)	And he believed the LORD; (Gen 15:6)
n/a	and the LORD reckoned it to him as righteousness. (Gen 15:6)
and was not led astray with them. ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 23:5b)	n/a
And I rescued him from the flame and I took him and brought him over all the land of Canaan ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 23:5c)	“Then I took (וַאֲקָח) your father Abraham from beyond the River and led him through all the land of Canaan” (Josh 24:3a)
n/a	“You are the LORD, the God who . . . brought him ( וְהוֹצֵאתוֹ ) out of Ur (מִאּוּר) of the Chaldeans . . .” (Neh 9:7)
n/a	and made his offspring many. (Josh 24:3b)
And I gave him Isaac ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 23:8a)	I gave him Isaac (Josh 24:3b)
and formed him in the womb of her who gave birth to him and commanded her to restore him quickly and to give him	n/a

---

**L.A.B. 23:4–5c, 8**

**Josh 24:2–3**

---

back to me in the seventh month. And therefore every woman who gives birth in the seventh month, her son will live, because upon him I have brought my glory and revealed the new age.” (L.A.B. 23:8b)

---

The declaration that Abraham believed God (L.A.B. 23:5a; Gen 15:6) was the first of several Gen 15 insertions into Pseudo-Philo’s rewriting of Josh 23 that he had omitted from his primary patriarchal narrative (L.A.B. 6–8). The central question regarding the inserted Abraham covenant material (L.A.B. 23:5b–7) pertains to the promise of “seed” (i.e. offspring). This promise is central to the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant in L.A.B. 8:3 (“To your seed I will give this land,” cf. L.A.B. 23:5b). The uncertainty concerning Abraham’s heir (which is present in Gen 15–17 but is not present in Pseudo-Philo’s reworking of the Abrahamic covenant in L.A.B. 8:3) surfaces in L.A.B. 23:5b–7. Abraham’s description of his wife as a “rock . . . that is closed up” is not paralleled in the Jewish Scriptures,<sup>100</sup> but the unease that Abraham expresses in L.A.B. 23:5 regarding the sterility of his wife is based on the Gen 15:2–3 depiction of Abraham as being “childless” and without offspring. God’s response to Abraham’s question in L.A.B. 23:5b–7 is adapted from Gen 15. Abraham is told to bring four sacrifices (L.A.B. 23:5b; Gen 15:9). After he does so (L.A.B. 23:6a; Gen 15:10), a “deep sleep” comes upon Abraham (L.A.B. 23:6b; Gen 15:12) and God’s promises are affirmed in a fiery vision (L.A.B. 23:6c; Gen 15:17).

*The Impact of Reward and Punishment on the Establishment of the Abrahamic Covenant in L.A.B.*

Based on the foregoing outlines of the narratives in which Pseudo-Philo depicted the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant, what impact does reward and punishment have on the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant in L.A.B.? Does Pseudo-Philo exemplify E. P.

---

<sup>100</sup> The closest scriptural parallel to the wording in this statement is Isa 51:1 in which Abraham and Sarah are referred to as a “rock” (צור) and a “quarry” (מִקְבַּת בּוֹר) respectively.

Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in his depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors in *L.A.B.* 1–8?

The starting point for the consideration of these questions is the promise in *L.A.B.* 7:4 that Abraham would be God's covenant partner:

And before all these (*ante omnes hos*) I will choose my servant Abram, and I will bring him out from their midst and will bring him into the land upon which my eye has looked from of old, when all those inhabiting the earth sinned in my sight and I brought the water of the flood and I did not destroy it but preserved that land. For neither did the springs of my wrath burst forth in it, nor did my water of destruction descend on it. For there I will have my servant Abram dwell and will establish my covenant with him and will bless his seed and be LORD for him as God forever. (*L.A.B.* 7:4)

Of particular significance for our study is the referent for the words “before all these” (*ante omnes hos*). In *L.A.B.* 7:4, Pseudo-Philo did not give a reason for God's selection of Abraham as the covenant partner. He merely stated that Abraham, the servant of God (lit. “my servant”),<sup>101</sup> was chosen (*eligam*) “before all these” (*ante omnes hos*).

It is indisputable that Pseudo-Philo highlighted reward and punishment as the context within which the parameters of the Abrahamic covenant were established (*L.A.B.* 6–7). Given this strong context, it is very tempting to conclude that *L.A.B.* 6–7 depicts Abraham as having been chosen “in preference to” (*ante*) his peers who refused to face the fiery furnace. However, the scenario set forth in *L.A.B.* 7:4 in which God's servant (*puerum meum*) Abraham is chosen “in preference to” (*ante*) those whom God punished (cf. *L.A.B.* 7:3) simplifies the scenario depicted in *L.A.B.* 6. *L.A.B.* 7:4 presupposes a simplistic two-fold division with Abraham on one side and the tower builders on the other while *L.A.B.* 6 presents three distinct groups:

1. The people of the land, the particular focus of God's wrath in *L.A.B.* 7:3 (cf. v. 1).
2. The three leaders, Joktan, Nimrod, and Fenech (*L.A.B.* 6:14), of whom Joktan is the chief (*L.A.B.* 6:6).

---

<sup>101</sup> See Gen 26:24, “I am with you and will bless you and make your offspring numerous for my servant Abraham's sake (בְּעִבּוֹר אֲבְרָהָם עֶבְדִּי).” *L.A.B.* 7:4 is the only place in *L.A.B.* where Abraham is called God's servant. In *L.A.B.*, this term also is used once in reference to Joseph (*L.A.B.* 43:5) and commonly is used of Moses (*L.A.B.* 20:2; 30:2; 53:2, 8, 10; 58:1).

3. The twelve dissenters: Abraham (Abram), Nahor, Lot, Ruge, Tenute, Zaba, Armodat, Jobab, Esar, Abimahel, Saba, and Augin (*L.A.B.* 6:3).

Pseudo-Philo depicted the *people of the land* as the initiators of wickedness and the leaders as helpless pawns. In contrast, some early Jewish texts depict Nimrod as an initiator of and a leader in postdiluvian humanity's wickedness.<sup>102</sup> In *L.A.B.* 6:3–5, the people of the land seize the twelve dissenters and bring them to the leaders for a trial. Then, they initiate Abraham's near execution (*L.A.B.* 6:15) and re-start the construction of the tower after its initial failure (*L.A.B.* 7:1). Joktan's plan to provide refuge for the dissenters focuses on the people of the land (not on their leaders) as those who are to be feared (*L.A.B.* 6:6, 9). He sought to deliver the dissenters from the "hand of the people" (v. 6) whose "hatred" fueled a "foolish" plot to destroy the dissenters (v. 9). Joktan believed that these people would be destroyed (v. 9). Abraham likewise recognized the people of the land to be his chief opponents (v. 11). In this scenario, Nimrod, Fenech, and Joktan (*L.A.B.* 6:14) are portrayed as seemingly powerless.

The dissenters burst onto the scene in *L.A.B.* 6:3 as twelve men from Shem's clan<sup>103</sup> who are unified in piety. Having been seized by the "people of the land" and brought before the leaders with the allegation that they had "gone against our [the people's] plans" and "ways" (*L.A.B.* 6:4),<sup>104</sup> the dissenters justified their non-participation based on monotheistic devotion ("We know the one Lord and him we worship," *L.A.B.* 6:4). Their religion had no goal apart from the worship of the one God, worship that was preferable to life itself ("Even if you throw us into

---

<sup>102</sup> E.g. Philo, *Gig* 65–66; QGE 2.82; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.110–113.

<sup>103</sup> Regarding the names of the twelve dissenters listed in *L.A.B.* 6:3, Ginzberg, *Legends*, 1:160 n. 76, stated, "These were, as ps-Philo clearly asserts, relatives of Joktan and, with the exception of Abraham, Nachor [Nahor], Lot and Reu [Ruge], correspond to the names given in Gen. 10.26–29." See also Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 95; Feldman, "Prolegomenon," lxxxviii; Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 43 n. 46; Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:310 n. 6c; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:357; Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1975)," 114 n. 3a.

<sup>104</sup> The tower builders charged that the twelve descendants of Shem who refused to help build the tower went against their plans (*transgressi sunt consilia nostra*) and did not walk in their ways (*nolunt ambulare in viis nostris*; *L.A.B.* 6:4).

the fire with your bricks, we will not join you," *L.A.B.* 6:4).<sup>105</sup> They alleged that even the prospect of death by the fiery furnace could not force them to take part in the tower-building project (*L.A.B.* 6:4).

In *L.A.B.* 6:5 and 6:9, Pseudo-Philo divided the three groups further. When the leaders opted to take the dissenters up on their challenge and sentenced the dissenters to death in a fiery furnace (*L.A.B.* 6:5), divisions appeared within the group of leaders and the group of dissenters and a fourth group was formed. One of the leaders, Joktan, and eleven of the dissenters (i.e. all but Abraham) agreed that the best response to the threat of death by the fiery furnace was to hide in the mountains "until the hatred of this people subsides" when God destroys the people of the land (*L.A.B.* 6:9). This left two leaders and one dissenter who remained faithful to their original positions. The two leaders hated the dissenters and desired to destroy them while the lone dissenter remained unwaveringly faithful to his stance that death by the fiery furnace was preferable to participation in the project. In *L.A.B.* 7, however, God's choice of a covenant partner narrows: Joktan and the eleven dissenters who accepted Joktan's offer of refuge vanish, leaving only Abraham as a potential covenant partner.

This sudden (and unexpected) absence of Joktan and the tower builders from the second half of Pseudo-Philo's Babel narrative raises the question: whom did God choose Abraham "in preference to" (*ante*) in *L.A.B.* 7:4? The distinctions between the God-fearing people (i.e. Joktan and the twelve dissenters) that Pseudo-Philo developed in *L.A.B.* 6 form a natural progression that culminates in *L.A.B.* 7:4 with God's promise to choose Abraham as the covenant partner.<sup>106</sup> However, the absence of Joktan and the eleven other dissenters from the immediate context in which the promise of Abraham's election occurs, namely the second attempt to build the city

---

<sup>105</sup> See Dan 3:17–18, "If our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the furnace of blazing fire and out of your hand, O king, let him deliver us. But if not, be it known to you, O king, that we will not serve your gods and we will not worship the golden statue that you have set up."

<sup>106</sup> As Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:380, observed concerning *L.A.B.* 7:4, "The (unexpressed) reason for God's selection of Abraham must be the devotion displayed by him in chapter six."

and the tower (*L.A.B.* 7:2–5), leaves only one potential group for Abraham to be chosen “in preference to” (*ante*, *L.A.B.* 7:4). Abraham was chosen “in preference to” (*ante*, *L.A.B.* 7:4) the “people of the land” (*L.A.B.* 7:1) in whose midst he was living and from among whom God promised to take him out (“I will bring him out from their midst,” *L.A.B.* 7:4).

Pseudo-Philo confirmed this identification of those whom Abraham was chosen “in preference to” (*ante*; *L.A.B.* 7:4) in his account of the second attempt to build Babel with the description of the fates of only two groups: (1) the people of the land who resumed the construction of Babel (*L.A.B.* 7:3) and (2) Abraham and his descendants (*L.A.B.* 7:4). Regarding the fate of the people of the land, Pseudo-Philo referred to the declaration in Gen 11:8 that God scattered (וַיִּפְּץ) the tower builders across the face of the earth (עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ) and that God “confused” (בָּלְלַל) humanity’s languages (Gen 11:9). From this chapter, Pseudo-Philo derived the promise that the people of the land will have their languages divided (*dividam*) and that they will be scattered (*dispergam*). He also referred to the promise in *L.A.B.* 3:9 that sinners will be scattered (*dispergentur*) by God into uninhabitable places (*in inhabitabilia*).<sup>107</sup> Also from *L.A.B.* 3:9, Pseudo-Philo derived the promise that the people of the land will be banished (*commendabo*) to live “like the beasts of the field” (*quemadmodum fere campi*)<sup>108</sup> in the “cliffs,”

---

<sup>107</sup> For instances of the divine *scattering* of sinners in the Jewish Scriptures, see Lev. 26:33; Deut 4:27; 28:64; 30:3; 1 Kgs 14:15; 22:17; 2 Chr 18:16; Neh 1:8–9; Jer 9:16; 13:24; 49:32; Ezek 29:12–14; 30:23; Nah 3:18. There are also a number of passages that depict individuals and groups *voluntarily* residing in caves, strongholds, rocks, and mountains in times of great fear brought on by military defeat (e.g. Ezek 33:27–28; Josh 10:16–17; Judg 6:2; 1 Sam 13:6; 1 Kgs 18:4). These concepts never are combined in the Jewish Scriptures as they are in *L.A.B.* 7:3.

<sup>108</sup> The belief that the tower builders were fated to “live like the beasts of the field” (*L.A.B.* 7:3) is paralleled in 3 Baruch (Greek Apocalypse) where Baruch is shown the tower builders as humans living in fields, bearing characteristics of various animals (3 Bar. 2:3, 7; 3:3). See also Daniel 4 where King Nebuchadnezzar is informed by Daniel that he will reside with the beasts of the field (חַיֵּי הַבְּרָאָה, Dan 4:20 [ET 4:23]). This punishment is restated to Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4:28–29 [ET 4:31–32] when a voice speaks to him from heaven: “You shall be driven away from human society, and your dwelling shall be with the animals of the field. You shall be made to eat grass like oxen.” However, unlike the tower builders in *L.A.B.* 7:3, there is a set limit upon Nebuchadnezzar’s punishment (Dan 4:29 [ET 4:32]).

in “huts . . . of straw,” and in “caves” where they would die.<sup>109</sup> Finally, Pseudo-Philo referred to the description of the “nations” in Isa 40:15 as “like a drop in a bucket” and as “dust on the scales” when he described the people of the land as being “like a drop of water” and “spittle.”

Regarding Abraham’s fate, Pseudo-Philo referred to God’s command to Abraham in Gen 12:1 that he must leave his country, family, and house (Gen 12:1). He rewrote the promise in *L.A.B.* 7:4 to state that God would “bring him out” from the midst of the wicked people with whom he presently lived (cf. *L.A.B.* 6:1–7:3) and “bring him” to another land, an untainted land that had never felt the heat of God’s wrath, even during the flood (*L.A.B.* 7:4).<sup>110</sup> Pseudo-Philo presented God as promising four things in *L.A.B.* 7:4 concerning this untainted land: (1) Abraham would live there, (2) God would establish a covenant with Abraham there, (3) God would “bless his seed” there, and (4) God would be Abraham’s “God forever” there.

The Abrahamic insertions provide insight into Abraham’s character but the contrast developed between Abraham and his dissenter peers in *L.A.B.* 6 is of little significance for his election. As stated previously, Abraham is not elected over his fellow dissenters. Rather, he is elected over the people of the land. The eleven other dissenters have disappeared from the narrative when the construction of the city and the tower resumes in *L.A.B.* 7:1–5.

If Abraham was chosen over the people of the land, what was the purpose of Pseudo-Philo’s lengthy discussion of the differences within the God-fearing segment of society? Was Abraham’s election his “reward” for obedience? Alternatively, was the godly character that Abraham displayed in *L.A.B.* 6:11 not considered as a factor in his election since the choice that

---

<sup>109</sup> “And to some the end will come by water, but others will be dried up with thirst” (*L.A.B.* 7:3). Chronicles of Jerahmeel 30:3 adds that some will be destroyed “with fire.” For the promise that sinners will be destroyed by fire, see *L.A.B.* 3:9.

<sup>110</sup> The belief that the land of Israel was not touched by the flood is found elsewhere in Jewish literature (e.g. *Gen. Rab.* 33:6; CJ 30:4). For further discussion of parallels to this concept in Judaism, see Feldman, “Prolegomenon,” lxxxix; and Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 99. The belief that the land of Israel was spared the flood is not mentioned elsewhere in *L.A.B.*



remained in *L.A.B.* 7 was between the sinful tower builders whom God desired to destroy and the one who was not a tower builder?<sup>111</sup>

Some clarity concerning these questions emerges during the secondary flashback in *L.A.B.* 23 to the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant. *L.A.B.* 23:4 contains a story about two men, Abraham and Nahor, and their wives, Sarah and Melcha. Nothing positive or negative concerning these four people is stated in *L.A.B.* 23:4. As was the case in Pseudo-Philo's rewritten Babel narrative (*L.A.B.* 6–7), when the matter of Abraham's election comes to the forefront (*L.A.B.* 23:5), Nahor and the others vanish from the narrative<sup>112</sup> and only Abraham and "all those inhabiting the land" (*habitantes terram*) remain. *L.A.B.* 23:5 describes Abraham as believing in God (*credidit . . . mihi*; cf. Gen 15:6) and not being "led astray" (*non est seductus*) when "all those inhabiting the land" (*habitantes terram*) were "led astray" (*seducerentur*). God's choice of Abraham is described as God rescuing (*erui*) him "from the flame" (*de flamina*; cf. *L.A.B.* 6:16–17), showing him the land of Canaan, and establishing with him a covenant (*L.A.B.* 23:5b–7; cf. Gen 15:1–21).

The connection in *L.A.B.* 23:5 that Pseudo-Philo made between Abraham's belief and actions (i.e. "Abraham believed in me and was not led astray") and the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant certainly suggests that Abraham's election in *L.A.B.* is based, at least in part, upon his godly character. Ultimately, however, as an explanation for God's decision to establish a covenant with Abraham, the depiction of Abraham's character in *L.A.B.* (e.g. *L.A.B.* 6:11; 23:5) is of secondary importance to Melcha's prophecy in *L.A.B.* 4:11b. As discussed

---

<sup>111</sup> See George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Good and Bad Leaders in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980), 52. In his discussion of Pseudo-Philo's Abraham narrative (*L.A.B.* 6–7), Nickelsburg contended that Abraham's "election is a reward for his superlative trust-put-into-action" in *L.A.B.* Elsewhere in the same article (*ibid.*, 59), Nickelsburg observed that "Abraham's courageous rejection of idolatry leads to his election as the patriarch whose descendants will be blessed (7:4)."

<sup>112</sup> Nahor (*Nachor*) also is among the dissenters of *L.A.B.* 6:3.

previously in our consideration of the Noahic covenant in *L.A.B.*, generations before Abraham's birth God had already determined that a covenant would be established with Abraham:

From him [Serug] there will be born in the fourth generation one who will set his dwelling on high and will be called perfect and blameless; and he will be the father of nations, and his covenant will not be broken, and his seed will be multiplied forever. (*L.A.B.* 4:11b)

Pseudo-Philo's insertion of this unparalleled prophecy into his rewriting of the list of Shem's descendants (Gen 11:10–32) provides us with a framework to interpret the relationship between his subsequent comments concerning Abraham's godly character (i.e. *L.A.B.* 6:11; 23:5) and God's decision to establish a covenant with Abraham. The message is clear: Abraham in *L.A.B.* certainly is deserving of the favour that God grants him when he is chosen as the recipient of the covenant but God's decision to establish a covenant with Abraham was made and announced long before Abraham did or believed anything. In *L.A.B.* Abraham's election ultimately is not a reward for his actions or beliefs but rather a reflection of God's prior decision to establish a covenant with Abraham.<sup>113</sup>

*The Impact of Reward and Punishment on Life in the Abrahamic Covenant in L.A.B.*

Pseudo-Philo's concise reworking of the scriptural patriarchal narratives (Gen 12–50; *L.A.B.* 8) does not provide significant insight regarding the impact of reward and punishment upon life under the Abrahamic covenant. Pseudo-Philo's sanitized portrayal of the Abrahamic

---

<sup>113</sup> Contra Ida Fröhlich, *'Time and Times and Half a Time: Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras'* (JSPSup 19; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 178, who concluded that, in *L.A.B.* "Abraham . . . earned the covenant that the Lord made with him" (*L.A.B.* 6:11). Fröhlich stated that the "salvation" that Abraham and his companions earn in *L.A.B.* is "graded," with Abraham receiving the "highest level," the "twelve righteous ones" of *L.A.B.* 6:3–4 receiving the "next level," and Joktan and those who helped the fugitives receiving the "third level" (ibid.). Fröhlich's extremely brief analysis of the passage did not support her conclusions. Indeed, not only did she fail to recognize the overall narrative structure of the *L.A.B.* 6–7 (as discussed above), she did not discuss (or even mention) the earlier promises of the Abrahamic covenant in *L.A.B.* 4:11 and the resumption of the Babel narrative in *L.A.B.* 7! In *L.A.B.* the Abrahamic covenant is not established in *L.A.B.* 6:3–4 (contra Fröhlich, *Time and Times*, 177) but is heralded in *L.A.B.* 4:11, promised in *L.A.B.* 7:4, and established in *L.A.B.* 8:3. See also Chris VanLandingham, *Judgment and Justification in Early Judaism and the Apostle Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2006), 16, who contends that widespread in early Judaism was the view that God's election of "Abraham and his descendants" was "a response to Abraham's obedience."

offspring (*L.A.B.* 8) focused upon genealogical matters. The rivalries between Abraham's descendants that are present in the scriptural narrative do not appear in *L.A.B.* 8. No reason is given in *L.A.B.* for the choice of Isaac over Ishmael (*L.A.B.* 8:1, 3) and for the choice of Jacob over Esau (*L.A.B.* 8:4–6). Even the rivalries within Jacob's family are virtually absent from the text (*L.A.B.* 8:7–10). Only one hint of trouble between Jacob's sons appears in Pseudo-Philo's extremely brief reworking of the Joseph narrative (*L.A.B.* 8:9–10) but even this is sanitized.<sup>114</sup>

Pseudo-Philo used Gen 12–50 as his primary source for *L.A.B.* 8 as he briefly sketched the story of Abraham's offspring from their entrance into Canaan (*L.A.B.* 8:1)<sup>115</sup> until their departure from Canaan for Egypt (*L.A.B.* 8:11–14). The specific events briefly mentioned in *L.A.B.* 8:1–14 are:

- Sarah's sterility (*L.A.B.* 8:1; cf. Gen 16:1)
- the subsequent birth of Ishmael via Hagar (*L.A.B.* 8:1; cf. Gen 16:1–4, 15–16)
- the separation of Lot and Abraham (*L.A.B.* 8:2; cf. Gen 13:5–12)
- the Abrahamic covenant of Gen 17 (*L.A.B.* 8:3)
- the subsequent birth of Isaac (*L.A.B.* 8:3; cf. Gen 21:1–5)
- the rape of Dinah (*L.A.B.* 8:7; cf. Gen 34:1–2, 25–26)
- the selling of Joseph into slavery (*L.A.B.* 8:9; cf. Gen 37:12–36)
- Joseph's time with Potiphar (*L.A.B.* 8:9; cf. Gen 39:1–5)

---

<sup>114</sup> In *L.A.B.* 8:9–10, Pseudo-Philo observed that Joseph's brothers "hated" (*oderant*) him and that this resulted in Joseph being "delivered" to Egypt (v. 9) but that, years later, Joseph "did not deal vengefully" with his brothers when they came to Egypt in search of food (v. 10). As Maren Niehoff, *The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature* (AGJU 16; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 47, observed, much of Pseudo-Philo's extremely abbreviated Joseph narrative is "almost rendered incomprehensible without prior knowledge of the biblical account." Key in this regard is Pseudo-Philo's failure to mention Jacob's great love for Joseph (Gen 37:3–4), the firstborn son of his favourite wife (Gen 29:18–20, 30–31; 30:21), and his failure to mention Joseph's provocative interaction with his brothers (Gen 37:2, 5–11).

<sup>115</sup> In *L.A.B.* 8, Pseudo-Philo emphasized the connection between Abraham's family and the land of Canaan. "The land of Canaan" occurs five times in *L.A.B.* 8 (vv. 1, 2, 7, 9, 10) and only once otherwise in *L.A.B.* (*L.A.B.* 23:5). Abraham, Sarah, and Lot moved to Canaan (*L.A.B.* 8:1; cf. Gen 12:4), Abraham "lived in the land of Canaan" (v. 2), "Jacob dwelt in the land of Canaan" (v. 7), "Jacob and his twelve sons lived in the land of Canaan" (v. 9), and Joseph summoned his father from the "land of Canaan" (v. 10).

- the initial dream of Pharaoh that Joseph interpreted (*L.A.B.* 8:10; cf. Gen 41:1–36)
- Joseph’s leadership over Egypt (*L.A.B.* 8:10; Gen 41:37–57)
- the arrival of Jacob’s sons in Egypt to buy food (*L.A.B.* 8:10; cf. Gen 42:3, 7a)
- Joseph’s summoning of his father from Canaan (*L.A.B.* 8:10; cf. Gen 45:1–47:12)

Numerous significant events in Gen 12–50 are not mentioned in *L.A.B.* 8. Gen 22 (the Akedah) is exemplary in this regard. Pseudo-Philo omitted the Akedah from *L.A.B.* 8 but cited it three times elsewhere in *L.A.B.* as a significant event in Israel’s sacred history (*L.A.B.* 18:5; 32:2–4; 40:5).

***Conclusions concerning the Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Israel’s Ancestors in L.A.B. 1–8***

What impact, then, did reward and punishment have upon Israel’s ancestors in *L.A.B.* 1–8? Surprisingly, reward and punishment had little impact upon the establishment of the Noahic covenant (as depicted in *L.A.B.* 1–3) or in life under the Noahic covenant (as depicted in *L.A.B.* 4–5). The surprise is two-fold. First, wickedness and the need for punishment are downplayed in postdiluvian humanity to the extent that humanity appears even worse off after the flood (i.e. in *L.A.B.* 4–5) than it was before (i.e. in *L.A.B.* 1–2). Second, the realization of punishment is downplayed throughout *L.A.B.* 1–5. Punishment is meted out only once in the first five chapters of *L.A.B.* (i.e. in *L.A.B.* 3:4–7). Even Cain is not subjected to divine punishment in *L.A.B.* 2. The sole reprimand he faced for having killed Abel was the provision of a certain land in which to live (*L.A.B.* 2:1). The inheritance of land is not a punishment.

If reward and punishment is of secondary importance for humanity living under the Noahic covenant in *L.A.B.* 1–5, what, then, is of primary importance for them? Ultimately, the answer is that unexplained divine mercy appears to be front and centre at all key junctures of the narrative. For reasons that remain unexplained, God: (1) chose Israel prior to the creation of the world (*L.A.B.* 28:4), (2) deemed that Noah would be in Israel’s lineage, and (3) restrained the hand of punishment from the postdiluvian humanity. As long as Noah remained alive, divine mercy was extended to the human race.

The impact of reward and punishment upon the Abrahamic covenant is more difficult to ascertain than the impact of reward and punishment on the Noahic covenant. Based on our previous analysis of *L.A.B.* 6–8, Pseudo-Philo’s interweaving of the scriptural Babel narrative (Gen 11:1–9) in his reworking of the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant suggests that he understood that reward and punishment played a major role in the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant. First, Pseudo-Philo divided the participants in the first part of the tower narrative into three groups: (1) the people of the land, (2) the leaders, and (3) the twelve dissenters. Second, Pseudo-Philo singled out one individual from the second and third groups who was different from his peers. Joktan is differentiated from Nimrod and Fenech when he is identified as coming from the same tribe as the dissenters and as one who served their God (*L.A.B.* 6:6). Abraham is differentiated from Nahor, Lot, Ruge, Tenute, Zaba, Armodat, Jobab, Esar, Abimahel, Saba, and Aulin (*L.A.B.* 6:11; cf. 6:3) when he alone refuses Joktan’s offer of refuge and stays to face the people’s wrath. Abraham is shown to be one who trusts God more than his peers. He is thrown into the furnace and is saved by God from it.

The spectacular conclusion to the narrative depicts the punishment of thousands of the builders through death in the fire caused by the earthquake and the reward of the twelve dissenters through life and freedom from oppression. The narrative singles out Abraham for his trust in God but it concludes with all twelve dissenters receiving the same reward. In *L.A.B.* 6, Abraham receives no added benefit for his trust in God, which differentiates him from his peers.

After *L.A.B.* 6:1–7:3, however, there is little need for further justification for the divine declaration in *L.A.B.* 7:4 that Abraham would be the recipient of God’s covenant. God could have made no other choice than to select Abraham as the covenant partner. Therefore, when the scenario repeats itself in *L.A.B.* 7 with the resumption of the tower project, Abraham receives the due reward for the trust that he exhibited in *L.A.B.* 6 and the tower builders receive punishment for their actions. Abraham is promised a lasting covenant relationship with God (*L.A.B.* 7:4) while the tower builders are promised unfettered divine wrath (*L.A.B.* 7:3, 4).

Despite the emphasis that Pseudo-Philo placed upon reward and punishment within his reworking of the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant, Pseudo-Philo believed that the Abrahamic covenant was established upon long-standing divine promises rather than upon the principles of reward and punishment. *L.A.B.* 4:11, for example, illustrates that the Abrahamic covenant was promised generations before Abraham's birth. Pseudo-Philo avoided any suggestion that God might be capricious in the election of Abraham by depicting Abraham in glowing terms but the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant is not connected to the reward and/or punishment of Abraham. Ultimately, Abraham's election in *L.A.B.* must be considered in a greater context than just the immediate context within which the narrative occurs (i.e. *L.A.B.* 6–7). Abraham was chosen as God's covenant partner because he was a key ancestor of the people of Israel whom God had chosen before the creation of the world (*L.A.B.* 28:4).

Overall, Pseudo-Philo in *L.A.B.* 1–8 exemplifies E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in his depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors. Despite the apparent prominence given to reward and punishment in *L.A.B.* 1–8, reward and punishment has no discernible impact upon Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors' getting in and staying in their respective covenants. While Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors consistently are depicted in a positive light, divine mercy is *the* reason that these covenants are established and continue to exist.

### 3: The Reward and Punishment of the Israelite Covenant Community as a Whole in *L.A.B.*

In this chapter, our quest to determine whether *L.A.B.* exemplifies E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel continues with a comparative analysis of the impact of reward and punishment upon the Israelite covenant community as a whole in *L.A.B.* and in the Jewish Scriptures. In general, are Pseudo-Philo's omissions, additions, changes, and adaptations to the scriptural account of Israel's history consistent with Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism? To this end, we will focus on the impact of reward and punishment on: (1) the establishment of the nation of Israel as the covenant community and (2) the nation of Israel's continuation as the covenant community.

#### ***The Establishment of the Mosaic Covenant in L.A.B.***

Pseudo-Philo's primary account of the establishment of the Mosaic covenant is contained in *L.A.B.* 11, a highly selective reworking of Exod 19–31. *L.A.B.* 11 opens with a brief statement concerning the arrival at Sinai of the "children of Israel" (*filiorum Israel*; *L.A.B.* 11:1a),<sup>1</sup> an almost verbatim citation of Exod 19:1 (see Table 3.1, row 1). This is followed by an otherwise unknown divine aside in which the reader of *L.A.B.* is given a cryptic explanation for the events that will take place at Sinai ("And God remembered his words . . .," *L.A.B.* 11:1b; see Table 3.1, row 2). Pseudo-Philo's account of Israel's arrival at Sinai omits four key elements found in the scriptural narrative:

---

<sup>1</sup> In *L.A.B.*, a frequent designation for the Israelites is the "children of Israel" (*filiorum/filiis/filii/filios Israel*) in *L.A.B.* 11:1, 5, 15; 12:1; 14:3. They also are identified as God's "people" (*populo suo*, *L.A.B.* 11:6; *plebem meam*, *L.A.B.* 14:1) and God's "vine" (*vineam tuam*, *L.A.B.* 12:8; *vinee tue*, *L.A.B.* 12:9; *vineam eius*, *L.A.B.* 18:10; *vineam quam plantavit dextera tua*, *L.A.B.* 39:7; see also *plantatio me*, *L.A.B.* 28:4). In the scriptural Sinai narrative (Exod 19:1–Num 10:10), the most common designation for the Israelites is the "children of Israel" (בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל). This phrase appears 142 times between Exod 19:1 and Num 10:10.

1. further details concerning Israel's arrival at Sinai (Exod 19:2)
2. God's offer that the children of Israel may become God's "treasured possession out of all the peoples" if they "obey" God's "voice" and "keep" God's "covenant" (Exod 19:3–6; esp. v. 5)
3. the children of Israel's acceptance of God's terms (Exod 19:7–8, esp. v. 8)
4. the explanation that God was coming "in a thick cloud" so that the children of Israel would "hear" and "trust" God (Exod 19:9)

Table 3.1. Israel's Arrival at Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11:1)

<b><i>L.A.B.</i> 11</b>	<b>Exodus</b>
And in the third month after the sons of Israel had gone forth from the land of Egypt, they came into the wilderness of Sinai (v. 1a)	On the third new moon after the Israelites had gone out of the land of Egypt, on that very day, they came into the wilderness of Sinai. (19:1)
and God remembered his words and said, "I will give a light to the world and illumine their dwelling places and establish my covenant with the sons of men and glorify my people above all nations. For them I will bring out the eternal statutes that are for those in the light, but for the ungodly a punishment." (1b)	

Pseudo-Philo followed his account of the children of Israel's arrival at Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11:1; cf. Exod 19:1) with a selective and eclectic account of the children of Israel's consecration (*L.A.B.* 11:2–3; cf. Exod 19:10–15; see Table 3.2) focused on sexual abstinence.<sup>2</sup> Included in this passage is an otherwise unknown speech in which God declares that the Law will be revealed through Moses<sup>3</sup> and that all humanity, including those who have never known God's Law, will be held accountable to this law (*L.A.B.* 11:2b; see Table 3.2, row 7). Pseudo-Philo omitted from this account the directives that the community must wash their clothes (Exod 19:10) and that boundaries be established around the mountain (Exod 19:12–13).

<sup>2</sup> In Lev 15:18, sexual intercourse between a man and a woman that involves the discharge of semen renders the man and the woman ritually impure until evening. See also Lev 22:4–7; Deut 23:10–11.

<sup>3</sup> See Exod 4:12–16, Isa 51:16, Isa 59:21, and Jub 8:20 for the language Moses used to communicate the divine revelations to the children of Israel ("and I will put my words in your mouth," *L.A.B.* 11:2).



Table 3.2. Israel's Preparation (L.A.B. 11:2–3)

<i>L.A.B. 11</i>	<i>Exod 19</i>
And he said to Moses, "Behold <u>I will call you</u> tomorrow;	Then Moses went up to God; <u>the LORD called to him</u> from the mountain, saying, (19:3a)
be prepared	"and <u>prepare</u> for the third day," (19:11)  " <u>Prepare</u> for the third day;" (19:15)  "Be <u>ready</u> in the morning," (34:2)
and <u>tell my people</u> ,	"Thus you shall say to the house of Jacob, and <u>tell the Israelites</u> :" (19:3b)
'For <u>three days</u> let no man <u>approach his wife</u> .'	"Prepare for the <u>third day</u> ; do not <u>go near a woman</u> ." (19:15)
and <u>on the third day</u> I will speak to you and to them. (v. 2a)	"because <u>on the third day</u> the LORD will come down upon Mount Sinai in the sight of all the people." (19:11b)
And afterward <u>you will come up to me</u> , and <u>I will put my words in your mouth</u> , and <u>you will enlighten my people</u> ,	The LORD said to Moses, " <u>Come up to me on the mountain</u> , and wait there; and I will give you the tablets of stone, with the law and the commandment, <u>which I have written for their instruction</u> ." (24:12)  " <u>I will put my words in the mouth</u> of the prophet" (Deut 18:18)
for I have given everlasting Law into your hands and by this I will judge the whole world. For this will be a testimony. For even if men say, 'We have not known you, and so we have not served you,' therefore I will make a claim upon them because they have not learned my Law." (v. 2b)	n/a
And Moses did what God commanded him, and he consecrated the people and said to them, "Be prepared on the third day, <u>because after three days God will establish his covenant with you</u> ." And the people were consecrated." (v. 3)	So Moses went down from the mountain to the people. He consecrated the people, <u>and they washed their clothes</u> . And he said to the people, "Prepare for the third day; <u>do not go near a woman</u> ." (19:14–15)

Pseudo-Philo followed his account of the children of Israel’s consecration (*L.A.B.* 11:2–3; cf. Exod 19:10–15) with a description of the celestial signs that heralded the commencement of the giving of the Law (*L.A.B.* 11:4–5; cf. Exod 19:16–19). He slightly reworked Exod 19:16–17a in *L.A.B.* 11:4 (see Table 3.3, row 1), based *L.A.B.* 11:5a loosely on Exod 19:18 (see Table 3.3, row 2),<sup>4</sup> and added descriptions of the event not found in the Exodus account into *L.A.B.* 11:5b (see Table 3.3, row 1). Pseudo-Philo also inserted a brief description of the Law into his description of the celestial signs in *L.A.B.* 11:5b. Finally, he omitted the note that Israel stood at the foot of Mount Sinai (Exod 19:17b) and omitted God’s command (Exod 19:20–25) for Moses to keep the children of Israel away from the “holy” mountain (v. 23) by establishing boundaries around it.

Table 3.3. Celestial Signs (*L.A.B.* 11:4–5)

<i>L.A.B.</i> 11	Exod 19
And on the third day there were claps of thunder and the brightness of lightning, and the sound of trumpets sounded aloud. Terror came upon all the people who were in the camp. And Moses brought the people out before God. (v. 4)	On the morning of the third day there was thunder and lightning, <u>as well as a thick cloud on the mountain</u> , and a blast of a trumpet so loud that all the people who were in the camp trembled. Moses brought the people out of the camp to meet God. (19:16–17a)
	As the blast of the trumpet grew louder and louder, Moses would speak and God would answer him in thunder. (19:19)
And behold the mountains burned with fire, and the earth quaked, and the hills were disturbed, and the mountains were rolled about, (v. 5a)	Mount Sinai was wrapped in smoke, <u>because the LORD had descended upon it in fire</u> ; the smoke went up like the smoke of a kiln, while the whole mountain shook violently. (19:18)
and the abysses boiled, and every habitable place was	n/a

<sup>4</sup> For *montes ardebant igni* (*L.A.B.* 11:5), see also Exod 24:17; Deut 5:4–5, 22–23. For *et terra tremuit, et colles con turbati sunt, et montes voluebantur, et abyssi ebulliebant, et omne habitabile movebatur* (*L.A.B.* 11:5), see Sir 16:17–20; Joel 2:10–11; 3:14–16; Ps 68:7–8; Nah 1:3–6; 4; Es 16:8–14; Ps 46:1–6; 104:31–32; 2 Sam 22:7–16; Ezek 38:19–20.

---

**L.A.B. 11**

**Exod 19**

---

shaken, and the heavens were folded up, and the clouds drew up water, and flames of fire burned, and thunders and lightnings were many, and winds and storms roared, the stars gathered together, and angels ran on ahead, until God should establish the Law of his eternal covenant with the sons of Israel and give his eternal commandments that will not pass away. (v. 5b)

---

With three key exceptions, Pseudo-Philo's reworking of the Decalogue in *L.A.B.* 11:6–13 contains the complete (albeit lightly edited) text of the Exod 20:1–17 (see Table 3.4). These exceptions are:

1. Pseudo-Philo's conflation of the first commandment (*no other gods*, Exod 20:3) and the second commandment (*no idols*, Exod 20:4–5)<sup>5</sup> into one commandment (*L.A.B.* 11:6; see Table 3.4, rows 1-2).<sup>6</sup>
2. Pseudo-Philo's omission of the proscription against the worship of idols (Exod 20:5a; see Table 3.4, row 8).
3. Pseudo-Philo's omission of the eighth commandment (*no theft*, Exod 20:15; see Table 3.4, row 2).<sup>7</sup>

A minor difference in the text is that the sixth (*no murder*, Exod 20:13) and seventh (*no adultery*, Exod 20:14) commandments are reversed (*L.A.B.* 11:10–11; see Table 3.4, rows 6-7).<sup>8</sup> However,

---

<sup>5</sup> Early exegetes of the Jewish Scriptures divided the first two commandments of the Decalogue in different ways. For some, Exod 20:2 is the first commandment and Exod 20:3–4 is the second commandment (e.g. *Tg. Neof.* Exod 20:2–3). For others, Exod 20:2 is the prologue to the Decalogue, Exod 20:3 is the first commandment, and Exod 20:4 is the second commandment (e.g. Philo, *Decal.* 51; Josephus, *Ant.* 3:91). This study shall follow the latter system for enumerating the commands of the Decalogue (see Table 3.4, column 3).

<sup>6</sup> The first and second commandments also are conflated in the lists of commandments in *L.A.B.* 44:6 and in *L.A.B.* 44:7.

<sup>7</sup> The eighth commandment is inserted before the sixth commandment in the lists of commandments in *L.A.B.* 44:6 and in *L.A.B.* 44:7.

<sup>8</sup> The seventh commandment also is before the sixth commandment in Exod 20:13–15 (*no adultery*, v. 13; *no theft*, v. 14; *no murder*, v. 15). The order of the commandments in the two lists of commandments in *L.A.B.* 44:6–7 is (1) *no theft*, (2) *no murder*, and (3) *no adultery*.

Pseudo-Philo added statements that are unparalleled in the Exodus account into his rewriting of the Decalogue in *L.A.B.* 11:6–13.

Table 3.4. The Decalogue in *L.A.B.* 11:6–13 and in Exod 20

<i>L.A.B.</i> 11	Exod 20	Commandment Number
“I am the Lord your God who led you forth from the land of Egypt, from the house of slavery. (v. 6a)	“I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery; (v. 2)	
<i>You shall not make for yourselves graven gods; (v. 6b)</i>	<i><u>you shall have no other gods before me (v. 3)</u></i>	<b>1</b>
	<i>You shall not make for yourself <u>an idol</u>, (v. 4a)</i>	<b>2</b>
neither shall you <u>make</u> any abominable image of the sun and moon or of any of the ornaments of heaven; nor shall you <u>make</u> a likeness of any of the things that are upon the earth or of those things that crawl in the water or upon the earth. (v. 6c)	whether in the form of anything that is in heaven above, or that is on the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. (v. 5a)	
n/a	You shall not <u>bow down</u> to them or <u>worship</u> them; (v. 5a)	
I am the Lord your God, a jealous God and <u>visiting</u> until the third and fourth generation the sins of them that sleep on the living sons of the ungodly (v. 6d)	for I the LORD your God am a jealous God, <u>punishing</u> children for the iniquity of parents, to the third and the fourth generation of those who reject me (v. 5b)	
if they will walk in the ways of their parents, (v. 6e)	n/a	
but acting <u>mercifully</u> for a thousand generations to those who love me and keep my commandments. (v. 6f)	but showing steadfast <u>love</u> to the thousandth generation of those who love me and keep my commandments. (v. 6)	
<i>You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain, (v. 7a)</i>	<i>You shall not make wrongful use of the name of the LORD your God, (v. 7)</i>	<b>3</b>
lest my ways be made empty. (v. 7b)	n/a	
For God <u>detests</u> him who takes his name in vain. (v. 7c)	for the LORD <u>will not acquit</u> anyone who misuses his name. (v. 7)	

<b>L.A.B. 11</b>	<b>Exod 20</b>	<b>Commandment Number</b>
<i>Take care to sanctify the Sabbath day. (v. 8a)</i>	<i>Remember the Sabbath day, and keep it holy. (v. 8)</i>	<b>4</b>
Work for six days, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD. You shall not do any work on it, you and <u>all your help</u> , (v. 8b)	Six days you shall labor and do all your work. But the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God; you shall not do any work-- <u>you, your son or your daughter, your male or female slave, your livestock, or the alien resident in your towns.</u> (vv.9-10)	
except to praise the LORD in the assembly of the elders and to glorify the Mighty One in the council of the older men. (v. 8c)	n/a	
For in six days the Lord made the heaven and the earth and the sea and all, things that are in them (v. 8d)	For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, (v. 11)	
and all the world and the uninhabitable wilderness and all things that labor and all the order of heaven. (v. 8e)	n/a	
And God rested on the seventh day. Therefore, God sanctified the seventh day <u>because he rested on it.</u> (v. 8f)	but rested the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and consecrated it.	
<i>Love your father and your mother, and you shall honor them, (v. 9a)</i>	<i>Honor your father and your mother, (v. 12)</i>	<b>5</b>
and then your light will rise. And I will command the heaven, and it will give forth its rain, and the earth will give back fruit more quickly. (v. 9b)	n/a	
And you will live many days and dwell in your land, (v. 9c)	so that your days may be long in the land that the LORD your God is giving you. (v. 12)	
and you will not be without sons, for your seed will not be lacking in people to dwell in it. (v. 9d)	n/a	
<i>You shall not commit adultery, (v. 10a)</i>	<i>You shall not commit adultery. (v. 13)</i>	<b>7</b>
because your enemies did not commit adultery against you, but you came forth with a high hand. (v. 10b)	n/a	
<i>You shall not kill, (v. 11a)</i>	<i>You shall not murder. (v. 15)</i>	<b>6</b>

<b>L.A.B. 11</b>	<b>Exod 20</b>	<b>Commandment Number</b>
because your enemies had power over you so as to kill you, but you saw their death. (v. 11b)	n/a	
n/a	<i>You shall not steal. (v. 14)</i>	<b>8</b>
<i>You shall not be a false witness against your neighbor, speaking false testimony, (v. 12a)</i>	<i>You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor. (v. 16)</i>	<b>9</b>
lest your guardians speak false testimony against you. (v. 12b)	n/a	
<i>You shall not covet your neighbor's house or what he has, (v. 13a)</i>	<i>You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or male or female slave, or ox, or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbor." (v. 17)</i>	<b>10</b>
lest others should covet your land." (v. 13b)	n/a	

*Note:* See Table 4.4 for a comparison of the Decalogue in Exod 20 and Pseudo-Philo's flashback to the Decalogue in *L.A.B.* 44:6–7.

Most of the statements that Pseudo-Philo added into his reworked Decalogue are interpretive in nature. In keeping with his well-documented belief in moral causality, Pseudo-Philo added a qualifier to the divine declaration that subsequent generations will be punished for the sins of their parents (*L.A.B.* 11:6; cf. Exod 20:5): only those who “walk in the ways of their parents” will share in their parents’ punishments. Into the third commandment, Pseudo-Philo inserted the cryptic statement that God’s name should not be taken “in vain lest my ways be made empty” (*L.A.B.* 11:7; cf. Exod 20:7). To the fourth commandment, he added a statement permitting the worship and praise of God on the Sabbath (*L.A.B.* 11:8b). Pseudo-Philo also emphasized God’s creation of everything, even the “uninhabitable wilderness” (*L.A.B.* 11:8) in this commandment. Into the fifth commandment, Pseudo-Philo added a statement that links the observance of this commandment with the enjoyment of covenant blessings (*L.A.B.* 11:9a, c). The reward language in *L.A.B.* 11:9a (“And I will command the heaven, and it will give forth its rain, and the earth will give back fruit more quickly”) parallels *L.A.B.* 13:10 where the promise is

given that, if the children of Israel “walk” in God’s “ways,” God will “bless their seed.” Included in these blessings are the promises that “the earth will quickly yield its fruit, and there will be rains for their advantage, and it will not be barren” (*L.A.B.* 13:10).<sup>9</sup> Pseudo-Philo justified the sixth and seventh commandments with appeals to Israel’s pre-history (*L.A.B.* 11:11), omitted the eighth commandment, and urged obedience to the ninth commandment because its violation may lead to their “guardians” speaking “false testimony” against them (*L.A.B.* 11:6). He then urged obedience to the tenth commandment because its violation could lead to others coveting their land (*L.A.B.* 11:13).

Pseudo-Philo followed his reworking of God’s revelation of the Decalogue to Israel with a description of the fear that it caused among the Israelites (*L.A.B.* 11:14; cf. Exod 20:18–20; see Table 3.5). *L.A.B.* 11:14 differs from its scriptural counterpart in minor ways. For example, the wording of *L.A.B.* 11:14a differs from that of Exod 20:18 (see Table 3.5, row 1) but the differences do not have a great impact upon the meaning. The thunder, lightning, trumpet sounds, and smoke from the mountain that frighten the Israelites in Exod 20:19 are described aptly in *L.A.B.* 11:14a as the people hearing God “speaking” (cf. Exod 19:19) and the people seeing a “mountain burning with torches of fire.” *L.A.B.* 11:14b differs from Exod 20:19 (see Table 3.5, row 2) by omitting the people’s promise to “listen” to what Moses would say and including a statement that the revelation of the Decalogue had shown the children of Israel that it was possible to hear God and live (cf. Exod 19:9). The sole unmatched material in *L.A.B.* 11:14 is the people’s declaration to Moses (v. 14c) that even “the earth has borne the voice with quaking” (cf. *L.A.B.* 11:5).<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> The language in *L.A.B.* 13:10 is derived from Lev 26:3–5 (“If you follow my statutes and keep my commandments and observe them faithfully, I will give you your rains in their season, and the land shall yield its produce, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit. Your threshing shall overtake the vintage, and the vintage shall overtake the sowing; you shall eat your bread to the full, and live securely in your land”). See also Lev 26:10; Deut 28:4–5, 11–12; 30:5, 8–9.

<sup>10</sup> The earth’s response to God’s voice (*L.A.B.* 11:14c) parallels that of Israel (*L.A.B.* 11:1a). In the Jewish Scriptures, the earth is frequently described as “*trembling* at God’s presence” but the significance of this declaration within *L.A.B.* 11:14 remains uncertain (Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:477). Perhaps this relates back to Lamech’s inclusion of the earth as humanity’s co-beneficiary of the rest from wicked

Table 3.5. Israel's Fear (*L.A.B.* 11:14)

<i>L.A.B.</i> 11	Exodus
And when the LORD ceased speaking, the people were very much afraid, because they saw the mountain burning with torches of fire. (v. 14a)	When all the people witnessed the thunder and lightning, the sound of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking, they were afraid and trembled and stood at a distance (20:18)
And they said to Moses, "You speak to us, but do not let God speak to us lest perhaps we die. <u>For behold today we know that God speaks at a man face to face and that man may live.</u> (v. 14b)	and said to Moses, "You speak to us, <u>and we will listen</u> ; but do not let God speak to us, or we will die" (20:19)
And now we have recognized that the earth has borne the voice with quaking." (v. 14c)	
And Moses said to them, "Do not fear. For God has come to test you that you yourselves should to fear him so that you will not sin." (v. 14c)	Moses said to the people, "Do not be afraid; for God has come only to test you and to put the fear of him upon you so that you do not sin." (20:20)

Pseudo-Philo concluded his highly selective reworking of Exod 19–31 with *L.A.B.* 11:15, a one-verse synopsis of Exod 20:21–31:18. Pseudo-Philo opened *L.A.B.* 11:15 with a slightly reworked quotation from Exod 20:21 (*L.A.B.* 11:15a; see Table 3.6, row 1) which introduces Moses's time with God. The inclusion of two words differentiates *L.A.B.* 11:15a from Exod 20:21 (MT): (1) "all" the people stand back<sup>11</sup> and (2) Moses walks "knowing" that God is in the cloud (cf. Exod 19:9).<sup>12</sup> *L.A.B.* 11:15b summarizes several scriptural encounters between God and Moses and states that God "told" Moses of "his statutes and his judgments" and commanded him "many things" (see Table 3.6, row 2). The progression of events in *L.A.B.* 11:15 is somewhat

---

humanity that he anticipated would be realized in Noah's lifetime (*L.A.B.* 1:20). Neither the earth nor humanity realized this rest following the establishment of the postdiluvian Noahic covenant (*L.A.B.* 3:9–10) or following the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant (*L.A.B.* 8:3). With the revelation of the law at Sinai, all humanity would now be held accountable (*L.A.B.* 11:2) as had been promised following the flood (*L.A.B.* 3:9–10).

<sup>11</sup> The word "all" is absent in the MT, LXX, and Vulgate but, according to Jacobson (*Commentary*, 1:477), the word "all" is present in the Lucianic recension of the LXX and in the Old Latin.

<sup>12</sup> Exodus 20:21 does not state specifically (as Pseudo-Philo does) that Moses knew that God was in the cloud, but, according to Exod 19:9, Moses had been informed that God would come in a cloud.



simpler than the progression in Exod 20:21–31:18. One journey up the mountain in *L.A.B.* 11:15 takes the place of the two separate journeys up the mountain in Exod 20:21 and Exod 24:9, 15, and 18.<sup>13</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s highly abbreviated account of God’s revelations to Moses on Sinai focuses upon the content of Exod 25:1–31:18 (see Table 3.6, rows 4-7). The revelations to Moses in Exod 20:22–23:33 are not referenced in *L.A.B.* 11:15. Also absent from *L.A.B.* 11:15 is any reference to the covenant ceremony of Exod 24:1–11. Pseudo-Philo also included in *L.A.B.* 11:15c a brief (albeit anachronistic) reference to the waters of Marah (see Table 3.6, row 3; cf. Exod 15:22–27).<sup>14</sup>

Table 3.6. Moses Meets with God (*L.A.B.* 11:15)

<i>L.A.B.</i>	Exodus
And <u>all</u> the people stood far off, but Moses drew near the cloud, <u>knowing</u> that God was there, (v. 15a)	Then the people stood at a distance, while Moses drew near to the thick darkness where God was. (20:21)
And then God told him his statutes and his judgments, and he detained him forty days and forty nights. And there he commanded him many things (15b)	Moses was on the mountain for forty days and forty nights. (24:18)
and showed him the tree of life, from which he cut off and took and threw into Marah, and the water of Marah became sweet, And it followed them in the wilderness forty years and went up to the mountain with them and went down into the plains. (v. 15c)	n/a

<sup>13</sup> In the scriptural account, Moses ascends the mountain (Exod 20:21) to receive divine revelation from God (Exod 20:22–23:22). Moses descends the mountain to “tell the people all the words of the Lord” (Exod 24:3). After a brief covenant ceremony (Exod 24:3b–8), Moses, Nadab, Abihu, and the elders ascend (Exod 24:9) and have an encounter with God (Exod 24:10–11). Afterwards, Moses and Joshua ascend the mountain (Exod 24:15) only to return many days later to find that Israel has constructed a golden calf (Exod 34:15).

<sup>14</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s anachronistic reference in *L.A.B.* 11:15 to the waters of Marah stands out because it interrupts the seemingly logical progression from v. 15a to v. 15b to v. 15d. Kugel, *Traditions*, 628, suggested that the *waters of Marah* that in *L.A.B.* 11:15 “followed them in the wilderness forty years” was the “the Torah” as revealed to Moses on Sinai but there is no clear evidence in *L.A.B.* 11:15 that Pseudo-Philo intended to make this connection (Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:478).

<i>L.A.B.</i>	Exodus
And he commanded him about the <u>tabernacle</u> and the <u>ark of the LORD</u> and about the <u>sacrifice of burnt offerings</u> and <u>incense</u> and about <u>setting up the table</u> and the <u>candlestick</u> and about the <u>laver and its basin</u> and about the <u>ephod and the breastplate</u> and about the <u>precious stones</u> , (v. 15d)	Exodus 25:1–9; 26:1–37; 27:9–21 (“tabernacle”); 25:10–22 (“ark of the Lord”); 27:1–8; 29:38–46 (“sacrifice of burnt offerings”); 30:1–10; 22–38 (“incense”); 25:23–30 (“setting up the table”); 25:31–40 (“candlestick”); 30:17–21 (“laver and its basin”); 28:1–43 (“ephod and the breastplate and . . . precious stones”).
so that the sons of Israel might make these things. (15e)	So the sons of Israel did all the work according to all that the LORD had commanded Moses. (39:42; also 39:32, 43)
And he showed him their likeness in order that he might make them according to the pattern that he had seen. (15f)	“Then you shall erect the tabernacle according to its plan which you have been shown in the mountain.” (26:30; also 25:40; 27:9)
And he said to him, “Make me a sanctuary and the tent of my glory will be among you.” (15g)	“In accordance with all that I show you concerning the pattern of the tabernacle and of all its furniture, so you shall make it.” (25:8–9)
	“And have them make me a sanctuary, so that I may dwell among them.” (25:8)

Ten flashbacks to the establishment of the Mosaic covenant in *L.A.B.* 15:5–6; 19:8–9; 22:5; 23:10; 28:4–5; 30:5; 32:7–8; 44:6–7; 47:4; 53:8 supplement Pseudo-Philo’s primary account in *L.A.B.* 11:1–15. These flashbacks are not contained in their corresponding scriptural accounts. Divine judgment against a sinful Israel sets the stage for six of the eight flashbacks.

In *L.A.B.* 15:5–6; 30:5; 44:6–7; 53:8, Pseudo-Philo inserted unparalleled speeches in which God (or an authorized spokesperson, cf. *L.A.B.* 30:5) recalls Sinai while pronouncing (cf. *L.A.B.* 15:6; 44:6–7; 53:8) and/or explaining (cf. *L.A.B.* 30:5) divine judgment. This divine judgment is pronounced upon either the nation of Israel (*L.A.B.* 15:6; 30:5), a part thereof (i.e. the priesthood in *L.A.B.* 53:8), or both the whole nation and a part (*L.A.B.* 44:6–7).<sup>15</sup> In this chapter, God declares the imminent destruction of Israel because they have abandoned and

<sup>15</sup> The judgments pronounced against Micah and his mother are extended to include not just these two individuals but also “all who sin against me” (44:10).

disbelieved God (vv. 5–6). Later, in *L.A.B.* 30, the nation of Israel mourns and calls out to God for mercy (v. 4) after having been punished (vv. 2–3) for turning away from God (v. 1). God’s reply, via the prophetess Deborah, informs them of their former status before God (“like a flock before our Lord,” v. 5). God “led” them into the “height of the clouds,” established the Law with them, and showed them “not a few wonders” (e.g. God commanding the luminaries, enemies being destroyed by hailstones, v. 5). Nevertheless, Israel did not obey Moses, Joshua, Kenaz, and Zebul (v. 5). Again, in *L.A.B.* 44, God recalls Sinai while pronouncing divine judgment on Micah, his mother, and “all who sin against me” (v. 10). In this speech, God reviews the giving of the Decalogue, describes how Israel affirmed its contents (v. 6), and shows how Israel violated these laws (v. 7). Finally, in *L.A.B.* 53, God recalls Sinai while explaining divine judgment on the priesthood to young Samuel (53:8). The recollection of Sinai here is very brief.

In *L.A.B.* 19:8–9 and 22:5, Pseudo-Philo inserted speeches into his rewriting of the scriptural account. In these speeches, one of Israel’s leaders recalls Sinai while anticipating future divine judgment. In *L.A.B.* 19, Moses learns from God that, in the distant future, Israel and its place of worship will be destroyed (v. 7). He then pleads for God to have mercy on Israel, the “chosen race,” “loved . . . before all others” (v. 8), the people whom God freed from Egypt (v. 9), and the people to whom God “gave . . . laws and statutes in which they might live and enter as sons of men” (v. 9). *L.A.B.* 19:9 concludes with Moses’s recognition that God will “correct” Israel and with an appeal to God not to use “anger” when applying this correction.<sup>16</sup> In *L.A.B.* 22, Joshua confronts the Israelite tribes on other side of the Jordan (vv. 2–7) who have constructed an altar and a sanctuary and are offering sacrifices to God (v. 1). Central to Joshua’s exhortation is the directive to meditate on God’s law rather than create a new cultic centre on the other side of the Jordan. Joshua refers here to the golden calf incident at Sinai (i.e. the construction of the golden calf, cf. *L.A.B.* 12:2–3) when Moses “went up to receive the tablets” (v. 5; cf. *L.A.B.* 12:1).

---

<sup>16</sup> Similar sentiments are found in the Jewish Scriptures. “Correct me, O LORD, but in just measure; not in your anger, or you will bring me to nothing” (Jer 10:24). See also Ps 6:2 (ET 6:1) and Ps 38:2 (ET 38:1).

The consideration of future divine blessings for Israel provides the context for the flashbacks to Sinai in *L.A.B.* 23:10 and 32:7–8. In *L.A.B.* 23, God (cf. *L.A.B.* 23:3–4) reviews Israel's history from the time of Abraham (v. 4) until Israel's settlement in Canaan (v. 11). Conducted through Joshua, this review refers to God's deliverance of Israel from Egypt and God's revelation of the Law to Israel (*L.A.B.* 23:10). It explains the revelation of the Law as constituting their enlightenment "in order that by doing these things they would live and have many years and not die" (*L.A.B.* 23:10). This history review concludes with the promise of great blessings (v. 12) and "life eternal" (v. 13). In *L.A.B.* 32, Deborah reviews select events in Israel's history from the time of Abraham (v. 1) until her present age (v. 11–12). She uses a song (v. 1) to relate that Israel cried out to God in Egypt and that God heard their prayer and "brought them out of there and brought them to Mount Sinai" (v. 7). At Sinai, God "brought forth for them the foundation of understanding" that had been "prepared for them from the creation of the world" (v. 7). Deborah also describes the wonders that took place at that time (vv. 7–8), including the creatures coming together "to see the Lord establishing a covenant with the sons of Israel" (v. 8).

***The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon the Establishment of the Israelite Covenant Community in L.A.B.***

In *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, E. P. Sanders briefly considered the possibility that at least some adherents to early Judaism believed that reward and punishment had an impact upon the establishment of the Mosaic covenant at Sinai. He argued that rabbinic literature presents three possible explanations for why God chose Israel:

1. "God offered the covenant (and the commandments) to all, but only Israel accepted it"<sup>17</sup>
2. "God chose Israel because of some merit found either in the patriarchs or in the exodus generation or on the condition of future obedience"<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 87 (explained on pp. 88–89).

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 87 (explained on pp. 89–98).

3. "God chose Israel for his name's sake"<sup>19</sup>

Sanders concluded that the Rabbinic literature provides "no clear doctrine" because the Rabbis could not "give up the idea of reward for merit; nor could they accept capriciousness on God's part" in the election of Israel.<sup>20</sup> Although Sanders stated that "the cause of election goes unexplained" in rabbinic literature, he clearly emphasized the priority of divine mercy in Israel's election when he stated that "God's love cannot be earned."<sup>21</sup>

Sanders's treatment of the rabbinic views for why God chose Israel is a helpful model for our consideration of whether or not *L.A.B.* exemplifies covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact of reward and punishment upon the Israelite covenant community. The reward and punishment motif is present in Sanders's first two categories listed above, namely (1) that all humanity was offered the covenant and its commandments and (2) that God chose Israel because of past, present, or future merit. Are these explanations or any other explanation present in *L.A.B.*? If so, did Pseudo-Philo give priority to these explanations for God's election of Israel or does some other explanation ultimately rule the day in *L.A.B.*?

Through the omission of Exod 19:3–8 and Exod 24:1–8 from his primary account of the establishment of the Mosaic covenant, Pseudo-Philo downplayed the possibility that the covenant might have been a reward for the children of Israel's acceptance of the covenant and its commandments. Unlike in the scriptural account, the children of Israel are not given an opportunity to either accept or reject the covenant and its commandments in *L.A.B.* 11 when they first arrive at Sinai (cf. Exod 19:7) or during the formal covenant ceremony (cf. Exod 24:7). Instead, God in *L.A.B.* 11 appears to impose unilaterally the Mosaic covenant and its Law upon the children of Israel. Pseudo-Philo later affirmed that the children of Israel *agreed* to obey the

---

<sup>19</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 88 (explained on pp. 99–100).

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 100–101.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.

Decalogue following its revelation (*L.A.B.* 44:6; cf. Exod 24:7), but he stopped short of depicting them as receiving a *choice* to accept the covenant as in Exod 19:3–8.

Concerning the possibility that Pseudo-Philo believed that God chose the children of Israel because of past merit, nothing in *L.A.B.* 11 suggests this. In addition to our discussions of the establishment of covenants with Noah (*L.A.B.* 3:9–12) and with Abraham (*L.A.B.* 8:3), there is a statement in *L.A.B.* 18:5 that might be construed as stating that God chose the children of Israel because of the merit of past generations. *L.A.B.* 18:5 states that God “chose” (*elegi*) Israel “on account of his blood (*pro sanguine eius*).” The phrase “his blood” most logically refers to Isaac, Abraham’s offering.<sup>22</sup> This identification is not without difficulty for nothing in *L.A.B.* 18:5 (or, for that matter, elsewhere in *L.A.B.*) suggests that Isaac lost even one drop of blood or that he was injured physically during the incident when Abraham offered him to God.<sup>23</sup> Despite this difficulty, *L.A.B.* 18:5 states little more concerning Israel’s election than what is contained in the scriptural passage being reworked. In Gen 22, the “angel of the Lord” responds to Abraham’s willingness to sacrifice Isaac with a reaffirmation of the covenant promises. This passage establishes a clear causal relationship between Abraham’s action and the promises: “Because you have done this and have not withheld (וְלֹא הִשְׁכַּחְתָּ) your son, your only son, I will indeed bless you . . .” (Gen 22:16–17). The focus in *L.A.B.* 18 is not upon *why* or *when* God chose Israel but on

---

<sup>22</sup> It is grammatically possible that “his blood” in *L.A.B.* 18:5 could refer to Abraham’s blood but this does not make sense logically.

<sup>23</sup> The view that Isaac was injured and bled is not present in Second Temple period Jewish literature but it is present in some late rabbinic texts (e.g. *Num. Rab.* 17.2). A much earlier rabbinic text (*Mekilta* R.I.) refers somewhat cryptically to “the blood of Isaac’s Aqedah” but, as Isaac Kalimi observed in “Go, I Beg You, Take Your Beloved Son and Slay Him! The Binding of Isaac in Rabbinic Literature and Thought,” *RRJ* 13 (2010): 21, it is not clear whether this text presumes that Isaac was injured and bled during the incident or whether it follows the interpretation of *Gen. Rab.* 56.9 and presumes that God viewed the ram’s blood “as if it were the blood of Isaac.” Some late rabbinic texts even espouse the view that Isaac was not only injured but that he actually died as a result and later came back to life (e.g. *Midrash Haggadol* on Gen 22:12).

the fact that Israel is chosen by God. God's speech to Balaam in *L.A.B.* 18:5–6 traces God's blessing of Israel, the chosen seed of Abraham, through three generations:

1. Abraham met God in a vision and he was given promises concerning his *seed* (*L.A.B.* 18:5).
2. Abraham's son Isaac was a willing sacrifice as "on account of his blood I chose them" (*L.A.B.* 18:5).
3. Isaac's son Jacob wrestled with an angel and did not let go until he was blessed (*L.A.B.* 18:6).

These examples served as a warning to Balaam: "And do you propose to go forth with them to curse whom I have chosen? But if you curse them, who will be there to bless you?" (*L.A.B.* 18:6).

Another passage in *L.A.B.* that bears consideration at this juncture is *L.A.B.* 19:8–9, Pseudo-Philo's account of Moses's final intercession on Israel's behalf. Judith H. Newman's contention that Pseudo-Philo, through his use of the so-called "divine attribute formula" in *L.A.B.* 19:8–9, depicted Moses as "securing an eternal covenant" for Israel "at a time when his righteous merit was at its most potent"<sup>24</sup> bears brief mention. Newman's essay overlooks the fact that, despite Moses's fears, Israel's covenant status is not really in jeopardy at the time of Moses's speech in *L.A.B.* 19:8–9. It only *appears* to be in jeopardy. As Rhonda Burnette-Bletsch observed, "the disparity between reality and human perception" is "an important theme" in *L.A.B.*<sup>25</sup> If "the disparity between reality and human perception" as it pertains to the Israel's survival as God's covenant people during the Mosaic era in *L.A.B.*, is overlooked, it is easy to reach the incorrect conclusion that Moses's intercession on Israel's behalf ultimately was *the* deciding factor in its preservation and continuance as God's covenant people. Pseudo-Philo's

---

<sup>24</sup> Judith H. Newman, "The Staff of Moses and the Mercy of God: Moses's Final Intercession in Pseudo-Philo 19," in *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala; TBN 10; Leiden: Brill, 2008): 140. See also Scott J. Hafemann, "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey," *JSP* 7 (1990) who likewise incorrectly contended that, at key junctures in Pseudo-Philo's Moses narrative, "Moses's intercession" on Israel's behalf "is consistently" that which "engages" the "covenantal faithfulness" that God demonstrates towards Israel (p. 98).

<sup>25</sup> Rhonda Burnette-Bletsch, "At the Hands of a Woman: Rewriting Jael in Pseudo-Philo," *JSP* 17 (1998): 58.

perspective is that which is engaged already (i.e. God's covenantal faithfulness toward Israel) does not require engagement. Ultimately, in *L.A.B.*, God's plan takes place despite human interventions and failures.

There is no suggestion in *L.A.B.* that God chose to establish the Mosaic covenant with the children of Israel because of its merit. However, *L.A.B.* 14 suggests that merit determines which Israelites would be included in the covenant community. *L.A.B.* 14, a reworking of the scriptural account of the census of the children of Israel conducted before their departure from Sinai (Num 1–9), states that, because of their unbelief in Egypt, God “put to death” (*mortificavi*)<sup>26</sup> a vast majority of the children of Israel (*L.A.B.* 14:1, 4).<sup>27</sup> Only a small remnant of Israel remained. This remnant was “consecrated” (*sanctificavi*) to God. The word “consecrated” brings together God's statements to Moses on Mount Sinai concerning the children of Israel (Exod 19:3–6) and God's command that Moses consecrate the children of Israel at Sinai (Exod 19:10–15). The surviving remnant who are consecrated (*L.A.B.* 11:2–3; cf. Exod 19:10–15) are chosen from among the children of Israel (*L.A.B.* 14:4)<sup>28</sup> rather than chosen as a “treasured possession out of all the peoples” (Exod 19:5). The primary messages in *L.A.B.* 14 are: (1) that

---

<sup>26</sup> The declaration in *L.A.B.* 14:4 that God “put to death the whole crowd of them” is the second statement in *L.A.B.* 14 concerning the children of Israel's “death” in Egypt. The first is the simple declaration in *L.A.B.* 14:1 that the majority of Israel's ancestors died in the land of Egypt.

<sup>27</sup> *L.A.B.* 14 states that “forty-nine parts” of the children of Israel “died in the land of Egypt” (v. 1) “because they did not believe in me” (v. 4). The depiction of Israel in Egypt seen in *L.A.B.* 14:4 also parallels in part Ezek 20:6–14. Ezekiel 20 states that, while the nation of Israel was in Egypt, it was exceedingly sinful. It was a nation of idolaters and rebels who refused to listen to God (Ezek 20:7–8a). The parallel between *L.A.B.* 14:4 and Ezek 20:6–14 is not complete because Ezek 20:8b–10 states that God contemplated punishing the Israelites in Egypt for their sinfulness but, instead, delivered them “for the sake of my name” (Ezek 20:8b–10).

<sup>28</sup> The language utilized in *L.A.B.* 14:4 also partially parallels the description of the selection of the Levites from among Israel in Num 8. Numbers 8:17 states that God “consecrated” (הִקְדִּישְׁתִּי) for himself “all the firstborn” (כָּל־בְּכוֹרֵי) in Israel and “struck down (הִכִּיתִי) all the firstborn (כָּל־בְּכוֹרֵי) in the land of Egypt (בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם).” While both *L.A.B.* 14:4 and Num 8:17 depict the consecration to God of a small portion of Israel in the context of a large number of people being killed, the identities of the ones consecrated and the ones killed differ in the two passages. In *L.A.B.* 14:4, the Israelites who did not believe in God are killed while a small portion of Israel is sanctified. In Num 8:17, the firstborn Egyptians are killed while the Levites are consecrated in the place of the firstborn Israelites.



God will be faithful to honour the Abrahamic covenant and (2) that the selection of people to be consecrated in *L.A.B.* 14:4 is intra-covenantal.

In *L.A.B.* 14, Pseudo-Philo juxtaposed a flashback to the children of Israel's sojourn in Egypt to a flashback to the Abrahamic covenant (*L.A.B.* 14:2) and the scriptural promise of many offspring for Abraham.<sup>29</sup> Central to this are his powerful affirmations of God's intent to fulfill the covenant promises, including statements such as "until I fulfill (*donec adimpleam*) all that I have spoken (*omnia que locutus*) to their fathers" and "not a single word (*nullum verbum*) from what I have spoken (*de quibus locutus*) to their fathers will I renege on (*minueram*)" (*L.A.B.* 14:2). The chief promise highlighted in this context is the Abrahamic promise of numerous descendants: "I said to them, 'Your seed will be like the stars of heaven in multitude'" (*L.A.B.* 14:2; cf. Gen 22:17).<sup>30</sup> The land promise is not presented as the central promise to be fulfilled but, rather, is the context in which the promise of numerous offspring will be fulfilled. God in *L.A.B.* 14:2 assures Moses that, despite the troubles that were encountered in the land of Egypt, Abraham's chosen descendants (i.e. the children of Israel) will become numerous again because God will faithfully honour the Abrahamic covenant.

*L.A.B.* 9:1–10:1, Pseudo-Philo's primary account of the children of Israel's oppression in the land of Egypt, depicts events much differently than *L.A.B.* 14. *L.A.B.* 9 omits two key points of the *L.A.B.* 14 account: (1) God killed the majority of the children of Israel in Egypt because of their unbelief and (2) God "consecrated" only a small remnant of them (*L.A.B.* 14:4). In *L.A.B.* 9:1–10:1, Pseudo-Philo divided the primary characters into three groups: (1) the Egyptians, (2)

---

<sup>29</sup> Abraham is promised that he will become a great nation (Gen 12:2), that his offspring will be innumerable like the dust of the earth (Gen 13:16; 22:17; 28:14) and the stars of heaven (Gen 15:5; 22:17; 26:4), that he will be the ancestor of many of nations (Gen 17:4–6; 35:11), and that he will be exceedingly fruitful (Gen 17:5).

<sup>30</sup> "I will make your offspring as numerous as the stars of heaven" (Gen 22:17). See also "He brought him outside and said, 'Look toward heaven and count the stars, if you are able to count them.' Then he said to him, 'So shall your descendants be'" (Gen 15:5), and "I will make your offspring as numerous as the stars of heaven" (Gen 26:24).

the oppressed children of Israel, and (3) Amram.<sup>31</sup> The king of the Egyptians, seeking to control Israel's rapidly growing population,<sup>32</sup> mandated that all male Hebrew babies be thrown into the river (*in flumen abicite*) and killed (*interficiamus*) and that all female Israelite babies be raised as wives for the slaves of the Egyptians (*ut eas nostris demus servis in uxores*; *L.A.B.* 9:1).<sup>33</sup> The

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *L.A.B.* 6 where the primary characters in the narrative are divided into three main groups: (1) the tower builders, (2) the twelve dissenters, and (3) Abraham.

<sup>32</sup> *L.A.B.* 9:1, *multiplicati sunt filii Israel et creverunt valde* (cf. Exod 1:7). The description in Exod 1:7 of Israel's proliferation in Egypt (פָּרוּ וַיִּשְׂרְצוּ וַיִּרְבוּ) parallels the language encountered in the Genesis creation and flood accounts. In Gen 1:28, God commands the newly created humanity to "Be fruitful (פָּרוּ) and multiply (וַיִּרְבוּ), and fill (וַיִּמְלְאוּ) the earth." Following the flood, God likewise commands Noah and his family to "Be fruitful (פָּרוּ) and multiply (וַיִּרְבוּ), and fill (וַיִּמְלְאוּ) the earth" (Gen 9:1). The verbal sequence in Exod 1:7 most closely parallels Gen 9:7 in which God commands postdiluvian humanity to "Be fruitful (פָּרוּ) and multiply (וַיִּרְבוּ), abound (וַיִּשְׂרְצוּ) on the earth and multiply (וַיִּרְבוּ) in it."

Neither the Egyptian king in *L.A.B.* 9 nor the Egyptian king in Exod 1 seeks the total eradication of the Hebrew people. This contrasts with Josephus (*Ant.* 2:204) who suggests that the Egyptian king's plan ultimately involved Israel's destruction rather than just its oppression. The Egyptian king in Exod 1 notes that the Israelites are numerous (רַב, v. 9; cf. וַיִּרְבוּ, v. 7) and powerful (וַעֲצוּם, v. 9; cf. וַיַּעֲזְמוּ בְּמַאֲד מְאֹד, v. 7) and he fears that, if the Israelites continue to increase (וַיִּרְבּוּ), they will "join our enemies and fight against us and escape (וַיִּעַלְקוּ) from our land" (v. 10). The fact that the Egyptian king's goal in Exod 1 is not Israel's destruction is also evident in the interaction between Moses and the Egyptian king later in Exodus. The Egyptian king protests that Israel's proposed journey into the wilderness would take the Israelites away from their appointed duties (Exod 5:4–8). After the Israelites were finally permitted to leave (Exod 12:31–33; 13:17), the Egyptian king and his officials realized they had made a mistake in letting "Israel leave our service" (כִּי־שָׁלַחְנוּ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַבְדֵּנוּ; Exod 14:5). No mention is made of them expressing regret that the Israelites remained alive. Rather, Egypt is depicted as needing Israel's labour. Likewise, the Egyptian king in *L.A.B.* 9:1 fears that the Israelites will become more numerous than their own people (*Ecce populus iste multiplicatus est magis quam nos*; v. 1) and he seeks a means to ensure that the Israelites will "not increase" (*ut non multiplicetur*). The Egyptian king's successful ambition to maintain the Israelites as a controlled slave population also is affirmed in *L.A.B.* 9:11 with the declaration that the Israelites were "humiliated (*humiliabantur*) and worn down (*aggravati*) in making bricks."

<sup>33</sup> There is no parallel in the scriptural account for the portion of the edict in *L.A.B.* 9:2 in which the female Hebrew babies are kept alive as future wives for their slaves. A late rabbinic text, *Exodus Rabbah* 1:18, includes the female Hebrew babies in the Egyptian plan but the female Hebrew babies eventually become the Egyptian's own wives rather than their slaves' wives. Other Jewish sources suggest that the Egyptians specifically excluded the female Hebrew babies from their edict because, as Philo writes, a "woman is, by her natural weakness (διὰ φύσεως ἀσθένειαν), unfit for warfare (ἀκνηρὸν εἰς πόλεμον)" (*Mos.* 1:8).

Although grim, the scenario depicted in *L.A.B.* 9:1 pales in comparison to the scenario in its scriptural counterpart, Exodus 1. The scriptural account depicts Egyptian oppression as commencing with forced labour (Exod 1:11). When this proved unsuccessful ("the more they were oppressed, the more they multiplied and spread," Exod 1:12), the Egyptians increased the ruthlessness of the forced labour (Exod 1:13–14). The Egyptian Pharaoh even commanded the midwives who delivered the Hebrew babies to kill all male children (Exod 1:16) but this, too, did not bring about the desired reduction of the Hebrew population (Exod 1:17–21). Thus, according to the scriptural account, the edict depicted in *L.A.B.* 1:1 concerning the male Hebrew babies was only enacted (Exod 1:22) after previous attempts to control the Israelite population proved unsuccessful.

elders of the children of Israel responded to this mandate with an edict that forbade<sup>34</sup> sexual intercourse between men and women in their community (*L.A.B.* 9:2).<sup>35</sup> The elders believed that it was preferable (*Melius est*) to “die without sons” (*sine filiis mori*) than to let their offspring be “defiled” (*contaminetur*) or “serve idols” (*idolis serviant*).<sup>36</sup> It does not appear that the elders considered their edict as anything more than a temporary measure until God intervened on their behalf (*L.A.B.* 9:2).<sup>37</sup>

One Israelite man, Amram, did not share the elder’s uncertainty.<sup>38</sup> Amram thought he knew what God would do and when it would be done (*L.A.B.* 9:3–6). Citing as his authority God’s covenant promises to Abraham in Gen 15:13,<sup>39</sup> Amram contended that the children of Israel’s

---

<sup>34</sup> Lit., they “set up rules” (*constituamus nobis terminos*)” against sexual relations. Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:403, plausibly suggested that Pseudo-Philo here (*terminos*) likely utilized a Hebrew word that has a suitably broad semantic range such as חֶק (“portion,” “limit,” “boundary,” “statute”). The Vulgate reads *terminus* where the MT reads חֶק in Job 14:5; 26:10; 38:10; Prov 8:29; Isa 5:14; Jer 5:22. Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1975),” 122–123, interpreted *terminos* as a chronological reference: “Und nun laßt uns aufhören und für un bestimmte Zeiten festsetzen . . . .” Dietzfelbinger (*ibid.*, 105 n. 2c) contended that, in *L.A.B.*, *terminos* always connotes “eine aufhaltende Grenze, sei es im zeitlichen” (*L.A.B.* 3:2; 9:2; cf. Feldman, “Prolegomenon,” xci). In *L.A.B.* 15:6 and 51:3, however, Dietzfelbinger translated *terminus* with *Grenzen* (“boundaries”).

<sup>35</sup> Lit. “a man should not approach his wife,” *non appropinquet mulieri sue vir. Appropinquare* occurs nine other times in *L.A.B.* (5:2; 19:13; 23:1; 28:1; 32:5, 10; 33:1; 59:4; 64:7) but only in *L.A.B.* 32:5 is it used to refer to sexual intercourse.

<sup>36</sup> See Ezekiel 20:7–8 in which the Israelites are depicted as worshipping idols while in Egypt: “And I said to them, Cast away the detestable things your eyes feast on, every one of you, and do not defile yourselves with the idols of Egypt (וּבְגִלּוֹי מִצְרַיִם); I am the LORD your God. But they rebelled against me and would not listen to me; not one of them cast away the detestable things (אֶת־שִׁקּוּצֵי) their eyes feasted on, nor did they forsake the idols of Egypt (וְאֶת־גִּלּוֹי מִצְרַיִם).” A partial parallel to the elder’s fear that their offspring would become idol worshippers (*L.A.B.* 9:2) is *t. Sotah* 15.10 in which there is a prohibition against sexual relations because the Egyptians had forbidden the observance of Torah.

<sup>37</sup> “. . . until we know what God may do” (*donec sciamus quid faciat Deus, L.A.B.* 9:2). The qualification that the elders attached to their edict is similar to the qualification that David attached to a request for the king of Moab to shelter his parents: “Please let my father and mother come to you, until I know what God will do (Vulg., *donec sciam quid faciat mihi Deus*; MT, עַד אֲשֶׁר אֵדַע מִהַיַּעֲשֶׂה־לִּי אֱלֹהִים, (1 Sam 22:3).

<sup>38</sup> Amram’s opposition to the elders’ edict stands in *L.A.B.* 9 in contrast to *b. Sotah* 12a in which Amram proposes sexual abstinence (and even divorce) as a means by which to thwart the Egyptian plan.

<sup>39</sup> “Then the LORD said to Abram, “Know this for certain, that your offspring (וְיִרְעֶדָה) shall be aliens (גֵּר) in a land that is not theirs, and shall be slaves there, and they shall be oppressed for four hundred years” (Gen 15:13).

time in Egypt was almost at an end<sup>40</sup> and, thus, they would not have to cast their newborn sons into the river (*L.A.B.* 9:6) in accordance with the Egyptian plan. The children of Israel's population would not be diminished (*minuatur*, *L.A.B.* 9:3)<sup>41</sup> by the Egyptian king's edict. Amram, therefore, urged his peers to defy the elders' edict and produce children so that the children of Israel "may be made many (*amplificemur*) on the earth" (*L.A.B.* 9:4).<sup>42</sup> At this point in the narrative, Pseudo-Philo interrupted his account of Israel's oppression in Egypt to state that God approved of Amram's plan (*L.A.B.* 9:7–8):

And God said, "Because Amram's plan (*verbum*) is pleasing to me, and he has not put aside the covenant established between me and his fathers, so behold not he who will be born from him will serve me forever, and I will do marvelous things in the house of Jacob through him and I will work through him signs and wonders for my people that I have not done for anyone else; and I will act gloriously among them and proclaim to them my ways. And I, God, will kindle for him my lamp that will abide in him, and I will show him my covenant that no one has seen. And I will reveal to him my Law and statutes and judgments, and I will burn an eternal light for him, because I thought of him in the days of old, saying, 'My spirit will not be a mediator among these men forever, because they are flesh and their days will be 120 years.'" (*L.A.B.* 9:7–8)

---

<sup>40</sup> In *L.A.B.* 9:3, Pseudo-Philo portrayed Amram as calculating that Israel's sojourn in Egypt would end in 50 years (i.e. the children of Israel's 400 years total in Egypt minus the 350 years already completed). This conflicts with Pseudo-Philo's statement in *L.A.B.* 53:2 that Moses, born after the events of *L.A.B.* 9:3, was 80 years old during the burning bush episode, an event that took place prior to Israel's exodus from Egypt. Three hundred and fifty years from the time of the promise plus 80 years until the time of the exodus results in a period of 430 years from the promise until the exodus rather than the 400 years noted in *L.A.B.* 9:3. Pseudo-Philo appeared to be oblivious to this chronological difficulty. The chronological difficulties in *L.A.B.* 9:3 parallel the chronological difficulties concerning Israel's sojourn in Egypt as recorded in the Jewish Scriptures (cf. Gen 15:13; Exod 12:40).

<sup>41</sup> The phrase reads *quam genus filiorum Israel minuatur* in Latin (*L.A.B.* 9:3). Harrington ("Pseudo-Philo," 2:315) and Jacobson (*Commentary*, 1:104) translated the phrase as referring to the prospect of Israel's destruction (Harrington, "ended"; Jacobson, "destroyed"). As Jacobson seemed to recognize (*Commentary*, 1:405), however, *minuatur* (from *minuo*, "to make smaller, to lessen, diminish") likely reflects the Hebrew verb *מעט* (to be or become few, be diminished). If that is the case, Pseudo-Philo in *L.A.B.* 9:3 did not refer to Israel's potential destruction or demise but, rather, to its reduction. For this sense of *מעט*, see Lev 26:22, "I will let loose wild animals against you, and they shall bereave you of your children and destroy your livestock; they shall make you few in number (MT וְהִמְעִטָּה אֶתְכֶם), and your roads shall be deserted."

<sup>42</sup> The two possible outcomes that Amram presents in *L.A.B.* 9:3–4 echo the Jewish Scriptures. When the nation of Israel has sinned against God, its population will decrease (Lev 26:21; Ezek 29:15; cf. *minuatur*, *L.A.B.* 9:3). When it is obedient to God, its numbers will increase (Ps 107:38–39; Jer 29:6; 30:19; cf. *amplificemur*, *L.A.B.* 9:4).

Thus, God promises in *L.A.B.* 9:7–8 that Amram’s offspring will receive a leading role in the implementation of the covenant and in the nation’s future. Amram’s male offspring (i.e. Moses) “will serve me forever (*serviet in eternum*)” (v. 7).<sup>43</sup> Through Moses, God will “do marvelous things (*faciam mirabilia*)” in Israel and previously unknown “signs and wonders (*signa et prodigia*)” for God’s people (*L.A.B.* 9:7).<sup>44</sup> Furthermore, God will “act gloriously” in Israel<sup>45</sup> and will “proclaim to them my ways” (*L.A.B.* 9:7).

Amram’s plan met with apparent failure in that the Egyptian plan “prevailed” (lit. “grew strong,” *invallescebat*) against Israel (*L.A.B.* 9:11).<sup>46</sup> The apparent failure of Amram’s plan is accentuated, at least for Israel’s elders, when Amram and Jochebed cast Moses into the river (*L.A.B.* 9:13).<sup>47</sup> This is the last allusion to Amram’s seemingly unsuccessful plan in *L.A.B.* Moses’s birth narrative concludes with an extremely abbreviated account of the miraculous preservation of baby Moses (*L.A.B.* 9:15), of Moses’s maturation into a man who was “glorious above all other men” (*L.A.B.* 9:16), and of God’s deliverance through Moses of the children of Israel (*L.A.B.* 10:1). Unlike in *L.A.B.* 14:4, where God is said to have killed the vast majority of the children of Israel because of their unbelief, all Israel shares in the deliverance in *L.A.B.* 9:16–10:1.

In *L.A.B.* 11:1b, Pseudo-Philo offered only one explanation for God’s decision to establish the Mosaic covenant with Israel at Sinai:

---

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *Deus in eternum* (*L.A.B.* 7:4); *precepta eterna* (*L.A.B.* 11:5); *vita eterna* (*L.A.B.* 23:13).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *L.A.B.* 9:10, “And I will work signs through him and save my people, and he will exercise leadership always.” *L.A.B.* 42:5, “Behold I am not worthy to hear the signs and wonders that God has done among us or to see the face of his messenger.”

<sup>45</sup> Cf. *L.A.B.* 6:1; 9:7; 23:8; 32:1; 35:5; 51:7.

<sup>46</sup> *Invallescere* occurs in *L.A.B.* 20:9 with the sense of “prevailing” against enemies.

<sup>47</sup> Note the elders’ derisive comments to Amram and Jochebed in *L.A.B.* 9:14. “Are not these our words that we spoke, ‘It is better for us to die without having sons than that the fruit of our womb be cast into the waters?’” According to the elders, the non-existence of these children is preferred over their slaughter at the hands of the Egyptians. Many newborn children were slaughtered in accordance with the Egyptian plan (*L.A.B.* 9:12; cf. 9:1). However, Pseudo-Philo omitted Exod 1:12–21 in which numerous Israelite children were spared through the actions of the two midwives of the Hebrews. Moses, the offspring conceived because of Amram’s plan, becomes the one whom God uses to deliver Israel (*L.A.B.* 9:16).

and God remembered his words and said, "I will give a light to the world and illumine their dwelling places and establish my covenant with the sons of men and glorify my people above all nations. For them I will bring out the eternal statutes that are for those in the light, but for the ungodly a punishment.

*L.A.B.* 11:1b has no parallel in Exod 19 (see Table 3.1 above ) but it takes the place of God's offer of the covenant to the children of Israel in Exod 19:3–8.

. . . the LORD called to him from the mountain, saying, ". . . You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself. Now therefore, if you obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my treasured possession out of all the peoples. Indeed, the whole earth is mine, but you shall be for me a priestly kingdom and a holy nation. . . ." The people all answered as one: "Everything that the LORD has spoken we will do."

Pseudo-Philo's replacement of Exod 19:3–8 with *L.A.B.* 11:1b transforms a bilateral offer of a covenant (Exod 19) into a unilateral imposition of a covenant (*L.A.B.* 11). Rather than giving Israel the opportunity to accept the terms of the covenant that is offered to them (Exod 19:3–8), God in *L.A.B.* 11:1b declares that a covenant will be established and God states that "eternal statutes" will be brought out that will benefit some people and punish others.

The nearest possible antecedent in *L.A.B.* for the "words" which "God remembered" when Israel reached Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11:1b) is *L.A.B.* 9:7–8, the high point of Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of Israel's oppression in and deliverance from Egypt (*L.A.B.* 9:1–10:1; cf. Exod 1:1–2:10; 7:14–11:10; 12:29–30). However, *L.A.B.* 9:7–8 does not contribute to our understanding of Israel's election since it explains why *Moses was chosen* to mediate the establishment of the Mosaic covenant but it does not explain why *the nation of Israel was chosen* over other nations as God's covenant partner.<sup>48</sup> Other possible antecedents in *L.A.B.* for the "words" which "God remembered" when Israel reached Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11:1b) are God's prior promises concerning Israel. Foremost among these are the promises that God gives to humanity in *L.A.B.* 1–8. The "words" which "God remembered" when Israel reached Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11:1b) also have possible

---

<sup>48</sup> Contra Fröhlich, *Time and Times*, 179, who contended incorrectly that, because Amram "unconditionally believes in the covenant made with Abraham, and in the promise of the land," he actually "earns . . . the covenant" that God later "established with Moses." Fröhlich failed to recognize that in *L.A.B.* Amram does not earn the covenant *per se* as a reward but, rather, he earns the reward that his son will mediate the covenant. The difference between the two concepts is tremendous!

echoes of the declaration in Exod 2:23–24 that God “remembered (וַיִּזְכֹּר) his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob”<sup>49</sup> when the children of Israel “groaned (וַיִּאָנְחוּ) under their slavery and cried out (וַיִּזְעֻקוּ; v. 23).”<sup>50</sup> However, Pseudo-Philo replaced “his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob” with “his words,” thereby extending the declaration to include more than just the promises of the Abrahamic covenant.

Chief among the promises and/or hopes that culminate in the establishment of the Mosaic covenant is the belief that God’s relationship with Israel began before the creation of the world. According to *L.A.B.* 28:4, God determined prior to the creation of the world (*ante secula*)<sup>51</sup> that one “plant” (i.e. the nation of Israel) would be chosen from the “great vineyard” (i.e. the human race or, possibly, creation) and that this plant would be God’s “forever.” *L.A.B.* 28:4 does not state explicitly that Israel is the chosen plant, but this fact is clearly implied in *L.A.B.* 28:5 when the nation of Israel repents after hearing the parable of the wayward chosen plant of *L.A.B.* 28:4.<sup>52</sup> Likewise, *L.A.B.* 28:4 places God’s decision to elect Israel prior to the creation of the world, but it does not state if this decision was acted upon at that time. Two statements from *L.A.B.* 7:4 and from *L.A.B.* 39:7 fill in some of these gaps. The first statement concerns the land of Israel while the second concerns the nation of Israel:

And before all these I will choose my servant Abram, and I will bring him out from their midst and will bring him into the land upon which my eye has looked (*respexit*) from of old (*ab initio*), when all those inhabiting the earth sinned (*cum*

---

<sup>49</sup> The scriptural context of Exod 2:23–24 is reworked briefly in *L.A.B.* 10:1 (“But they cried out to the LORD, and he heard them”), but the declaration that “God remembered . . .” is absent.

<sup>50</sup> The Abrahamic connection is developed further in Exodus when the God of the exodus narrative is declared to be the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob (Exod 3:6, 15, 16; 4:5; 6:3) and the act of deliverance is described ultimately as the fulfillment of the promises given to Abraham (Exod 6:2–8; cf. Exod 3:8, 15–17).

<sup>51</sup> That *ante secula* in *L.A.B.* 28:4 refers to a time before everything was created is affirmed by Pseudo-Philo’s explanation later in the same verse that this was at a time when humanity had not been created (*in tempore quo non erat homo* (*L.A.B.* 28:4) and when God determined “the world would be created” (*fieret seculum*; *L.A.B.* 28:4).

<sup>52</sup> The plant is described in *L.A.B.* 28:4 as one that rose up, corrupted its “ways,” turned from God’s “commands,” “destroyed its own fruit,” and failed to “yield” its fruit to God.

*peccaverunt . . . omnes inhabitantes terram*) in my sight and I brought the water of the flood and I did not destroy it but preserved that land. . . . (*L.A.B.* 7:4)

Look, Lord, upon the people that you have chosen, and may you not destroy vine that your right hand has planted, in order that this nation which you have had (*habuisti*) from the beginning (*ab initio*) and always preferred (*pretulisti semper*) . . . . (*L.A.B.* 39:7)

The specific meaning(s) for *ab initio* in *L.A.B.* 7:4 and in *L.A.B.* 39:7 must be derived from their contexts. In the Latin Vulgate, *ab initio* is used in place of eleven different Hebrew words or phrases that carry one of two principal meanings:<sup>53</sup> (1) “from the beginning”<sup>54</sup> or (2) “(from) long ago.”<sup>55</sup> In *L.A.B.* 7:4, *ab initio* indicates the period during which God has given special care and attention to the land of Israel, most significantly sparing it from the ravages of the flood:<sup>56</sup> it is the land upon which [God’s] eye has looked *from of old* (*ab initio*). Some translations of *L.A.B.* separate *ab initio* (“from the beginning” or “from long ago”) and *cum peccaverunt . . . omnes inhabitantes terram* (“when all those inhabiting the earth sinned”) with a comma, thereby indicating that the *cum* clause qualifies *ab initio*.<sup>57</sup> According to this interpretation of *L.A.B.* 7:4, God’s eye began to look upon the land of Israel from *before the flood* when humanity became very sinful. However, the critical Latin text of *L.A.B.* and some translations of *L.A.B.* separate *ab initio* and the *cum* clause into two sentences,<sup>58</sup> thereby removing the necessity of a temporal connection between them. According to this interpretation of *L.A.B.* 7:4, God’s eye began to look upon the land of Israel before the flood and possibly as early as “the beginning” (*initio*) of the

---

<sup>53</sup> Of the sixteen occurrences of *ab initio* in the Vulgate translation of the Jewish Scriptures only Deut 13:7 [MT 13:8] (מִקְצֵה, “from the end”); Isa 43:13 (מִיּוֹם, “from the day”); Ezra 7:5 (הַרְאֵשׁ, “the chief”) do not fit into this pattern.

<sup>54</sup> Second Samuel 21:10 (מִתְחִלָּתָא); Eccl 3:11 (מִרְאֵשׁ); Isa 40:21 (מִרְאֵשׁ), 46:10 (מִרְאֵשִׁיתָא); Ezek 36:11 (מִרְאֵשׁ תִּיכֶם).

<sup>55</sup> Joshua 24:2 (מִעוֹלָם); 2 Kings 19:25 (לְמִרְחוֹק); Ps 73:2 [MT 74:2] (מִקְדָּם); 76:12 [MT 77:12; ET 77:11] (מִקְדָּם); 77:2 [MT 78:2] (מִגִּי־קְדָּם); Isa 45:21 (מִקְדָּם); Jer 28:8 (מִזְהַרְעוֹלָם); Mic 5:2 [MT 5:1] (מִקְדָּם).

<sup>56</sup> The view that the land of Israel was not touched by the flood also is found in rabbinic literature, the earliest examples of which date from the Amoraic period (*Gen. Rab.* 32:10).

<sup>57</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 95; Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1975),” 118; Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2:313.

<sup>58</sup> Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 98; Cazeaux in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 99; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:101.



world (e.g. *Initio mundi*, *L.A.B.* 1:1). Ultimately, however, the uncertainty surrounding *ab initio* makes the meaning “from long ago” preferred over the meaning “from the beginning.”<sup>59</sup> The meaning for *ab initio* in *L.A.B.* 39:7 is somewhat more straightforward to ascertain than it was in *L.A.B.* 7:4. Scholars have consistently translated *ab initio* in *L.A.B.* 39:7 as a reference to the beginning of the world (i.e. creation).<sup>60</sup> Key in this regard are the references to “planting” and the declaration that Israel was “always preferred” (*pretulisti semper*) by God.

For Pseudo-Philo, the establishment of the Mosaic covenant was the realization of long-unfulfilled hopes and promises. Lamech had hoped that, during Noah’s lifetime, the earth and its inhabitants would experience relief from wicked humanity (*L.A.B.* 1:20). After the flood, God had promised that humanity would be held accountable for their wickedness by a comprehensive program of reward and punishment in the present world and in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 3:9–10). Nevertheless, postdiluvian life differed little from its antediluvian counterpart. Sin was still pervasive and the promised comprehensive system of reward and punishment seemed nowhere to be seen. Long after the flood, these hopes remained unfulfilled. The fact the fulfillment of these hopes remained a future event is illustrated best with the words uttered by Melcha at the birth of her son Serug. Melcha, married to Shem’s great-great-great grandson,<sup>61</sup> anchored humanity’s hope in one whose birth was still four generations in the future. Under the leadership of this coming “perfect and blameless” one in the fourth generation, Melcha predicted (*L.A.B.* 4:11) there would come: (1) a wondrous time of divine law (“set his dwelling on high”), (2) an unbroken universal covenant, and (3) an eternal and numerous line of offspring.

---

<sup>59</sup> Jacobson (*Commentary*, 1:382) suggested that the Hebrew original behind *ab initio* in *L.A.B.* 7:4 is either בראשית (“in the beginning”) or מראשית (“from the beginning”).

<sup>60</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 190; Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1975),” 209; Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2: 352; Cazeaux in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 277; and Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:159.

<sup>61</sup> According to *L.A.B.* 4:9–11 (cf. Gen 10:22–25; 11:17–20), Melcha’s husband Reu was the son of Peleg who was the son of Eber who was the son of Shelah who was the son of Arpachshad who was the son of Shem.

If Melcha had lived to see Abraham's era, the one about whom she spoke in *L.A.B.* 4:11, she might have been disappointed. Pseudo-Philo's narrative depicts Abraham in glowing terms, but Melcha's predictions were not fulfilled in Abraham's generation. Instead, Abraham's era in *L.A.B.* was a time of turmoil with Abraham himself being singled out as the only one truly deserving of God's favour (*L.A.B.* 7:3–4). Lamech's hopes (*L.A.B.* 1:20), God's promises (*L.A.B.* 3:9–10), and Melcha's predictions (*L.A.B.* 4:11) do not begin to be fulfilled until Sinai when God "remembered his words" (*L.A.B.* 11:1b) and revealed to the children of Israel the Law to which all humanity will be held accountable (*L.A.B.* 11:2).

In sum, in *L.A.B.* reward and punishment does *not* have an impact upon the establishment of the Israelite covenant community. Unlike in the scriptural account (Exod 19:3–8; 24:1–11), the nation of Israel in *L.A.B.* 11 is not given the opportunity to accept or to reject the covenant. Pseudo-Philo did not attempt to justify God's decision to establish the Mosaic covenant with Israel rather than with any other nation or people group. Even Pseudo-Philo's discussion of God's selection of Israel reveals *when* God chose Israel (i.e. before the creation of the world, *L.A.B.* 28:4), but it does not explain *why* God chose Israel. In *L.A.B.*, God's decision to choose Israel remains unexplained.

***The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Life in the Israelite Covenant Community in L.A.B.***

The belief that God, in mercy, will keep the children of Israel eternally and unconditionally as the covenant community is foundational to E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism. Sanders conjectured that covenant was early Judaism's "principal soteriological category."<sup>62</sup> The *salvation* that early Jews believed was theirs through membership in the covenant community was contingent upon the certainty and security of the covenant community's status before God. Pseudo-Philo's chief consideration of this matter is contained in his rewriting of the scriptural Moses narrative in *L.A.B.* 12–19.

---

<sup>62</sup> Sanders, "Covenant as a Soteriological Category," 39.

In *L.A.B.*, the prospect that God might destroy or abandon Israel first comes to the forefront in Pseudo-Philo's reworked golden calf narrative (*L.A.B.* 12:1–10). The scriptural golden calf narrative refers to the possibility that God might destroy Israel (Exod 32:10) or abandon (Exod 33:1–3) Israel. God's declaration in Exod 32:10 states that divine "wrath" (אַפִּי) would "burn" (וַיִּחַר) against Israel and "consume" (וַאֲכַלֶּם) it. Under this scenario, Israel's place as God's people will be taken by Moses, whom God will make into a "great nation" (Exod 32:10; cf. Gen 12:2).<sup>63</sup> In the scriptural account, Moses averts this destruction when he implores God to consider the promises God gave to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 32:13) and to consider how the Egyptians would respond to Israel's destruction (v. 12). The prospect that God might abandon Israel comes to the forefront in Exod 33:1–3 when God threatens not to accompany them on the journey from Sinai to the Promised Land, a "land flowing with milk and honey" (v. 3). The reason stated is that, if God accompanies Israel on this journey, God will "consume them" (אֶכְלֶדָּה) because they are "a stiff-necked people" (עַם־קָשֵׁה־עֲרֹף, v. 3). After the Israelites mourn (v. 6) and Moses intercedes on their behalf (vv. 12–16), God agrees to accompany them (v. 17). Nevertheless, the possibility that God might destroy Israel during the journey remains (cf. Exod 33:3).

The prospect that God might destroy Israel, pivotal in the scriptural account, is reduced in *L.A.B.* 12:4 from a threat to destroy the nation of Israel (see Table 3.7, row 2) to a prediction that God will "forsake" (*relinquam*) Israel, and to a prediction that Israel's sinfulness someday will result in the destruction of a temple (lit. "house" for God; see Table 3.7, rows 6-7) that would not be built for many years in the future. Pseudo-Philo's inclusion of the prediction that the temple would be destroyed as punishment for Israel's sinfulness is not remarkable since Pseudo-Philo was a Jew living shortly after the second destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 C.E. The belief that Israel's sinfulness prompted God to destroy the first temple in 586 B.C.E. is

---

<sup>63</sup> The language is heightened in Deut 9:14 which states that God will: (1) destroy (וַאֲשַׁמְדֶם) Israel and "blot out (וַאֲמַחֶה) . . . from under heaven" its name, and (2) make Moses into "a nation mightier and more numerous" than Israel (לְגוֹי־עָצוּם וְרַב מִמֶּנִּי).

present in scriptural books such as Ezekiel (e.g. Ezek 5:5–12; see Table 3.7, row 7). Unlike the book of Ezekiel, which contains lengthy descriptions of a future Jerusalem temple (Ezekiel 40–48); Pseudo-Philo left the possibility of Israel’s restoration in the *present world* unresolved.<sup>64</sup>

Table 3.7. *L.A.B.* 12:4 and the Jewish Scriptures

<b><i>L.A.B.</i> 12:4</b>	<b>The Jewish Scriptures</b>
<p>The Lord said to Moses, “<u>Hurry from here</u>, because the people <u>have been corrupted</u> and <u>have turned aside from my ways that I commanded them</u>.”</p>	<p>The LORD said to Moses, “<u>Go down at once!</u> Your people, whom you brought up out of the land of Egypt, <u>have acted perversely</u>; they have been quick to <u>turn aside from the way that I commanded them</u>; they have cast for themselves an image of a calf, and have worshiped it and sacrificed to it, and said, ‘These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt!’” (Exod 32:7–8)</p> <p>Then the LORD said to me, “Get up, <u>go down quickly from here</u>, for your people whom you have brought from Egypt <u>have acted corruptly</u>. They have been quick to <u>turn from the way that I commanded them</u>; they have cast an image for themselves.” (Deut 9:12)</p>
<p>n/a</p>	<p>The LORD said to Moses, “I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are. Now let me alone, so that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them; and of you I will make a great nation.” (Exod 32:9–10)</p>
<p>What if the promises I made to your fathers had been fulfilled, when I said to them, ‘To your seed I will give the land in which you live.’</p>	<p>But Moses implored the LORD his God, and said, “O LORD, why does your wrath burn hot against your people . . . ? . . . Turn from your fierce wrath; change your mind and do not bring disaster on your people. Remember <u>Abraham, Isaac, and Israel</u>, your servants, how <u>you swore to them</u> by your own self, saying to them, ‘I will multiply your descendants like the stars of heaven, and <u>all this land that I have promised I will give to your descendants</u>, and they shall inherit it forever.’” (Exod 32:11–13)</p> <p>Then the LORD appeared to Abram, and said, “<u>To your offspring I will give this land</u>.” So he built there an altar to the LORD, who had appeared to him. (Gen 12:7; also 13:15; 15:7, 18; 17:18; 26:3)</p>

<sup>64</sup> Israel’s restoration in the *world to come*, however, is addressed in *L.A.B.* 19.

---

L.A.B. 12:4	The Jewish Scriptures
For behold the people have not even entered the land yet and already now are guilty, and they have abandoned me. Thus, I know that if they enter that land, they will do greater iniquities.”	“For when <u>I have brought them into the land flowing with milk and honey, which I promised on oath to their ancestors</u> , . . . they will turn to other gods and serve them, despising me and breaking my covenant . . . . <u>For I know what they are inclined to do even now, before I have brought them into the land that I promised them on oath.</u> ” (Deut 31:20–21)
n/a	And the LORD changed his mind about the disaster that he planned to bring on his people. (Exod 32:14)
“Now I in turn will abandon them, but I will turn again and be reconciled with them so that a house may be built for me among them,	“ <u>Go up to a land flowing with milk and honey; but I will not go up among you.</u> ” (Exod 33:3)  When all these things have happened to you, the blessings and the curses that I have set before you . . . then <u>the LORD your God will restore your fortunes and have compassion on you, gathering you again</u> from all the peoples among whom the LORD your God has scattered you. Even if you are exiled to the ends of the world, from there the LORD your God will gather you, and from there he will bring you back. <u>The LORD your God will bring you into the land that your ancestors possessed, and you will possess it; he will make you more prosperous and numerous than your ancestors.</u> (Deut 30:1–5)
a house that in turn will be destroyed because they will sin against me.	“Now let me alone, <u>so that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them</u> ; and of you I will make a great nation.” (Exod 32:10)  Thus says the Lord GOD: “This is Jerusalem; I have set her in the center of the nations, with countries all around her. But <u>she has rebelled against my ordinances and my statutes . . . rejecting my ordinances and not following my statutes</u> . . . therefore thus says the Lord GOD: I, I myself, am coming against you; I will execute judgments among you in the sight of the nations. And because of all your abominations, I will do to you what I have never yet done, and the like of which I will never do again. . . . I will execute judgments on you, and any of you who survive I will scatter to every wind. . . . <u>I will cut you down; my eye will not spare, and I will have no pity.</u> One third of you shall die of pestilence or be consumed by famine among you; one third shall fall by the sword around you; and one third I will scatter to every wind and will unsheathe the sword after them. . . .” (Ezek 5:5–12)

---

---

<b>L.A.B. 12:4</b>	<b>The Jewish Scriptures</b>
And the race of men will be to me like a drop from a pitcher and will be counted as spittle.”	“If all <u>the nations</u> have been accounted as a drop from a <u>jar</u> and as the sinking of a balance, <u>they will also be accounted as spittle.</u> ” (Isa 40:15 LXX)
	“You shall be a mockery and a taunt, a warning and a horror, to the nations around you, when I execute judgments on you in anger and fury, and with furious punishments – I, the LORD, have spoken.” (Ezek 5:15)

---

Source: Translation of *L.A.B. 12:4* from Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:111

Pseudo-Philo did not provide any details concerning the threat that God would “forsake” Israel (*L.A.B. 12:4*). It is possible that he envisaged the scenario presented in Exod 33:1–3 where it states that God will not accompany Israel when it enters the “land of which I [God] swore to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob” (v. 1). The covenant land promise will be fulfilled since God pledges to send an angel ahead of Israel to “drive out” (גרש) the present inhabitants of the land (v. 2) but God will not be with them (v. 3). The parallels between the proposed divine abandonment of Israel in Exod 33:1–3 and in *L.A.B. 12:4* are incomplete. The proposed divine abandonment of Israel in *L.A.B. 12:4* includes something not found in the scriptural version: it will be a *temporary* abandonment which will conclude when God “will turn again and make peace with” Israel (*L.A.B. 12:4*).

The punishment that God proposes in *L.A.B. 12:4* in part parallels a pattern that God later reveals to Moses (*L.A.B. 13:10*). According to this pattern, God will: (1) bless Israel when Israel walks in God’s “ways,” (2) abandon Israel when the nation corrupts its “ways,” and (3) reconcile with Israel in the future since God “will not forget them forever.” The pattern in *L.A.B. 13:10* partially parallels the pattern in Lev 26:3–45, Deut 28:1–68, and Deut 30:1–10 where God promises blessing when the nation is obedient (Lev 26:3–13; Deut 28:1–14), severe punishment when it is disobedient (Lev 26:14–39; Deut 28:15–68), and restoration following its time of

punishment (Lev 26:40–45; Deut 30:1–10). The parallel is not complete for, in Lev 26 and Deut 28 and 30, God scatters Israel rather than abandoning her.<sup>65</sup> In addition, in the scriptural passages, Israel's return to God is preceded by repentance and turning to God.<sup>66</sup> *L.A.B.* 13:10, however, merely states that God "will not abandon them forever" while repentance is reduced to the recognition that (1) they were punished "on account of their own sins" and (2) God is "faithful."

Central to this interpretation of *L.A.B.* 12:4 is an affirmation of Jacobson, Fisk, and others' contentions that, in this verse, God contemplated what would take place had the promises been fulfilled<sup>67</sup> and a rejection of Harrington and James's contentions that God contemplated abrogating the Abrahamic covenant.<sup>68</sup> In the pivotal phrase "*Quid si complete fuissent sponsiones,*" the Latin word *complete* conveys its more natural meaning "fulfilled" or "accomplished"<sup>69</sup> rather its more uncommon meaning "ended."<sup>70</sup> Key in this regard is the fact that, with the possible exception of this one word, nothing in *L.A.B.* 12:4 suggests that Pseudo-Philo believed that Israel's sinfulness at Sinai might result in God ceasing to fulfill the covenant

---

<sup>65</sup> "The LORD will scatter you among all peoples" (Deut 28:64; also Deut 30:3; Lev 26:33); cf. "I will abandon them" (*L.A.B.* 13:10).

<sup>66</sup> ". . . if you . . . return to the LORD your God, and you and your children obey him with all your heart and with all your soul . . . then . . ." (Deut 30:1–3; also Lev 26:40–42).

<sup>67</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:487–488; Bruce N. Fisk, "Scripture Shaping Scripture: The Interpretive Role of Biblical Citations in Pseudo-Philo's Episode of the Golden Calf," *JSP* 17 [1998]: 10. This interpretation also is implicit in the translations of Jacques Cazeaux in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 129 and of Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1975)," 134. Their translations are cited in footnote 69 below.

<sup>68</sup> Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:320; James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 111. See also Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 70; Christopher T. Begg, "The Golden Calf Episode According to Pseudo-Philo," in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction - Reception - Interpretation* (ed. Marc Vervenne; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 581–582.

<sup>69</sup> "What if the promises I made to your fathers had been fulfilled . . .?" (Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:111); "Que serait-ce si les promesses . . . étaient accomplies . . ." (Jacques Cazeaux in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 129); "Was wenn vollendet gewesen wären die Gelöbnisse . . .?" (Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1975)," 134); "What if the promises . . . had fully come to pass?" (Fisk, "Scripture Shaping Scripture," 9–10).

<sup>70</sup> "Are the promises . . . at an end?" (Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:320); "What and if the promises are at an end?" (James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 111).

promises that God gave the patriarchs. Indeed, the punishment pronounced in *L.A.B.* 12:4 presupposes the continuation of God's relationship with Israel. Despite Israel's sinfulness, God in *L.A.B.* 12:4 contemplates the future fulfillment of the covenant promises rather than their revocation!<sup>71</sup>

Somewhat of an incongruity exists between the punishment that God describes in *L.A.B.* 12:4 and the punishment that Moses fears in *L.A.B.* 12:8–9. The prospect that God might destroy Israel is absent from God's declaration in *L.A.B.* 12:4 but Moses's response to God in *L.A.B.* 12:8–9 focuses upon the prospect that God might destroy Israel. Moses, using the vine as a metaphor for Israel,<sup>72</sup> describes Israel as a vine planted by God (*Deus, qui plantasti vineam hanc, L.A.B.* 12:8).<sup>73</sup> This cosmic tree-like vine's<sup>74</sup> influence was pervasive, extending from its roots in the

---

<sup>71</sup> A partial scriptural parallel for God's words in *L.A.B.* 12:4 is Deut 31:20–21 in which God speaks to Moses concerning the sin that Israel will commit after God has brought Israel into the Promised Land as God "promised them on oath" (v. 20). Further details concerning Israel's future sinfulness and its repercussions for Israel are contained in vv. 16–18 of the same passage.

<sup>72</sup> In the Jewish Scriptures, sometimes the nation of Israel is described as a vine planted by God. See Ps 80:9–17 [ET 8–16], Isa 5:1–7; Jer 2:21; Ezek 19:10–14; Hos 10:1. The reference to Israel as a vine planted by God in Psalm 80 is particularly relevant for Moses' words in *L.A.B.* 12:8–9. In this Psalm, the Psalmist implores God to "turn again . . . look down from heaven, . . . see, have regard for this vine [Israel]" (v. 15) [ET v. 14] that God had previously brought out of Egypt and planted (v. 9 [ET v. 8]) in the land that God had prepared for it (i.e. Canaan; v. 10 [ET v. 9]). The transplanted vine had covered the trees and mountains (v. 10), extended to the river, and then reached the sea (v. 11) before it was ravaged (v. 14 [ET v. 13]). For more on the use of Psalm 80 in *L.A.B.*, see Robert Hayward, "The Vine and Its Products as Theological Symbols in First Century Palestinian Judaism," *DUJ* 82 [New Series 51] (Jan 1990): 9–18.

<sup>73</sup> Pseudo-Philo also included the imagery of the nation of Israel as God's chosen vine in other passages. Balaam (*L.A.B.* 18:10) refers to the nation of Israel as God's "vine" (*vineam*) and as "the planting of the Most Powerful" (*plantaginem Fortissimi*). Israel is "an overshadowing (*obumbrans*) and highly desirable (*desiderio*) vine (*vinea*)" that "does not wither (*non marcescit*)" (*L.A.B.* 18:11). Joshua (*L.A.B.* 23:12) describes the nation of Israel as a "desirable vine" (*vineam desiderii*) and as a "loveable flock" (*gregem amabilem*). Phinehas (*L.A.B.* 28:4) recalls that, in Eleazar's vision, God declared that, "before the creation of the world" (*ante secula*), God had determined that a "great vineyard" (*vineam grandem*) would be planted (*plantabo*) and that one special vine would be chosen from this vineyard (*eligam plantationem*). This chosen vine would be cared for by God (*et disponam eam*), called by God's name (*et nominabo eam nomine meo*), and would be God's vine forever (*et erit mea semper*). Deborah refers to the nation of Israel as the "plant" (*plantationem*) of God's "vineyard" (*vinee*; *L.A.B.* 30:4). Jephthah describes the nation of Israel as a "vine" (*vineam*) planted (*plantavit*) by God's "right hand" (*dextera*; *L.A.B.* 39:7).

<sup>74</sup> Many religious traditions picture a *cosmic tree* at the centre of the created realm. See Pamela R. Frese and S. J. M. Gray, "Trees," *ER* 15: 27–28; Mircea Eliade, *From Gautama Buddha to the Triumph of Christianity* (vol. 2 of *A History of Religious Ideas*; trans. Willard R. Trask; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 157–158. Cosmic tree imagery also occurs in the Jewish Scriptures. Cosmic tree imagery certainly is conjured up while reading the Psalmist's description of the vine of Psalm 80 that grows until it



abyss (*abyssum*) up to God's throne (*ad sedem tuam altissimam*; *L.A.B.* 12:8).<sup>75</sup> Moses contended that the vine's destruction would have dire consequences for God. Should the vine be uprooted (*eradices*, v. 8),<sup>76</sup> dried up (*arefacias*), burned (*incendisti*, v. 8),<sup>77</sup> or otherwise destroyed (*dissipasti*, v. 9),<sup>78</sup> no one again would ever glorify (*glorificet*, v. 9), trust (*credet*, v. 9), or obey (lit. "do [*faciet*] for you what you say," v. 9) God.<sup>79</sup> Without Israel, everything that God had done would have been "in vain" (*L.A.B.* 12:8).

Pseudo-Philo's references to the tablets in *L.A.B.* 12:5 and 10 hold the key for resolving the apparent incongruity between God's declaration in *L.A.B.* 12:4 that God will "forsake" Israel and Moses's fears in *L.A.B.* 12:8–9 that God will "uproot" or destroy Israel. The scriptural account of this incident states that, when Moses descended the mountain, his "anger burned hot" (וַיִּחַר-אַף) when he "saw" (וַיִּרְא) Israel's worship of the golden calf. In his anger, Moses "threw" (וַיִּשְׁלֵךְ) and "broke" (וַיִּשְׁבֵּר) the stone tablets (Exod 32:19) of law that God had given him on the mountain (cf. Exod 31:18; 32:15).<sup>80</sup> In Pseudo-Philo's account, an obedient Moses

---

covers "mountains" and "mighty cedars" (v. 11) [ET v. 10] with "deep" roots (v. 10) [ET v. 9]. Cosmic tree imagery also appears in Ezek 17:22–24 with its description of God taking a small cedar twig and planting it on a mountain (v. 22). This planted twig becomes a "noble cedar" with "every kind of bird" living in its branches (v. 23). Cosmic tree imagery also is applied to the nation of Assyria in Ezekiel and to King Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel. In Ezek 31:1–9, Assyria is depicted as a cosmic cedar of Lebanon (Ezek 31:1–9) which is "so beautiful in its greatness" that the "cedars in the garden of God could not rival it." In Dan 4:10–16, Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, is depicted as a cosmic tree which grows until its "top reached to the heavens" and it becomes "visible to the ends of the whole earth."

<sup>75</sup> See 1QH 14:14–17 for the imagery of a plant that extends from the depths (עַד תְּהוֹם) to the heavens.

<sup>76</sup> For a description of the finality of being uprooted, see *L.A.B.* 18:10; 44:6; 44:8.

<sup>77</sup> Pseudo-Philo also depicts destruction by fire in *L.A.B.* 6:2; 6:16; 20:7; 31:2; 38:3; 38:4; 43:1; 44:3; 47:10.

<sup>78</sup> The word *dissipare* (*L.A.B.* 31:2) also bears the meaning "destruction."

<sup>79</sup> In the scriptural account, the nation of Israel affirmed its willingness to obey God. Exodus 19:8 states, "Everything that the LORD has spoken we will do" (כָּל אֲשֶׁר-דִּבֶּר יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה). Exodus 19:8 (LXX) adds to the end of this ". . . and be obedient" (καὶ ἄκουσόμεθα). Exodus 24:3 states "All the words that the LORD has spoken we will do" (כָּל-דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר-דִּבֶּר יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה). Exodus 24:3 (LXX) also adds the phrase "and be obedient" (καὶ ἄκουσόμεθα). The phrase that is added in Exod 19:8 and 24:3 is found also in Exod 24:7: "All that the LORD has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient" (כָּל אֲשֶׁר-דִּבֶּר יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה וְנִשְׁמָע).

<sup>80</sup> The anger that Moses experiences in Exod 32:19 when he sees Israel's sinfulness contrasts sharply with Moses's reaction to the anger that God had expressed while informing Moses of Israel's

“hurried down” the mountain (*L.A.B.* 12:5a) after God’s speech in *L.A.B.* 12:4. Moses “saw” the calf and “looked at” (*respexit*) the tablets from God and he “hurried to break (*confregit*) them” when he realised that they no longer contained any writing (*non erant scripte*).<sup>81</sup> Pseudo-Philo did not mention the scriptural description of Israel’s worship of the calf in his account. In *L.A.B.* 12, the disappearance of the writing from the law tablets (*L.A.B.* 12:4) precipitates Moses’s destruction of the tablets (*L.A.B.* 12:5a), his personal brokenness (*L.A.B.* 12:5b),<sup>82</sup> his subsequent resolve to test Israel (*L.A.B.* 12:6), his testing of Israel (*L.A.B.* 12:7; cf. Exod 32:20),<sup>83</sup> and his passionate appeal to God (*L.A.B.* 12:8–9).

Pseudo-Philo’s description of the sin that precipitated God’s words in *L.A.B.* 12:4 differs somewhat from its scriptural counterpart. Israel is described in *L.A.B.* 12:4 as having “been corrupted” (*corruptus est*) and having “turned aside from” (*prevaricatus est*) God’s “ways” (*vias*). Further details concerning Israel’s sin are found in Pseudo-Philo’s earlier declaration (*L.A.B.* 12:2, see Table 3.8 below) that “the heart” (*cor*) of the Israelite “people” (*populum*) had become “corrupted” (*corruptum*) and they had commanded Aaron to “make gods” (*fac . . . deos*) for them whom they could “serve (*serviamus*), as the other nations have.” Pseudo-Philo’s version of

---

sinfulness (Exod 32:7–10). God in anger threatened to destroy sinful Israel (Exod 32:9–10) but Moses intervened successfully on Israel’s behalf (Exod 32:11–14).

<sup>81</sup> By contrast, in *L.A.B.* 19:7, Pseudo-Philo has God reveal to Moses that, at Sinai, “I smashed (*contrivi*) the tablets of the covenant that I drew up (*disposui*) for you on Horeb.” Pseudo-Philo does not explain how God might have “smashed the tablets.”

<sup>82</sup> “He [Moses] became like a woman bearing (*similis mulieri parturienti*) her firstborn who, when she is in labor, her hands are upon her chest and she has no strength (*virtus non erit*) to help herself bring forth” (*L.A.B.* 12:5).

<sup>83</sup> Pseudo-Philo toned down the scriptural account of Moses’s destruction of the calf and his subsequent forcing of Israel to consume it (see Exod 32:20) by transforming it into a test for intentional participation in Israel’s sin. As in the scriptural account, the golden calf is destroyed and mixed with water into a drink that all Israelites are forced to consume. Unique to *L.A.B.* is the declaration that the Israelites who willingly took part in the idolatry lost their ability to speak while those who unwillingly took part came through unscathed with shining faces. Whether by human means (i.e. tongues literally cut off) or by divine intervention (i.e. miraculous loss of speech or tongues being literally cut off), those people whose faces that did not shine (i.e. share temporarily in Moses’s glory from the mountain) never again uttered a word! In *L.A.B.* 12, this incident takes the place of the account in Exod 32:25–29 in which the Levites join Moses in a mass-slaughter of the Israelites. For the consumption of water as a test by which sinfulness was determined, see Num 5:11–31.

Israel's request for "gods" avoids any possible ambiguity that may be within the scriptural account of Israel's request for "gods to go before them" (Exod 32:1; also 32:23). As Childs observed concerning Israel's request in Exod 32 that "gods" to be "made" for them, "Did they really believe that gods themselves could be 'made', or was the issue that of a symbol for God?"<sup>84</sup> Israel in *L.A.B.* 12 is not seeking a "symbol" of their deity to accompany them on their way but, rather, they are seeking the creation of other deities to whom they may venerate. In other words, in *L.A.B.* 12, Israel wants to have a polytheistic system of religion as it has observed in the nations around it.<sup>85</sup> Having earlier omitted the offer given Israel to reject or accept the offer of the covenant (cf. Exod 19:5–8) in his *L.A.B.* 11 account of the establishment of the covenant, Pseudo-Philo now depicts Israel's actions at Sinai as tantamount to rejecting decisively its election as God's people.<sup>86</sup> Despite this, Israel remains God's people.

Table 3.8. *L.A.B.* 12:2a and the Jewish Scriptures

<b><i>L.A.B.</i> 12:2</b>	<b>The Jewish Scriptures</b>
And while he was on the mountain, <u>the heart of the people was corrupted</u> , and they gathered together to Aaron saying,	When the people saw that Moses delayed to come down from the mountain, the people gathered around Aaron, and said to him, (Exod 32:1)
"Make gods for us whom we may <u>serve, as the other</u>	"Come, make gods for us, who shall go before us . . ." (Exod 32:1; also v. 23)

<sup>84</sup> Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster, 1974), 564.

<sup>85</sup> Fisk, "Scripture Shaping Scripture," 20, n. 55, contended that the wording of Israel's request to be "as the other nations" (*L.A.B.* 12:2) "is likely indebted to" the wording of Israel's request for a king in 1 Sam 8:5. Similarly, Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 70, sees parallels between Israel's "motivation" in *L.A.B.* 12 and in 1 Sam 8.

<sup>86</sup> Eckart Reinmuth, *Pseudo-Philo und Lukas: Studien zum Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum und seiner Bedeutung für die Interpretation des lukanischen Doppelwerks* (WUNT 74; Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 52–53. Fisk, "Scripture Shaping Scripture," 21, similarly interpreted *L.A.B.* as depicting "clearly" Israel's "attempt to overturn the very monotheism that set her apart from the sinful nations."

<b>L.A.B. 12:2</b>	<b>The Jewish Scriptures</b>
<u>nations</u> have,”	“Let us be <u>like the nations</u> , like the tribes of the countries, and <u>worship wood and stone.</u> ”(Ezek 20:32)
	“ appoint for us, then, a king to govern us, <u>like other nations</u> . . . . and the LORD said to Samuel, “Listen to the voice of the people . . . for . . . they have rejected me from being king over them. Just as they have done to me, from the day I brought them up out of Egypt to this day, forsaking me and <u>servicing other gods</u> , so also they are doing to you” (1 Sam 8:5, 7–8)
“because that Moses through whom wonders were done before our eyes has been taken away from us.”	“as for this Moses, the man who brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we do not know what has become of him.” (Exod 32:1; also v. 23)

In *L.A.B.*, Moses’s interaction with God and Pseudo-Philo’s golden calf narrative conclude with an apparent resolution to the crisis. Pseudo-Philo reveals that God will “be merciful” (*misericors factus sum*, *L.A.B.* 12:10). God commands Moses to cut a second set of tablets and to “rewrite on them the commandments that were on the first ones” (*L.A.B.* 12:10). God’s words in *L.A.B.* 12:10 seem to placate Moses and his concern that God might destroy Israel, for, in Pseudo-Philo’s narrative, the fears that Moses’s expresses in *L.A.B.* 12:8–9 do not resurface until the waning hours of his life (*L.A.B.* 19:8-9).

After the golden calf incident, Pseudo-Philo portrayed Moses as being confident that any punishment that Israel may receive will not jeopardize its status as God’s covenant community. Moses’s response to God in *L.A.B.* 15:5–6 particularly shows this.<sup>87</sup> According to this

<sup>87</sup> The punishment facing Israel in *L.A.B.* 15:5–6 is a reworking of God’s proclamation against Israel in Num 14:12 (LXX) which stated that God would “strike them with death (*θανάτω*)” and would “destroy (*ἀπολώ*) them.” Numbers 14:12a (MT) is somewhat less ominous than its counterpart in the Septuagint because, in Num 14:12a, God does not threaten death and destruction (LXX) but, rather, *merely* threatens to “strike them with pestilence (*בַּדָּבָר*) and disinherit them (*וְאֹרְשָׁנִי*).” The perception that God’s proposed actions against Israel will result in Israel’s destruction nevertheless is still present in the MT. Moses’s response to God (Num 14:15 MT) focuses upon his contention that God cannot “kill” Israel as has been proposed. Numbers 14:12 (LXX) does not specify how this death and destruction was to come about but in *L.A.B.* 15, Pseudo-Philo (in keeping with his frequent use of fire as a preferred means of punishment) specified that Israel’s destruction would be by fire (*L.A.B.* 15:5). Fire destroyed the tower builders (*L.A.B.* 6:17), the Israelites in Kenaz’s era who had secret sins (*L.A.B.* 25:3, 6; 26:1, 2, 5; 27:15), Jair

proclamation, the angel of God's wrath (*angelum ire mee*) will be sent to "afflict (*contribulet*) their bodies with fire (*igni*) in the wilderness." What is more, God's angels will not be permitted to intercede on Israel's behalf (*non rogent pro eis*). Israel will eventually die in the wilderness ("I will cast forth [*deiciam*] their bodies in the wilderness" [*in heremo*], *L.A.B.* 15:6; cf. Num 14:32)<sup>88</sup> but, even in death, the people of Israel will not find relief. Their souls (*animas eorum*) will be "shut up (*includam*) in the chambers of darkness (*thesauros tenebrarum*)" (*L.A.B.* 15:5). In Num 14:13–19, Moses responds to God's devastating decree by arguing passionately that God cannot "kill" (וְהִמָּתָה) Israel "all at one time" (Num 14:15).<sup>89</sup> Moses's argument is that the "nations" would conclude that God had "slaughtered them" (וַיִּשְׁחָטֵם) because of an inability (מִבְּלֹתַי יִבְלֹתַי) to "bring" (לְהַבִּיאַ) Israel into the Promised Land (Num 14:16). In spite of his pessimistic outlook, Moses affirms Israel's utter dependence on God's mercy for its existence and sustainment and declares that God has been responsible for Israel from before the creation of humanity with a rhetorical question: "Before you took the seed from which you would make man upon the earth, was it I who did establish their ways?" (*L.A.B.* 15:7a). Without God's "mercy" (*miserearis*), Moses contends, no one ever would have been born (*L.A.B.* 15:7d). Israel is dependent on God's "mercy" (*misericordia*) and "fidelity" (*pietas*) to "sustain" them "until the end" (*L.A.B.* 15:7d).

Pseudo-Philo's reworking of Num 13:1–14:45 abruptly concludes after Moses's appeal in *L.A.B.* 15:7, omitting God's response (Num 14:20–38) to Moses's appeal for mercy (Num 14:13–19). In the scriptural account, God responds to Moses's appeal with a declaration that Israel has been forgiven (סָלַח, v. 20; cf. *L.A.B.* 12:10). God also declares that, despite being forgiven, most Israelites will die in the wilderness. Israel was to live in the wilderness for forty years and, during

---

(*L.A.B.* 38:4), Micah (*L.A.B.* 44:9; 45:17), and Doeg (*L.A.B.* 63:4). Death by fire also is on the list of punishments facing postdiluvian sinners (*L.A.B.* 3:9) and is the means by which sinners sought to destroy the God-fearing in the tower narrative (*L.A.B.* 6:14, 17), the Jair account (*L.A.B.* 38:4), and the Jephthah narrative (*L.A.B.* 39:9).

<sup>88</sup> See Num 14:32, "But as for you, your dead bodies (וּפְגָרֵיכֶם) shall fall (יִפְּלוּ) in this wilderness."

<sup>89</sup> Lit. "as one man" (כְּאִישׁ אֶחָד), Num 14:15.

this time, all of the Israelites aged twenty and over would die (Num 14:29–35).<sup>90</sup> Only Joshua and Caleb, the two spies who urged Israel to obey God and enter the land (*L.A.B.* 15:2–3; see Num 13:30; 14:6–9),<sup>91</sup> and the Israelites under the age of twenty (Num 14:29) would survive. Moses’s appeal (*L.A.B.* 15:7) leaves no doubt that the mercy of God, which he believes has preserved Israel thus far, will continue to preserve Israel even during its punishment in the wilderness (*L.A.B.* 15:5–6).

Pseudo-Philo brought closure to his discussion of the prospect that God might destroy Israel in *L.A.B.* 19, an account of the waning days of Moses’s life. *L.A.B.* 19 opens with an aged Moses “declaring” (*manifestare*) the Law to Israel (*L.A.B.* 19:1)<sup>92</sup> and exhorting the people to obey God (*L.A.B.* 19:2–5). Pseudo-Philo omitted the content of Moses’s speech to Israel<sup>93</sup> and focused instead upon a conversation that God and Moses had prior to Moses’s death (*L.A.B.* 9:16). This conversation is not contained in the Jewish Scriptures (cf. Deut 34:5–8).

Moses’s almost formulaic (see Table 3.9) final exhortation of Israel in its first section (*L.A.B.* 19:2) highlights his impending death (*L.A.B.* 19:2a; cf. *L.A.B.* 19:3a; 21:1a; 28:1a), predicts Israel’s future sinfulness (*L.A.B.* 19:2b; cf. *L.A.B.* 21:1c; 28:4), reveals the punishment that Israel subsequently will receive from God (*L.A.B.* 19:2c; 21:1d; 28:2d, 5), and promises that God’s punishment of Israel will not last forever (*L.A.B.* 19:2d). This pattern of death-sin-punishment is

---

<sup>90</sup> Also absent from Pseudo-Philo’s account is any punishment specifically directed at the spies (cf. Num 14:36–37) who argued that Israel could not “inherit” (*hereditare*) Canaan. Caleb and Joshua’s appeal to Israel in *L.A.B.* 15 captures the essence (though brief) of its scriptural counterpart. What they had seen had not caused them to waver in their desire to enter Canaan for God was on their side (*L.A.B.* 15:2; cf. Num 13:30; 14:8–9).

<sup>91</sup> Caleb and Joshua are somewhat more confident in *L.A.B.* 15 than in they are in Num 13–14 in which Israel’s conquest is contingent on God finding pleasure in Israel (“If the Lord delights in us . . .,” Num 14:8). Nevertheless, like their scriptural counterparts, Caleb and Joshua focus on their God rather than on their foe in *L.A.B.* 15. Pseudo-Philo adds in visions supposedly experienced by these two men when they were in Canaan that confirmed that God was on their side. These visions appear neither in the scriptural account nor in early Jewish literature.

<sup>92</sup> “And he began declaring to them the words of the Law that God had spoken to them on Horeb” (*L.A.B.* 19:1). This sentence is Pseudo-Philo’s succinct summary of the book of Deuteronomy.

<sup>93</sup> In the Jewish Scriptures, the book of Deuteronomy is presented as a speech given by an aged Moses to the Israelite community that was about to cross the Jordan River into the Promised Land.

repeated (albeit with slight variances) in the second section of Moses’s exhortation of Israel (*L.A.B.* 19:3–5). The second time through, though, the references to Israel’s sin (*L.A.B.* 19:4b) and punishment (*L.A.B.* 19:4c) are set, at least from Moses’s perspective, in a hypothetical future time following Moses’s death (*L.A.B.* 19:3). After his death, Moses posits that Israel will lament his demise (*L.A.B.* 19:3a) and wonders if anyone will take his place as the one who intercedes with God on their behalf (*L.A.B.* 19:3b). This hypothetical future perspective continues in *L.A.B.* 19:4b following a brief interlude in which Moses highlights God’s revelation of the law to Israel (*L.A.B.* 19:4a). In this hypothetical future, “wicked” Israel will “remember” (1) their former willingness to obey God (*L.A.B.* 19:4b) and (2) the punishment of being “cut off” from God facing them should they “transgress or grow corrupt” (*L.A.B.* 19:4c).

Table 3.9. *L.A.B.* 19:2 and Parallels

	<i>L.A.B.</i> 19:2	<i>L.A.B.</i> 19:3–5	<i>L.A.B.</i> 21:1	<i>L.A.B.</i> 28
<b>Death of Leader</b>	And he [Moses] spoke to them, saying, “Behold I am to sleep with my fathers and will go to my people.” (19:2a)	“But then you and your sons and all your generations will rise up after you and lament the day of my [Moses’s] death and say in their heart, ‘Who will give us another shepherd like Moses or such a judge for the sons of Israel to pray always for our sins and to be heard for our iniquities?’” (19:3)	And when Joshua had grown old and was advanced in days, God said, “Behold you are old and advanced in days; and there is very much land, and there is no one to divide it up by lot.” (21:1a)	And when the days of Kenaz drew near for him to die, (28:1a)
<b>Preamble</b>		Now I call to witness against you today heaven and earth (for heaven will hear this, and the earth will know it with its		he sent and summoned all of them and Jabis and Phinehas the two prophets and Phinehas the son of Eleazar the priest,

	<b>L.A.B. 19:2</b>	<b>L.A.B. 19:3–5</b>	<b>L.A.B. 21:1</b>	<b>L.A.B. 28</b>
		ears) that God has revealed the end of the world so that he might establish his statutes with you and kindle among you an eternal light. (19:4a)		and he said to them, “Behold now the Lord has shown to me all the wonders that he is ready to do for his people in the last days. (28:1b–c)
<b>Sin</b>	But I know that you will rise up and forsake the words established for you through me, (19:2b)	And you will remember, you wicked ones; for when I spoke to you, you answered saying, ‘All that God has said to us, we will do and hear. But if we transgress or grow corrupt in our ways, (19:4b)	And after your departure this people will be intermingled with those inhabiting the land, and they will be seduced after strange gods, (21:1b)	And now I will establish my covenant with you today so that you do not abandon the Lord after my departure” (28:2a; see also 28:4, 9)
<b>Punishment</b>	and God will be angry at you and abandon you and depart from your land. And he will bring upon you those who hate you, and they will rule over you, (19:2c)	you will recall this as a witness against us and cut us off.’ (19:4c)	and I will abandon them as I testified in my speech to Moses. (21:1c)	And Kenaz and the elders and all the people lifted up their voices and wept with great lamentation until evening and said, “Will the Shepherd destroy his flock for any reason except that it has sinned against him? And now he is the one who will spare us according to the abundance of his mercy, because he has toiled so much among us.” (28:4)
<b>End of Punishment</b>	but not forever, because he will remember the covenant			“If the repose of the just after they have died is like this, we must die to the corruptible world so



	<b>L.A.B. 19:2</b>	<b>L.A.B. 19:3–5</b>	<b>L.A.B. 21:1</b>	<b>L.A.B. 28</b>
	that he established with your fathers.” (19:2d)			as not to see sins.” (28:10c?)
<b>Exhortation</b>		But know that you have eaten the bread of angels for forty years. And now behold I bless your tribes before my end comes. But you, acknowledge my toil that I have toiled for you from the time you went up from the land of Egypt.” (19:5)	But you bear witness to them before you die.” (21:1d)	”For you have seen all the wonders that came upon those who sinned and what they declared in confessing their sins voluntarily, or how the Lord destroyed them because they transgressed against his covenant. Now therefore spare those of your household and your children, and stay in the paths of the Lord your God lest the Lord destroy his own inheritance.” (28:2b)

The opening verse of Moses’s discourse (*L.A.B.* 19:2) also parallels God’s words to Moses in *L.A.B.* 13:10 (see Table 3.10). In *L.A.B.* 13:10, Pseudo-Philo combined a reworking of God’s declaration to Moses that Israel would sin after his death (Deut 31:29) with a brief encapsulation of the curses portion of the blessings and curses of the Mosaic covenant (Lev 26:3–46; see also Deut 28:1–68; 30:1–10; see Table 3.10).<sup>94</sup> In *L.A.B.* 19:2, Moses states that, when Israel commits sin (see Table 3.10, row 3), God will abandon it (see Table 3.10, row 4) for a time (see Table 3.10, row 5). Moses’s appeal to the covenant (*L.A.B.* 19:2; see Table 3.10, row 5) as the reason that God will not punish Israel forever is not contained in *L.A.B.* 13:10 *per se* but it is included in one of the key scriptural passages in the passage’s background, Lev 26. Leviticus 26:44b–45 bases

<sup>94</sup> Feldman, “Prolegomenon,” xcvi; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:523.

God's decision to cease punishing Israel for its sins upon the covenant relationship between God and Israel (see Table 3.10, row 5). Pseudo-Philo's belief that Israel's covenant status assures that God will not punish it forever is developed further in the ensuing conversation between God and Moses (*L.A.B.* 19:6–15).

Table 3.10. *L.A.B.* 19:2; 13:10; and the Jewish Scriptures

	<i>L.A.B.</i> 19:2	<i>L.A.B.</i> 13:10	Jewish Scriptures
<b>Obedience</b>	n/a	"If they will walk in my ways,	"If you follow my statutes and keep my commandments and observe them faithfully," (Lev 26:3; also Deut 28:1a)
<b>Reward</b>	n/a	I will not abandon them but will have mercy on them always and bless their seed; and the earth will quickly yield its fruit, and there will be rains for their advantage, and it will not be barren.	"all these blessings shall come upon you and overtake you, if you obey the LORD your God." (Deut 28:2)  "I will give you your rains in their season, and the land shall yield its produce, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit. Your threshing shall overtake the vintage, and the vintage shall overtake the sowing." (Lev 26:4–5a; also Deut 28:4–5, 12a)
<b>Sin</b>	"But I know that you will rise up and forsake the words established for you through me	But I know for sure that they will make their ways corrupt . . . and they will forget the covenants that I have established with their fathers	"For I know that after my death you will surely act corruptly, turning aside from the way that I have commanded you." (Deut 31:29a)  "But if you will not obey me, and do not observe all these commandments, if you spurn my statutes, and abhor my ordinances, so that you will not observe all my commandments, and you break my covenant," (Lev 26:14–15; also Deut 28:15a)
<b>Punishment</b>	and God will be angry at you and abandon you and depart	and I will abandon them	In time to come trouble will befall you," (Deut 31:29b)  "The LORD will scatter you among all

	<b>L.A.B. 19:2</b>	<b>L.A.B. 13:10</b>	<b>Jewish Scriptures</b>
	from your land.		peoples, from one end of the earth to the other." (Deut 28:64a; also Lev 26:33)
	And he will bring upon you those who hate you, and they will rule over you	n/a	"I will set my face against you, and you shall be struck down by your enemies; your foes shall rule over you." (Lev 26:17a)
<b>End of Punishment</b>	but not forever,	but nevertheless I will not forget them forever.	"Yet for all that . . . I will not spurn them, or abhor them so as to destroy them utterly," (Lev 26:44a; also Deut 30:1–3)
	because he will remember the covenant that he established with your fathers."	n/a	"and break my covenant with them; for I am the LORD their God; but I will remember in their favor the covenant with their ancestors . . . to be their God: I am the LORD." (Lev 26:44b–45)
<b>Epilogue</b>	n/a	For they will know in the last days that on account of their own sins their seed has been abandoned, because I am faithful in my ways."	The fierce anger of the LORD will not turn back until he has executed and accomplished the intents of his mind. In the latter days you will understand this. "At that time," says the LORD, "I will be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people. . . . I have loved you with an everlasting love; therefore I have continued my faithfulness to you." (Jer 30:24–31:3)
			"But if they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their ancestors . . . then will I remember my covenant . . . and I will remember the land." (Lev 26:40–42)

The conversation between Moses and God that began in *L.A.B.* 19:2–5 continues in *L.A.B.* 19:6–9. God’s response (*L.A.B.* 19:6–7) to Moses’s speech in *L.A.B.* 19:2–5<sup>95</sup> opens in *L.A.B.* 19:6 with an echo of the death-sin-punishment pattern (see Table 3.11) that was encountered in Moses’s earlier speech. God informs Moses that Moses is about to die (*L.A.B.* 19:6a; see Table 3.11, row 1), that Israel will fall into sin after his death (*L.A.B.* 19:6b; see Table 3.11, row 2), and that God will abandon Israel to punish it for its sin (*L.A.B.* 19:6d; see Table 3.11, row 3). The temporary nature of this abandonment is implied in the declaration that the punishment is “for a time” (*L.A.B.* 19:6d; see Table 3.11, row 3) and in God’s announcement that Moses will be shown “the land” (i.e. the Promised Land) and “the place where they will serve me” (i.e. the temple; *L.A.B.* 19:7a; see Table 3.11, row 4). God’s response to Moses breaks from the pattern in *L.A.B.* 19:7b with the revelation that God will hand over the temple to Israel’s enemies who will destroy it. With this revelation, Pseudo-Philo picked up a thread in the narrative that was left hanging during the golden calf narrative (*L.A.B.* 12:1–10).

Table 3.11. *L.A.B.* 19:6–7a

<b><i>L.A.B.</i> 19:6–7a</b>	
<b>Death of Leader</b>	And on his [Moses] saying these words, God spoke to him a third time, saying, “Behold you are going forth to sleep with your fathers. (19:6a)
<b>Preamble</b>	n/a
<b>Sin</b>	But this people will rise up and not seek me, and they will forget my Law, by which I have enlightened them, (19:6b)
<b>Punishment</b>	and I will abandon their seed for a time. (19:6c)
<b>End of Punishment</b>	<u>Now I will show you the land before you die, but you will not enter it in this age lest you see the graven images with which this people will start to be deceived and led off the path. I will show you the place where they will serve me for 740</u>

<sup>95</sup> Pseudo-Philo prefaced God’s speech to Moses with a statement that indicates clearly that *L.A.B.* 19:6–7 is in direct response to Moses’s exhortation: “On saying these words, God spoke to him [Moses] a third time, saying” (*L.A.B.* 19:6a).

---

**L.A.B. 19:6–7a**

---

years." (19:7a)

**Exhortation** n/a

---

*Note:* See Table 3.9 above for this pattern elsewhere in *L.A.B.*

During the golden calf incident (*L.A.B.* 12:4), God declares to Moses: (1) that Israel will be abandoned temporarily as punishment for its sin, (2) that this time of abandonment will be followed by a time of restoration marked particularly by the temple's construction, and (3) that the time of restoration will come to an end with the temple's destruction. Following the erasure and destruction of the law tablets (*L.A.B.* 12:5), Moses launches into a passionate appeal for God to have mercy on Israel (*L.A.B.* 12:8–9). The punishments pronounced in *L.A.B.* 12:4 are not negated but fall into the background after Moses's appeal. God is "made merciful" toward Israel and commands that the law tablets be re-carved and rewritten (*L.A.B.* 12:10). Nothing more in *L.A.B.* is said concerning God's pronouncements in *L.A.B.* 12:4 until God responds to an aged Moses in *L.A.B.* 19:6–7.

In *L.A.B.* 19:6–7, Pseudo-Philo reworked the principal themes of *L.A.B.* 12:4 (see Table 3.12). Pseudo-Philo incorporated minor differences in the terminology with which he described Israel's sin (Table 3.12, row 2).<sup>96</sup> Israel's sin in the Promised Land is more imminent in *L.A.B.* 19:7 than it is in *L.A.B.* 12:4 (Table 3.12, row 5). The temple's construction is the focus of *L.A.B.* 12:4 and the temple's use is the focus of *L.A.B.* 19:7 (Table 3.12, row 6). More detail is given concerning the temple's destruction in *L.A.B.* 19:7 than in *L.A.B.* 12:4. A paraphrase of Isa 40:15 appears in *L.A.B.* 12:4 (Table 3.12, row 7) but not in *L.A.B.* 19:7. Finally, the material is fit into its new context in *L.A.B.* 19 with a reference to Moses's death (19:6a; Table 3.12, row 1) and with an addendum establishing a firm link between the passages (19:7d; Table 3.12, row 8).

---

<sup>96</sup> "Has been corrupted" (*corruptus est*) and "have turned aside" (*prevaricatus est*; *L.A.B.* 12:4) versus "not seek" (*non requiret*) and "forget" (*obliviscentur*; *L.A.B.* 19:6).

Table 3.12. *L.A.B.* 12:4 and 19:6–7

	<i>L.A.B.</i> 12:4	<i>L.A.B.</i> 19:6–7
<b>Death of Moses</b>	n/a	And on his saying these words, God spoke to him a third time, saying, “Behold you are going forth to sleep with your fathers. (6a)
<b>Sin</b>	And the LORD said to Moses, “Hurry away from here, because <u>the people have been corrupted and have turned aside from my ways that I commanded them.</u> ” (4a)	<u>But this people will rise up and not seek me, and they will forget my Law,</u> by which I have enlightened them, (6b)
<b>Punishment</b>	<u>“And now I too will forsake (relinquam) them,(4c)</u>	<u>and I will abandon (relinquam) their seed (6c)</u>
<b>End of Punishment</b>	<u>and I will turn again and make peace with them” (4d)</u>	<u>for a time. (6d)</u>
<b>Sin in the Promised Land</b>	“Are the promises that I promised to your fathers when I said to them, 'To your <u>seed I will give the land in which you dwell</u> ' - are they at an end? For behold the people have not even entered the land yet and now even have the law with them, and they have forsaken me. And indeed <u>I know that if they had entered that land, even greater iniquities would have been done.</u> ” (4b)	Now <u>I will show you the land before you die, but you will not enter it in this age lest you see the graven images with which <u>this people will start to be deceived and led off the path.</u></u> (7a)
<b>Temple</b>	<u>“so that a house may be built for me among them, (4e)</u>	<u>I will show you the place where they will serve me for 740 years. (7b)</u>
<b>More Punishment</b>	<u>a house that will be destroyed because they will sin against me.</u>	And after this <u>it will be turned over into the hands of their enemies, and they will destroy it, and foreigners will encircle it.</u> (7c)
	<u>And the race of men will be to me like a drop from a pitcher and will be reckoned like spittle.” (4f)</u>	n/a
<b>Addendum</b>	n/a	And it will be on that day as it was on the day I smashed the

---

**L.A.B. 12:4**

**L.A.B. 19:6–7**

---

tablets of the covenant that I drew up for you on Horeb; and when they sinned, what was written on them flew away. Now that day was the seventeenth day of the fourth month.” (7d)

---

Moses’s response to God’s words the second time through (L.A.B. 19:8–9) builds upon his earlier appeal to God during the golden calf incident (L.A.B. 12:8–9). Ascending the mountain once again (L.A.B. 19:8a; cf. 12:8a), Moses makes a brief reference to his long life (L.A.B. 19:8b; cf. 19:6a) and builds upon the plea for divine mercy that served as the climax of his earlier discourse.<sup>97</sup> Dispensing with the imagery of Israel as God’s chosen vine (L.A.B. 12:8–9), Moses describes Israel as God’s “people,” “heritage,” “chosen race,” and the one whom God “loved . . . before all others” (19:8). He then builds upon his earlier description of God as the one who planted and cared for Israel the vine (L.A.B. 12:8) by describing God’s continuing actions on Israel’s behalf. Moses states that God “called” (*vocasti*) a shepherd (*pastor*) and “sent” (*misisti*) him to lead Israel (i.e. Moses), “freed” (*liberasti*) Israel from bondage in Egypt, “drowned” (*demersisti*) their enemies, and “gave” (*dedisti*) to them the law (L.A.B. 19:9). Moses’s description of the purpose of God’s gift of the law to Israel, namely that Israel “might live (*viverent*) and enter (*intrarent*) as sons of men (*fili hominum*)” (L.A.B. 19:9), draws God’s earlier comment concerning humanity (L.A.B. 12:4) into the discourse. In L.A.B. 12:4, God stated that, after the temple (i.e. God’s “house”) is destroyed, thereby severing God’s relationship with humanity (or so it seems), humanity (lit. “the race of men”) would be considered as nothing – “like a drop from a pitcher and . . . like spittle.” In L.A.B. 19:9, Moses picks up a thread from L.A.B. 12:4 when he proclaims that the gift of the law restores humanity’s standing before God

---

<sup>97</sup> “Therefore, if you do not have mercy on your vine, all things, LORD, have been done in vain, and you will not have anyone to glorify you,” L.A.B. 12:9.

because it permits humanity to “live” as humans (*filii hominum*).<sup>98</sup> Moses’s appeal closes with an emphasis on the need of the perpetually and permanently sinful Israel for God to be “merciful” (*longanimitas*, *L.A.B.* 19:9; cf. *Ecce misericors factus sum*, *L.A.B.* 12:10). Moses hopes that the punishment predicted in *L.A.B.* 19:6–7 will demonstrate this mercy by being both temporary (“for a time”) and restrained (i.e. “not in anger”; *L.A.B.* 19:9).<sup>99</sup>

After revisiting Moses’s interaction with God during the golden calf incident, Pseudo-Philo finally provided the final components of his belief concerning the impact of punishment upon the children of Israel’s continuation as the covenant community. In *L.A.B.* 19:10, God shows Moses the Promised Land (v. 10a) and takes Moses on a tour of the heavens. This tour demonstrates to Moses that the promised destruction of the earthly temple in which Israel worships God (*L.A.B.* 12:4; 19:7) does not ultimately matter to Israel. Israel’s sin will bring about the destruction of God’s earthly sanctuary but the heavenly sanctuary will remain intact. This is made evident through the emphasis placed in *L.A.B.* 19 upon the heavenly sanctuary and its sacrificial system (v. 10d), Moses is shown the earth’s water (v. 10b), the heavenly storehouse for the manna that fed Israel in the wilderness (v. 10c), and the heavenly sanctuary where sacrifices are offered (v. 10d).

Pseudo-Philo’s account of Moses’s tour of the heavens also reintroduces an aspect of his worldview that has not been encountered since it was first introduced in *L.A.B.* 3:10: one day this present world will end and there will be a world to come.

But when the years appointed for the world have been fulfilled, then the light will cease and the darkness will fade away. . . . And the world will cease, and death will be abolished, and hell will shut its mouth. . . . And there will be another earth and another heaven, an everlasting dwelling place (*habitaculum sempiternum*). (*L.A.B.* 3:10)

---

<sup>98</sup> For a discussion of the translation of *filii hominum* as “human beings,” see Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:631–632.

<sup>99</sup> Several passages in the Jewish Scriptures parallel Moses’s request in *L.A.B.* 19:9 for God not to punish Israel “in anger.” See Ps 6:2 (ET 6:1), 38:2 (ET 38:1), and Jer 10:24. See also the description in Ps 77:38 of God’s restrained anger during punishment. These passages contrast with many passages in the Jewish Scriptures that describe God as being “angry” during the punishment of humanity or as pouring anger out on those being punished.



In his discussion of Moses's post-mortem fate in *L.A.B.* 19:10–13, Pseudo-Philo reintroduced his readers to the world to come. In this passage, which is unparalleled in the Jewish Scriptures, it is revealed that God will “glorify” (*glorificabo*) Moses with his ancestors (*patribus*) after Moses's death,<sup>100</sup> “give . . . rest” (*requiem dabo*) to him, and “bury” (*sepeliam*) him “in peace” (*cum pace*). At the end of the present world (v. 13), God will “raise up” (*excitabo*) Moses and his ancestors (lit. “your fathers,” *patres tuos*) from their place of post-mortem rest (*dormietis*)<sup>101</sup> to “dwell” (*habitabitis*) in the immortal dwelling place (*inhabitationem immortalem*) that is not subject to time” (v. 12).<sup>102</sup> *L.A.B.* 19:12 reveals that at least some Israelites will be in this ultimate Promised Land but does not reveal whether all Israelites, most Israelites or, perhaps, just a remnant of Israel will join them in there. In *L.A.B.* 19, the closest that Pseudo-Philo comes to delineating this group is his cryptic statement in *L.A.B.* 19:13 that “all who can” will “dwell” in this place.

---

<sup>100</sup> James (*Biblical Antiquities*, 130), Dietzfelbinger (“Pseudo-Philo [1975],” 153), and Jacobson (*Commentary*, 2:641) preferred the variant *dormificabo* (mss. group π): “I will take you from here and lay you down to sleep (*dormificabo*) with your fathers” (*L.A.B.* 19:12; translation from Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:122). Although Harrington in his critical text adopted the reading *glorificabo* in his critical text and in his English translation (Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2:328), in the critical apparatus of his critical text (*Pseudo-Philon I*, p. 162) he contemplated whether *dormificabo* might be the correct reading. The only other occurrence of *glorificabo* in *L.A.B.* is *L.A.B.* 11:1, “I will give a light to the world and illumine their dwelling places and establish my covenant with the sons of men and glorify (*glorificabo*) my people above all nations.”

<sup>101</sup> In the text, Pseudo-Philo called the place of post-mortem rest in which Moses and his ancestors will sleep (*dormietis*) and up from which they will be raised (*excitabo*) at the end of time “the land of Egypt” (*terra Egipti*). This cannot be a reference to the Israelites who died in the land of Egypt (*L.A.B.* 14:4) for the text clearly includes Moses in the group of those who sleep in and will be raised from “the land of Egypt.” It is possible that the reference to Egypt in this context should be read as a foil for the ultimate Promised Land that Moses is promised here in *L.A.B.* 19. Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2:643, also suggested that the reference to “Egypt” in *L.A.B.* 14:4 might result from the “corruption of some other word” but he was unable to find any examples that he deemed very suitable. The best example Jacobson cited was the phrase the “pangs of Sheol” (וּמְצָרֵי שְׁאוֹל) in Ps 116:3. In this example, the emphasis is on the similarities between the words “pangs” (or, “distress,” מְצָר; מְצָרִים) and “Egyptian” (מְצָרִי, cf. “Egypt,” מְצָרִים). While a reference to Sheol might be more suitable in a discussion of the resurrection of the dead, this option is long on speculation and short on solid evidence. In the absence of such evidence, perhaps the best solution is that of James who omitted the word from his translation because he deemed it “intrusive” (James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 130; also Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:642).

<sup>102</sup> For an examination of Pseudo-Philo's views concerning paradise, see Richard Bauckham, “Paradise in the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo,” in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views* (ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 43–56.

However, Pseudo-Philo did not explain in *L.A.B.* 19 the criteria that will determine who “can” join them in that place.

With these revelations (*L.A.B.* 19:10–13), the final pieces fall in place regarding Pseudo-Philo’s understanding of the impact of punishment upon the children of Israel’s continuation as the covenant community. In *L.A.B.* 12:8–9 and *L.A.B.* 19:8–9, Pseudo-Philo implied that Moses’s fear that Israel’s sin someday might negatively influence its standing as God’s covenant community is unfounded. God will abandon Israel and God will permit the destruction of the temple but even these punishments will not mark the end of God’s relationship with Israel. Instead, at least one portion of Israel can anticipate living in a heavenly sanctuary in the world to come. The question that remains is if Pseudo-Philo believed that most (or all) Israelites would share in this blessing. This question will be addressed in Chapter 4.

After Moses’s death (*L.A.B.* 19:16), only a few passages in *L.A.B.* raise the prospect that Israel’s sinfulness may result in the loss of its status as God’s covenant people. Even fewer depict the nation of Israel or its leaders expressing such fear. Moses died (*L.A.B.* 19:16) shortly after his final conversation with God (*L.A.B.* 19:6–15). When the mantle of leadership was passed to Joshua (literally!) (*L.A.B.* 20:2–3a), the task of disseminating what Moses learned in his final conversation with God fell on Joshua.<sup>103</sup> Joshua donned Moses’s clothing and belt (*L.A.B.* 20:3a) and immediately his “spirit was moved.” He delivered a stirring speech focused on the themes addressed in *L.A.B.* 19:5–15. In the speech, Joshua warned Israel that it was at a crossroads. If its leaders led the nation in God’s ways, God would be with them (*L.A.B.* 20:3). If, however, its leaders did not obey God but, rather, acted like the previous generation who died “in the

---

<sup>103</sup> John R. Levison, “Prophetic Inspiration in Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” *JQR* 85 (1995): 318–320, contended that Pseudo-Philo’s description of Joshua’s inspiration in *L.A.B.* 20:3–4 not only is dependent upon scriptural accounts of prophetic inspiration (i.e. Deut 34:9; Judg 6:34; 1 Sam 10:6) but also dependant (“consciously or unconsciously”) upon the “conceptions of inspiration” (p. 319) within Greco-Roman literature. Levison’s comments build upon and modify the research of Antonio Piñero, “A Mediterranean View of Prophetic Inspiration: On the Concept of Inspiration in the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* by Pseudo-Philo,” *MHR* 6 (1991): 5–34.

wilderness” because of their rebellion (*L.A.B.* 20:3),<sup>104</sup> they would be destroyed. This time their destruction would be complete as their affairs would be “spoiled” (*corrumpentur*), they would be “crushed” (*confringemini*), and their name would “perish (*periet*) from the earth” (*L.A.B.* 20:3). Even this utter destruction, however, would not mark Israel’s exit from God’s covenant. Joshua declared that even the Gentiles would recognize that Israel’s punishment for sin did not include their replacement as God’s covenant people (*L.A.B.* 20:4). In keeping with Moses’s argument in *L.A.B.* 12:8–9, the absence of a replacement to take Israel’s place as God’s people means that Israel will remain as God’s covenant people even if they are decimated. The meaning of Joshua’s somewhat cryptic declaration (*L.A.B.* 20:3–4) becomes clearer when it is read in light of God’s interaction with Joshua in *L.A.B.* 21.

Joshua’s hope that God will keep the children of Israel eternally and unconditionally as the covenant community is evident in *L.A.B.* 21, an episode not found in the scriptural account. In this passage, Joshua is informed that, after his death (lit. “departure,” *recessum*), the time of abandonment about which God had told Moses would take place (v. 1). This time of abandonment would be precipitated by Israel’s being “intermingled” (*commisceatur*) with “those inhabiting the land” (*habitantibus terram*) and being “seduced” (*seducentur*) by their “strange gods” (*deos alienos*, v. 1).<sup>105</sup> Joshua responds with a prayer to God (*L.A.B.* 21:2–6) in which he petitions God to set events into motion that would keep Israel from falling into sin and, thus, avert the predicted abandonment.<sup>106</sup> In particular, Joshua’s two chief petitions are: (1) that God would grant the people “a wise heart and a prudent mind” (*cor sapientie et sensum*

---

<sup>104</sup> Lit. “spoken against God.”

<sup>105</sup> When God declared to Moses that Israel would be abandoned because of its sinfulness, the threat of abandonment was coupled with the promise of restoration (*L.A.B.* 12:4; 13:10; 19:6). The threat of abandonment which Joshua receives in *L.A.B.* 21:1 does not include the promise of restoration.

<sup>106</sup> This parallels Joshua’s appeal in *L.A.B.* 20:3–4. This sounds like Ezekiel 18, 33 (individual response within the context of covenant faithfulness to an ever wayward people).

*prudentie*)<sup>107</sup> so that they would not “sin” (*peccabunt*) against God (*L.A.B.* 21:2) and (2) that God would send a leader to take Joshua’s place after his death (*L.A.B.* 21:4b–5). Nevertheless, Joshua expresses his confidence that God will fulfill the promises (lit. *tu tamen facies verbum tuum vivum*) even if God’s prediction comes true and the nation of Israel is put “in Sheol” (*L.A.B.* 21:4). Ultimately, no matter what happens, the time will come when a repentant nation of Israel will “attain the salvation (*expugnabunt salutem*)<sup>108</sup> that will come about for them” (*L.A.B.* 21:6).

Joshua’s belief concerning the impact of punishment upon the nation of Israel’s “staying in” comes to the forefront again in Pseudo-Philo’s rewriting of Josh 22 (*L.A.B.* 22). In Josh 22, the nation of Israel heard that the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh had built a large altar near the Jordan (Josh 22:9–12) and gathered at Shiloh (Josh 22:12). As they prepared to make war against them (Josh 22:12; cf. Deut 13:12–16),<sup>109</sup> Israel sent Phinehas the high priest and ten tribal leaders to inquire about the altar (Josh 22:13–14). Israel’s envoys accused the two-and-a-half tribes of “treachery” and of “turning away from the Lord.” Phinehas and the tribal leaders in Josh 22 compared the construction of the altar to Israel’s sexual relations with Moabite women and the worship of foreign deities (Num 25:1–5)<sup>110</sup> and to

---

<sup>107</sup> This petition has a partial echo of the transformation that Joshua himself underwent years earlier when he donned the “garments of wisdom” (*vestimenta sapientie*) and “the belt of understanding” (*zona intelligentie*, *L.A.B.* 20:3).

<sup>108</sup> This translation is that of Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:126. All extant Latin texts of *L.A.B.* read *expugnabunt salutem que nascetur ex eis*. The most common meaning for the verb *expugno* is “to fight” but it may also carry the less common meaning “attain” or “obtain.” Harrington’s critical Latin text here reads *expectabunt salutem que nascetur ex eis* which he, in his later English edition of *L.A.B.*, translated “these . . . will hope for the salvation that is to be born from them” (Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2:330). The word *expectabunt* is not present in any extant text of *L.A.B.* but, rather, is Harrington’s conjectured emendation.

<sup>109</sup> The threatened war in Josh 22:12 is a religious war in which the majority of Israel attempts to purge Israel of sin (cf. Judg 20:12–13). See Deut 13:12–16 for the command that Israel “inquire and make a thorough investigation” into charges that “scoundrels” have led an Israelite community into the worship of other gods (v. 13). If the charges are proved correct (v. 14), the Israelites are to kill all the people in that community, destroy the community and everything in it (v. 15), and never rebuild it (v. 16).

<sup>110</sup> In this passage, God responded to these sins with a plague that killed 24,000 Israelites (Num 24:9).

Achan's violation of the ban placed on Jericho (Josh 7:1–27; cf. Josh 6:17).<sup>111</sup> The tension dissolved quickly, however, when the two-and-a-half tribes revealed that the altar had been constructed to remind their offspring of the covenant and had not been used for cultic purposes (Josh 22:21–29). This response "satisfied" Phinehas and the tribal leaders (Josh 22:30) who then returned home in peace (Josh 22:33) with a good "report" (Josh 22:34).

Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of Josh 22 depicts Joshua as the leader of the fact-finding expedition to the two-and-a-half tribes (*L.A.B.* 22:2; cf. Josh 22:13–14) and as fearful that the altar might lead to Israel's destruction. Rather than drawing comparisons to Israel's sins in Num 25 and in Josh 7, Joshua declares his fear that the altar might be the corruption that Moses stated would come after Israel entered the Promised Land (*L.A.B.* 22:2).<sup>112</sup> Joshua finds some justification for this claim in the prevalence of Israel's enemies (*L.A.B.* 22:2) which represents a covenantal sign of divine displeasure (cf. *L.A.B.* 13:10). Joshua fears that Israel's enemies will "crush" them because of the actions of these two-and-a-half tribes (*L.A.B.* 22:2).<sup>113</sup> This fear of destruction differs significantly from the scenarios presented in Josh 22 in which the nation's survival is not threatened.<sup>114</sup>

The situation in *L.A.B.* 22 is also resolved differently from the scenario in Josh 22. Unlike in Josh 22, a sin was actually committed in *L.A.B.* 22. An altar is constructed and used, complete with an active priesthood (*L.A.B.* 22:1). The sinners' fate (and, seemingly, that of the nation) hinges on whether the two-and-a-half tribes committed an intentional or unintentional sin. To ward off any possible divine wrath in the event that the sin was intentional, Joshua orders the

---

<sup>111</sup> In this passage, God responded to Achan's sin by permitting the nation of Israel to be defeated in battle at Ai (Josh 7:2–6). Thirty-six Israelite soldiers died in that battle (Josh 7:6).

<sup>112</sup> Nowhere in *L.A.B.* does Moses actually say the words that Joshua quotes in *L.A.B.* 22:2: "Beware that on entering your land you grow corrupt in your own deeds and destroy all this people?" This quotation seems to be based on God's words to Moses in *L.A.B.* 19:6–7 concerning Israel's future waywardness and its consequences.

<sup>113</sup> This emphasis is not present in the scriptural account.

<sup>114</sup> The closest parallel to this is Num 25 in which it seems that God's wrath would have continued had not Phinehas intervened.

two-and-a-half tribes to destroy the unauthorized cultic center<sup>115</sup> and commands them to “teach your sons the Law and have them meditate on it day and night, so that through all the days of their life the Lord may be for them a witness and a judge” (*L.A.B.* 22:6). Joshua and the rest of Israel also offer sacrifices and prayers on behalf of the perpetrators (*L.A.B.* 22:7). All this was done and more (*L.A.B.* 22:7).

Pseudo-Philo downplayed the prospect of destruction in *L.A.B.* 23–24, his rewritten version of Josh 23–24. This account contains a combination of Joshua’s farewell speech to the leaders (Josh 23:1–18) and the covenant renewal (Josh 24:1–27). In *L.A.B.* 23:12–14, Pseudo-Philo emphasized the surety of Israel’s “staying in” instead of its possible destruction. He transformed the lengthy scriptural sections describing Joshua setting the prospect of divine blessing or destruction before Israel and its leaders into promises for an obedient Israel (*L.A.B.* 23:12–14). As stated elsewhere in *L.A.B.* and in the Jewish Scriptures, Israel’s future blessings are conditional upon their obedience (*L.A.B.* 23:12; cf. *L.A.B.* 13:10). If (*si*) the people of Israel “listen” to their “fathers” (*patres vestros*),<sup>116</sup> God will be with them and their enemies will no longer fight against them (*L.A.B.* 23:12). Their land will be “renowned (*nominata*) over all the earth” and their seed will be “special (*electum*) among all the peoples” (*L.A.B.* 23:12). In addition, God promises that all the rain and dew they need shall be theirs in abundance (*L.A.B.* 23:12).

In *L.A.B.*, the blessings that the nation of Israel *may receive* in the present world are contingent on its obedience but the blessings that the nation of Israel *will receive* in the world to come are unconditional. The promise of “life eternal (*vita eterna*) for you and your seed” is promised to “each one of you” (*uniuscuiusque omnium vestrum*, *L.A.B.* 23:13). At the end of life, the souls (*animas vestras*) of the people of Israel will be stored “in peace” (*in pace*) until the end

---

<sup>115</sup> Lit. *sacraria* (“sanctuaries”). Throughout *L.A.B.* 22, however, the issue has been that of “an altar” (*altare*, 22:1) that was constructed at an unauthorized cultic center (lit. “sanctuary”; *sacrario*, *L.A.B.* 22:1; *sacrarium*, 22:3, 4, 5).

<sup>116</sup> I.e. Ancestral covenants. See *L.A.B.* 19:2.

of the world when Israel will be restored (*Et reddam vos*, *L.A.B.* 23:13). The nation of Israel's fate in the world to come is secure regardless of what happens in the present world.<sup>117</sup>

The apprehension concerning the nation of Israel's covenantal status that is present in Pseudo-Philo's Moses narrative and, to a lesser extent, in his Joshua narrative almost disappears following Joshua's death (*L.A.B.* 24:5–6). It resurfaces in *L.A.B.* 30:4 and *L.A.B.* 39:7 during national crises, which are exacerbated by the absence of a divinely appointed leader. It also resurfaces in *L.A.B.* 49:1–7 when the Israelites find themselves unable to ascertain the person whom God has chosen as their next leader. Each episode will be examined in turn.

In the first episode, apprehensions concerning the nation of Israel's covenantal status surface in *L.A.B.* 30:4 after the death of Zebul (*L.A.B.* 29:4) when the leaderless nation of Israel falls into sin (*L.A.B.* 30:1). As punishment for its sin, God sends upon them the army of Jabin, the king of Hazor. After Hazor's army commander, Sisera, defeats Israel (v. 3), the humiliated (*humiliates fuisset*, v. 4) nation gathers in the mountains of Judah and the people acknowledge (v. 4) that they have been "more blessed (*beatos*) than other nations (*ceteris gentibus*)." They confess that their "wicked deeds" (*iniquitates*), namely their desertion (*dereliquimus*) of God and their "walking" (*ambulavimus*) in unprofitable (*non proderant*) ways, have caused their present crisis. They call (v. 4) for seven days of fasting in the hope that God might "be reconciled" (*replacabitur*) with and not destroy (*non disperdat*) "his inheritance" (*hereditati sue*) and the "plant of his vineyard" (*plantationem vinee sue*).

The Jewish Scriptures state that Israel "cried out to the Lord for help" after having been "oppressed . . . cruelly" for many years (Judg 4:1) but do not indicate what Israel said when it cried out to God. In *L.A.B.* 30, God's response to Israel's confession and fasting (v. 4) is to send Deborah. Deborah reveals (v. 7) that God will "take pity" (*inviscerabitur*) on them and will "hand over" (*tradet*) their "enemies" (*inimicos*) to them because of:

---

<sup>117</sup> Despite Joshua's words affirming Israel's place in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 23:13), Pseudo-Philo still depicted Joshua as believing that, following his death, the nation of Israel would "stray" (*incipient prevaricari*) from God (*L.A.B.* 24:4).

1. The “covenant” (*testamento*) God had “established” (*disposuit*) with Israel’s ancestors.
2. The “oath (*iuramento*) . . . not to abandon . . . forever” (*non desereret . . . in finem*) that God had sworn (*iuravit*) to Israel.

In *L.A.B.*, Pseudo-Philo underscored Deborah’s confidence that God will save Israel despite its sinfulness by having Deborah reveal that sinfulness always has been the norm rather than the exception in Israel (*L.A.B.* 30:5b–6). This revelation is unparalleled in the scriptural Deborah narrative.<sup>118</sup> As observed by Deborah, Israel has not obeyed any of its previous leaders (*L.A.B.* 30:5), including Moses (*L.A.B.* 9:1–19:16), Joshua (cf. *L.A.B.* 20:1–24:6), Kenaz (cf. *L.A.B.* 25:1–28:10), and Zebul (cf. *L.A.B.* 29:1–4). Deborah maintains that any obedience to God demonstrated during these years was apparent rather than real:

For while these were alive, you showed yourselves as if you were serving your God; but when these died, your heart also died. And you became like iron cast into the fire, which when made molten by flame becomes like water, but when it comes out of the fire, it reverts to its original hardness. So you also, while those who warned you burned you, you were taught the matter; but after they have died you forgot everything. (*L.A.B.* 30:6)

Despite its perpetual sinfulness, Deborah instructs Barak to attack Sisera and he is successful due to God’s disturbance of the stars. In *L.A.B.* 32, Deborah observes that God always has and will continue to intervene on Israel’s behalf (*L.A.B.* 32:1–18) in spite of its perpetual sinfulness.

*L.A.B.* 32 is based loosely upon Deborah’s song in Judges 5 and highlights God’s acts on Israel’s behalf throughout history (*L.A.B.* 32:1–13). Abraham was rescued “out of the fire” (v. 1), given a unique opportunity to respond to angelic jealousy (vv. 2–4) and, even at an old age, given a son (v. 1). Isaac’s wife was barren but God gave him two sons (v. 5). When Jacob’s family became oppressed (v. 7) after having migrated to Egypt (v. 6), God intervened. God brought them out of Egypt and took them to Sinai where they encountered many wonders (vv. 7–8) as

---

<sup>118</sup> Deborah’s interpretation of Israel’s history in *L.A.B.* 30:5–6, however, largely parallels the review of Israel’s history in Ezek 20:5–32 in which Israel is depicted as sinful at every stage of its existence: from its time in bondage in Egypt (vv. 7–8), during its time in the wilderness (v. 13), to its time in the Promised Land (vv. 28–32). This sinfulness included the younger generation that survived in the wilderness (vv. 18–21).



God established a covenant with them (v. 8). When Israel was in battle during Joshua's era, God intervened by giving light to Israel and darkness to their enemies (v. 10).<sup>119</sup> When Sisera tried to “enslave” Israel, God commanded and the “stars came down” and attacked Israel's enemies and guarded Israel (v. 11).<sup>120</sup> These acts of deliverance for a sinful people (cf. *L.A.B.* 30:5–6) will continue throughout the present world and into the future:

“And from this hour, if Israel falls into distress, it will call upon those witnesses along with these servants, and they will form a delegation to the Most High, and he will remember that day and send (*mittet*) the saving power of his covenant (*liberationem testamenti sui*).” (*L.A.B.* 32:14b)

In the second episode, apprehensions concerning the nation of Israel's covenantal status surface in *L.A.B.* 39:7 after the “sons of Ammon” (*fili Ammon*) caused great “distress” (*coangustarentur . . . valde*) by attacking Israel and many Israelite cities (*L.A.B.* 39:1). Jephthah calls for Israel to “set” their “hearts” on God's law, to “beg” God jointly while they “fight” their “enemies,” and to trust and hope in the Lord that he will not deliver . . . up forever” the nation of Israel (*L.A.B.* 39:6). In response, the Israelites pray to God and urge God not to “destroy” Israel, God's chosen people (*populum quem elegisti*) people, the “vine” (*vineam*) God had “planted” (*plantavit*) and “always preferred” (*pretulisti semper*) and the people for whom God had “made dwelling places (*habitabilia*)” and to whom God had given the land (*L.A.B.* 39:7). They also appeal God not to hand them over (*ne tradas nos*) to people who “hate” (*odientium*) God (*L.A.B.* 39:7).

Jephthah's call for Israel to “beg” God in *L.A.B.* 39:6 is paralleled in the scriptural Jephthah narrative (Judg 11:1–40). Israel's prayer in *L.A.B.* 39:7 is paralleled in Judg 10:10 in Israel's cry to God during the time of sin and oppression (Judg 10:6–18), which immediately precedes Jephthah's introduction in the book of Judges (Judg 11:1). However, the parallel between Israel's prayer in *L.A.B.* 39:7 and its cry to God in Judg 10:10 is incomplete since the nation of Israel does not confess its sinfulness in *L.A.B.* as it does in Judg 10:10. In *L.A.B.*,

---

<sup>119</sup> Pseudo-Philo is the sole witness to this tradition concerning Joshua.

<sup>120</sup> Pseudo-Philo is the sole witness to this tradition concerning Israel's battle against Sisera.

Jephthah refers to Israel's sins as being "overabundant" (*L.A.B.* 39:6) but his sentiment is not echoed by the nation. The nation of Israel in *L.A.B.* 39 is aware that God forgives sins (cf. *L.A.B.* 39:4) but the Israelite people do not base their appeal on this knowledge. Instead, Israel's appeal to God in *L.A.B.* 39:7 highlights three of God's actions on Israel's behalf:

1. God chose Israel ("Look, Lord, upon the people that you have chosen")
2. God planted Israel ("May you not destroy vine that your right hand has planted")
3. God created the world for Israel ("for which you made dwelling places and brought into the land you promised").

Israel's appeal to God in *L.A.B.* 39:7 also highlights Israel's value to God. Israel has always been God's people ("this nation which you have had from the beginning and always preferred") and is God's inheritance ("may be for you as an inheritance," *L.A.B.* 39:7; cf. *L.A.B.* 12:8–9). Finally, the nation's appeal to God in *L.A.B.* 39:7 emphasizes that Israel had been handed over to God's enemies ("may you not hand us over before those who hate you"). This appeal is very unlike Israel's appeal in Judges 10 in which it acknowledges its sin (Judg 10:10, 15), casts itself upon God (Judg 10:15), abandons its foreign gods (Judg 10:16), and serves God (Judg 10:17). Israel's prayer in *L.A.B.* 39:7, although lacking in repentance, was the reason why God freed Israel from the foreign oppression that it faced: "I [God] will surely free my people in this time, not because of him [Jephthah] but because of the prayer that Israel prayed" (*L.A.B.* 39:11).

In the third episode, apprehensions concerning Israel's covenantal status in *L.A.B.* surface in *L.A.B.* 49:1–7 as the Israelites debate their inability to ascertain the person whom God had chosen as their next leader. At first, Israel believes that God will reveal the chosen leader if they cast lots "by tribe" rather than as a nation. They believe that the nation as a whole is not "worthy" and that God will respond (lit. "be reconciled") to the worthy tribal group(s) (v. 2). When the lot again comes up empty, Israel concludes that they themselves should choose their next leader since God obviously "hated" and "detested" them (v. 2b). However, Nethes refutes this notion. He argues that God does not "hate" Israel, but that God has abandoned them

because they have made themselves "so hateful" (v. 3). Nethetz then argues that Israel's proper response should not be to abandon God, but rather to "flee" to God since their "long-suffering" God will not "reject" them "forever," nor will God "hate" them "for all generations." (*L.A.B.* 39:3). Nethetz's appeal wins the day and Israel again casts lots, this time by the cities (v. 4) rather than by the nation (v. 1–2a) or by the tribes (v. 2b). This approach works and the city of Ramathaim is chosen (v. 4). From this city, Elkanah is chosen by lot (v. 4).

However, Israel's relief once again turns to grief when Elkanah refuses to assume the mantle of leadership (v. 5). The prospect that God has rejected Israel is no longer at issue when Israel once again cries out to God (v. 6). Ironically, in their prayer to God, the Israelites now express their preference that God cut them off (*abscido*) rather than "neglect" (*negligas*) them. The situation is resolved when God reveals that Israel (and with them all of humanity) deserves to be neglected and rejected (lit. "pay no attention at all to your race") but that, nevertheless, God has not neglected or rejected the nation (v. 7). Instead, the chosen leader is from Elkanah's line but has not been born yet (v. 7). *L.A.B.* 49:1–7 is unparalleled in the scriptural narrative.

One additional episode from the era of the judges in *L.A.B.* highlights Pseudo-Philo's conviction that nothing, including sinfulness, can ever change Israel's status as God's chosen people. In his reworked account of Gideon's call to lead Israel (*L.A.B.* 35:1–7; cf. *Judg* 6:11–23), Pseudo-Philo credited Gideon with the astounding declaration that Israel would "prefer" (*malebamus*) utter destruction (lit. "to be handed over to death once and for all") in place of their present experience of being punished "over a period of time" by God (*L.A.B.* 35:2). The belief that nothing can change Israel's status as God's chosen people brought a measure of comfort to Joshua as he considered Israel's future (*L.A.B.* 21:1–6) but brought distress rather than comfort for Gideon (*L.A.B.* 35:2) and the nation of Israel (*L.A.B.* 49:6). For better or for worse, Israel's status as God's covenant community is eternally secure!

***Conclusions concerning the Impact of Reward and Punishment upon the Israelite Covenant Community as a Whole in L.A.B.***

Two questions were the focus of this chapter. First, does *L.A.B.* exemplify E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon the nation of Israel as God's covenant community? Second, in general, are Pseudo-Philo's omissions, additions, changes, and adaptations to the scriptural account of Israel's history consistent with Sanders's covenantal nomism? In order to answer these questions, we undertook a comparative analysis of the impact of reward and punishment on: 1) the establishment of the nation of Israel as the covenant community and (2) the nation of Israel's continuation as the covenant community.

Pseudo-Philo's views concerning the impact of reward and punishment on the nation of Israel's establishment as God's covenant community exemplify E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism. In *L.A.B.*, neither reward nor punishment ultimately has an impact upon the nation of Israel's establishment as God's covenant community. In his Mosaic covenant narrative, Pseudo-Philo highlighted events that featured reward and punishment but avoided any suggestion that reward and/or punishment influenced the covenant community's establishment. The prospect that God's election of Israel was based on "some merit either in the patriarchs or in the exodus generation or on the condition of future obedience"<sup>121</sup> is absent from Pseudo-Philo's narrative. Instead, he underscored Israel's inherent *unworthiness* to be the recipients of the Mosaic covenant. This is evident in his juxtaposition of events, which are separated by several chapters of other narrative in the Jewish Scriptures.<sup>122</sup>

1. Israel's oppression in Egypt (*L.A.B.* 9:1–16a; cf. Exod 1:1–2:10).

---

<sup>121</sup> See Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 87.

<sup>122</sup> The omitted narrative includes Moses's flight from Egypt (Exod 2:11–23), Moses's encounter with God in the wilderness (Exod 3:1–4:17), the song of Moses (Exod 15:1–21), Israel's complaints to God at Marah (Exod 15:22–27) and Rephidim (Exod 17:1–7), Israel's battle with Amalek (Exod 17:8–16), and Jethro's visit (Exod 18:1–27). Although they are not omitted entirely, God's deliverance of Israel from the land of Egypt (Exod 3:1–13:16; cf. *L.A.B.* 9:16b–10:1) and Israel's complaints to God in the wilderness of Sin (Exod 16:1–36; cf. *L.A.B.* 10:7) are reduced to mere passing mentions.

2. Israel's impending destruction at the Red Sea (*L.A.B.* 10:2–6; cf. Exod 13:17–14:31).

3. The establishment of the Mosaic covenant at Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11:1–15; cf. Exod 19–24).

Pseudo-Philo's narrative does not contain the suggestion that, although unworthy, Israel became God's covenant community because it was the only nation to accept the covenant.<sup>123</sup>

Rather, Pseudo-Philo omitted Israel's acceptance of the covenant (Exod 19:3–8; 24:1–11).<sup>124</sup>

*L.A.B.* does not contain any suggestion that God "chose Israel for his name's sake."<sup>125</sup> Ultimately, in *L.A.B.*, God's election of Israel as the covenant community remains unexplained apart from unmerited divine mercy.

Pseudo-Philo's views concerning the impact of reward and punishment on the establishment of the Israelite covenant community in *L.A.B.* exemplifies E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism. There is no indication that, in *L.A.B.*, reward and/or punishment have an impact on the nation of Israel's continuance as the covenant community. Pseudo-Philo's clearest statements on this issue appear in his Moses's narrative. Following the disappearance of the divine Law from the tablets (*L.A.B.* 12:5a) during the golden calf incident (*L.A.B.* 12:1–10), Pseudo-Philo depicted Moses raising the prospect that Israel's sinfulness might result in the loss of its status as God's covenant community someday (*L.A.B.* 12:5b–9). God's words to Moses in *L.A.B.* 12:10 temporarily assuage Moses's fears, but Moses only finds complete and final relief for these fears during his final conversation with God in *L.A.B.* 19:6–15. Left unresolved until this final conversation is the problem of how to correlate the supposed indestructibility of Israel's covenant relationship with God with the promise that the temple, the tangible symbol of Israel's covenant relationship with God, would be destroyed and (seemingly) never rebuilt (*L.A.B.* 12:4; 19:7). The solution that God presents to Moses in *L.A.B.* 19:10–13 centers upon Pseudo-Philo's

---

<sup>123</sup> See Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 87.

<sup>124</sup> *L.A.B.* 44:6–7 cites Israel's acceptance of the Decalogue (v. 6) in its condemnation of Israel's perpetual propensity to violate the terms of the Decalogue (v. 7). However, Israel's acceptance of the covenant *per se* is not mentioned here.

<sup>125</sup> See Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 88.

belief that the *real* temple of God is in heaven and not on earth. Israel can rest in the hope that it will experience this heavenly temple someday (*L.A.B.* 19:12; cf. v. 10). This conviction that Israel's status as the covenant community holds firm even though its perpetual sinfulness is reinforced in Pseudo-Philo's Joshua narrative (*L.A.B.* 20–24) and is affirmed on several occasions when Israel begins to doubt the indestructibility of its covenant relationship with God (*L.A.B.* 29–32, 39, and 49).

A slight revision of Murphy's declaration that God's covenant relationship *borders on* "making the actions of the people ultimately irrelevant"<sup>126</sup> is in order. As it pertains solely to the topic under consideration in this chapter, namely the reward and punishment of the nation of Israel as a whole, God's covenant relationship with Israel does not border on "making the actions of the people irrelevant." Rather, God's covenant relationship with Israel *makes* "the actions of the people ultimately irrelevant."<sup>127</sup> As Gideon (*L.A.B.* 35:2) and Israel (*L.A.B.* 49:6) affirm, the nation of Israel will remain God's covenant people in *L.A.B.* whether it likes to or not! Stated alternately, in *L.A.B.*, the nation of Israel is *very destructible* in the present world but its place in the world to come is unconditionally assured based on its *indestructible* covenant relationship with God.<sup>128</sup> Although inexplicable, the conclusion that Moses, Joshua, and other Israelites in *L.A.B.* reach is that Israel's destruction does not matter as long as there is a world to come in which the covenant relationship will be continued.

---

<sup>126</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 246.

<sup>127</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 246.

<sup>128</sup> A slight revision of M. R. James's famous declaration that, in *L.A.B.*, "the indestructibility of Israel" is among its foremost theme (*Biblical Antiquities*, 34).

#### 4: The Reward and Punishment of Individual Israelites in *L.A.B.*

Following our examination of Pseudo-Philo's depiction of the impact of reward and punishment upon Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors (Chapter 2) and upon the nation of Israel as a whole (Chapter 3), the prospect remains strong that *L.A.B.* exemplifies covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel. Despite its prominence within the sections of *L.A.B.* examined thus far in this dissertation, reward and punishment has been found to have negligible (if any) lasting impact upon either Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors (Chapter 2) or upon the nation of Israel as a whole (Chapter 3). Phrased according to Sanders's terminology, reward and punishment have no impact upon the getting in and staying in for individuals in the pre-Sinaitic narratives (*L.A.B.* 1–8) and for the nation of Israel as a whole in *L.A.B.* 11–65. The acquisition and maintenance of Israel's covenant status is dependant ultimately upon God's decision (made prior to the creation of the world) to select Israel as the covenant people. Nevertheless, the crux of the matter remains. At the heart of Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism stands Sanders's hypothesis that most individual adherents to Judaism of the first centuries of the Common Era believed that any reward and punishment they might receive from God is "intra-covenantal" and without impact<sup>1</sup> upon that which may be deemed "salvation."<sup>2</sup> However, without a thorough examination of Pseudo-Philo's depiction of the impact of reward and punishment upon individual, post-Sinaitic Israelites, it remains impossible to determine whether Pseudo-Philo exemplified Sanders's theory in this regard. Such an examination will be the focus of this chapter.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 234.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 17–18, 75.

### ***Moral Causality***

The well-received hypothesis that moral causality<sup>3</sup> was part of Pseudo-Philo's ideology serves as an excellent starting point for our consideration of the impact that reward and punishment had upon individual Israelites in *L.A.B.* The evidence in support of this hypothesis is strong but it is not without its difficulties. One of the arguments that Murphy made in defence of his hypothesis that Pseudo-Philo "subscribes . . . completely" to moral causality is that, "toward the beginning of the book," God lays down the "rules for history" in *L.A.B.* 3:9.<sup>4</sup> The system of reward and punishment presented in *L.A.B.* 3:9 is consistent with the principles of moral causality. However, as we saw in Chapter 2 of this thesis, Pseudo-Philo did not enact this system of reward and punishment evenly and consistently during the pre-Sinaitic period. Rather, postdiluvian humanity's descent into sin continues unabated. Shortly following the pronouncement in *L.A.B.* 3:9, Pseudo-Philo revealed (*L.A.B.* 4:16) that, once again, with the exception of only one family (cf. Noah in *L.A.B.* 3:4), all humanity is deeply sinful. At the very least, the present world portion of the supposed "rules for history" that Murphy highlighted in *L.A.B.* 3:9 is not enforced in this era and postdiluvian humanity continues to sin with apparent impunity. There is no indication that the world-to-come portion of the "rules for history" (*L.A.B.* 3:10) will be enforced either. Pseudo-Philo may have envisaged that postdiluvian humanity would be held accountable in the world to come (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:10) but, if this is the case, he did not mention it.

Pseudo-Philo's Abraham narrative (*L.A.B.* 6–8) contains the first postdiluvian examples of moral causality in action but, even here, the principle is not applied evenly and consistently. Foundational to Abraham's willingness to face the tower builders' wrath is his unwavering belief that all of the negative events in a person's life are rooted in something the person has done

---

<sup>3</sup> As observed earlier in this thesis, the term *moral causality* refers to the belief that, if you do good works, you will be rewarded and, if you do evil deeds, you will be punished. Also inherent with the term moral causality is the belief that there is a moral cause for everything that has happened to a person.

<sup>4</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 247.



previously. Abraham is confident that his life does not contain any “sin” that merits death by fire and so he waits fearlessly to be thrown into the fire (*L.A.B.* 6:11). The tower builders who wanted Abraham to be thrown into the fire (*L.A.B.* 6:16) are “burned” in the fire (*L.A.B.* 6:17) and the tower builders who wanted to avert being scattered and divided (*L.A.B.* 6:1) are “scattered . . . over the face of all the earth” and are divided racially and linguistically (*L.A.B.* 7:5). The uneven and inconsistent manner in which moral causality is applied in this narrative is seen in the uncertain fates of Joktan (*L.A.B.* 6:3–9, 16) and of the eleven dissenters (cf. *L.A.B.* 6:3, 9–10, 12).<sup>5</sup> Joktan’s proximity to the furnace in *L.A.B.* 6:16–17 and Pseudo-Philo’s silence concerning his well-being suggests that this God-fearing man (who secretly went to great lengths to ensure the dissenters’ safety, *L.A.B.* 6:6–12) was among those who died in the fire (*L.A.B.* 6:17). The eleven dissenters do not share Abraham’s unwavering belief in moral causality (*L.A.B.* 6:10–11) but they share in the deliverance and the subsequent respect/fear that Abraham experienced (*L.A.B.* 6:17–18). When the tower’s construction resumes in *L.A.B.* 7:1, the eleven dissenters do not reappear. The two-part division of humanity in *L.A.B.* 7:3–4 into (1) Abraham and his descendants (*L.A.B.* 7:4) and (2) everyone else (*L.A.B.* 7:3) implies that, ultimately, the eleven dissenters who shared in Abraham’s deliverance (*L.A.B.* 6:17–18) became recipients of God’s wrath (*L.A.B.* 7:4). If this is the case, the reader of *L.A.B.* is left to guess what, if anything, changed in the eleven dissenter’s circumstances between *L.A.B.* 6:18 and 7:1. Furthermore, Pseudo-Philo observed that the people of Sodom with whom Lot lived were “very wicked and great sinners” (*L.A.B.* 8:2). Had Pseudo-Philo wished to emphasize moral causality, this would have been an ideal place to insert a brief note in the narrative explaining the fate of the people of Sodom (cf. Gen 19:1–29) and explaining how their fate was related to what they had done. Pseudo-Philo also mentioned Job’s trials (*L.A.B.* 8:8a) without even a brief explanation as to why he deserved it. Pseudo-Philo also noted the animosity between Joseph and his brothers (*L.A.B.* 8:9–10) but he did not attempt to explain whether they faced divine wrath for their actions.

---

<sup>5</sup> The twelfth dissenter, Abraham, was spared (*L.A.B.* 6:17).

Overall, the moral causality based “rules for history”<sup>6</sup> revealed in *L.A.B.* 3:9 remain, with a few notable exceptions, a forgotten side note in Pseudo-Philo’s pre-Sinaitic narrative.

Pseudo-Philo’s clear synopses of moral causality in *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 and in *L.A.B.* 44:10, along with the various examples of moral causality within material unique to Pseudo-Philo’s narrative (e.g. the tower builders’ fates in *L.A.B.* 6:17; cf. 6:13, 16), demonstrate that moral causality has a place within Pseudo-Philo’s ideology. Nevertheless, the inconsistency with which Pseudo-Philo integrated moral causality into his narrative leaves some doubt regarding whether Murphy was correct when he contended that Pseudo-Philo “subscribes . . . completely” to moral causality.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps the “rules for history” that Pseudo-Philo ostensibly laid down in *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 were not the sole (or even the primary) “rules” in *L.A.B.* by which “history” functions. Murphy appeared to recognize this when he included the unsubstantiated declaration that Pseudo-Philo’s view concerning “recompense” for “sin” and the prospect of “salvation, either in this world or in the next,” actually “corresponds to what Sanders . . . calls ‘covenantal nomism’” in a footnote.<sup>8</sup>

Murphy did not explore the relationship between his contention that Pseudo-Philo affirms moral causality<sup>9</sup> and his contention that Pseudo-Philo’s view on reward (i.e. salvation) and punishment (i.e. “recompense” for “sin”) “corresponds to . . . covenantal nomism”<sup>10</sup> but the concepts are not mutually exclusive. Even the strictest application of moral causality is admissible within Sanders’s theory of covenantal nomism as long as reward and punishment is “intra-covenantal”<sup>11</sup> and without impact upon “how man is saved.”<sup>12</sup> Since, in Sanders’s

---

<sup>6</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 247.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 233.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 247–248.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 233.

<sup>11</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 234.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 181.

terminology, *salvation* refers to the process by which individuals *get in* and *stay in* the Israelite covenant community,<sup>13</sup> covenantal nomism may be deemed present within an early Jewish text that also represents moral causality as long as the moral causality does not impact upon an individual getting in and staying in the Israelite covenant community. Of course, Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism does envisage that "the most unregenerate sinners"<sup>14</sup> through their rejection of "God and his covenant"<sup>15</sup> would "exclude themselves from the covenant."<sup>16</sup> In this scenario, however, Sanders placed the onus on the individual member of the covenant community rather than on God since Sanders reasoned that God never cancels anyone's membership in the covenant<sup>17</sup> but God punishes those who "exclude themselves from the covenant."<sup>18</sup>

At the other extreme in the interpretation of Pseudo-Philo's strict system of reward and punishment for individual Israelites is the tendency of some scholars to focus primarily (or even solely) upon the declaration in *L.A.B.* 3:10 that, at the end of time, there will be a final judgment. For example, as was noted in Chapter 1 of this thesis, M. R. James dedicated several pages of the introduction to his widely influential English-language translation of *L.A.B.* to a synopsis of major themes in *L.A.B.* He dwelt at some length upon Pseudo-Philo's beliefs concerning an Israelite's "duty of faithfulness to the one God"<sup>19</sup> but he ignored Pseudo-Philo's clear synopses of a moral causality-based system of reward and punishment (*L.A.B.* 3:9; 44:10) and Pseudo-Philo's examples of it in action (e.g. Abraham in *L.A.B.* 6:11, 17–18). Instead, James emphasized Pseudo-Philo's beliefs concerning a final reckoning in the world to come when individuals would be

---

<sup>13</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 75.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>19</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

rewarded “according to . . . works” (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:10).<sup>20</sup> Another scholar, Michael Phillip Wadsworth, outlined Pseudo-Philo’s system of reward and punishment in some detail but, likewise, focused upon the prospect of a post-mortem final judgment (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:10; 19:13).<sup>21</sup> Even Simon Gathercole, who included *L.A.B.* on a short list of early Jewish texts that “cause a very serious problem for the paradigm of covenantal nomism,”<sup>22</sup> highlighted Pseudo-Philo’s belief in a final judgment of humanity (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:10).<sup>23</sup> Common to each of these three interpretations of Pseudo-Philo’s strictly applied system of reward and punishment is the contention, either implicit or explicit, that Pseudo-Philo’s inclusion of a system of reward and punishment in his rewriting of Gen 8:21-22 (*L.A.B.* 3:9-10) was strong proof that Pseudo-Philo’s ideology at its core was (borrowing terminology from Sanders) a more or less “legalistic” system of “works-righteousness.”<sup>24</sup>

Pseudo-Philo’s failure to apply moral causality evenly and consistently throughout the narratives we have examined thus far raises the prospect that, within his ideology, his belief in moral causality was subservient to or tempered by some other belief. The key possibility regarding this prospect is that a belief in that which Sanders deemed covenantal nomism underlies Pseudo-Philo’s ideology. We will consider this possibility in this chapter. The evidence uncovered thus far suggests that a covenantal-nomism-based ideology influenced Pseudo-Philo’s rewriting of the pre-Sinaitic narratives and his rewriting of the story of the nation of Israel as a whole. If anything, Pseudo-Philo’s ideology appears to go beyond even what Sanders proposed in its emphasis upon God’s covenant people being utterly dependent upon God for their preservation and continuation. The possibility that Pseudo-Philo’s belief in moral causality was

---

<sup>20</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>21</sup> Wadsworth, “Pseudo-Philo,” 1:16–21.

<sup>22</sup> Gathercole, *Boasting*, 160.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 79–80.

<sup>24</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 59.

subservient to or somehow tempered by the pattern of religion that underlay his ideology (i.e. covenantal nomism) must be considered in light of Pseudo-Philo's references to his belief that, at the end of the present world, individuals will face a final reckoning (e.g. *L.A.B.* 3:9).<sup>25</sup> As we have seen, for scholars such as James and Wadsworth, Pseudo-Philo's belief in a final judgment was one of the key components in their more or less legalistic portraits of Pseudo-Philo's ideology.

The prospect of a post-mortem, final judgment has not come to the forefront in the passages of *L.A.B.* that we have studied thus far. This is not unexpected since this portion of our study focused on Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors and on the nation of Israel as a whole. The closest we have come to the prospect of a post-mortem, final judgment has been: (1) God's revelation to Moses in *L.A.B.* 19 that "all who can may dwell in the place of sanctification" (v. 13; i.e. "paradise," v. 10), (2) Joshua's reference to his generation of Israelites being "in Sheol" (*L.A.B.* 21:4), and (3) Deborah's warning that, if the Israelites do not change their ways, "hell" (*inferno*) will be their post-mortem fate (*L.A.B.* 33:3).

As we proceed in our consideration of the impact that reward and punishment had upon individual Israelites in *L.A.B.*, the key will be to determine whether the reward and punishment of individual Israelites in Pseudo-Philo's post-Sinaitic narratives ultimately was, in Sanders's terminology, "intra-covenantal" and without impact upon soteriology.<sup>26</sup> An early Jewish text with the most harsh and unwavering examples of moral causality-based reward and punishment may be deemed representative of covenantal nomism *if* the individual's acquisition and maintenance of place within the covenant community is not related to the said reward and punishment.<sup>27</sup> In the case of *L.A.B.*, this means that place within the Israelite covenant

---

<sup>25</sup> James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 34.

<sup>26</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 234.

<sup>27</sup> Among the texts that Sanders studied in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, the closest to this particular scenario was his contention that the book of Jubilees, despite evidence of that which he deemed a "very strict legalism" (*ibid.*, 375), represented covenantal nomism (*ibid.*, 380–385). For Sanders's brief analysis of reward and punishment in the book of Jubilees, see pp. 366–367. Sanders

community in the world to come could not be at stake at the final reckoning (*L.A.B.* 3:10) if this text is deemed representative of covenantal nomism. Four secondary questions based on Sanders's theory will also be pondered in the background as we consider the reward and punishment of individual Israelites in *L.A.B.*:

1. Did Pseudo-Philo make "room for one who is basically loyal . . . but who disobeys"?<sup>28</sup> If so, "how perfect must obedience be to prove basic loyalty"?<sup>29</sup>
2. Did the "theme of God's mercy to the basically righteous but not always obedient members of Israel" appear in Pseudo-Philo's consideration of these matters?<sup>30</sup>
3. Did Pseudo-Philo believe that God's law provided ways for basically righteous people to make atonement for their sins?<sup>31</sup>
4. Did Pseudo-Philo believe that nothing less than the forfeiture of membership in the Israelite covenant community through the "denial of God" and the covenant<sup>32</sup> will result in an individual's loss of membership in the Israelite covenant community?

Our consideration of Pseudo-Philo's depiction of the impact of reward and punishment upon individual Israelites will begin with a brief examination of the few cases in which Pseudo-Philo depicted God as rewarding an individual or a small group of Israelites. In this section, the key question will be whether Pseudo-Philo considered the acquisition or the maintenance of individual membership in the Israelite covenant community as a divinely granted "reward" for

---

contended that, in the book of Jubilees, the nation of Israel is responsible to obey (p. 364) but it can have confidence that God will never forsake the covenant (Jub. 1:18) and, hence, it will never lose its salvation. Sanders stated that the "basis of salvation is membership in the covenant and loyalty to it" (Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 367; see Jub. 15:26–28). Sanders contended that, in the book of Jubilees, God "graciously" gave "salvation" when God established a covenant with Israel (Jub. 1:18; Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 366).

<sup>28</sup> Adapted from Sanders's discussion of 4 Ezra (Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 422).

<sup>29</sup> Ibid. Also Sanders, "Comparing Judaism and Christianity," 24.

<sup>30</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 422.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

correct actions, attitudes, or beliefs. The bulk of this chapter will then focus upon the many cases in which Pseudo-Philo depicted God punishing an individual Israelite or a small group of Israelites. In this section, the key question will be whether Pseudo-Philo believed that even punishment for sin is intra-covenantal and without impact in the Israelite covenant community in its ultimate form in the world to come. The chapter will conclude with a consideration of two passages in which a post-Sinaitic leader of Israel addresses this topic.

Pseudo-Philo's appeal to "paradise" (*L.A.B.* 19:10) in the world to come as Israel's ultimate "immortal dwelling place" (*L.A.B.* 19:12) provides clear direction for us as we consider the many cases in which Pseudo-Philo depicted God as punishing an individual Israelite or a small group of Israelites. Explicit statements concerning whether the punishment extends into the world to come will be used to divide these individual cases into three groups.

The first group of Israelite sinners in *L.A.B.* considered in this section contains those whose punishment for sin extends into the world to come, thereby potentially jeopardizing their share of Israel's blessings in the world to come. This group includes Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:1–4), Korah and his co-conspirators (*L.A.B.* 16:1–6), and Gideon (*L.A.B.* 36:3–4). With the exception of these Israelites, Pseudo-Philo left hope that the people of Israel might avoid God's wrath in the world to come.

The second group of Israelite sinners in *L.A.B.* considered in this section is comprised of those for whom it is not certain whether the punishment for their sin will extend into the world to come, thereby potentially jeopardizing their share of Israel's blessings in the world to come. This group includes the secret sinners in *L.A.B.* 25–27:15, Micah and his mother Dedila (*L.A.B.* 44:1–10), and King Saul (*L.A.B.* 64–65).

The third group of Israelite sinners in *L.A.B.* considered in this section contains those for whom there is no mention of the possibility that the punishment for their sin will extend into the world to come, thereby not jeopardizing their share of Israel's blessings in the world to come. This group includes Jephthah (*L.A.B.* 39:9–40:9; cf. *Judg* 11:29–40), Eluma (*L.A.B.* 42:1–3; cf. *Judg*

13:2–25), Samson (*L.A.B.* 43:1–8; cf. Judg 14:1–16:31), Beel’s concubine (*L.A.B.* 45:1–4; cf. Judg 19:1–30), and Eli and his sons (*L.A.B.* 52; cf. 1 Sam 4:10–11).

***The Reward and Punishment of Individuals and the Acquisition of Membership in the Israelite Covenant Community in L.A.B.***

Pseudo-Philo included only a few narratives in which God rewards an individual member of the Israelite covenant community. The first example is Moses who became the mediator of the Mosaic covenant as a reward for the actions of his father, Amram, during Israel’s oppression in the land of Egypt (*L.A.B.* 9:1–8). Chapter 3 of this thesis demonstrated that Moses is rewarded for the “strategy” (*verbum*) that his father, Amram, employed during Israel’s trying times in Egypt, a “strategy” that “pleased” (*placuit*) God (*L.A.B.* 9:7).<sup>33</sup> However, Amram’s strategy in *L.A.B.* 9 does not influence the status of Amram, his unborn son, and the nation of Israel as God’s covenant people. Their status as God’s covenant people is presupposed in *L.A.B.* 9:7.

The second examples are Joshua and Caleb, the only two members of the exodus generation who entered the Promised Land in *L.A.B.* (*L.A.B.* 20:6–7; cf. Num 14:30; Josh 14:6–12). Pseudo-Philo’s depiction of their preservation as a reward for having “alone fulfilled the word of the Lord” (*solii complevimus verbum Domini*, *L.A.B.* 20:6)<sup>34</sup> parallels the scriptural depiction of Caleb as having “wholeheartedly followed the Lord” (Josh 14:8–9). The account in Num 13–14 groups Caleb and Joshua together as the only two spies who exhort the nation of Israel to enter the Promised Land despite the presence of a formidable foe.<sup>35</sup> Caleb urges Israel to enter the

---

<sup>33</sup> We also saw in Chapter 3 of this dissertation that Moses’s role as a mediator between God and Israel was foreordained by God before Moses’s birth. In *L.A.B.* 9:8 God states concerning the unborn Moses, “I thought of him in the days of old, saying, ‘My spirit will not be a mediator among these men forever, because they are flesh and their days will be 120 years’” (cf. Gen 6:3). For a citation of Gen 6:3 without a reference to Moses’ role as mediator, see *L.A.B.* 3:2.

<sup>34</sup> Pseudo-Philo omitted from his reworking of Num 13–14 (*L.A.B.* 15) any mention of the fact that Caleb, Joshua, and all Israelites under the age of twenty would survive the wilderness years (Num 14:24, 28–33).

<sup>35</sup> For the other ten spies’ reports, see Num 13:27–28, 32–33. They focused on the great stature of the land’s inhabitants (the spies felt “like grasshoppers,” v. 33, in comparison to the “great size” of the land’s inhabitants, v. 32) and on the strength of the fortifications their armies would encounter (“the towns are fortified and very large,” v. 28).



land “for we are well able to overcome it” (Num 13:30) and, together, Caleb and Joshua urge Israel not to “fear them” because “the Lord is with us” (Num 14:9).

*L.A.B.* contains other examples of God blessing individuals within the Israelite covenant community. In none of these episodes did Pseudo-Philo depict the blessings from God that these individuals receive as a reward from God. First, Pseudo-Philo included a flashback in *L.A.B.* 47:1 to the events that led to God’s promise of a “covenant of perpetual priesthood” to Phinehas in the scriptural account (Num 25:13). Pseudo-Philo related how Phinehas killed two individuals as they committed a sin (*L.A.B.* 47:1) but did not depict God as rewarding Phinehas for his actions through a promised perpetual priesthood. Second, God chooses Joshua as Moses’s successor (*L.A.B.* 20:1–5) but this selection does not contain any indication that Joshua’s selection is a reward. Third, Saul is anointed as Israel’s future king but his anointing is depicted as a punishment for Saul and for Israel rather than as a reward (*L.A.B.* 56:3). Fourth, David is anointed as Israel’s future king by the prophet Samuel (*L.A.B.* 59:1–4) but this anointing is described as an act of divine mercy shown to the “least shepherd of all” (*pastorem omnium minimum*, *L.A.B.* 59:2; cf. v. 4, “his mercy drew near to me”).

In all, reward has little impact upon members of the Israelite covenant community in the present. In none of these instances is the acquisition of covenant membership under consideration. The acquisition of membership in the Israelite covenant community by individuals, whether Jewish or otherwise, is a non-issue in *L.A.B.* No one is depicted as seeking entry into the covenant community, no one is depicted as considering whether or not they have membership in the covenant community, and no one is depicted as encouraging individuals to seek membership in the covenant community. None of the individual rewards depicted in the studied examples can be construed as “salvation” as defined by Sanders.<sup>36</sup> The best reward portrayed in *L.A.B.* is the reward that Moses received. However, even the bestowment of this

---

<sup>36</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 75.

reward is tempered by the revelation that God had foreordained Moses for this promised leadership role long before Moses's father, Amram, was born.

***The Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Life in the Israelite Covenant Community for Individual Israelites in L.A.B.***

*Individual Israelites in L.A.B. Whose Punishment for Sin Extends into the World to Come*

In this section, we will look at the group of individual Israelites in *L.A.B.* whose punishment for sin extends into the world to come: (1) Korah and his co-conspirators (*L.A.B.* 16:1–7), (2) Gideon (*L.A.B.* 36:3–4), and (3) Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:1–4).

**KORAH AND HIS CO-CONSPIRATORS (*L.A.B.* 16:1–7; CF. NUM 16:1–17:15 [ET 16:1–50])**

In *L.A.B.*, Korah and his co-conspirators provide the first example of individual Israelites whose punishment for sin extends explicitly into the world to come. In Num 16:1–17:15 [ET 16:1–50], Korah, Dathan, Abiram, On, and two hundred and fifty “well-known” (אֲנָשֵׁי־יָשָׁם) men who were “leaders of the congregation” (נְשִׂי־אֵי עֵדָה) in Israel challenged the leadership of Moses and Aaron (Num 16:1–3). Moses responded to their challenge by setting up a test to reveal clearly whom God had chosen as Israel's leaders (Num 16:5–7). The two hundred and fifty challengers and Moses and Aaron each brought an incense-filled censer (מִקְהָתָה; Num 16:17) and stood before the “tent of meeting” (v. 18). God appeared before “the whole congregation” (v. 19) and commanded Moses and Aaron to “separate” themselves from the rest of Israel so that God could destroy them (v. 21). After Moses made an appeal on behalf of Israel (v. 22), God mandated that the rest of the Israelites separate themselves from Korah, Dathan, Abiram, their families, and all they possessed (v. 24–27). Moses then asked God for one final sign to demonstrate that God had “sent” him (v. 28). This sign was that Korah, Dathan, Abiram, and their families, and all they possessed would “go down alive into Sheol” when the earth “opens its mouth and swallows them up” (v. 30). The sign took place as Moses requested (v. 31–33): the earth swallowed Korah, Dathan, and Abiram and their families and possessions (vv. 31–33) and

“fire . . . from the Lord” (v. 35) destroyed the two hundred and fifty leaders.<sup>37</sup> Despite these two signs, the Israelites grumbled that Moses and Aaron had “killed the people of the Lord” (Num 17:6 [ET 16:41]). God once again declared a desire to “consume” (פָּלֶה) Israel (Num 17:10 [ET 16:45]) and sent a plague upon the Israelites (Num 17:12 [ET 16:47]). Moses and Aaron once again “made atonement” for the Israelites (Num 17:11–12 [ET 16:46–47]) and the plague ended (Num 17:13–15 [ET 16:48–50]).

In *L.A.B.* 16:1–7, Korah and two hundred men<sup>38</sup> rebel (*restitit*) against an “unbearable law” (*insufferibilis*) that requires the Israelites to place “tassels” (*fimbriis*; v. 1) on their garments. Pseudo-Philo did not provide any details concerning this law, but, in Num 15, God commanded the Israelites “throughout their generations” to place tassels (צִיָּצִית) on the “corners of their garments” and to place a “blue cord” (פֶּתִיל תְּכֵלֶת) on the corner tassels (v. 38). The stated purpose of the tassel law in Num 15:38–39 was to remind Israelites throughout history to “remember and do all my [God’s] commandments” (v. 38–39). Korah’s words angered God (*iratus est Deus*) who, after recalling that Cain killed his brother Abel (*L.A.B.* 16:2), declared that humanity’s “thoughts” (*cogitationes*) were “very corrupt” (*fortiter contaminate*) (*L.A.B.* 16:3). God then revealed to Moses how the rebels would be punished. On God’s “command” (*precipio*), the earth would “swallow up” (*deglutiet*) the “body and soul together” (*corpus et animam pariter*) of each of the rebels’ (v. 3). The place of “darkness” (*tenebris*) and the “destruction” (*perditione*) into which the rebels will descend will become their “dwelling place” (*habitatio*) until the end of the present world (v. 3). At that time, the rebels finally will “die” (*morientur*), and will not live again (*et non vivent*), even in the world to come (v. 3).<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Fire descended and consumed the conspirators (Num 16:35). All that remained were the censers they were holding (Num 17:2–3 [ET 16:37–38]; cf. 16:16–19). Josephus, *Ant.* 4:54–56, stated that fire destroyed Korah and his co-conspirators. In addition, an early second century C.E. Christian text (Ign. *Magn.* 3:4) has Korah and his co-conspirators destroyed by the fire of Hades into which they were cast.

<sup>38</sup> Pseudo-Philo alone stated that only 200 men, not 250 as stated in the scriptural account (Num 16:2, 17; Num 26:10), took part in this rebellion.

<sup>39</sup> In this regard, *L.A.B.* 16:3 cites as a parallel the fate of the Egyptians who were “destroyed (*perdideram*) with the flood of water” at the Red Sea (cf. *L.A.B.* 10:6; Exod 14:24–28; 15:4–5, 10).

Moses relayed God's words to the rebels but they remained "unbelieving" (*diffidens*) (v. 4).<sup>40</sup> Korah summoned his seven sons,<sup>41</sup> who were not among the rebels, to join him (*L.A.B.* 16:4b).<sup>42</sup> Citing their preference to "walk" (*ambulaverimus*) in God's "ways" (*viis*) as revealed in the "Law of the Most Powerful" (*Iegem Fortissimi*), they did not come to him (*L.A.B.* 16:5b). When the earth split open, ready to "swallow up" the rebels, Korah's sons appealed to their father to repent: "If your madness is still upon you, who will help you in the day of your destruction (*perditionis*)?" (*L.A.B.* 16:6). Unfortunately, their appeal had no effect on Korah. After the rebels and their households (*domus eorum*) were swallowed up by the earth (*L.A.B.* 16:6b), Moses heeded the request of the people to move from the "place where Korah and his men were swallowed up" (*L.A.B.* 16:7).

The basic narrative sequence is the same in both the scriptural account and Pseudo-Philo's account: led by Korah, a group of Israelites rebels (*Num* 16:1–3; *L.A.B.* 16:1) and, as the punishment for their sin, is swallowed by the earth (*Num* 16:31–33; *L.A.B.* 16:6). However, the major details of the narratives differ and many portions of the narratives do not have parallels (see Table 4.1).

---

<sup>40</sup> In *L.A.B.* 16:4, Harrington ("Pseudo-Philo," 2:324) and Cazeaux (in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 145) translated *diffidens* as "defiant" ("défiant") but, in *L.A.B.* 16:5, Harrington ("Pseudo-Philo," 2:324) and Cazeaux (in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 147) translated *diffidens* as "unbelieving" and "lack of faith" ("manques de foi"), respectively. There is no reason to translate *diffidens* differently between *L.A.B.* 16:4 and *L.A.B.* 16:5 and "unbelieving" is a more natural translation of *diffidens* than is "defiant." Both occurrences of *diffidens* in *L.A.B.* 16 are translated as "unbelieving" in James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 121; in Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1975)," 144 ("ungläubig"); and in Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:117.

<sup>41</sup> Exodus 6:24 lists only three sons of Korah. Frederick J. Murphy, "Korah's Rebellion in Pseudo-Philo 16," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin; College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), 117, offers a promising suggestion concerning the difference in the number of sons when he cited the seven martyr brothers in 2 Maccabees 7 as a possible source for Pseudo-Philo's account.

<sup>42</sup> Numbers 20:10–11 states "Korah's sons did not die" (v. 10) along with their father and his co-conspirators (v. 11).

Table 4.1. Korah's Rebellion in Numbers and in *L.A.B.*

<b>Num 16:1–17:15 [ET 16:1–50]</b>	<b><i>L.A.B.</i> 16:1–7</b>
The rebels focus upon Moses and Aaron's leadership (16:1–3)	The rebels focus upon an "unbearable law" (v. 1)
Moses proposes a test to reveal God's chosen leadership in Israel (16:5–7)	n/a
Moses chastises the rebels (16:8–11)	Korah's sons exhort their father (v. 6)
Moses summons Dathan and Abiram (16:12–14)	Korah summons his sons (v. 4b–5)
Dathan and Abiram respond to Moses (16:12b–14)	Korah's sons refuse their father's summons and respond to their father (v. 5)
Moses defends his leadership record (16:15)	n/a
All Israel is gathered in front of the tent of meeting and witness the events (16:16–19)	n/a
God threatens twice to kill all of the Israelites except Moses and Aaron (16:20–21; 17:7–10a [ET 16:42–45a])	n/a
Moses and Aaron twice appeal for God not to destroy all of the Israelites (16:22–24; 17:10b–15 [ET 16:45b–50])	n/a
Moses urges the Israelites to separate themselves from the rebels (16:25–27)	n/a
Moses proposes that God kill the rebels by swallowing them alive in the earth (16:28–30)	God reveals that the rebels will be killed by being swallowed alive in the earth (v. 2–3)
Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, along with their households and goods, are swallowed by the earth (16:31–33)	The rebels are buried alive by the earth (v. 7)
The rest of the rebels are burned alive (16:35)	

Num 16:1–17:15 [ET 16:1–50]	L.A.B. 16:1–7
The rebels' censers are crafted into a covering for the altar (17:1–5, ET 16:35–40)	
Many other Israelites die in a plague (17:11–14, ET 16:46–49)	
Fearful for their safety, the Israelites flee from the place (16:34)	Israel no longer wants to remain at the place (v. 7)
The Israelites grumble that Moses and Aaron have killed God's people (17: 6; ET 16:41)	n/a

Two emphases are apparent in Pseudo-Philo's narrative. First, in *L.A.B.* 16, individual Israelites face God's wrath only for their own sins, not for the sins of others (regardless of their relationship to the sinners). In the scriptural account, God sent a plague upon the Israelites resulting in many deaths (Table 4.1, row 12) but, in Pseudo-Philo's account, God only punished Korah and his co-conspirators (Table 4.1, rows 7-9). In *L.A.B.* 16:4–5, Pseudo-Philo divided the Israelites into two groups: (1) those who "walk in God's ways" and are God's "sons"<sup>43</sup> and (2) those who are "unbelieving" (*diffidens*, *L.A.B.* 16:5; cf. *diffidens*, *L.A.B.* 16:4) and "go" their "own way" (*L.A.B.* 16:5). Korah's sons, through their steadfast refusal to join their father (*L.A.B.* 16:4b–5a) and their affirmation of their unwavering commitment to God and the Law (*L.A.B.* 16:5), showed themselves to be among those who "walk in God's ways" rather than among the "unbelieving." Punishment is reserved for and is meted out only to those who are sinners.<sup>44</sup> This is classic moral causality in action.

<sup>43</sup> The depiction of the relationship between God and Israel as filial appears frequently in the Jewish Scriptures (e.g. Exod 4:22; Isa 1:2; 64:8; Jer 31:9; Mal 1:6).

<sup>44</sup> In *L.A.B.* 13:9–10, Pseudo-Philo depicted Moses as learning from God concerning related matters. The "ways of paradise" (*vias paradysi*) were "lost" because humanity did not "walk" as they should (*L.A.B.* 13:9). If the Israelites "walk in my ways," then God will have mercy upon and bless Israel (*L.A.B.* 13:10). Israel's obedience to God in *L.A.B.* 13:10 results in blessings but does not result in the acquisition of covenant status (cf. reference to the "covenants . . . with their fathers"). In *L.A.B.* 11:6 (cf. Exod 20:5–6), Pseudo-Philo reworked the scriptural declaration that punishment is extended to "the third and fourth generations" (Exod 20:5) to state that the offspring of the ungodly (*filios impiorum*) will be

Second, Pseudo-Philo's simplification and clarification of the rebels' fate in *L.A.B.* 16 highlighted his belief that punishment, for at least some individual Israelites, continues in the world to come. The rebels face only one, two-part fate: a live descent into the earth and a lasting "dwelling place" in the place of "darkness" (*tenebris*) and "destruction" (*perditione*; *L.A.B.* 16:3). The scriptural account does not state what might happen to the rebels at the end of the present age (cf. Num 16:30–33) but Pseudo-Philo's account states that the rebels at the end of the present age will "die" (*morientur*) and not live again (*et non vivent*; *L.A.B.* 16:3). These "unbelieving" (*L.A.B.* 16:4) rebels will share the fate of the villainous Egyptians who sought to destroy Israel and the people that God destroyed in the flood (*L.A.B.* 16:3).

Pseudo-Philo's narrative does not offer any hope that the rebels might escape this fate someday and share in Israel's blessings in the world to come. Korah's sons' final exhortation to their father, "If your madness is still upon you, who will help you in the day of your destruction (*perditionis*)?" (*L.A.B.* 16:6), suggests that Pseudo-Philo believed that, even at the time of their demise, the rebels had had a chance to avoid eternal damnation. In the scriptural account, no one exhorts the Korah and his co-conspirators to repent but two members of the group, Dathan and Abiram, affirm their position when they are summoned by Moses (Num 16:12–14).

GIDEON (*L.A.B.* 36:3–4; cf. JUDG 8:22–35)

The second example of individual Israelites in *L.A.B.* whose punishment for sin extends into the world to come is Gideon. In the Jewish Scriptures, an episode at the end of Gideon's story (Judg 8:22–35) appears to cast a dark cloud over an otherwise distinguished lifetime.<sup>45</sup>

---

punished only if they "walk in the ways of their parents" (*in viis parentum suorum ambulabunt*). The reward for walking "in the ways of the Lord" is divine guidance ("and he will guide you," *L.A.B.* 20:4). The connection between walking in God's ways and divine blessing for God's people is implied in *L.A.B.* 30:4 where wickedness is described as having "walked in these ways that have not profited us." In *L.A.B.* 49:3, walking "in our evil ways" is perceived to result in temporary, not permanent, abandonment from God. See also *L.A.B.* 52:2 in which Eli exhorts his wicked sons to "straighten out your ways and walk in good ways." The result is not a blessing but, rather, the maintenance of the status quo ("and your positions will remain the same"). A refusal to "walk in good ways" will result in destruction.

<sup>45</sup> This dark cloud is similar to the one that the story of Noah's drunkenness in Gen 9:17–28 casts over Noah's otherwise exemplary life.

After destroying the altar of Baal and the Asherah pole in his town (Judg 6:28–32) and after leading Israel to victory over the Midianites against all odds (Judg 7:1–8:21), Gideon leads his family and his nation astray by fabricating an “ephod” (אֶפֹּד, Judg 8:27). The story of Gideon’s ephod opens with Gideon turning down Israel’s request that he become their king (vv. 22–23). Gideon, however, requests that each of the Israelites give him a gold earring from the plunder that they received following their military victory over the Midianites (vv. 24; cf. Judg 7:1–8:21).<sup>46</sup> Upon receiving the gold earrings, Gideon makes them into an “ephod” (אֶפֹּד). The text of Judges does not describe Gideon’s ephod but, in the Jewish Scriptures, the term *ephod* most commonly describes either: (1) an ornate, high-priestly garment made out of gold, fabric, and precious stones (Exod 28, 39 *passim*) or (2) a linen garment (אֶפֹּד בָּד) worn by priests, temple workers (1 Sam 2:18; 22:18), and others during times of worship of God (2 Sam 6:14).<sup>47</sup> Whatever its exact appearance was, Judg 8:27 states that “all Israel” (כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל) worshipped Gideon’s ephod (lit. “they committed fornication . . . after it,” אֶתְרִיו . . . וַיִּזְנוּ)<sup>48</sup> and that the ephod “became a snare (מוֹקֵשׁ) to Gideon and to his family” (v. 27).<sup>49</sup> The scriptural account does not mention that God punished Gideon for his actions. Rather, Gideon “died at a good age” (בְּשִׁיבָה טוֹבָה; v. 32)<sup>50</sup> and, after his death, the Israelites soon returned to Baal worship (v. 33).

Based on the aforementioned common usage of the word “ephod” in the Jewish Scriptures, some interpreters of the Jewish Scriptures conclude that Gideon’s ephod was a high-

---

<sup>46</sup> Gideon's request for gold earrings from the plunder (Judg 8:24) parallels Aaron’s request at Sinai for gold earrings from the Israelites (Exod 32:2). The earrings that Aaron received (v. 3) were melted down and made into the golden calf (v. 4) that Israel subsequently worshipped (vv. 5–6).

<sup>47</sup> In the Jewish Scriptures, an ephod may be used for divination (1 Sam 23:9–11; 30:7–8). The ephod regularly also appears alongside idol worship (e.g. Judg 17:5; 18:14, 17, 18, 20).

<sup>48</sup> In the Jewish Scriptures, the word זָנָה carries both literal (e.g. illicit sexual intercourse, cf. Gen 38:24) and metaphorical meanings (e.g. the worship of other gods. Cf. Exod 34:15, also Judg 8:27).

<sup>49</sup> Idols and the worship of other gods are also depicted as snares (מוֹקֵשׁ) to Israel in Exod 23:33; Deut 7:16; Judg 2:3; Ps 106:36.

<sup>50</sup> The experience of the blessings of God are implied within the statement that Gideon “died at a good age” (בְּשִׁיבָה טוֹבָה; Judg 8:32). In the Jewish Scriptures, this is written only of Abraham (Gen 15:15; 25:8) and David (1 Chr 29:28) in addition to Gideon.



priestly garment connected to the worship of Israel's God (see definition (1) above).<sup>51</sup> However, since Judg 8:22–35 does not describe how the manufacture of an object that is so closely connected to the worship of the God of Israel would lead Gideon, his family, and his country astray, interpreters of the Jewish Scriptures vary in their explanations. According to some interpreters, a devout Gideon made an ornate, high-priestly garment and used it himself during a time when the worship of the God of Israel was all but absent in Israel.<sup>52</sup> According to other interpreters of the Jewish Scriptures, Gideon made an ornate, high-priestly garment which he himself wore, thereby indicating a lack of respect for God's laws and for the priesthood.<sup>53</sup> A final group of interpreters of the Jewish Scriptures speculate that, perhaps, Gideon's ephod (אֶפֹּד) was not an object connected to the worship of Israel's God but, rather, was a statue or an idol connected to the worship of another deity or deities.<sup>54</sup> Some support for this view might be

---

<sup>51</sup> E.g. Robert G. Boling, *Judges* (AB 6a; Garden City: Doubleday, 1975), 160–161.

<sup>52</sup> Boling (*Judges*, 160–161) suggested that, at a time “when there was nobody left but Gideon to tell the world that Yahweh is King in Israel” (161), Gideon expressed his “strictly orthodox Yahwism” through the manufacture of an “elaborate priestly garment” (160) of which there was “to be only one . . . in Israel” (161). According to this interpretation, the declaration that “all Israel prostituted themselves to it [i.e. the ephod]” (Judg 8:27) indicates that Israel was “trusting in Gideon's divinatory guidance” rather than “trafficking with other deities” (Boling, *Judges*, 160). Jacobson, in his discussion of *L.A.B.* 36:3 (*Commentary*, 2:924–927), appeared to align his own interpretation of Judges 8 with this option. According to Jacobson, Pseudo-Philo sought “to represent Gideon's actions in the worst light” as he reworked the scriptural narrative (*ibid.*, 926), transforming a “relatively neutral” reference to Gideon having made an ephod into a statement that Gideon made an idol. Jacobson suggested that, while the scriptural Gideon likely “had nothing pernicious in mind” when he made his ephod, Pseudo-Philo's concern to “fight against idolatry” and the scriptural suggestion that Gideon's “act led to the people adopting idolatrous practices” (cf. Judg 8:27) led Pseudo-Philo to depict Gideon in “the worst light” (*ibid.*, 2:927; cf. *ibid.*, 2:925).

<sup>53</sup> Cheryl Brown, “Judges,” in *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, by J. Gordon Harris, Cheryl A. Brown, and Michael S. Moore (NIBCOT 5; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2000), 203. Focusing upon the divinatory usages of ephods in the Jewish Scriptures (e.g. 1 Sam 23:9–12; 30:7–8), Brown stated that Gideon's actions were “treasonous against the Lord” and in contradiction of his declaration that only “the LORD will rule over” Israel (Judg 8:23) since, with the ephod, he “took upon himself the role of the Lord” (*ibid.*).

<sup>54</sup> J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981), 160, described Gideon's ephod as “a cult object,” likely “some kind of statue.” Daniel I. Block, *Judges, Ruth* (NAC 6; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 300, conjectured that, in the Jewish Scriptures, Gideon's ephod was part of a Baal shrine that he had reconstructed (cf. Judg 6:28–32). J. Clinton McCann, *Judges* (IBC; Louisville: John Knox, 2002), 70, contended that Gideon made an idol. Susan Niditch, *Judges: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 105, likewise concluded that Gideon's ephod was “some sort of statuary.”

found in the usage of the word אֶפֶדָה (“closely-fitting cover” cf. אֶפֶד, “ephod”) in Isa 30:22. There, the אֶפֶדָה is gold plating on an “image” (מַסַּכֶּת).<sup>55</sup> Indeed, Baal worship brackets the scriptural Gideon narrative (Judg 6:25–32; 8:33).

Pseudo-Philo’s reworked account of Gideon’s story (*L.A.B.* 36:3) leaves no doubt as to what took place: Gideon made (*fecit*) and worshipped (*adorabat*) idols (*idola*, *L.A.B.* 36:3) following his decisive victory over the Midianites (*L.A.B.* 36:1–2). Despite this conclusion, however, Pseudo-Philo depicted Gideon in a fairly positive light. His account of Gideon’s encounter with an angel (*L.A.B.* 35:1–7) depicted Gideon as a humble (*L.A.B.* 35:5; cf. Judg 6:15), respectful (*L.A.B.* 35:6; cf. Judg 6:17) follower of the God of Israel who is aware of the covenant promises (*L.A.B.* 35:2; cf. Judg 6:13) and who is empowered by the “spirit of the Lord” (*L.A.B.* 36:2; cf. Judg 6:34). In both *L.A.B.* and the Jewish Scriptures, Gideon took an active stance against Baal worship by destroying Baal’s sanctuary (*L.A.B.* 36:4; cf. Judg 6:25–27). Pseudo-Philo also included no specific mention of the two altars that Gideon built to the God of Israel (Judg 6:24, 25–27) in his account. However, nothing in *L.A.B.* 35–36 precludes their construction. Finally, Pseudo-Philo omitted the scriptural declaration that Gideon’s “idols” (*L.A.B.* 36:3; an “ephod” in Judg 8:27) resulted in “all Israel” committing religious fornication with them (cf. Judg 8:27) and he omitted the scriptural statement that they “became a snare to Gideon and to his family” (Judg 8:27). *L.A.B.* 36:3 contains no indication that Gideon’s idolatry was anything more than a personal sin as it does not appear to affect anyone other than himself.

Pseudo-Philo’s reworked Gideon narrative (*L.A.B.* 35:1–36:4; cf. Judg 6:11–8:35) culminates with God proclaiming that Gideon’s idolatry had “offended” (*deliquerit*) God. Under a strict, normative application of moral causality, Gideon should expect punishment for his sin in the present world (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:9). Instead, Pseudo-Philo had God speculate that Gideon’s compatriots might incorrectly interpret (cf. Judg 6:28–32) any punishment that Gideon might

---

<sup>55</sup> In Isa 30:22 (LXX), “image” (מַסַּכֶּת) and the parallel term “image” or “idol” (פְּסִיל) both are rendered “idols” (τὰ εἰδωλα).

receive as punishment for his idolatry as punishment for having destroyed Baal's sanctuary. For this reason, Pseudo-Philo concluded, God permits Gideon to live until "a good old age" (*L.A.B.* 36:4; cf. *Judg* 8:32) and only punishes him post-mortem for his idolatry. *L.A.B.* 36:4 states that, after Gideon's death, God will chastise (*castigabo*) Gideon "'once and for all (*semel*) because he has offended me'" but the text does not reveal exactly how Gideon will be chastised post-mortem<sup>56</sup> nor does it reveal the impact that this post-mortem chastisement will have upon his share of Israel's blessings in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 19:12).

This declaration that Gideon will be chastised (*castigabo*) in the afterlife for having "offended" (*deliquerit*) God (*L.A.B.* 36:4) does not provide insight into Pseudo-Philo's views concerning the impact of reward and/or punishment upon the members of the Israelite covenant community. Rather, it seems that, due to his unwavering commitment to moral causality, he included this notice of Gideon's pending post-mortem chastisement in an otherwise positive account of Gideon's life. Gideon's ultimate fate in *L.A.B.* 36:4 is left unresolved and in the hands of the God in whose justice Pseudo-Philo trusted.

Given Pseudo-Philo's emphasis upon moral causality, it is remarkable that Pseudo-Philo does not depict the grisly demise of Gideon's son Abimelech as divine punishment for sin. The opportunity to do so certainly exists since Abimelech is a mass-murderer in *L.A.B.* and in the Jewish Scriptures (*L.A.B.* 37:1; cf. *Judg* 9:1). The declarations in Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of Jotham's speech (*L.A.B.* 37:2-4) that Abimelech will have a short reign (v. 2) and will "die by

---

<sup>56</sup> Insufficient evidence exists to support Jacobson's tentative suggestion that Pseudo-Philo might have considered the death of all of Gideon's sons in *L.A.B.* 37 as "part of the posthumous punishment" promised in *L.A.B.* 36:4 (*Commentary*, 2:929). Jacobson's tentative suggestion is based declaration in *L.A.B.* 37:1 that "Abimelech killed **all** (*omnes*) of his brothers" (cf. "he killed his brothers," *Judg* 9:5) and on Pseudo-Philo's failure to mention Jotham (cf. *Judg* 9:5, 7, 21, 57). In the scriptural account, Gideon's son Jotham (*Judg* 9:5) survived the slaughter (*Judg* 9:5), delivered a key speech condemning his brother's actions (*Judg* 9:7–20), and fled to Beer "for fear of his brother" (*Judg* 9:21). However, even Jacobson admits that "possible flaws in the textual transmission" of *L.A.B.* 37 "make it hard to be certain" (*ibid.*). As Jacobson states, "*LAB's omnes* could be just a slip" (*ibid.*). Given the emphasis that Pseudo-Philo in *L.A.B.* 36:4 placed on ensuring that the surrounding nations would not credit Baal with being the one who punished Gideon, it seems likely that Pseudo-Philo believed that Gideon's postmortem punishment was hidden from these nations. The very public annihilation of Gideon's entire line that Jacobson's hypothesis tentatively posits would not fit this scenario.

stoning” (v. 2) could have easily been adapted to make this a divinely ordained punishment for sin. However, Pseudo-Philo did not do this. Indeed, Pseudo-Philo even omits the scriptural declaration that Abimelech’s death (Judg 9:53-55) was the culmination of a series of events that occurred because “God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the lords of Shechem” (Judg 9:23). Judges 9:56 clearly depicts Abimelech’s death as punishment for his sin (“God repaid Abimelech for the crime he committed against his father in killing his seventy brothers”) but is also omitted from Pseudo-Philo’s account.

JAIR (*L.A.B.* 38:1–4; *CF.* JUDG 10:3–5)

The third example of individual Israelites in *L.A.B.* whose punishment for sin extends into the world to come is Jair. In Judg 10:3–5, the story of Jair is brief and innocuous. The Jewish Scriptures inform us of Jair’s identity (“Gileadite,” v. 3), of the length of his reign (“twenty-two years,” v. 3), that he died (v. 5), and where he was buried (“Kamon,” v. 5).<sup>57</sup> The Jewish Scriptures also state that Jair had thirty sons who had thirty donkeys and thirty cities in the land of Gilead (v. 4),<sup>58</sup> but this, too, is a neutral reference that neither denounces nor praises Jair.<sup>59</sup> The scriptural Jair narrative discusses neither Jair’s religion nor the religion of Israel during Jair’s era<sup>60</sup> but it is followed by the formulaic declaration that, after Jair’s death, the nation of Israel abandoned the worship of the God of Israel and “again (וַיַּעַבְדוּ) did evil in the Lord’s sight.”<sup>61</sup> Israel

---

<sup>57</sup> רַמֹּן (MT). The LXX reads “Rammo” (Ραμμω; Judges A) or “Ramnon” (Ραμνων; Judges B).

<sup>58</sup> In the Septuagint, Jair has thirty-two sons who ride on thirty-two “colts” (πώλους) and who have “thirty-two cities” (Judg 10:4 LXX).

<sup>59</sup> Scholars such as T. J. Schneider, *Judges* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2000), 157, read an implicit condemnation of Jair into the description of Jair’s family in Judg 10:4. In contrast, scholars such as Block (*Judges, Ruth*, 340) and Alan J. Hauser, “Unity and Diversity in Israel before Samuel,” *JETS* 22 (1979), 301, read positive images into the description. Ultimately, however, the description of Jair’s family in Judg 10:4 should be viewed merely as a neutral reference to the wealth and power wielded by Jair and his family.

<sup>60</sup> In the book of Judges, implicit or explicit comments concerning the religion(s) followed by one of the leaders generally are reserved for the so-called *major judges’* narratives. As Trent C. Butler, *Judges* (WBC 8; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2009), 261, noted, *minor judges’* narratives such as those of Jair (Judg 10:3–5), Shamgar (Judg 3:31), Tola (Judg 10:1–2), Ibzan (Judg 12:8–10), Elon (Judg 12:11–12), and Abdon (Judg 12:13–15) usually do not contain such information.

<sup>61</sup> This phrase is repeated in Judg 3:12; 4:1; 13:1; with Judg 3:7 and 6:1 only varying slightly.

instead worshipped “the Baals and the Astartes, the gods of Aram, the gods of Sidon, the gods of Moab, the gods of the Ammonites, and the gods of the Philistines” (Judg 10:6).<sup>62</sup>

Early Jewish literature largely is silent concerning Jair. An exception to this is Josephus (*Ant.* 5:254) whose portrait of Jair mirrors the portrait in the scriptural account. He says little more concerning Jair other than noting that Jair was a “fortunate man” (εὐδαίμων, *Ant.* 5:254). The Jair encountered in Judg 10:3–5 and in *Ant.* 5:254 bears little resemblance to the Jair encountered in *L.A.B.* 38:1–4.

In *L.A.B.* 38:1–4, Jair is a zealous worshipper of Baal who wants to exterminate the few remaining Israelites who remain true to the God of Israel. A “sanctuary to Baal” (*sacrarium Baal*) is constructed<sup>63</sup> and, at the pain of death, all of the people are compelled to “sacrifice to Baal” (*sacrificaverit Baal*; *L.A.B.* 38:1). Seven Israelites refuse to join in the mandated Baal-worship (*L.A.B.* 38:1), citing their unwavering devotion to “the Law of the Lord” (*legi Domini*) in support, a devotion urged upon them by Deborah, the great and pious leader of years gone by (*L.A.B.* 38:2; cf. *L.A.B.* 33:3).<sup>64</sup> Jair orders his servants to throw into the fire (*igni*) the seven men who had “blasphemed against Baal” (*blasphemaverunt Baal*) through their refusal to join in the sacrifices. Supernatural intervention permits the seven men to escape while Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:4) and his servants (*L.A.B.* 38:3) are burned in the fire instead. Before Jair’s demise, “the angel of the Lord” reveals to Jair the nature of his punishment (*L.A.B.* 38:4). Because he had “corrupted” (*corruptisti*) God’s covenant, “deceived” (*seduxisti*) God’s people, and attempted to “burn up”

---

<sup>62</sup> The worship of other gods is part of similar formulae in Judg 2:11–13; 3:7; 8:33.

<sup>63</sup> Due to an apparent lacuna in the text at the beginning of *L.A.B.* 38:1 (James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 187; Feldman, “Prolegomenon,” cxxi; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2:939), the name of the individual who built the sanctuary is absent from most manuscripts. The sole exception is the Phillips 461 manuscript (mss. P) which appends a brief summary of Jair’s judgeship adapted from Judg 10:3 to the statement concerning the construction of the sanctuary (see Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2:939).

<sup>64</sup> The seven men emphasize Jair’s wickedness and imply that Jair was as devoted to Baal (*L.A.B.* 38:2) as Deborah had been devoted to God (*L.A.B.* 38:2; cf. 33:2–3).

(*concremare*) God's "servants," the angel of the Lord states that Jair will have a post-mortem "dwelling place" (*habitationem*) in the fire<sup>65</sup> in which he will soon die (*L.A.B.* 38:4).

The reason why Pseudo-Philo chose to transform Jair from a minor, innocuous character (cf. *Judg* 10:3–5) into a Baal-worshipping enemy of the God of Israel (*L.A.B.* 38:1–4) is not readily apparent. Ginzberg suggested plausibly that this transformation was based on a "haggadic interpretation" of the scriptural declaration that Jair was buried "in Kamon" (בְּקָמוֹן; *Judg* 10:5).<sup>66</sup> Ginzberg conjectured that Pseudo-Philo interpreted this reference to the city of "Kamon" (קָמוֹן) as a declaration that Jair had "perished in a fire" (קָמִין, *Aram.*; καμινος, *Gk.*, "furnace, oven").<sup>67</sup> However, Ginzberg's hypothesis requires a slight modification since, in *L.A.B.* 38, the place of Jair's *post-mortem abode* is of greater significance than the place of his *death*.<sup>68</sup> Jair and his servants all perish in the fire (*L.A.B.* 38:3–4) but Jair alone is given a post-mortem dwelling place in the fire. Jair's servants "who were burned with corruptible fire" (*igne corruptibili*, *L.A.B.* 38:4) did not face post-mortem punishment. Following their deaths in the fire (*L.A.B.* 38:3), they were "made alive" (*vivificati sunt*) and "freed" (*liberati sunt*) by "living fire" (*igne vivo*; *L.A.B.* 38:4). Jair's designated post-mortem "dwelling place" in the fire (*L.A.B.* 38:4) contrasts with the eternal "everlasting dwelling place" (*habitaculum sempiternum*) in an untainted earth and heaven promised in *L.A.B.* 3:10 and with the "immortal dwelling place" (*inhabitationem immortalem*) in the "place of sanctification" (*locum sanctificationis*) promised in *L.A.B.* 19:12–13. When combined, the references to Israel's Baal worship (*Judg* 10:6) and to Jair's burial בְּקָמוֹן ("in Kamon" or "in a fire," *Judg* 10:5) provide a plausible explanation for Pseudo-Philo's conclusion that the worship of Baal resulted in his fiery post-mortem abode. Completing the negative

---

<sup>65</sup> In 2 *Baruch* 44, a portion of humanity at the end of time departs "to torment" (v. 12) to have a "dwelling . . . in the fire" (v. 15).

<sup>66</sup> Ginzberg, *Legends*, 2:872 n. 104.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.* In this regard, Jacobson (*Commentary*, 2:940) also pointed to the superficial similarities between Jair's name (יָאִיר) and the Hebrew word for fire (אֵשׁ).

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.* Jacobson accounted partially for this discrepancy by observing that "an eager exegete might well ignore the detail."

portrait of Jair with details drawn from the fiery ordeals of Abraham (*L.A.B.* 6:1–18); Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (Dan 3:1–30)<sup>69</sup> is only a further small step.

Later, in *L.A.B.*, Pseudo-Philo links Jair's post-mortem fate to that of "Doeg the Syrian" (*L.A.B.* 63:2, 4)<sup>70</sup> whose sole deed in *L.A.B.* is informing King Saul of David's actions (*L.A.B.* 63:2; cf. 1 Sam 21:7; 22:9). Absent from Pseudo-Philo's account is the scriptural declaration that Doeg, on orders from King Saul (1 Sam 22:18), slaughtered many people in the city of Nob (1 Sam 22:18–19). Pseudo-Philo reported that Doeg could anticipate a post-mortem "dwelling place with Jair in the inextinguishable fire (*igne inextinguibili*) forever" (*L.A.B.* 63:4). Pseudo-Philo's depiction of Jair and Doeg (*L.A.B.* 38:4; 63:3–4) as co-inhabitants in a post-mortem place of fire affirms that, in *L.A.B.*, at least one Israelite (Jair) ended up outside the Israelite covenant community. For Pseudo-Philo, a post-mortem existence in a place of fire was an equitable punishment for one who had rejected God and the covenant in favour of Baal worship. Inexplicably, in *L.A.B.* 38, Jair acted like Israel had acted many times elsewhere in *L.A.B.* but God permanently rejects Jair and permits Israel to remain.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> There is a clear parallel in *L.A.B.* between these two narratives. Just as Joktan ordered all those who did not take part in the tower's construction thrown into a fiery furnace (*L.A.B.* 6:5, 17) and Nebuchadnezzar ordered Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego thrown into a fiery furnace for refusing to worship the statue (Dan 3:18–20), so, too, Jair promised to cast into a fire all those who did not sacrifice to Baal (*L.A.B.* 38:1, 3).

<sup>70</sup> Doeg's nationality varies in Jewish literature and in the versions of the Jewish Scriptures. In the MT text of 1 Sam 21:8 [ET 21:7]; 22:9, 18, 22; Ps 52:1, Doeg is an "Edomite" (אֱדוּמִי). In the Septuagint text of the same verses, Doeg is a Syrian (Σύρος). In the Vulgate text of the same verses, Doeg is an Idumean (*Idumeus*). Doeg is a Syrian in Josephus, *Ant.* 6:244, 254, 259.

<sup>71</sup> The divine condemnation of Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:4) is similar to condemnations of and the descriptions of Israel elsewhere in *L.A.B.* God "raised up" Jair (cf. *L.A.B.* 28:4, "I would choose a plant [i.e. Israel]") and "appointed" him as the leader of God's people (cf. description of Israel as the leading "ram" in *L.A.B.* 31:5) but Jair "rose up" and "corrupted" the covenant (cf. "forgot the promise and transgressed the ways" (*L.A.B.* 30:1); for Israel as being corrupt cf. *L.A.B.* 12:2, 4; 13:10; 16:3; 19:4; 22:2; 25:5; 28:4; 38:4), deceived God's people, and sought to destroy those who chastised Jair for his wickedness (*L.A.B.* 38:4; cf. *L.A.B.* 28:4, "it destroyed its own fruit").

## SYNOPSIS

In two of the three cases examined in this section, we observed that Pseudo-Philo believed that, in certain circumstances, individual Israelites would receive harsh, unending post-mortem punishment for their sins. According to Pseudo-Philo:

1. God sentenced Jair to death by fire and to a post-mortem “dwelling place” in the fire in which he will die (*L.A.B.* 38:4).
2. God sentenced Korah and his fellow rebels to being swallowed alive by the earth and to an eternal “dwelling place . . . in darkness and the place of destruction” with no hope of sharing in the resurrection of the dead (*L.A.B.* 16:3).

The Jewish Scriptures contain no precedents for the fates of these individuals. For example, the scriptural account states that Korah and his fellow rebels were swallowed by the earth (Num 16:31–32) but does not include any post-mortem punishment for Korah and his fellow rebels. In addition, Pseudo-Philo also specifically omitted Korah’s sons from those whom God punished along with Korah and his fellow rebels (*L.A.B.* 16:4–6).

In the case of Gideon, the second case studied in this section, Pseudo-Philo depicted an individual Israelite sinner receiving a post-mortem punishment. God, restrained from punishing Gideon in the present world (*L.A.B.* 36:4a), promises that he will be chastised “once and for all” (*L.A.B.* 36:4b) after his death “at a good old age.” Pseudo-Philo did not specify the type of punishment that Gideon will receive nor did he state whether this post-mortem punishment would be eternal. The scriptural account, in contrast, does not list any punishment for Gideon, either in the present world or in the world to come.

In our examination of these three cases, we also observed that Pseudo-Philo reserved the prospect of harsh and unending punishment for those who reject God. In two of the three cases studied in this section, idolatry and/or the worship of other gods precipitates their punishment in the world to come.



In the case of Gideon, Pseudo-Philo depicted Gideon making idols that he himself worshipped (*L.A.B.* 36:3). In the scriptural account, Gideon makes an ephod (Judg 8:27a) which “all Israel” worshipped (Judg 8:27b) and which ensnared Gideon and his family (Judg 8:27c).

In the example of Jair, Pseudo-Philo presented Jair as a staunch proponent of Baal worship who sought to kill any Israelite who did not join him in sacrificing to Baal (*L.A.B.* 38:1). The scriptural account makes no comment concerning the religious preferences of Jair, a minor character in the book of Judges who is described briefly in three verses (Judg 10:3–5).

In the case of Korah and his followers, the first example studied in this section, rebellion against God’s law (*L.A.B.* 16:1) instead of idolatry and/or the worship of other gods precipitates the punishment of some Israelites. According to Pseudo-Philo, Korah and his fellow rebels challenge an “unbearable law” (*L.A.B.* 16:1). The fact that they are rejecting all of God’s law and not just one law becomes evident when Korah remains defiant in the face of his sons’ open declaration of their desire to “walk” in God’s “ways” (*L.A.B.* 16:4). In the scriptural account, Korah and his fellow rebels challenge the leadership of Moses and Aaron (Num 16:1–3) and Korah’s sons are not mentioned.

Absent from each of the three cases studied in this section is any prospect that an individual sinner’s status as a member of the indestructible Israelite covenant community might mitigate the punishment due to the individual. Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:4) and each participant in Korah’s conspiracy (*L.A.B.* 16:3, 6) received harsh and lasting punishment that matched or exceeded the punishments promised in *L.A.B.* 3:9–10:

And God said, “. . . But when those inhabiting the earth sin, I will judge them by famine or by the sword or by fire or by death; and there will be earthquakes, and they will be scattered to uninhabited places. . . . But when the years appointed for the world have been fulfilled, then the light will cease and the darkness will fade away. And I will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth. And hell will pay back its debt and the place of perdition will return its deposit so that I may render to each according to his works and according to the fruits of his own devices, until I judge between soul and flesh. . . .” (emphases added).

Gideon's punishment is delayed rather than mollified (*L.A.B.* 36:4). According to Pseudo-Philo, God was restrained from punishing Gideon "during his lifetime" in consideration of the fact that people might conclude incorrectly that Baal caused Gideon's punishment to avenge the destruction of "the sanctuary of Baal" (*L.A.B.* 36:4a). Nothing in Pseudo-Philo's narrative suggests that Gideon asked for or was aware of the fact that God had deferred his punishment. The scriptural Gideon narrative (Judges 6–8) contains no parallel to Pseudo-Philo's promise concerning Gideon's post-mortem punishment.

*Individual Israelites in L.A.B. Whose Punishment for Sin Might Extend into the World to Come*

As we saw in the previous section, Pseudo-Philo depicted Jair (*L.A.B.* 38) along with Korah and his fellow rebels (*L.A.B.* 16) as having fixed courses of harsh and enduring punishment in the world to come. Pseudo-Philo portrayed Gideon (*L.A.B.* 36) as having a fixed course of unspecified punishment in the world to come (see *L.A.B.* 36:4). Regarding three other cases of Israelites who sinned in *L.A.B.*, Pseudo-Philo did not state that their courses of punishment were fixed. Instead, we are left to wonder if they, too, may experience harsh and enduring punishment in the world to come. This group of sinners whose punishment for sin might extend into the world to come includes three sets of individuals: (1) the individual Israelites whose secret sin becomes known during Kenaz's lifetime (*L.A.B.* 25:3–13; *L.A.B.* 27:1–4, 15), (2) Micah and Dedila (*L.A.B.* 44:1–10), and (3) King Saul (*L.A.B.* 57:1–4; 64:1–9).

THE IDENTIFICATION AND PUNISHMENT OF SINNERS IN KENAZ'S ERA (*L.A.B.* 25:1–27:16)

*L.A.B.* 25:1–27:16 tells a story which occurs in the years following the death of Joshua (*L.A.B.* 25:1; cf. Judg 1:1a). The story begins with the Philistines threatening to make war against the Israelites (*L.A.B.* 25:1a). A devout Israelite nation seeks God's guidance: "Should we go up and fight the Philistines?" (*L.A.B.* 25:1b). God's response to Israel's question sets a chain of events in motion that culminates with God giving Israel a great victory over its enemies (*L.A.B.* 27:1–14). Israel's venture into battle is preceded by a nation-wide purging of sin (*L.A.B.* 25:1–

26:15) which is precipitated by God informing Israel that, if they went up “with a pure heart,” they should go into battle. However, if their hearts were “defiled,” God informs them that they should not go into battle (*L.A.B.* 25:1). When the Israelites, in accordance with God’s command (*L.A.B.* 25:1), cast lots, many Israelites are identified as having defiled (*contaminatum*) their hearts and having “turned away (*recessit*) from the Lord” (*L.A.B.* 25:3).

Before the individual Israelites selected by the casting of lots (*L.A.B.* 25:3–6) were “burned in the fire” (cf. *L.A.B.* 25:3), Kenaz urges them to “declare” (*renuntiate*) their “wicked deeds and schemes” in the hope that “God will have mercy” on them at the final resurrection (*L.A.B.* 25:7). The sins to which these Israelites confess vary considerably. However, they share a common theme of rejecting God or God’s commandments and challenging or testing God:<sup>72</sup>

- Sins involving rejecting God and/or God’s commandments.
  - “We merely profaned the Sabbaths of the Lord” (*L.A.B.* 25:13).
  - “We have committed adultery with each other’s wives” (*L.A.B.* 25:10).
  - “We desired to copy and make the calf that they made in the wilderness” (*L.A.B.* 25:9)
  - “We desired to sacrifice to the gods of those who inhabit the land” (*L.A.B.* 25:9).
  - “The Amorites have taught us what they make so we might teach our children, and behold these things are hidden beneath Abraham’s mountain and stored in a heap of earth” (*L.A.B.* 25:9).
  - “We desired to make what the Amorites make, and behold they are hidden below the tent of Elas, who told you to examine us” (*L.A.B.* 25:9; cf. 25:8).

---

<sup>72</sup> Jacobson referred to the Israelite sinners’ common “lack of faith in God” (*Commentary*, 2:747), while Murphy observed that “idolatry underlies all the sins” (*Pseudo-Philo*, 119). They may be correct but it is also evident that it would be difficult to compose a better list of “secret sins” through which Israelites in this era could demonstrate their rejection of God and/or God’s commandments or their desire to challenge and/or test God.

- “We found the seven golden idols which the Amorites call the sacred virgins, and we carried them off with the precious stones set upon them and hid them. . . For these are what seven sinful men devised after the flood” *L.A.B.* 25:10–11).
- Sins involving challenging and/or testing God.
  - “We desired to test the tent of meeting, whether or not it is holy” (*L.A.B.* 25:9).
  - “We desired to eat the flesh of our own children to know whether or not God has care for these” (*L.A.B.* 25:9).
  - “We desired to make our sons and daughters pass through the fire, to know if what had been said would be proved by direct evidence” (*L.A.B.* 25:13).
  - “We desired to investigate the book of the Law, whether God had really written what was in it or Moses had taught these things by himself” (*L.A.B.* 25:13).
  - “We desired to make inquiry through the demons of the idols whether or not they would reveal things plainly” (*L.A.B.* 25:9).

Despite the Israelites’ careful adherence to God’s instructions concerning the casting of the lots and concerning the punishment of the sinners (*L.A.B.* 26:1–15), it soon becomes evident that the casting of the lots did not identify all of the sinners in Israel. After two successful days on the battlefield (*L.A.B.* 27:1–2), a group of Israelites is imprisoned (*L.A.B.* 27:3–4) for having “grumbled against Kenaz” (*L.A.B.* 27:2). Later, after God had wondrously granted Israel victory over the Amorites (*L.A.B.* 27:5–14), the imprisoned grumblers of *L.A.B.* 27:1–4 astonishingly: (1) confess to having committed the same sins as those committed by the Israelites identified by the casting of the lots (see *L.A.B.* 25:3–6), and (2) pronounce upon themselves the same death sentence received by the previously identified sinners. This sentence is carried out (*L.A.B.* 27:15). This victory marked the start of many decades during which Kenaz led Israel and during which Israel’s enemies lived in fear (*L.A.B.* 27:16).

Pseudo-Philo’s Kenaz narrative (*L.A.B.* 25–28) has no clear parallel in the Jewish Scriptures or in early Jewish literature. In the Jewish Scriptures, Kenaz is but a name mentioned

in passing: he is the father of the warrior Othniel who accepts Caleb's challenge, who captures the city of Kiriath-sepher (Judg 1:12–13), and who becomes the first judge named in the book of Judges (Judg 3:9–11). Jacobson briefly raised the possibility that Pseudo-Philo's Kenaz narrative might be a "greatly elaborated version" of the scriptural Othniel narrative (Judg 3:7–11)<sup>73</sup> but the absence of parallels between the narratives all but negates this possibility. Furthermore, this suggestion is made even less likely by the vastly differing settings in which the narratives occur. Long-term oppression at the hands of its enemies precedes and follows Othniel's time of leadership in the scriptural account. Before he rises to power, Israel has been oppressed for eight years (Judg 3:8–9) and, after his death, Israel is oppressed for eighteen years (Judg 3:12–14). By contrast, *L.A.B.* states that peace precedes and follows Kenaz's time of leadership in Israel. Kenaz rises to leadership when a "peaceful" land of Israel is facing a Philistine threat (*L.A.B.* 25:1). After his death, Israel enjoys twenty-five uneventful years under the leadership of Zebul (*L.A.B.* 29:1–4).

The only other Kenaz narrative in early Jewish literature is Josephus's brief account of a judge named Kenaz (Κεβιάζος, *Ant.* 5.182–184). Josephus's Kenaz narrative is a slight reworking of the scriptural Othniel narrative (Judg 3:7–11). In *Ant.* 5:182, 184, Josephus named the first judge 'Kenaz' rather than 'Othniel son of Kenaz'<sup>74</sup> but, apart from the name, Josephus's Kenaz narrative bears no resemblance to Pseudo-Philo's Kenaz narrative. Several attempts have been made to find parallels in Jewish literature to Pseudo-Philo's Kenaz but these have proved unconvincing.<sup>75</sup> Perhaps Jacobson was correct when he suggested that Pseudo-Philo did not base

---

<sup>73</sup> *Commentary*, 2:740.

<sup>74</sup> Most of the scriptural occurrences of Kenaz's name occur in the phrases, עֹתְנִיאל בֶּן־קִנּוּ ("Othniel son of Kenaz," Judg 3:11), עֹתְנִיאל בֶּן־קִנּוּ אָחִי כָלֵב ("Othniel son of Kenaz, brother of Caleb," Josh 15:17), or עֹתְנִיאל בֶּן־קִנּוּ אָחִי כָלֵב הַקָּטָן מִמֶּנּוּ ("Othniel son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother," Judg 1:13; 3:9). Kenaz also is listed as Othniel's father in 1 Chr 4:13.

<sup>75</sup> Ginzberg (*Legends*, 2:855 n. 1) suggested that Kenaz is Cenec/Cethel. This has been refuted convincingly by Feldman, "Prolegomenon," xiii-xiv, and by Jacobson, *Commentary*, 740–741. The medieval *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* also contain a Kenaz narrative but the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* has been shown to be subsequent to Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (James, "Notes on Apocrypha," 565).

his Kenaz character on “traditional folklore”<sup>76</sup> but, rather, Pseudo-Philo chose a “blank character” with “no role in the biblical narrative aside from a brief mention of his existence.”<sup>77</sup> Jacobson speculated that Pseudo-Philo used this “blank character” to incorporate “elaborate non-biblical stories” into his narrative.<sup>78</sup> He surmised that, perhaps, the “important” aspect for Pseudo-Philo “is not Cenez [i.e. Kenaz] himself, but rather the events that surround his tenure.”<sup>79</sup>

The clear differentiation in *L.A.B.* 25:7 between the sinners’ initial fate and the sinners’ ultimate fate offers hope to the members of the Israelite covenant community who fall into sin. All those who sinned were executed for their sins but those who confessed their sins prior to their death departed the present world with the hope that they might retain a share in the covenant community’s blessings in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 3:10; 19:12–13).

MICAH AND DEDILA (*L.A.B.* 44:1–10; *CF.* *JUDG* 17:1–18:31)

The case of Micah and Dedila represents a second example of individual Israelites in *L.A.B.* whose punishment for sin might extend into the world to come. Judges 17–18 tells the story of an otherwise unknown man named Micah who is commissioned by his unnamed mother to construct an idol (פְּסֵל) and a metal image (וּמְסֻכָּה)<sup>80</sup> from silver that she had consecrated “to

---

<sup>76</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2:739.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 740.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:740. Jacobson’s assessment more or less aligns with that of James (*Biblical Antiquities*, 146) who writes concerning Pseudo-Philo’s Kenaz and Zebul narratives: “Up to this point, *Philo* has followed the Bible story faithfully enough. He now draws freely on his own imagination, and presents us with an entirely new history of the beginning of the period of the Judges.” See also Nickelsburg, “Good and Bad Leaders,” 54, who, similar to Jacobson, contended that, in Kenaz, “Pseudo-Philo has created a character to serve his purpose.”

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> The next verse states that the silversmith made an idol and a metal image (פְּסֵל וּמְסֻכָּה) but then the text states that “it” (third person singular) ended up in Micah’s house, thereby suggesting that it may be one cultic object rather than two. However, when the Danite raiders come through and seize Micah’s cultic center and his priest (*Judg* 18), the syntax makes it clear that the idol and the metal image were separate objects: “They took the idol, the ephod, the teraphim, and the metal image ( לָקְחוּ אֶת־הַפְּסֵל וְאֶת־הַמְּסֻכָּה וְאֶת־הַתְּרָפִים וְאֶת־הָאֶפֹּד )” (*Judg* 18:17; see also v. 18). The translation of *Judg* 18:17 cited here is my own.

the Lord" (17:3). Along with teraphim (תְּרָפִים; idols)<sup>81</sup> and an ephod (אֶפֹד),<sup>82</sup> the constructed idol and the metal image become the centerpieces of a household shrine established in Micah's house. One of Micah's sons initially serves as priest (Judg 17:4b–5). In time, however, Micah hires a Levite who came through his town as a priest (Judg 17:7–13). Micah's shrine continues until its contents and the Levite priest are whisked away by Danite marauders (Judg 18:14–31).

In *L.A.B.* 44, Micah and his mother Dedila are key contributors to many Israelites' descents into religious depravity. In this account, Micah is commissioned by his mother to construct idols from some gold that she gave him in order to "make a name" (*facies . . . nomen*) for himself (*L.A.B.* 44:2). These golden idols will be his gods and he will be their priest. Along with these new "gods" (*L.A.B.* 44:2), Dedila instructs him to have an altar and a golden column constructed (*L.A.B.* 44:3) so that he can become a "priest" (*sacerdos*) and a "worshipper of the gods" (*cultor deorum*) for those around him (*L.A.B.* 44:3). Micah does as his mother instructs him and he uses the images of boys, calves, a lion, an eagle, a dragon, and a dove that he creates for various cultic purposes (*L.A.B.* 44:5). Micah's cultic center appears to have been so successful that it results in many Israelites "departing from the Lord" (*recedentibus . . . a Domino, L.A.B.* 44:6a). As punishment for this violation of the Decalogue (*L.A.B.* 44:6–7), God promises to bring divine wrath upon them, in particular upon the tribe of Benjamin (*L.A.B.* 44:8) and upon Micah and his mother (*L.A.B.* 44:9). The episode concludes with the statement that the punishment received by Micah and his mother was a prototype of what other individual sinners can expect when they sin (*L.A.B.* 44:10).

---

<sup>81</sup> For תְּרָפִים as idols, see 1 Sam 19:13–16 in which David's wife, Michal, is depicted using תְּרָפִים as the centerpiece of a figure that fooled his pursuers long enough to allow him to escape. תְּרָפִים can also be used for divination (Ezek 21:26 and Zech 10:2).

<sup>82</sup> As is the case with Gideon's "ephod" (Judg 8:27), there is considerable uncertainty concerning the nature and function of Micah's ephod (Judg 17:5). The principle options are (1) a garment worn by the priest (see Exod 28:4, 27–31; 35:9, 27; 1 Sam 2:18, 28), (2) an object used by the priest for divination (see 1 Sam 23:6–12), or (3) even possibly an idol (Isa 30:22).

When we read *L.A.B.* 44:1–10 in parallel with Judg 17:1–18:31, it becomes evident that only the first half of Pseudo-Philo’s Micah narrative is a reworking of the scriptural Micah narrative. The basic Micah narrative (*L.A.B.* 44:1–5) is a reworking of Judg 17:1–6 (see Table 4.2). However, the lengthy discourse in which God reveals the punishments of Micah, Dedila, and Israel (*L.A.B.* 44:6–10) is not paralleled in Judges 17–18. With his omission of Judg 17:2, the verse in which Micah admits to the theft of the silver, and his reworking of the mother’s statements concerning the precious metal, Pseudo-Philo transformed the precious metal from stolen property that Micah’s mother permits him to retain into a straightforward gift from mother to son. Also not paralleled in Pseudo-Philo’s Micah narrative are: (1) the story of Micah’s Levite priest (Judg 17:7–13) and (2) the story of the tribe of Dan’s acquisition of Micah’s Levite priest and the contents of Micah’s shrine during its migration (Judg 18:1–31).

Table 4.2. Judges 17:1–6 and *L.A.B.* 44:1–5

<b>Judges 17:1–6</b>	<b><i>L.A.B.</i> 44:1–5</b>
<u>There was a man in the hill country of Ephraim whose name was Micah.</u> (v. 1)	And in that time <u>there arose Micah</u> the son of Dedila the mother of Heliu, (v. 2a)
He said to his mother, “The eleven hundred pieces of silver that were taken from you, about which you uttered a curse, and even spoke it in my hearing, -- that silver is in my possession; I took it; but now I will return it to you.” And his mother said, “May my son be blessed by the LORD!” (v. 2)	n/a
Then he returned the eleven hundred <u>pieces of silver</u> to his mother; (v. 3a)	and he had one thousand pieces of gold and four wedges of melted gold and forty double <u>pieces of silver</u> . (v. 2b)
<u>and his mother said, “I consecrate the silver to the LORD from my hand for my son, to make an idol of cast metal.”</u> (3b)	<u>And Dedila his mother said to him, “My son, hear my voice, and you will make a name for yourself before death. Take that gold and melt it down and make for yourself idols,</u> (v. 2c)
n/a	and they will be as gods for you, and you will become a priest for them. And whoever wishes to



---

**Judges 17:1–6**

**L.A.B. 44:1–5**

---

	<p>ask anything through them will come to you, and you will respond to him. And there will be an altar in your house and a column made out of that gold you have; you will prepare frankincense for burning and sheep for sacrifice. And whoever wishes to offer a sacrifice will give seven double pieces for the sheep; and for the incense, if he wishes to burn it, he will give one double piece of silver of full weight. And your title will be 'priest,' and you will be called 'worshiper of the gods.'" (v. 2d–3)</p>
n/a	<p>And Micah said to her. "You have advised me well, Mother, on how to live. And now your name will be even greater than mine, and in the last days all kinds of things will be requested of you." (v. 4)</p>
<p>So when he returned the money to his mother, his mother took two hundred pieces of silver, and gave it to <u>the silversmith, who made it into an idol of cast metal</u>; and it was in the house of Micah. (v. 4)</p>	<p>And Micah set out and did everything that his mother had commanded him. <u>And he shaped and made for himself three images of boys and calves, the lion, the eagle, and the dragon, and the dove</u> (v. 5a)</p>
<p>This man <u>Micah had a shrine</u>, and he made an ephod and teraphim, and installed <u>one of his sons, who became his priest</u>. (v. 5)</p>	<p>"<u>and they will be as gods for you, and you will become a priest</u> for them." (v. 2d)</p> <p>"<u>And your title will be 'priest,'</u> and you will be called 'worshiper of the gods.'" (v. 3b)</p>
n/a	<p>And all who were led astray would come to him. And if some wished to ask for a wife, they would ask him by means of the dove. But if anyone asked for sons, it was by the images of the boys. But whoever asked for riches did it through the likeness of the eagle. Whoever asked for courage, he advised him through the image of the lion. If for servants and maids, he asked through the images of the calves. But if for length of days, he asked by the Image of the dragon. And his wickedness took many forms, and his impiety was full of trickery. (v. 5b)</p>
<p><u>In those days there was no king in Israel; all the people did what was right in their own eyes.</u> (v. 6)</p>	<p>And <u>in those days there was no leader in Israel, but each one did what was pleasing in his own eyes.</u>(v. 1)</p>

---

Table 4.3 lists the key differences between the portions of *L.A.B.* 44:1–5 that correspond with portions of Judg 17:1–6.

Table 4.3. Some Key Differences between Judg 17:1–6 and *L.A.B.* 44:1–5

Judges 17:1–6	<i>L.A.B.</i> 44:1–5
Micah lives in the hill country of Ephraim (17:1).	Micah’s place of residence is not listed.
Micah’s mother is unnamed (17:1) and there is no mention of siblings.	Micah’s mother is named Dedila and his (half?) brother is named Heliu (44:2).
Micah returns to his mother some silver that he had stolen from her (17:2a).	Micah has gold and silver (44:2), but its origin is not discussed.
1,100 pieces of silver (17:2)	1,000 pieces of gold; 4 wedges of melted gold; 40 double pieces of silver (44:2)
200 pieces of silver are used to make an idol (17:4)	An unspecified amount of gold is used to make an idol (44:2)
Micah’s mother gives the silver to a silversmith, who makes it into an idol (17:4).	Micah makes the gold into idols (44:1, 3).
Micah sets up a shrine with one of his sons as a priest (17:5).	Micah sets up a cultic center and he is the priest (44:3).
Micah’s shrine primarily serves only Micah’s household (cf. 18:19).	Micah’s cultic center serves the community (44:3,5).

Ginzberg’s declaration that, by giving her the name *Dedila* (*L.A.B.* 44:2), Pseudo-Philo identified Micah’s mother as *Dalila* (“Delilah,” *L.A.B.* 43:5)<sup>83</sup> deserves special consideration.

According to Pseudo-Philo Dedila has a leading role in the establishment of the Micah’s cultic center (see Table 4.3, rows 4-6) and Delilah is a Philistine harlot (*L.A.B.* 43:5).<sup>84</sup> If Dedila is

<sup>83</sup> In *Legends*, 2:880 n. 125, Ginzberg wrote, “There can be no doubt that in ps-Philo . . . we ought to read Delila instead of Dedila.” Jacobson (*Commentary*, 2:1003) somewhat hesitantly concurred with Ginzberg’s conclusion when he stated that Dedila in *L.A.B.* 44:2 “is presumably Delilah” (emphasis mine) and cited Ginzberg in support.

<sup>84</sup> The scriptural account states that the woman whom Samson loved was named “Delilah” (דִּלְיָהָ). It states that she lived “in the valley of Sorek” (בְּנַחַל שֹׁרֵק, v. 4) and that she entered into a

Delilah, should we read *L.A.B.* 44 alongside *L.A.B.* 34 as examples of a non-Israelite leading the Israelites astray?

The primary reasons for concluding that Pseudo-Philo identified Dedila (*L.A.B.* 43:5) as being Dalila (*L.A.B.* 44:2) are: (1) the orthographic similarity between the names Dedila and Dalila,<sup>85</sup> (2) the close proximity of the passages in *L.A.B.* and in the book of Judges, and (3) the appearance of 1,100 pieces of silver in the scriptural Delilah (Judg 16:5) and Micah (Judg 17:2–3) narratives.<sup>86</sup> Of these, the orthographic similarity between Dedila (*L.A.B.* 44:2) and Dalila (*L.A.B.* 43:5) is the strongest evidence in favour of Ginzberg’s hypothesis. The proximity of the passages is no more evident in *L.A.B.* than in the scriptural account and the monetary parallels between Judg 16:5 and Judg 17:2–3 are not present in Pseudo-Philo’s account. *L.A.B.* 43:5–6 does not state that Dalila was paid for betraying Samson (cf. Judg 16:5) and the riches cited in *L.A.B.* 44:2 differ from those cited in Judg 17:2–3 (see Table 4.3, row 4). Pseudo-Philo would have had to make the connection between Dedila and Dalila more obvious than just orthographic similarities had he intended Dedila in *L.A.B.* 44 to be viewed as the Philistine harlot encountered in *L.A.B.* 43.

Through his adaptations, Pseudo-Philo transformed Micah from the leader of a household that has its own shrine (Judg 17:1–6) into the religious leader of a cultic shrine that leads astray the Israelites (*seducebantur*, *L.A.B.* 44:5). There is no pretext in *L.A.B.* 44 that Israel’s

---

business arrangement with the Philistines to deliver Samson to them (v. 5). However, the scriptural account does not comment upon Delilah’s ethnicity or her profession.

<sup>85</sup> In most ancient texts of the Jewish Scriptures, Samson’s lover in Judg 16:4–22 is a woman named Delilah (e.g. MT, דִּלְיָלָה; LXX Judges A, Δαλιλα; Vulg., *Dalila*). However, in the LXX Judges B text of Judg 16:4–22, Samson’s lover is a woman named “Dalida” (Δαλιδα). To go from *Dalida* (LXX Judges B, Judg 16:4–22) to *Dedila* (*L.A.B.* 44:2) is a small step primarily involving the transposition of two consonants. Neither Ginzberg nor Jacobson make this connection.

<sup>86</sup> In Judges 16, Delilah receives 1,100 units of silver from each of the Philistine lords for revealing to them the secret of Samson’s strength (vv. 5, 18). In Judges 17, Micah’s mother has 1,100 units of silver (vv. 2–3). Boling, *Judges*, 249, suggests that the 1,100 units of silver in Judg 17:2 was the literary “source” for the 1,100 units of silver listed in Judg 16:5. The weight and/or value of each unit of silver is not specified in the text, but, in the same passage, ten units of silver was the Levite’s wage for an entire year (Judg 17:10). Such a large quantity of silver appears nowhere else in the Jewish Scriptures.

God looks favourably upon Micah's cultic center. In the scriptural account, Micah's mother pronounces a blessing upon her son in the name of Israel's God (i.e. "the LORD," Judg 17:2) and Micah confidently declares that Israel's God (i.e. "the LORD") will be "good to him" now that his shrine is complete with a Levite as priest (Judg 17:13). By contrast, in Pseudo-Philo's account, Micah's mother expresses hope (1) that Micah might "make a name" for himself (*L.A.B.* 44:2, *facies tibi nomen*, cf. *L.A.B.* 6:1) and (2) that the establishment of the shrine will make Micah a "worshipper of the gods" (*L.A.B.* 44:3).

Pseudo-Philo appended a lengthy discourse to his reworking of Judg 17:1–6 (*L.A.B.* 44:1–5). Unparalleled in the scriptural account, in this discourse God reveals how Micah and Dedila will be punished for their sins (*L.A.B.* 44:9). Micah's punishment is severe: God promises to "deliver" (*tradam*) him "to the fire" (*igni*) and use the idols he constructed (cf. *L.A.B.* 44:5)<sup>87</sup> to maim and torture him while he is there.<sup>88</sup> Dedila's punishment, although different from that of her son, is on par with her son's: God promises that she will rot away (*marcescens*) with "worms" (*vermes*) coming out of her. The description of their punishments in *L.A.B.* 44:9 implies that Micah and Dedila's punishments will extend beyond the grave like the punishments of Korah and his co-conspirators (*L.A.B.* 16:3), Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:4), and Doeg the Syrian (*L.A.B.* 63:4),. Of particular importance in this regard is the lack of contrition with which Micah and Dedila meet their fates (*L.A.B.* 44:9).<sup>89</sup> This lack of contrition suggests that their punishment extends into the world to come, but this is not definitive.

---

<sup>87</sup> Micah constructed ten images in *L.A.B.* 44:5: three images of boys (*puerorum*), three images of calves (*vitulorum*), and one image each of a dragon (*draconem*), a dove (*columbam*), an eagle (*aquilam*), and a lion (*leonem*).

<sup>88</sup> "And the image of the dove that he made will be used for putting out his eyes, and the image of the eagle will be used for bringing fire upon them out of its wings, and the images of the boys that he made will be used for scraping his sides, and the image of the lion that he made will be like mighty ones tormenting him." (*L.A.B.* 44:9)

<sup>89</sup> "And then, while they are speaking to one another, she will say as a mother chastising her son, 'Behold what a sin you have committed!' And he will answer as a son heeding his mother and acting cleverly, 'And you have done even greater wickedness.'" (*L.A.B.* 44:9)

The absence of specific comments in *L.A.B.* 44:9 concerning Micah and Dedila’s fates in the world to come is not unexpected since their fates are not Pseudo-Philo’s primary concern in *L.A.B.* 44:6–10. When Pseudo-Philo later provided notice of their demise, he did not comment concerning whether they will experience punishment in the world to come but merely stated that “Micah was destroyed in the fire and his mother was rotting away, just as they Lord had said concerning them” (*L.A.B.* 47:12).

Beginning in *L.A.B.* 44:6, the culpability of Micah and Dedila for the construction and operation of their cultic shrine moves to the background and the culpability of other Israelites moves to the foreground. God’s discourse on sin and punishment (*L.A.B.* 44:6–10) supposedly responds to Micah and Dedila for their creation and operation of a cultic shrine in *L.A.B.* 44:1–5 (cf. Judg 17:1–6) but, in actuality, it focuses primarily upon the more widespread sinfulness in Israel. Within God’s discourse on sin and punishment (*L.A.B.* 44:6–10), only verse 9 focuses upon t Micah and Dedila. The remainder of the discourse (*L.A.B.* 44:6–8, 10) focuses more generally upon the “children of Israel” (*filiis Israel*, v. 6).

God’s discourse on sin and punishment (*L.A.B.* 44:6–10) opens with an extended section in which Pseudo-Philo establishes the culpability of all Israelites through references to the Decalogue that God had given Israel at Sinai (*L.A.B.* 44:6–7; see Table 4.4). Through participation in Micah and Dedila’s cultic shrine, the Israelites had violated almost every commandment within the Decalogue.

Table 4.4. The Decalogue in *L.A.B.* 44:6–7 and in Exod 20

<i>L.A.B.</i> 44:6	<i>L.A.B.</i> 44:7	Exod 20 <sup>a</sup>
		“I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery; (v. 2)

L.A.B. 44:6	L.A.B. 44:7	Exod 20 <sup>a</sup>
<p><i>“And I said that they should not make idols,</i></p>	<p><i>“And I told them not to make idols nor the works of those gods that have been born from corruption under the name ‘graven image’ and those things through which all these corruptions have been brought about.</i></p>	<p><u><i>you shall have no other gods before me</i></u> (v. 3)</p>
<p>and they agreed not to carve out the images of gods.</p>	<p>For mortal men have made them, and the fire has served to melt them down. The skill of a man has produced them, and hands have manufactured them, and imagination has invented them.</p>	<p><i>You shall not make for yourself an idol,</i> (v. 4a)</p>
<p><i>And I ordered them not to take my name in vain,</i></p>	<p><i>By accepting these they took my name vain, and they have given my name to graven images.</i></p>	<p>You shall not <u>bow down</u> to them or <u>worship</u> them; (v. 5a)</p>
<p>and they agreed that they themselves would not take my name in vain.</p>	<p><i>You shall not make wrongful use of the name of the LORD your God,</i> (v. 7)</p>	<p><i>You shall not make wrongful use of the name of the LORD your God,</i> (v. 7)</p>
<p><i>And I commanded them to keep the Sabbath,</i></p>	<p><i>And the day of Sabbath that they agreed to keep,</i></p>	<p><i>Remember the Sabbath day, and keep it holy.</i> (v. 8)</p>
<p>and they agreed to keep it holy.</p>	<p>they have done abominable things on it.</p>	<p><i>Honor your father and your mother,</i> (v. 12)</p>
<p><i>And I told them to honor father and mother,</i></p>	<p><i>Whereas have told them to love father and mother,</i></p>	<p><i>Honor your father and your mother,</i> (v. 12)</p>
<p>and they promised they would do it.</p>	<p>they have dishonored me, their Creator.</p>	<p><i>You shall not steal.</i> (v. 14)</p>
<p><i>And ordered them not to steal,</i></p>	<p><i>And whereas I told them not to steal,</i></p>	<p><i>You shall not steal.</i> (v. 14)</p>

<b>L.A.B. 44:6</b>	<b>L.A.B. 44:7</b>	<b>Exod 20<sup>a</sup></b>
and they agreed.	they have dealt like thieves in their schemes with graven images.	
<i>And I told them not to commit murder,</i>	<i>And whereas I told them not to kill,</i>	<i>You shall not murder. (v. 15)</i>
and they held it as acceptable not to do this.	they kill those whom they seduce.	
<i>And I commanded them not to commit adultery,</i>	<i>And though I commanded them not to commit adultery,</i>	<i>You shall not commit adultery. (v. 13)</i>
and they did not oppose this.	they have committed adultery with their zeal.	
<i>And I ordered them not to speak false testimony</i>	<i>And whereas they chose not to speak false testimony,</i>	<i>You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor. (v. 16)</i>
and they agreed.	they accepted false testimony from those whom they destroyed.	
<i>and not to covet each one his neighbor's wife or his house or all possessions and they agreed." (#9)</i>	<i>And they lusted for foreign women." (#9)</i>	<i>You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or male or female slave, or ox, or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbor." (v. 17)</i>

*Note:* The commandments are in an italicized font. The additional material within the Decalogue is in regular font.

<sup>a</sup> Column 3 contains only the commandments from Exod 20. For a comparison of the Decalogue in Exod 20 and Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of the Decalogue in *L.A.B.* 11:6–13) and see Table 3.4.

A further statement concerning the Israelite's culpability is found at the conclusion of Pseudo-Philo's brief, reworked account of the story of the Levite and his concubine (*L.A.B.* 45:1–5; cf. Judg 19:1–30). In *L.A.B.* 45:6, the readers of *L.A.B.* are treated to a divine aside in which God responds to "foolish" (*insipiens*) Israel's response (cf. *L.A.B.* 45:6) to the God-ordained

punishment of a woman who had been unfaithful to her husband (cf. *L.A.B.* 45:3).<sup>90</sup> God also condemns Israel for its earlier lack of response when Micah “craftily” (*versute*) led the Israelites astray (*seduceret*). According to *L.A.B.* 45:6, Israel was culpable for “allowing the evil deeds” (*iniqua*) that took place in Micah’s cultic center.

Having established the Israelite’s culpability with two flashbacks to the Decalogue in *L.A.B.* 44:6–7, Pseudo-Philo noted briefly the degree to which these acts of sinfulness in this “everlasting scandal” (*scandalum sempiternum*; *L.A.B.* 44:8) had become widespread among the Israelites of that era. Three statements in *L.A.B.* 44:8 leave the clear impression that sinfulness was widespread among the Israelites: (1) “those dying will outnumber those being born,” (2) “the house of Jacob has been infected (*viciata est*) in its wickedness (*iniquitatibus*),” and (3) “the impiety (*impietas*) of Israel has been multiplied (*multiplicata est*).” Although further explanation is not given in *L.A.B.* 44, the tribe of Benjamin are described as having “first of all” (*primi*) been “led astray (*seducti sunt*) after Micah” (*L.A.B.* 44:8). The tribe of Benjamin’s punishment is not stated specifically in God’s discourse but consideration is given to its utter destruction (“Can I not totally destroy [*toto disperdere*] the tribe of Benjamin?” *L.A.B.* 44:8).

Pseudo-Philo did not list specific punishments for these Israelites in *L.A.B.* 44. However, he did state in *L.A.B.* 44:10 that “all who sin against” God will share in the punishments that God had promised that Micah and Dedila will face (see *L.A.B.* 44:9). These shared punishments will be meted out in accordance with the principles of *lex talionis*: “to every man there will be such a punishment (*erit illa punitio*) that in whatever sin he shall have sinned (*in quo peccato peccaverit*), in this he will be judged (*in eo adiudicabitur*)” (*L.A.B.* 44:10b). The punished will ultimately agree that God’s justice is fair:

And when the soul is separated from the body (*discernitur anima a corpore*),  
then they will say, ‘Let us not mourn over these things that we suffer, but

---

<sup>90</sup> *L.A.B.* 45:3 states that God “delivered” (*tradidit*) the Levite’s concubine “into the hands of sinners” because she “had transgressed (*transgressa fuerit*) against her man once when she committed sin with the Amalekites.”



because whatever we ourselves have devised (*sed quia quaecumque adinvenimus*), these will we receive (*hec et recipiemus*). (L.A.B. 44:10d)

Israel's punishment for its complicity regarding Micah's idolatry (L.A.B. 45:6) was the death of thousands of Israelites during the first two days of fighting against the tribe of Benjamin (L.A.B. 46:2–3).<sup>91</sup> The tribe of Benjamin's punishment for being the first to be led astray by Micah was the almost-decimation of the tribe of Benjamin on the third day of fighting against the Israelites (L.A.B. 47:10).

SAUL (L.A.B. 64:1–9; CF. 1 SAM 28:3–25)

First Samuel 28:3–25 is a self-contained narrative set in the waning days of King Saul's life. While the army of Israel prepares to fight the army of the Philistines (1 Sam 28:4), King Saul tries unsuccessfully to inquire of the Lord (וַיִּשְׁאַל שְׂאֹל בַּיהוָה). King Saul had previously “expelled” (הִסִּיר) all of the mediums (הָאֹבֹת) and wizards (הַיִּדְעֹנִים) from Israel (1 Sam 28:3).<sup>92</sup> However, when King Saul is unable to consult God “by dreams, or by Urim, or by prophets” (1 Sam 28:6),<sup>93</sup> a terrified King Saul (1 Sam 28:5)<sup>94</sup> seeks out a medium (אֹב, 1 Sam 28:7).<sup>95</sup> The medium, fearful for her safety (1 Sam 28:9–10), reluctantly brings up Samuel for King Saul. When King Saul reveals his predicament to Samuel and asks Samuel for advice (1 Sam 28:15), Samuel responds sharply that God had done to Saul what God predicted (v. 17) when Saul did not destroy all the Amalekites as God had commanded (v. 18). Samuel concludes his words to Saul by revealing

---

<sup>91</sup> God directed the nation of Israel to go to war against one of its tribes (Benjamin) “so that he might fulfill his words” (L.A.B. 46:1; cf. 45:6).

<sup>92</sup> In the Jewish Scriptures, the Israelites are forbidden from becoming mediums and/or wizards (Lev 20:6, 27; Deut 18:10–11) and from consulting with them (Lev 19:31). The removal of mediums and wizards from the land is associated with turning back to the worship of the God of Israel (2 Kgs 23:23–25).

<sup>93</sup> Dreams (e.g. Gen 20:3–7; 28:11–16; Num 16:5–8a; 1 Kgs 3:5–15; Dan 2:1–28), the Urim (Num 27:18–21), and the prophets (Exod 7:1–2; Num 12:4–8; Deut 18:15–22) were some of the primary means by which God communicated with humanity in the Jewish Scriptures.

<sup>94</sup> “When Saul saw the army of the Philistines, he was afraid (וַיִּירָא), and his heart trembled greatly (וַיִּתְרַד לְבֹ מְאֹד)” (1 Sam 28:5; cf. 1 Sam 28:20). King Saul's reaction to the pending Philistine onslaught parallels in part Eli's reaction while waiting for the Ark of the Covenant during an earlier battle against the Philistines: Eli's “heart trembled (לְבֹ חָרַד) for the ark of God” (1 Sam 4:13).

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Isa 19:3 where God is said to “confound” the Egyptians with the result that they “consult the idols and the spirits of the dead and the ghosts and the familiar spirits.”

that, in the pending battle with the Philistines, he and his sons will die and his army will be defeated (v. 19).<sup>96</sup> First Samuel 28 concludes with a fearful (וַיִּרָא מְאֹד) and weak (כַּח לְאִתְּיָהּ בֵּן) Saul falling to the ground (v. 20) and refusing to eat (vv. 22–23a) before finally rising (v. 23b), having a meal (vv. 24–25a), and departing from the medium’s place (v. 25b).

*L.A.B.* 64, Pseudo-Philo’s account of King Saul’s encounter with the medium at Endor, highlights King Saul’s failures and his punishment from God. This first becomes evident in Pseudo-Philo’s rewritten version of 1 Sam 28 (*L.A.B.* 64:1–2) where he depicts King Saul as an individual without a relationship with the God of Israel and as a severely inadequate king. Pseudo-Philo transformed the seeming positive declaration in 1 Sam 28:3 that King Saul expelled all mediums and wizards from the land into a condemnation of King Saul’s religion: he had not expelled them out of “fear” (*timorem*) of the God of Israel, but, rather, out of a desire to “make a name for himself” (*sibi nomen faceret*; cf. *L.A.B.* 6:1; 44:2). Pseudo-Philo in *L.A.B.* 64:2 also interpreted causally the relationship between 1 Sam 28:3a and 1 Sam 28:4. The scriptural narrative states that the Philistines “assembled, and came and encamped” against Israel (1 Sam 28:4) because Samuel was dead (1 Sam 28:3a). Pseudo-Philo adds that the Philistines did this because they knew that Israel was very vulnerable without Samuel or David to pray on their behalf (*L.A.B.* 64:2). This is a stinging condemnation of King Saul’s religion: even Israel’s enemies recognized his religious shortcomings.

The notion of post-mortem reward and punishment, first introduced in *L.A.B.* 3:10, is brought subtly into the narrative by having Samuel declare to King Saul that he thought this was the final resurrection (*L.A.B.* 64:7).<sup>97</sup> Samuel’s declaration stands out, however, for he

---

<sup>96</sup> The Saul narrative in 1 Chronicles does not include the account of King Saul consulting with the medium of Endor but, following King Saul’s death (1 Chr 10:2–10), the Chronicler gives two reasons why God “killed” King Saul and “turned the kingdom to David” (1 Chr 10:14): (1) “the word of the Lord he did not keep” (1 Chr 10:13a; ) and (2) “he asked counsel of a medium . . . and did not inquire of the Lord” (1 Chr 10:13b–14a).

<sup>97</sup> “And Samuel said to him, ‘Why have you disturbed me by raising me up? I thought that the time for being rendered the rewards of my deeds had arrived’” (*appropinquasset tempus reddendi merces operum meorum*, *L.A.B.* 64:7).

immediately contradicts the ignorance that he displays in this statement by stating that God had informed him that this would happen prior to his death.<sup>98</sup> In 1 Sam 28, Samuel lists only King Saul's sin of not having destroyed the Amalekites (1 Sam 28:18). In *L.A.B.* 64, Samuel does not mention this sin directly but, rather, states that he had been sent to inform Saul that he had "sinned now a second time in neglecting God" (*L.A.B.* 64:7). Jacobson suggested that King Saul's second sin is the visit to the medium.<sup>99</sup> While this is possible, *L.A.B.* 64:1 does not describe Saul's visit to the medium as sin *per se* but as punishment for his sin of removing the "wizards" from Israel from a desire "to make a name for himself" rather than from a "fear of God."<sup>100</sup> This interpretation of Saul's second sin is affirmed by the description of Saul's sin as being that of "jealousy" (*zelata*) in *L.A.B.* 64:8. In keeping with the principles of moral causality, *L.A.B.* 64:8 states that Saul's punishment will fit the sin that he committed: "because your insides were eaten up with jealousy, what is yours will be taken from you" (*L.A.B.* 64:8). Perhaps Pseudo-Philo concluded that King Saul's desire "to make a name for himself" (v. 1) stemmed from his jealousy of David (*zelavit Saul David*, *L.A.B.* 62:1, 11).

Pseudo-Philo's declaration that King Saul had "sinned now a second time in neglecting God" (*L.A.B.* 64:7) raises the question as to Pseudo-Philo's views concerning the identity of his *first* sin and its consequences. In *L.A.B.*, the first sin for which King Saul, a man whom Pseudo-Philo introduced as one destined for destruction,<sup>101</sup> is condemned was his failure to kill the Amalekite king, King Agag, and his wife (*L.A.B.* 58:2–3).<sup>102</sup> Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of King Saul's

---

<sup>98</sup> "And so do not boast, King, nor you, woman; for you have not brought me forth, but that order that God spoke to me while I was still alive, that I should come and tell you that you have sinned now a second time in neglecting God." (*L.A.B.* 64:7).

<sup>99</sup> *Commentary*, 2:1211.

<sup>100</sup> Compare *L.A.B.* 39:10–11 which describes Jephthah's sacrifice of his daughter not as sin but as the punishment for his sin of having made a careless vow.

<sup>101</sup> "I will send them a king who will destroy them, and he himself will be destroyed afterward" (*L.A.B.* 56:3).

<sup>102</sup> Louis H. Feldman, "Remember Amalek!" *Vengeance, Zealotry, and Group Destruction in the Bible According to Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2004), 24, contended that Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of this episode places the "blame" "solely" upon King Saul. It

encounter with the Amalekites and their king (*L.A.B.* 58:1–4; cf. 1 Sam 15:1–35), in keeping with the principles of moral causality, creates a direct connection between Saul’s sin and the resultant punishment. According to *L.A.B.* 58:3 and *L.A.B.* 65:4, the Amalekite man who killed a mortally wounded King Saul (2 Sam 1:6–10) according to the scriptural account of King Saul’s death in battle recorded in 2 Sam 1<sup>103</sup> was God’s foreordained instrument of punishment. Pseudo-Philo transformed the Amalekite from an unnamed individual whose ethnic identity (2 Sam 1:13) is revealed only seconds before his execution at the hand of King David (2 Sam 1:15) into the divinely orchestrated offspring of King Agag and his wife who was conceived after King Saul permitted them to live (*L.A.B.* 58:3).<sup>104</sup>

Pseudo-Philo’s account of King Saul’s visit to the medium of Endor concludes with King Saul stating, “Perhaps my destruction will be an atonement for my wickedness” (*si ruina mea exoratio est iniquitatum mearum*, *L.A.B.* 64:9).<sup>105</sup> The belief that death can atone for sin is

---

should be noted, however, that although Pseudo-Philo omitted specific scriptural references to the involvement of other Israelites in the incident (1 Sam 15:9), Pseudo-Philo’s rewriting of this episode does not exonerate the nation of Israel. First, Pseudo-Philo does not state that King Saul *alone* was responsible for the preservation of King Agag and his wife. Their involvement is not mentioned in Pseudo-Philo’s account but nothing in his narrative precludes their involvement. Pseudo-Philo’s account also does not specifically state that other Israelites were involved in the battle against the Amalekites (see 1 Sam 15:4) but, in the absence of specific mention that King Saul alone destroyed the Amalekites (something that, indeed, would be require divine intervention; cf. *L.A.B.* 27:7–14), it can safely be presumed that King Saul *and the Israelites* together destroyed the Amalekites. If their probable presence in the battle is not mentioned, caution must be taken in reading too much into Pseudo-Philo’s failure to mention their involvement in the sparing of King Agag and his wife. Second, in his rewriting of 1 Sam 15, Pseudo-Philo reveals that Israel, indeed, is culpable for King Saul’s presence since he was appointed directly because of their own sinful request for a king. Samuel’s first statement in addressing King Saul after he had preserved the lives of King Agag and his wife concerned Israel’s sin in this regard: “How much harm has Israel done because they demanded you for themselves as a king before the time came that a king should rule over them?” (*L.A.B.* 58:4).

<sup>103</sup> The account of King Saul’s death recorded in 1 Sam 31:1–7 states that King Saul fell on his own sword (v. 4) after being mortally wounded by a Philistine archer (v. 3).

<sup>104</sup> In order to make possible King Saul’s punishment, Pseudo-Philo indicates that King Saul spared not only King Agag (cf. 1 Sam 15:8) but also King Agag’s wife, an individual not mentioned in the scriptural narrative.

<sup>105</sup> The scriptural account of Saul’s encounter with the witch of Endor does not provide Saul’s verbal response to Samuel’s declaration that Saul and his sons would die in the coming battle (1 Sam 28:19) but it graphically describes Saul’s fear (1 Sam 28:20, “Immediately Saul fell full length on the ground, filled with fear because of the words of Samuel; and there was no strength in him”).

present in Rabbinic literature<sup>106</sup> but *L.A.B.* 64:9 does not definitively indicate whether Saul is *expressing hope* that his death *might* atone for his sins<sup>107</sup> or whether he is *expressing confidence* that his death *will* atone for his sins.<sup>108</sup> At issue is whether the *si* clause in *L.A.B.* 64:9 (*si ruina mea exoratio est iniquitatum mearum*) has causal force.<sup>109</sup> If the *si* clause has causal force, *L.A.B.* 64:9 would stand alone in our study of *L.A.B.* thus far as a declaration that death will atone for sin. Apart from this passage, the passages of *L.A.B.* we have studied have not contained any suggestion that the atonement for individual sin is required, desired, or possible.

Regardless, the *si* clause in King Saul's declaration in *L.A.B.* 64:9 introduces an element of uncertainty concerning King Saul's post-mortem fate. In *L.A.B.*, King Saul had been introduced into the narrative as someone who was foreordained for destruction (*L.A.B.* 56:3). Into his reworking of Israel's request for a king (*L.A.B.* 56:1–3; cf. 1 Sam 8:1–22), Pseudo-Philo inserted a declaration from God that the king whom God will send "will destroy them (*eos exterminabit*)" (i.e. Saul) before he himself "will be destroyed (*exterminabitur*)" (*L.A.B.* 56:3).<sup>110</sup> In the scriptural account, 1 Sam 12:25 presents this concept as a possibility, not as a prediction: "But if you still do wickedly (וְאִם־הִרַעְתֶּם), you shall be swept away (תִּסָּפּוּ), both you and your king." Pseudo-Philo did not resolve the matter of King Saul's post-mortem fate for King Saul dies uncertain regarding whether the punishment for his sin might extend into the world to come.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> According to *Pirqe R. El.* 33, Saul died by the sword (see 1 Sam 31:4) knowing that Samuel had previously informed him that his death would atone for his sins if he died by the sword.

<sup>107</sup> ". . . ob wohl mein Untergang die Sühne für meine Sünden ist?" (Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1975)," 94); "Puisse ma mort être l'expiation de mes iniquités" (Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 385); ". . . if perchance my destruction may be an atonement for my sin" (James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 241); ". . . perhaps my destruction will be an atonement for my wickedness" (Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 2:377).

<sup>108</sup> ". . . for my destruction will be an atonement for my wickedness" (Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:193).

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:1212.

<sup>110</sup> Pseudo-Philo's account contrasts with the scriptural account in which the future king is presented as a divinely anointed (וּמִשְׁחָתוֹ) ruler sent to "save" (וְהוֹשִׁיעַ) God's people from the Philistines (1 Sam 9:16).

<sup>111</sup> The uncertainty concerning Saul's fate with which Pseudo-Philo leaves his readers contrasts with Pseudo-Philo's otherwise negative portrayal of Saul. For more on Pseudo-Philo's negative portrayal of

## SYNOPSIS

In our examination of these three cases, we observed contrition and hope that we did not observe in the previous section. The sinners selected by the casting of the lot in *L.A.B.* 25, for example, were given the opportunity to confess their sins with the promise that their act of confession might influence God to “have mercy on you when he will resurrect the dead” (*L.A.B.* 25:7). Pseudo-Philo revealed nothing further concerning their prospects in the world to come. Nevertheless, because they contritely confessed their secret sins of rejecting God, rejecting God’s commandments, and challenging and/or testing God (*L.A.B.* 25:8–13), the reader of *L.A.B.* is left with the understanding that these Israelites had hope in the world to come. The prospect that a contrite sinner might die with hope for mercy in the world to come also came to the forefront in *L.A.B.* 64. Before King Saul died in battle (*L.A.B.* 65:2–5), he openly hoped that his “destruction” somehow might “be an atonement for my wickedness” (*L.A.B.* 64:9). Within the cases studied in this section, the act of contritely confessing sin prior to death offers hope even for the worst of sinners.<sup>112</sup> Left unresolved in *L.A.B.* is whether any of these sinners actually realized this hope. Their stories remain unfinished, with the endings still to be written.

The case of Micah and Dedila was included in this section because Pseudo-Philo did not state specifically in *L.A.B.* 44:9 that their punishment will continue post-mortem. Nevertheless, the strong language that Pseudo-Philo utilized in *L.A.B.* 44:9 and his description of their complete lack of contrition leaves no doubt that he believed that these two people will not

---

Saul, see Abram Spiro, “Pseudo-Philo’s Saul and the Rabbis’ Messiah Ben Ephraim,” *PAAJR* 21 (1952): 120–134; Fröhlich, *Time and Times*, 182; Joachim Vette, “Samuel’s ‘Farewell Speech’: Theme and Variation in 1 Samuel 12, Josephus, and Pseudo-Philo,” in *Literary Construction of Identity in the Ancient World: Proceedings of the Conference Literary Fiction and the Construction of Identity in Ancient Literatures: Options and Limits of Modern Literary Approaches in the Exegesis of Ancient Texts. Heidelberg, July 10–13, 2006* (ed. Hanna Liss and Manfred Oeming; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 328–329.

<sup>112</sup> Of the Israelites studied in the previous section, only Korah was offered the chance to change and he did not take this opportunity.

receive reward in the world to come. This being the case, therefore, their story has more in common with those of Korah (*L.A.B.* 16) and Jair (*L.A.B.* 38) than it does with those of the sinners in Kenaz's generation (*L.A.B.* 25, 27) and King Saul (*L.A.B.* 64). The sinners in Kenaz's generation and King Saul die with hope that God will receive them favourably in the world to come but Micah and Dedila die with no prospect on the horizon but punishment.

*Individual Israelites in L.A.B. Whose Punishment for Sin does not appear to Extend into the World to Come*

This section examines the third group of individual Israelites who sinned and were punished in *L.A.B.* Common to all of the cases in this group is the absence of any discussion of the possibility that these individuals might experience punishment in the world to come for a sin committed in the present world. The individuals under consideration in this section are:

Jephthah (*L.A.B.* 39:9–40:9), Eluma (*L.A.B.* 42:1–3), Samson (*L.A.B.* 43:1–8), Beel's concubine (*L.A.B.* 45:1–4), Eli and his sons (*L.A.B.* 52; cf. 1 Sam 4:10–11), and the priests at Nob (*L.A.B.* 63:1).

JEPHTHAH (*L.A.B.* 39:9–40:9; CF. JUDG 11:29–40)

The focus of the scriptural Jephthah narrative (Judg 11:1–12:7) is Jephthah's "bittersweet victory"<sup>113</sup> over Israel's Ammonite oppressors (Judg 11:29–40). As he sets off for battle, Jephthah "made a vow to the Lord" (v. 30) promising to offer the first one to "meet" him upon his return from battle "as a burnt offering" to the Lord (v. 31). God grants Jephthah victory over the Ammonites (v. 32–33) but Jephthah is devastated when his only child, a daughter, is the first to meet him upon his return home (vv. 34–35). After father and daughter affirm that he must fulfill his vow (vv. 35b–36), Jephthah grants his daughter's last request that he permit her to "go and wander on the mountains, and bewail my virginity" (v. 37). The account concludes with the simple declarations that Jephthah "did with her according to the vow he had made" (v.

---

<sup>113</sup> Brown, "Judges," 227.

39) and that his daughter “never slept with a man.”<sup>114</sup> Although her death is tragic,<sup>115</sup> there is no indication in the text that her fate was a divinely directed punishment of Jephthah.

Pseudo-Philo’s reworking of Jephthah’s military victory over the Ammonites (*L.A.B.* 39:9b–40:9; cf. *Judg* 11:29–40) includes the added declaration that God, by ordering the events so that Jephthah would have to “accomplish” (*fiat*) his vow “against his own firstborn (*primogeni*) . . . the fruit of his own body . . . his only-begotten (*unigeni*)” (*L.A.B.* 39:11), punished Jephthah for having made his vow. In Pseudo-Philo’s account, Jephthah’s punishment came about because his vow did not guard against the possibility that something unsuitable for sacrifice such as a dog might be the first to meet Jephthah upon his return home (*L.A.B.* 39:11). According to Pseudo-Philo, Jephthah’s vow to offer as a sacrifice “whatever” met him when he returned was a sin because the vow meant that Jephthah would have sacrificed a “dog” to God if a dog was the first to meet Jephthah upon his return (*L.A.B.* 39:10–11; cf. *Judg* 8:30–31).<sup>116</sup> Pseudo-Philo appeared to be satisfied that this is sufficient punishment since the passage contains no suggestion that Jephthah should expect any further punishment for his sin.<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup> For the view that the scriptural account depicts Jephthah actually sacrificing his daughter, see Josephus, *Ant.* 5.266; Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 367–368; McCann, *Judges*, 84. For the view that the scriptural account depicts Jephthah dedicating his daughter to a life of perpetual virginity in the service of God, see David Marcus, *Jephthah and His Vow* (Lubbock, Tex.: Texas Tech University Press, 1986).

<sup>115</sup> The scriptural account captures the tragedy of the situation in its declaration that Israelite women spent four days each year mourning her fate (*Judg* 39:40).

<sup>116</sup> Inherent in this proclamation is the intimation that human sacrifice is preferable to canine sacrifice! Pseudo-Philo further highlighted the presence of human sacrifice in the Jewish Scriptures by having Seila describe herself in comparison to Isaac who almost became victim of human sacrifice in *Gen* 22:1–19.

<sup>117</sup> Pseudo-Philo also was careful to state that Jephthah’s daughter, whom he names Seila, did not die as punishment for her own sin (*L.A.B.* 40:3–4). Seila is described as a “virgin . . . wise in contrast to her father and perceptive in contrast to all the wise men who are here” whose “death” is “precious before” God (*L.A.B.* 40:4).



ELUMA (*L.A.B.* 42:1–3; *CF.* *JUDG* 13:2–25)

The scriptural Samson birth narrative (*Judg* 13:1–25) relates the story of how Manoah and his barren wife (*vv.* 2–3)<sup>118</sup> came to have a son (*v.* 24). An angel<sup>119</sup> appeared to her and informed her that she would have a son who “from the womb” would be “God’s Nazirite” (נָזִיר אֱלֹהִים; *v.* 5).<sup>120</sup> After Manoah’s wife informed her husband what the angel had said (*vv.* 6–7), Manoah prayed that the “man of God” would return and “teach us what we are to do

---

<sup>118</sup> Samson’s birth narrative in *Judg* 13:1–25 stands alongside the birth narratives of Isaac (*Gen* 18:1–15; 21:1–7), Jacob (*Gen* 25:21–26), Joseph (*Gen* 30:1–24), and Samuel (*1 Sam* 1:1–20) as a scriptural example of a son born to a barren woman through divine intervention.

<sup>119</sup> In *Judg* 13:3, the angel is called the “angel of the Lord” (מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה), also *vv.* 13, 15–18, 21). Later, when Manoah’s wife returns home to inform him of her encounter, she calls him a “man of God” (אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים, *v.* 6) with an appearance like an “angel of God” (מַלְאֲכֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, *v.* 6). In the Jewish Scriptures, King David is described as being “like an angel of God” (כְּמַלְאֲכֵי הָאֱלֹהִים; *2 Sam* 14:17; 19:27; *1 Sam* 29:9), but his appearance is never described as being like unto an angel.

<sup>120</sup> The translation of נָזִיר אֱלֹהִים is that of Boling, *Judges*, 217. Similar is the suggested translation in *BDB*: “God’s devotee” (*BDB*, sv. נָזִיר). Many modern translations of the Jewish Scriptures translate נָזִיר אֱלֹהִים as “a Nazirite (un)to God.” Compare *Judg* 13:5 (LXX<sup>A</sup>), “. . . the boy shall be sanctified, a Nazirite to God (ναζιραῖον ἔσται τῷ θεῷ).” *Judges* 13:5 (LXX<sup>B</sup>) reads closer to the MT, “. . . the boy shall be a nazir of God (ναζιρ θεοῦ ἔσται).”

Although they share the name “Nazirite,” the Nazirites described in *Num* 6:1–21 and in *Judges* 13 differ in many respects. Nazirites in the Torah are forbidden from consuming wine, “strong drink,” vinegar, grape juice, grapes, raisins (*Num* 6:3), or anything “produced by the grapevine” (*v.* 4). They also are to not cut their hair for the length of their vow (*v.* 5) and they are not permitted to “go near a corpse” (*v.* 6) even if the corpse is that of a close family member (*v.* 7). If, perchance, someone “nearby” (עֲלֵיו) to a Nazirite “dies very suddenly (בְּפֶתַע פְּתָאֵם),” a Nazirite must perform certain cultic rituals including shaving his head and he must begin anew the vowed time of consecration to God (*vv.* 9–12). Samson’s mother is prohibited from drinking “wine or strong drink” or from eating unclean food (*Judg* 13:4) but the only restriction specifically placed upon Samson in *Judges* 13 is that he cannot cut his hair (*v.* 5). The declaration that Samson will be a Nazirite from birth (*v.* 5) might suggest that Samson must also follow the rules imposed upon his mother. Unlike his counterparts in *Num* 6, Samson is not prohibited from touching corpses or from having someone die in his presence. The scriptural Samson narrative depicts people dying very suddenly near Samson (*Judg* 14:19; 15:7–8, 14–17) and it depicts Samson touching corpses (*Judg* 14:8–9, 19). The Nazirites depicted in *Num* 6 and in *Judges* 13 also differ in that the laws in *Num* 6:1–21 do not describe the situation depicted in *Judges* 13 in which God imposes a Nazirite vow upon an individual at his conception (*Judg* 13:3–5) and declares that the individual is to remain a Nazirite from conception (*Judg* 13:5, 7, 13–14) until death (*Judg* 13:5, 7). Although it is not mentioned in the angelic pronouncement (*Judg* 13:3–5), the most tangible benefit that Samson received as a result of keeping Nazirite law was a superhuman strength that permitted him to do many feats (*Judg* 14:5–6, 19; 15:14–17; 16:3, 23–30). Samson violated the Nazirite law as described in *Num* 6 with apparent impunity. When Samson revealed to Delilah that his superhuman strength was based on the fact he was a Nazirite from birth (*Judg* 16:17), she shaved his head (*Judg* 16:19) and his strength (*v.* 19) and his God (*v.* 20) left him. Only after his hair regrew (*Judg* 16:22) was Samson able to perform one final feat of superhuman strength.

concerning the boy who will be born" (v. 8). When the "angel of God" returned in answer to this prayer (vv. 9–11), the angel informed Manoah of the lifestyle that his wife was to follow during the pregnancy (vv. 13–14) to ensure that "from the womb" Samson truly would be "God's Nazirite" (v. 5, 7). The angel refused the offer of a meal (vv. 15–16a) but suggested that Manoah offer a burnt offering "to the Lord" instead (v. 16b). After a brief conversation concerning the angel's name (vv. 17–18), Manoah presented a burnt offering and a grain offering to God (v. 19).

Pseudo-Philo's reworking of the scriptural Samson birth narrative (*L.A.B.* 42:1–43:1a; cf. *Judg* 13:1–25) reduces the angelic pronouncement that Samson would be born (*L.A.B.* 42:3; cf. *Judg* 13:3) to secondary importance. In contrast to the scriptural account, Pseudo-Philo makes the determination of culpability between Manoah and his wife Eluma the primary focus of the narrative<sup>121</sup> and describes the interaction between Eluma and Manoah. Pseudo-Philo precedes the angelic pronouncement with the revelation that Manoah and Eluma were "quarrelling daily" (*altercarentur quotidie*, *L.A.B.* 42:2) concerning their inability to have children, each accusing the other of being the one whom God had rendered sterile (*L.A.B.* 42:1). Manoah's consternation at Eluma's inability to conceive a child was so great that he urged Eluma "every day" (*quotidie*) to permit him to leave her so that he could marry another woman in her place and not die childless (*L.A.B.* 42:1).<sup>122</sup> Eluma's retort to her husband was simple: she was not the one whom God had rendered sterile (lit. "shut up," *conclisit*, *L.A.B.* 42:1). Eluma then appealed for God to "reveal" to her which of them God had rendered sterile (*L.A.B.* 42:2). The angel's pronouncement that Samson would be born is preceded by the angel's revelation that Eluma is the guilty party (*L.A.B.*

---

<sup>121</sup> Manoah's wife is unnamed in *Judges* 13 but is named Eluma in Pseudo-Philo's account. This name is unique to Pseudo-Philo's account.

<sup>122</sup> This portrait of a woman's rights in the divorce process in *L.A.B.* 42:1 differs from that which is seen elsewhere in Jewish literature. According to *m. B. Bat.* 10:3, the courts could issue a divorce for a man without his wife's consent or presence (cf. *Deut* 24:1). Perhaps informative in this matter is Josephus's contention that Manoah was "madly in love with his wife" (*Ant.* 5:277). If Pseudo-Philo presumed this to be the case, it might explain his depiction of Manoah as being unable unilaterally to divorce his wife as might otherwise be his right. Their daily quarrelling (*L.A.B.* 42:1–2) might suggest otherwise, however.

42:3).<sup>123</sup> Pseudo-Philo did not identify the specific sin(s) that caused her sterility, however. Eluma returns home and informs Manoah that an angel had revealed to her that she is the sterile one and that she now would conceive and have a son (v. 4). Her words of contrition do not comfort Manoah and he is unbelieving, “perplexed,” “sad,” and fearful that he was “not worthy” to see the angel or hear the angelic pronouncement (v. 5). His disbelief later changes to belief (v. 10) after his own encounter with the angel (vv. 6–9). *L.A.B.* 42 contains no indication that Eluma can expect further punishment for the unspecified sin(s) that led to her sterility. This is confirmed by the restoration she experiences with the pronouncement that her punishment (i.e. her sterility) has ended (*L.A.B.* 42:3-4; see also 43:1).

SAMSON (*L.A.B.* 43:1–8; cf. JUDG 14:1–16:31)

The Samson death narrative in the Jewish Scriptures (Judg 16:1–31) depicts five attempts by the Philistines to seize Samson (Judg 16:1–21) while he is in the company of two different women. Samson avoids capture in the first four attempts (vv. 1–14) but he is captured, blinded, and imprisoned in the fifth attempt (v. 21). The first attempt to capture Samson occurs while he is with an unnamed prostitute (זֹנֶה) in the Philistine city of Gaza (vv. 16:1–3). After being informed that Samson is in their city, the men of Gaza wait in ambush to kill him (v. 2). However, Samson manages to escape, rips out the city gates, and takes gates to the top of a mountain (v. 3). The remaining four attempts by the Philistines to capture Samson occur while he is with a woman named Delilah in the valley of Sorek (vv. 4–21). Promised an exorbitant amount of silver from the Philistine lords in return for Samson’s capture (Judg 16:5),<sup>124</sup> Delilah asks Samson on three separate occasions to reveal the secret of his strength to her (vv. 6, 10, 13). Three times, she tries to subdue him using the information he reveals (vv. 8, 12a, 14a). Each

---

<sup>123</sup> “You are the sterile one who does not bring forth, and you are the womb that is forbidden so as not to bear fruit” (*L.A.B.* 42:3).

<sup>124</sup> Judges 16:5 states that, for Samson’s betrayal, each of the Philistine lords offer Delilah “eleven hundred pieces of silver” (אֵלֶף וּמֵאָה בָּקָרָה). Based on the presumption that there are five Philistine lords (see Judg 3:3; also Josh 13:3; 1 Sam 6:4), the amount of silver that Delilah is offered is 550 times the annual wage of 10 units of silver (עֶשְׂרֵת בָּקָרָה) that Micah pays his priest in Judg 17:10.

time Samson easily avoids capture (vv. 9, 12b, 14b). Delilah persists in asking Samson to reveal to her the secret of his strength (v. 16)<sup>125</sup> and he finally reveals to her that he is “God’s Nazirite” (נָזִיר אֱלֹהִים) and would lose his strength if his head is shaved (Judg 16:17). Delilah promptly calls the Philistines (Judg 16:18) and shaves Samson’s head while he sleeps (Judg 16:19).<sup>126</sup> Unlike the previous times (Judg 16:9, 12, 14), Samson finds he cannot resist his captors because his head is shaved and his strength is gone.

Pseudo-Philo positioned *L.A.B.* 43:1b–6, his rewriting of the scriptural account of the five Philistine attempts to seize Samson (Judg 16:1–21), immediately after his account of Samson’s birth narrative (Judg 13:1–25; cf. *L.A.B.* 42:1–43:1a). In *L.A.B.* 43:1b–6, the lengthy scriptural story of Samson’s troubled marriage to an unnamed Philistine woman (Judg 14:1–15:8) is condensed into a few words (*L.A.B.* 43:1b) and a footnote (*L.A.B.* 43:4). Into this setting, Pseudo-Philo inserted a rewriting of the first of the five Philistine attempts on Samson’s life as recorded in Judges 16 (*L.A.B.* 43:2–3).<sup>127</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s abbreviated account of the final four Philistine attempts to seize Samson in the valley of Sorek (*L.A.B.* 43:5–6; cf. Judg 16:4–21) includes a lengthy, unparalleled, divine aside in which God pronounces punishment upon Samson (*L.A.B.* 43:5). In addition to his chief sin of “mingling” (*commixtus est*) with Philistine women, God states that Samson’s eyes have led him astray (*seductus est*) and that Samson has “not remembered (*immemor*)” the “mighty works” (*virtutis*) that God has done through him. God promises to hand Samson over (*tradam*) to the people whose women Samson had lusted (*concupiscentia*) after

---

<sup>125</sup> Judges 16:16 states that Delilah “nagged” (הִצִּיקָה) and “pestered” (וְתִאֲלָצְהוּ) Samson daily until “he was tired to death” (cf. Judg 16:16 MT) “and his spirit was short (נִפְשׁוֹ לְמוֹת) to death.” Judg 16:16 (LXX<sup>A</sup>) states “and he was tired (lit. “discouraged,” ἀλιγοψύχησεν) to death” while Judg 16:16 (Vulg.) states, “he was tired (*lassata est*) until death.”

<sup>126</sup> Judges 16:19 (MT) somewhat awkwardly states that, after Samson fell asleep, Delilah “called a man” (וְתִקְרָא אֶל־אִישׁ) and then she shaved (וְתִגְלַח) him. In the Septuagint and in one Hebrew manuscript, the masculine form of the verb is employed to indicate that the man whom she called did the shaving.

<sup>127</sup> The first Philistine attempt to capture Samson is transformed from the story of a sexual encounter with a Philistine prostitute gone wrong in the city of Gaza (Judg 16:1–3) into the story of a marriage with a Philistine woman gone wrong (*L.A.B.* 43:1b–3).

and mingled (*commixtio*) with (L.A.B. 43:5)<sup>128</sup> and God tells Samson that he will be blinded by them. Neither L.A.B. nor the scriptural account reveal what awaits Samson in the world to come. BEEL'S CONCUBINE (L.A.B. 45:1–4; CF. JUDG 19:1–30)

A further example of individual punishment for sin in L.A.B. is Pseudo-Philo's assertion that the rape and murder suffered in the city of Nob<sup>129</sup> by Beel's concubine<sup>130</sup> was a divinely ordained punishment for her having "transgressed (*transgressa fuerat*) against her man . . . with the Amalekites"(L.A.B. 45:3).<sup>131</sup> The scriptural account does not make an overt connection between her grisly demise and something she may or may not have done during her lifetime. Nevertheless, Pseudo-Philo's contention that the Levite's concubine was unfaithful to her partner likely stems from his interpretation of the first word of the phrase וַתִּזְנוּהָ עָלָיו פִּילִגְשׁוֹ (Judg 19:2) translated in the NRSV as "But his concubine became angry with him" (emphasis added). Modern scholars of the Jewish Scriptures, citing the reading in LXX<sup>A</sup> "she became angry" (ὤργισθη), frequently conclude that וַתִּזְנוּהָ in Judg 19:2 is the sole scriptural instance of the verbal

---

<sup>128</sup> L.A.B. 43:5 describes Samson's lust for Delilah as his "stumbling block" (*scandalum*). For a similar use of *scandalum*, see L.A.B. 18:8 (Balaam's journey will be a *scandalum* for himself) and L.A.B. 58:3–4 65:4 (Agag's offspring will be Saul's *scandalum*).

<sup>129</sup> In Judges 19, the Levite's servant wants them to spend the night in Jebus (Jerusalem; v. 11), but the Levite does not want to spend the night there (v. 12). They proceed on to Gibeah (*Gabao*, vv. 13–15) where they spend the night with an old man from Ephraim who invites them into his house (vv. 16–20). In L.A.B. 45, the Levite arrives at Gibeah and wants to stay there (the city of Jebus is not mentioned). When the inhabitants of Gibeah do not permit him to do so (v. 1), the Levite, his concubine, and his servant proceed to the city of Nob (v. 11) where they spend the night with a Levite named Bethac (v. 2). The north-south trajectory (i.e. Gibeah to Nob) in Pseudo-Philo's account contrasts with the south-north trajectory (i.e. Jebus to Gibeah) in the scriptural account and might suggest that Pseudo-Philo did not just abbreviate the scriptural account (contra Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2:1028).

<sup>130</sup> Pseudo-Philo alone gave the name "Beel" to the Levite (L.A.B. 45:2). In the scriptural account (Judg 19:1–30), the Levite is not given a name. For a brief discussion of the Levite's name in Jewish literature, see Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2:1030.

<sup>131</sup> The statement in L.A.B. 45:3 that the concubine's sin was that "she had transgressed against her man" (*transgressa fuerat virum suum*) can only mean that she had been unfaithful to her partner. The verb *transgredior* (*transgressa fuerat*, L.A.B. 45:3) in L.A.B. is used with reference to a variety of deeds (L.A.B. 6:4; 13:8; 19:4; 24:4; 25:3; 28:2; 30:2; 34:3; 53:10; 58:10) but the description in L.A.B. 45:3 that the focal point of her transgression was her Levite partner points to the conclusion that her sin was that of unfaithfulness.

root זנה bearing the meaning “become angry.”<sup>132</sup> In the Masoretic Text of the Jewish Scriptures, the verbal root זנה usually bears the meaning “commit adultery.”<sup>133</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s declaration that the concubine “transgressed against her man” presupposes the more common meaning of “commit adultery.” Pseudo-Philo’s narrative does not reveal whether the concubine can expect further post-mortem punishment for her sin.

ELI AND HIS SONS (*L.A.B.* 52:1–4; 54:3–6; *CF.* 1 SAM 2:12–36; 4:4–22)

Pseudo-Philo’s account of the deaths of Eli and his two sons who served as priests in the tabernacle (*L.A.B.* 52:1–4; *cf.* 1 Sam 2:22–36) also highlighted individuals being punished for their sins. In the Jewish Scriptures, an aged and heavyset Eli falls backward, breaks his neck, and dies (1 Sam 4:18b) after receiving some very bad news. The news is that a battle between the Israelites and the Philistines has ended with “a great slaughter” (מִגְּדֹלָה גְּדוֹלָה) of the Israelites, the deaths of his sons Hophni and Phinehas, and the capture of the “Ark of God” by the Philistines (1 Sam 4:17–18a).

An unnamed “man of God” (1 Sam 2:34; *cf.* v. 27)<sup>134</sup> had prophesied to Eli that, by permitting his sons to have “the choicest parts (מִרְאשֵׁית) of every offering,” he was guilty of honoring (וְהִתְכַבֵּד) his sons more than God (1 Sam 2:29). As a result, the “man of God” declared that Eli’s priestly family would be decimated (1 Sam 2:31–33, 36)<sup>135</sup> and replaced by another

---

<sup>132</sup> *HALOT*, sv. זנה.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>134</sup> In the Jewish Scriptures, “man of God” (אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים / אִישׁ־אֱלֹהִים) is a common epithet for a prophet/seer.

<sup>135</sup> According to 1 Sam 4:17–21, Eli’s daughter-in-law (his son Phinehas’ wife) gave birth to Ichabod shortly after the news of Hofni and Phinehas’ deaths and the capture of the Ark. In the book of Samuel, the story of the fate of Eli’s line continues when King Saul has most of the priests from Eli’s line killed (1 Sam 22:12–19). The genealogical connection between the priests in these narratives is made in 1 Sam 14:3 and 1 Sam 22:9, 11. The story of the fate of Eli’s line concludes 1 Kgs 2:27 when Eli’s descendant Abiathar, the one priest from Nob who managed to escape (1 Sam 22:20), is banished from the priesthood (1 Kgs 2:27) by David’s son Solomon. Abiathar’s banishment is stated specifically as being the fulfillment of a prophecy against the house of Eli (1 Kgs 2:27; *cf.* 1 Sam 2:27–36).

priestly family descended from “a faithful priest” (1 Sam 2:35). The sign to Eli that God was going to do this was that his two sons would die “on the same day” (1 Sam 2:34).

God’s intent to punish Eli’s line was confirmed further to a youth named Samuel who served in the temple (1 Sam 3:11–14). One night, God informed Samuel that Eli’s “house” would be punished because Eli “knew” (יָדַע) the sins that his sons were committing yet “he did not restrain them” (וְלֹא כָהָה בָּם; v. 13).<sup>136</sup> The scriptural account describes Eli’s sons as being “scoundrels” (בְּנֵי בָלְעֵל; 1 Sam 2:12a) who did not recognize God’s moral authority (1 Sam 2:12b)<sup>137</sup> and who “treated . . . with contempt” (נִאָּצְוּ) the sacrifices that the Israelites were offering to God (1 Sam 2:17). They demonstrated this contempt by failing to follow the established protocol concerning the priests’ acquisition of their share of the animal sacrifices (1 Sam 2:13–16).<sup>138</sup> First Samuel 2:22–25 states that a “very old” Eli “heard” the unspecified sins that his sons were committing against “all Israel” and also that his sons were having sexual intercourse “with the women who served at the entrance to the tent of meeting.” Upon hearing this, Eli confronted his sons with the reports he was hearing of their “evil dealings” (אֲתִדְבְּרִיכֶם) (רָעִים; 1 Sam 2:23). The passage states that Eli exhorted his sons not to sin “against the Lord” because “the Lord” would not “make intercession” (יִתְפַּלֵּל) on their behalf for sins committed against God (1 Sam 2:25). Despite this appeal, Eli’s sons did not “listen” to their father because “it was the will of the Lord (כִּי־חָפֵץ יְהוָה) to kill them” (1 Sam 2:25).<sup>139</sup>

Pseudo-Philo’s reworking of the scriptural account of the punishment of Hophni, Phinehas, and Eli (*L.A.B.* 52:1–4; 54:3–6) is an excellent test case for Pseudo-Philo’s well-documented belief in moral causality. Pseudo-Philo left no doubt that Hophni and Phinehas

---

<sup>136</sup> The scriptural narrative in 1 Sam 2:12–17, 22–25 supplies further details concerning these indictments.

<sup>137</sup> Lit., they had “had no regard (לֹא יָדַעוּ) for the Lord” (1 Sam 2:12).

<sup>138</sup> Key in this regard was the priest’s demand that the worshippers give them the priest’s portion of meat before the fat had been burned off (1 Sam 2:15–16; cf. Lev 7:22–31; 17:6).

<sup>139</sup> כִּי־חָפֵץ יְהוָה (1 Sam 2:25) literally reads, “for the Lord desired.”

deserved their punishment.<sup>140</sup> He described them as doing “wicked things to the people” (*L.A.B.* 52:1; cf. 1 Sam 2:22–23) and as taking their portion of the “sacrificial offerings before they were offered . . . to the Lord” (*L.A.B.* 52:1; cf. 1 Sam 2:12–17). Pseudo-Philo’s treatment of Eli, however, seems to reveal some gaps in his seemingly unwavering commitment to moral causality. Pseudo-Philo wrote that God “was angry at Eli” (*L.A.B.* 52:4) and that Eli fell and died “in deep despair” upon hearing the news from the battlefield (*L.A.B.* 54:5). In *L.A.B.* 52–54, this reference seems out of place for nothing in Pseudo-Philo’s account to this point has prepared his readers for it. Conspicuous by its absence from Pseudo-Philo’s account is any reference to the sexual sins of Eli’s sons (1 Sam 2:22),<sup>141</sup> the unnamed prophet’s stinging indictment of Eli and his line (1 Sam 2:27–36), and God’s revelation to Samuel that Eli “knew” of his son’s sinfulness and did not restrain them (1 Sam 3:13). Also absent from Pseudo-Philo’s depiction of Eli is any reference to his old age (cf. 1 Sam 2:22; 4:15, 18), his visual impairment (cf. 1 Sam 3:2; 4:15), and his weight (cf. 1 Sam 4:18).<sup>142</sup> The centerpiece of Pseudo-Philo’s transformation of Eli appears *L.A.B.* 52:1–4 where he depicts Eli as a strong and eloquent opponent of his son’s wicked ways.

Pseudo-Philo set the tone in *L.A.B.* 52:2a by equating Eli’s reaction to his son’s sins (*L.A.B.* 52:1b–c) with that of God: “And this was pleasing neither to the Lord nor to the people nor to their father.” The scriptural account of Eli’s confrontation (1 Sam 2:22–25) does not contain this sentence, but Eli’s and God’s responses to Eli’s sons<sup>143</sup> are brought together in 1 Sam 2:25 where Eli tells his sons that their sins are “against the Lord” (v. 25). Nevertheless, Pseudo-Philo’s explicit

---

<sup>140</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s view that Hophni and Phinehas certainly deserved their punishment seems to contrast with *Gen. Rab.* 54.4 (on Gen 21:28) which includes them among the “righteous men” whom the Philistines would someday kill. The other five “righteous men” on the list in this late Amoraic period Rabbinic text are Samson, Saul, and Saul’s three sons.

<sup>141</sup> First Samuel 2:22 LXX also does not state that Eli’s sons committed sexual sins.

<sup>142</sup> The reference to Eli’s weight in 1 Sam 4:18 implicates him as a beneficiary (at the very least) of the sins for which his sons were condemned by the man of God in 1 Sam 2:29.

<sup>143</sup> Eli’s displeasure with his sons is clearly shown in his words to them in 1 Sam 2:23–25. God’s displeasure with Eli’s sons is clearly shown in the editorial declaration that their “sin . . . was very great in the sight of the Lord” (1 Sam 2:17), in the word from the Lord delivered by the man of God (1 Sam 2:27–36), and in the Lord’s words to Samuel (1 Sam 3:11–14).



equation of Eli's and God's displeasure with Eli's sons does grant an additional level of credibility to Eli's words, a credibility that is needed to counter the overall negative portrait of Eli presented in the scriptural narrative.

Functionally, Eli's words to Hophni and Phinehas (*L.A.B.* 52:2b–3) in *L.A.B.* take the place of the word from the Lord delivered by the “man of God” to Eli (1 Sam 2:27–36) in the Jewish Scriptures. Essentially, although not actually, Eli becomes the “man of God” and delivers a reworked version of the message (see Table 4.5). The two most significant differences between Eli's message in *L.A.B.* 52 and the man of God's message in 1 Sam 2 are found in rows 4 and 5 of Table 4.5. The first of these is the message of hope that Eli delivers to his sons (see Table 4.5, row 4): he tells them that there is still time to repent and avert their destruction and the destruction of the priesthood (*L.A.B.* 52:2). The second key difference is Eli's declaration in *L.A.B.* 52:3b that he has absolved himself of guilt in the matter (Table 4.5, row 5).

Table 4.5. The Speeches by the “Man of God” (1 Sam 2:27–36) and by Eli (*L.A.B.* 52:2–4)

Theme	The Man of God's Speech (1 Sam 2:27–36)	Eli's Speech ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 52:2–4)
The Origins of Eli's Priesthood	In Egypt Eli's “ancestor” was chosen by God to be priest (vv. 27–28a)  God gave the priesthood to the family of the chosen priest (v. 28b)	Eli received the priesthood from Phinehas
The Sins of Eli's Family	Greed shown toward the sacrifices being offered to God (v. 29a)  Eli is honoring his sons more than God (v. 29b)	Eli refers to the “wicked schemes” of his sons (v. 2), and to their “wickedness” (v. 3). See also the description of Eli's sons in <i>L.A.B.</i> 52:1.

Theme	The Man of God's Speech (1 Sam 2:27-36)	Eli's Speech (L.A.B. 52:2-4)
The Consequences of their Sins	God reconsiders the promise that this "family" would be priests "forever" (v. 30)	Eli expresses concern over what will happen if "he who entrusted" their family with the priesthood "asks for it back and should vex us over that which he committed to us?" (v. 2a)
	Those who honor God will be honored, those who despise God will be "treated with contempt" (v. 30)	
	No one in the family will live to an old age (v. 31-32)	"you will destroy yourselves, and the priesthood will be in vain and what has been sanctified will be reckoned at nought." (v. 2c)
	The family will be decimated by death (v. 33-34)	
	What remains of the family will beg for a position in the priesthood (v. 36)	
	"a faithful priest" will be raised up by God (v. 35)	"Then people will say, 'Did the staff of Aaron flower in vain, has the flower born of it come down to nothing?'" (v. 2d)
An Exhortation to Repentant	n/a	"Now straighten out your ways and walk in good ways and your actions will endure." (v. 2b) <sup>a</sup>
		"And so while you still can, my sons, correct what you have done sinfully, and the men against whom you have sinned will pray for you." (v. 3a)

Theme	The Man of God's Speech (1 Sam 2:27–36)	Eli's Speech (L.A.B. 52:2–4)
Eli's Declaration that He is now absolved of Guilt	n/a	"But if you are not willing and you persist in your wickedness, I will be guiltless and will only grieve lest perchance I hear of the day of your death before I die. But even if this happens, I will be free of guilt; and though I grieve, nevertheless you will perish." (v. 3b)

Source: The translation of *L.A.B.* 52:2–4 contained in this table is that of Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:178–179.

<sup>a</sup> The Latin of the last phrase of the first sentence of *L.A.B.* 52:2b reads *et permanebunt actus vestri*. "Position," Harrington's translation of *actus* ("Pseudo-Philo," 2:366–367), is a more fitting translation of the Latin words *situs* or *status*.

By omitting the negative aspects of Eli's religious character (e.g. he honors his sons more than God) and the seemingly pejorative description of his physical characteristics (e.g. old, blind, and fat) seen in the scriptural text and by rewriting Eli's confrontation of his sons (*L.A.B.* 52:2–4), Pseudo-Philo removed every apparent justification for God's displeasure with Eli that is evident in the scriptural narrative. The disjuncture between Pseudo-Philo's overwhelmingly positive depiction of Eli and Eli's inevitable death on the same day as his sons (*L.A.B.* 54:5; cf. 1 Sam 4:18) is accentuated with the declaration in *L.A.B.* 52:4d, unparalleled in the scriptural account, that "the Lord was angry at Eli."

If a belief in moral causality was important within Pseudo-Philo's ideology, why would he rewrite Eli's narrative as he did and then conclude it with the unexpected declaration that God was "angry" with him? The first possible answer to this question is that, in its present form, *L.A.B.* 52:4 is lacunose.<sup>144</sup> This possibility is suggested by the aforementioned inherent incongruity between the declaration that God was "angry" with Eli in *L.A.B.* 52:4d and Pseudo-Philo's depiction of Eli elsewhere in *L.A.B.* If *L.A.B.* 52:4 is lacunose, then Pseudo-Philo's explanation of God's anger toward Eli might reside in the missing section. A second possible answer to this question is that the extant Latin text of *L.A.B.* 52:4d may be corrupt. *Indignatus est*

<sup>144</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2:1116.

*Dominus* (“The Lord was angry”), the first three words of the sentence in question, readily fit into *L.A.B.* 52. At the heart of Eli’s oration (*L.A.B.* 52:2–3) is the conviction that the failure of Eli’s sons to change their ways would result in their destruction (v. 2). The declaration in *L.A.B.* 52:4d that God was “angry” follows hard on the revelation that Eli’s sons not only “did not listen” to their father, but that God had “not permitted” them “to repent” (*L.A.B.* 52:4a–c). Perhaps God’s anger in *L.A.B.* 52:4d is directed at Eli’s sons rather than Eli himself. In this scenario, a copyist influenced by the scriptural Eli narrative possibly added in the final two words of *L.A.B.* 52:4d, *ad Heli*. A third possible answer to this question is that Pseudo-Philo presumed his readers will read the declaration of God’s anger toward Eli in light of the scriptural Eli narrative in which clearly presents Eli’s culpability.<sup>145</sup> Of these options, the second option (i.e. a corrupt text) is preferable as it provides the simplest answer to the question. Nevertheless, the correct answer cannot be determined with certainty.

Pseudo-Philo’s account of the punishment of Eli’s sons builds on Eli’s exhortation for his sons to “straighten out” their “ways” and to “do good” (*L.A.B.* 52:2). Pseudo-Philo tied the theme of repentance into Eli’s speech through a flashback to words that Eli purportedly said to his sons: “For when he said to them, ‘Turn (*Penitemini*) from your evil ways,’ they would say . . .” (*L.A.B.* 52:4). The scriptural account merely notes that Eli’s sons “would not listen” to their father because “it was the will of the LORD to kill them” (1 Sam 2:25) but Pseudo-Philo’s account declares not only that Eli’s sons “did not listen (*non obaudierunt*),” it declares that Eli’s sons “were not permitted (*non datum est*) to repent” (*L.A.B.* 52:4).

Later in *L.A.B.*, Pseudo-Philo’s belief in moral causality comes to the forefront with his use of Eli’s sons as a prototype for priestly misconduct in the Nob narrative (*L.A.B.* 63:1–3). The priests at Nob whom King Saul had slaughtered at Nob (cf. 1 Sam 22:10–19) died as punishment for walking “in the ways of the sons of Eli” (*L.A.B.* 63:1),<sup>146</sup> not just in fulfilment of the earlier

---

<sup>145</sup> Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2:1116.

<sup>146</sup> Pseudo-Philo’s condemnation of the priests at Nob in *L.A.B.* 63:1 builds upon his likewise unparalleled declaration in *L.A.B.* 45:1–3 (also *L.A.B.* 47:10) that the Levite’s concubine was gang raped

prophecies against Eli's line (1 Sam 2:27–36; 3:11–14). As the sons of Eli had done in the scriptural account (1 Sam 2:13–16, 22–25), the priests at Nob in Pseudo-Philo's account had profaned "the holy things of the Lord" and had taken "for themselves the first fruits" (*L.A.B.* 63:1).

In *L.A.B.*, no consideration is given to the impact that these punishments upon Eli's line will have upon the place of the individual member of Eli's line within the Israelite covenant community. These details are also absent from the scriptural account.

#### SYNOPSIS

The consistency with which Pseudo-Philo rewrote the principles of moral causality into his accounts that deal with the reward and punishment of individual Israelites demonstrates that moral causality most certainly was within Pseudo-Philo's ideology. First, in Pseudo-Philo's account of Jephthah and his daughter (*L.A.B.* 39:1–40:9; cf. Judg 11:1–40), we are informed that God punished Jephthah for his vow to offer as a burnt offering "whoever meets [him] first" upon his successful return from battle (*L.A.B.* 39:10) by ensuring that his only daughter was the first to meet him (*L.A.B.* 39:11). This declaration has no parallel in the scriptural account.

Second, in Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of the interaction between Manoah, Eluma, and the "angel of the Lord" prior to Samson's birth (*L.A.B.* 42:1–10; cf. Judg 13:2–25), the "angel of the Lord" reveals that God had rendered Eluma barren as punishment for an unspecified sin (*L.A.B.* 42:4). This revelation also has no parallel in the scriptural account. Moral causality remains front and center in the narrative since the reason for Manoah and Eluma's childlessness is *the* issue under consideration in Pseudo-Philo's narrative. This emphasis, too, has no parallel in the scriptural account.

Third, in Pseudo-Philo's account of Samson's demise and death (*L.A.B.* 43:1–8; cf. Judg 16:1–31), God reveals that Samson will be punished for having sexual relations with non-Israelite

---

and murdered there. In the scriptural narrative, these events take place in Gibeah (Judg 19:11–30), not Nob.

women (*L.A.B.* 43:5). Again, this has no parallel in the scriptural account. Samson's punishment also is connected directly to the sin he was deemed to have committed – "Samson's lust will be a stumbling block for him and his mingling his ruin" (*L.A.B.* 43:5). This direct connection, too, has no parallel in the scriptural account.

Fourth, in Pseudo-Philo's account of the Levite and his concubine (*L.A.B.* 45:1–6; cf. *Judg* 19:1–20:6), an editorial comment reveals that the Levite's concubine was brutally raped and murdered as punishment for having been unfaithful to her Levite partner (*L.A.B.* 45:3). The conclusion that her death was punishment has no parallel in the scriptural account.

Fifth, in Pseudo-Philo's account of events leading up to the deaths Eli and his sons (*L.A.B.* 52:1–4; 54:3–6), the narrative clearly states that Eli's sons deserved their fates (*L.A.B.* 52:4). This conclusion is paralleled in the scriptural account. However, Pseudo-Philo's depiction of Eli's life and fate does not align with the principles of moral causality. Pseudo-Philo's narrative carefully excludes any possible reason for God's anger toward Eli (*L.A.B.* 52:4). Pseudo-Philo's failure to explain God's anger toward Eli suggests that the extant text of *L.A.B.* at this juncture either is lacunose or corrupt.

The most notable other exception to Pseudo-Philo's penchant in these cases to rewrite moral causality into the narratives is his reworking of the story of Jephthah's daughter, Seila (*L.A.B.* 39:11–40:8). Unlike Beel's concubine whose grisly demise is said to be punishment for her transgressions (*L.A.B.* 45:3), Seila's death is held up as an example of the death of the innocent. Indeed, she is the antithesis of one who deserves death within a system of moral causality.

With Seila, therefore, as the notable exception, moral causality is *the* rule that governs punishment for sin and the negative events that take place in an individual's life in these five cases. The value of this observation for this present study, however, is limited since the concepts of a final judgment and of a world to come are entirely absent from these five narratives, both in their scriptural forms and in their rewritten forms as contained in *L.A.B.* Given the almost complete silence of the Jewish Scriptures concerning the concepts of a final judgment and of a

world to come, their absence from these narratives does not come as a surprise. Therefore, we must exercise caution when drawing conclusions from these five cases concerning the impact of punishment for sin upon the individual sinner's place within the Israelite community in the world to come and must consider the possibility that Pseudo-Philo's failure to address this matter in these five cases was intentional.

There is a marked difference between the sins committed in three of the five cases and the sins committed in the cases studied in the two previous sections. Jephthah's sin was to make an inappropriate vow (*L.A.B.* 39:10) that might result in the sacrifice of a dog (*L.A.B.* 39:11). Samson's sin was to mingle "with the daughters of the Philistines" (*L.A.B.* 43:5). The concubine sin was unfaithfulness to her Levite partner (*L.A.B.* 45:3). In the fourth case, the Eluma narrative, the sin is not revealed. These sins stand in stark contrast to the idolatry, the worship of other gods, or the rebellion against God's law that we observed in the Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:1), Micah (*L.A.B.* 44:2–5), Gideon (*L.A.B.* 36:3), and Korah narratives (*L.A.B.* 16:1, 4). These narratives culminate with the promise of post-mortem punishment (*L.A.B.* 38:4; 16:3; 44:9; 36:4). Jephthah's potential violation of cultic ritual and the sexual sins of Samson and the concubine also stand in contrast, to a lesser degree, to the rejection of God and/or God's commandments and the challenging or testing of God to which the sinners confessed to in Pseudo-Philo's Kenaz narrative (*L.A.B.* 25:8–13; 27:15) that resulted in their uncertain fate in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 25:7). These sins also stand in contrast to the "neglecting" of "God" (*L.A.B.* 64:7), the desire "to make a name for himself" (*L.A.B.* 64:1), and the "jealousy" (*L.A.B.* 64:8) that Saul was said to have committed. The contrast, however, is not complete since some of the rejection of God's commandments encountered in the Kenaz narrative such as profaning the Sabbath (*L.A.B.* 25:13) and committing adultery (*L.A.B.* 25:10) do not seem to exceed the sins encountered in four of the five cases encountered in this section. For the most part, however, it seems that the punishment truly fits the sin for Pseudo-Philo. Perhaps the sins committed in most of the cases examined in this section did not fit Pseudo-Philo's criteria for post-mortem punishment. One

case, however, appears to challenge this trend: the case of Eli and his sons (*L.A.B.* 52:1–4; 54:3–6).

In *L.A.B.* 52:4, we are left wondering why God was “angry” with Eli. Pseudo-Philo’s Eli lacks the shortcomings of the scriptural Eli and even vigorously exhorts his sons to repent of their sins. His unrepentant sons are guilty of doing unspecified “wicked things to the people” and guilty of taking their portion of the “sacrificial offerings before they were offered” (*L.A.B.* 52:1). This clearly conjures up images of the “evil dealings” (1 Sam 2:23), the sexual transgressions (1 Sam 2:22), and the contempt displayed for God’s offerings (1 Sam 2:17) by these “scoundrels” (1 Sam 2:12b) in the scriptural narrative. The fact remains, however, that Eli’s sons seemed to have committed sins worthy of a comment noting that their fate in the world to come was uncertain or was perhaps even set.

Ultimately, in each of these five cases, the punishments for the sins remain staunchly intra-covenantal and without apparent impact upon the individual’s place in the Israelite covenant community in the world to come. For reasons that are not always clear, these sinners did not appear to be in danger of not “staying in.” Further consideration will be given of this matter shortly.

***Homilies or Exhortations within L.A.B. Concerning the Impact of Reward and Punishment on Individuals within the Israelite Covenant Community***

The impact of reward and punishment upon the members of the Israelite covenant community comes also to the forefront in two didactic sections: Deborah’s parting exhortation (*L.A.B.* 33:1–5) and the Song of Hannah (*L.A.B.* 51:3–6). These two passages will be considered in turn.

*Deborah’s Parting Exhortation (L.A.B. 33:1–5)*

Deborah’s parting exhortation,<sup>147</sup> unparalleled in the Jewish Scriptures,<sup>148</sup> introduces a perspective regarding the impact of reward and punishment upon individuals within the Israelite

---

<sup>147</sup> Louis H. Feldman, in “Josephus’ Portrait of Deborah,” in *Hellenica et Judaica: hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (ed. André Caquot, Mireille Hadas-Lebel, and Jean Riaud; Leuven: Peeters, 1986),



covenant community that, on the surface, appears to differ from the perspectives we have encountered in our study thus far. Deborah, in her much earlier inaugural statement (*L.A.B.* 30:7), stated that God would “take pity” (*inviscerabitur vobis*)<sup>149</sup> on Israel not “because of” (*pro*) them but, rather, “because of” (*pro*) the “covenant” (*testamento*) that God had “established” (*disposuit*) with their ancestors and the non-abandonment “oath” (*iuramento*) that God had “sworn” (*iuravit*). However, Deborah’s parting exhortation (*L.A.B.* 33:1–5) does not mention a covenant that had been established or an oath that had been sworn. Rather, it highlights what her people must do in the present world (*in tempore vite vestre*; lit. “during the time of your life”) in order to avoid the “underworld” (*inferno*)<sup>150</sup> in the afterlife. Deborah urges her people to “direct” (*dirigite*) their hearts (*cor vestrum*) to God (*L.A.B.* 33:2), to “obey” her (*obaudite . . . mee*, 33:3), and to “make straight” (*dirigite*) their “ways” (*vias*; 33:3).<sup>151</sup> This must be done in the

---

aptly described Pseudo-Philo’s Deborah as “a mother in Israel fully comparable to the matriarchs, to patriarchs, and to Moses” (p. 127). As it pertains to her leadership in matters of religion, Pieter Willem van der Horst, in “Deborah and Seila in Ps.-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992), was correct when he referred to Deborah as “one of the central leaders in Israel’s history” (p. 113).

<sup>148</sup> The scriptural Deborah narrative concludes with the declaration, “And the land had rest forty years” (*Judg* 5:31b). Similar formulaic notes also appear at or near the conclusions of the scriptural Othniel (*Judg* 3:11a), Shamgar (*Judg* 3:30), and Gideon (*Judg* 8:28) narratives. Pseudo-Philo transformed the brief note (*Judg* 5:31b) into a statement that specifically states that Deborah “judged” the nation of Israel (*L.A.B.* 32:18b) during the forty year period of rest noted in *Judg* 5:31b. Pseudo-Philo also prefaced his statement with an otherwise unknown episode in which Deborah joins Israel in offering sacrifices and burnt offerings at Shiloh (*L.A.B.* 32:18a) and followed it with an otherwise unknown parting exhortation by Deborah (*L.A.B.* 33:1–5).

<sup>149</sup> A close parallel to Deborah’s words in *L.A.B.* 30:7 is *Micah* 7:19–20, “He will again have compassion upon us (MT וְיִרְחַמֵּנוּ) . . . You will show faithfulness to Jacob and unswerving loyalty to Abraham, as you have sworn to our ancestors from the days of old.”

<sup>150</sup> In the Vulgate, *infernus* frequently occurs where the MT reads שְׁאוֹל (Sheol, underworld). Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2:347; Cazeaux in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon I*, 255; and James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 179, translate the two occurrences of *infernus* in *L.A.B.* 33:3 as “hell” (Fr. “enfer”). This meaning is common in ecclesiastical Latin but Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:152, and Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1975),” 199, translate them as “underworld” (Ger. “Unterwelt”), a meaning more in keeping with the Hebrew origins of *L.A.B.* than “hell.” In *L.A.B.* 33, Deborah only states that this underworld is a place in which sin no longer is possible and a place that retains its inhabitants (i.e. no resurrection) unless otherwise demanded by God (*L.A.B.* 33:3; see also *L.A.B.* 16:3).

<sup>151</sup> For *dirigite vias vestras*, also see *Jer* 18:11, “Turn now, all of you from your evil way, and amend your ways (וְהִיטִיבוּ דְרֹכֵיכֶם; Vulg. *et dirigite vias vestras*) and your doings (וּמַעֲלָלֵיכֶם).” In turn, the

present world because it will be too late to “repent” once one has died (*L.A.B.* 33:2). Nothing, not even ancestral merit, will benefit such a person (*L.A.B.* 33:5).<sup>152</sup>

Deborah’s parting exhortation in *L.A.B.* 33 partially parallels Joshua’s inaugural exhortation of Israel in *L.A.B.* 20. The basic structural similarities between Joshua’s exhortations (*L.A.B.* 20:3–4) and Deborah’s exhortations (*L.A.B.* 33:2–3; see Table 4.6) and the similarities between the greater contexts in which they occur (*L.A.B.* 20:3–7 and *L.A.B.* 33:1–5; see Table 4.7) draw attention to the thematic similarities that also exist between the two passages (see underlined material in Table 4.6). Ultimately, Joshua and Deborah preach a similar message: destruction awaits the Israelites (*L.A.B.* 20:4b–c; 33:2c–3c) who, in the present world, fail to live in accordance with God’s commands (*L.A.B.* 20:3; *L.A.B.* 33:3). Pseudo-Philo’s well-documented belief in moral causality comes through strongly in Joshua’s exhortation in *L.A.B.* 20: obedience will be rewarded and disobedience will be punished.

If you proceed in the ways of your God, your paths will be made straight. But if you do not heed his voice and you become like your fathers, your affairs will be spoiled and you yourselves will be crushed and your name will perish from the earth. (*L.A.B.* 20:3b–4a)

Whereas Joshua’s exhortation in *L.A.B.* 20 focuses on reward and punishment, Deborah’s exhortation in *L.A.B.* 33 focuses upon punishment. Joshua urges his people to obedience with the hope of reward and with the fear of punishment in the present world, but Deborah urges her people to obedience with the fear of punishment in the world to come (see Table 4.6, rows 2-3).

---

wording of Jer 18:11 (MT) is very similar to that of Jer 35:15 (MT), “Turn now everyone of you from your evil way, and amend your doings (וְהִיטִיבוּ מַעַלְלֵיכֶם).”

<sup>152</sup> “While a man is still alive he can pray for himself and for his sons but after his end he cannot pray or be mindful of anyone. Therefore do not hope in your fathers. For they will not profit you at all unless you be found like them” (*L.A.B.* 33:5). For similar sentiments against the belief that ancestors can successfully intercede on behalf of the living, see 4 Ezra 7:102–112; 2 En. 53:1; 2 Bar 85:12.

Table 4.6. *L.A.B.* 20:3–4 and *L.A.B.* 33:2–3 in Parallel Columns

Topic	<i>L.A.B.</i> 20:3–4	<i>L.A.B.</i> 33:2–3
Death as the Context	<u>“Behold the first generation has died in the wilderness because they have spoken against their God. (3a)</u>	<u>“Behold I am going today on the way of all flesh, on which you also will come.”(2a)</u>
Obedience and Straight Paths	And behold now, all you leaders, know today that if you proceed in the ways of your God, your <u>paths will be made straight (dirigentur)</u> . But if you do not <u>heed his voice (obaudieritis)</u> and you become like your fathers, (3b–4a)	“Now therefore, my sons, <u>obey (obaudite) my voice</u> ; while you have the time of life and the light of the Law, <u>make straight (dirigite) your ways.</u> ” (3d)
Possible Dire Consequences	your affairs will be spoiled and <u>you yourselves will be crushed and your name will perish from the earth</u> . And where will the words be that God spoke to your fathers? For even if the gentiles say, 'Perhaps God has failed, because he has not freed his people' – nevertheless they will recognize that he has not chosen for himself other peoples and done great wonders with them, then they will understand that the Most Powerful does not respect persons; but because you sin through pride, so he took away his power from <u>you and subdued you</u> . (4b–c)	“because after your death <u>you cannot repent of those things in which you live</u> . For then death is sealed up and brought to an end, and the measure and the time and the years have returned their deposit. For even if you seek to do evil in the underworld after your death, you cannot, because the desire for sinning will cease and the evil impulse will lose its power, because even the underworld will not restore what has been received and deposited to it unless it be demanded by him who has made the deposit to it.” (2c–3c)
Conclusion	And now rise up and <u>set (ponite) your heart to walk in the ways of your Lord, and he will guide (diriget) you.</u> ” (4d)	Only <u>direct (dirigite) your heart to the Lord your God</u> during the time of your life,” (2b)

Source: The text of *L.A.B.* 33:3 in this table was adapted from Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 2:347.

Table 4.7. *L.A.B.* 20:3–7 and *L.A.B.* 33:1–5

Content	<i>L.A.B.</i> 20:3–7	<i>L.A.B.</i> 33:1–5
Exhortation by the leader	vv. 3–4	vv. 1–3
Response by the people	v. 5	v. 4
Response by the leader	vv. 6–7	v. 5

Deborah's declaration that disobedient Israelites may face an unending afterlife in the "underworld" (*L.A.B.* 33:3) is a clarification of Joshua's declaration that a disobedient nation of Israel might be "crushed" (*confringimini*) with their name perishing (*periet*) "from the earth" (*L.A.B.* 20:4). Joshua's second discussion of the prospect that the nation of Israel might find itself in the "underworld" (*inferno*; *L.A.B.* 21:4) accounts for the evolution from the national destruction threatened in *L.A.B.* 20:4 to the individual destruction threatened in *L.A.B.* 33:3. When the possibility that Israel might find itself in the underworld is revisited in *L.A.B.* 21, Joshua tempers the threatened destruction with his confidence that, somehow, the "abundance" (*plentiudo*) of God's "mercy" (*miserationum*) would "sustain" (*sustineat*) the nation (*L.A.B.* 21:4). Therefore, when the matter of post-mortem life in the "underworld" is broached in Deborah's exhortation, the focus has shifted from the prospect that a disobedient nation of Israel might face destruction in the "underworld" to the prospect that disobedient Israelites might face destruction in the "underworld" (*L.A.B.* 33:3). The nation of Israel is indestructible but individual Israelites are vulnerable.

*The Song of Hannah (L.A.B. 51:3–6)*

In his reworking of the Song of Hannah (*L.A.B.* 51:3–6; cf. 1 Sam 2:1–10),<sup>153</sup> Pseudo-Philo again brings to the foreground the prospect that disobedient Israelites might face destruction in the "underworld." In this passage, Samuel's mother Hannah (*L.A.B.* 51:1; 1 Sam 1:20) divides humanity into two groups: (1) the "wicked" (*iniqui*) and (2) the "just" (*iustus*; *L.A.B.* 51:5). After death, the "wicked" will be "shut up in darkness" (*concludet in tenebris*) and will "perish" (*peribunt*; v. 5). In contrast, after death (lit. "sleep," *dormierint*), the "just" will be freed (*liberabuntur*), will be brought back "to life" (*vivificat*), and will enjoy God's "light" (*lumen*).

---

<sup>153</sup> In the Masoretic Text, the Song of Hannah is presented as a prayer ("Hannah prayed [וַתַּחַן] and said," 1 Sam 2:1). In the Vulgate, "Hannah prayed [*oravit*] and said" (1 Sam 1:28). In *L.A.B.*, "Hannah prayed [*oravit*] and said" (*L.A.B.* 51:3). The Septuagint merely states that "Hannah said" (1 Sam 2:1).

Antithetically parallel pairs of people characterize Hannah's prayer in the scriptural Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1–10). Each member of these antithetical pairs receives contrasting treatment from God.<sup>154</sup> In *L.A.B.* 51:3–6, Hannah focuses on the final two antithetically parallel pairs of people from the scriptural account (1 Sam 2:9–10):

1. The “wicked” (וְרָשָׁעִים) will be made silent (יִדְמֶוּ) in “darkness” (בְּחֹשֶׁךְ; v. 9), and the “faithful ones” (Q, חֲסִידָיו)<sup>155</sup> are guarded by God<sup>156</sup>
2. God's “adversaries” (Q: מְרִיבָיו)<sup>157</sup> will be “shattered” (יִחַתּוּ) while God's “anointed” one (מְשִׁיחוֹ), “his king” (לְמֶלְכּוֹ), will be empowered by God (v. 10).<sup>158</sup>

The two ethical and behavioral-based groups (“wicked” and “just”) do not have specific ethnic, cultural, or covenantal associations in *L.A.B.* 51:5. As in the scriptural Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1–10), Pseudo-Philo does not explain, delineate, or justify the makeup of these groups. Neither does he discuss whether membership transfers from one group to the other are possible. However, he does briefly delineate what will become of the people in these groups. In Pseudo-Philo's Song of Hannah, Hannah observes that the “wicked” only will exist “in this world” (*L.A.B.* 51:5).<sup>159</sup> She also states that the “just” can anticipate being brought back to life,<sup>160</sup> they

---

<sup>154</sup> In addition to the two examples in 1 Sam 2:9–10 that are mentioned here: (1) the “mighty” have their “bows” “broken,” while the “feeble” receive “strength” (v. 4); (2) the “full” are so hungry that they will do anything for “bread” while the “hungry” are “fat with spoil” (v. 5); and (3) the “barren” woman has seven children while the woman who has “many children” languishes (v. 5).

<sup>155</sup> Or “faithful one” (K: חֲסִידוֹ).

<sup>156</sup> The antithetical parallelism between the “faithful ones” and the “wicked” present in the MT (and also in the Vulgate) of 1 Sam 2:9 is absent in the LXX of 1 Sam 2:9. “Granting a prayer to the one who prays, he has even blessed the years of the righteous” (1 Sam 2:9 LXX).

<sup>157</sup> Or “adversary” (K: מְרִיבוֹ). Cf. “adversary” (ἀντιδίασων, 1 Sam 2:10 LXX).

<sup>158</sup> In 1 Sam 2:10 LXX, the contrast found in the MT between God's “adversaries” and God's “anointed” “king” is muted somewhat by (1) a lengthy addition that closely parallels Jer 9:23–24 and, (2) the absence of the synonymous parallelism between “his king” and “his anointed” found in the MT.

<sup>159</sup> The Latin text of *L.A.B.* 51:5 here is “*Quoniam iniqui sunt in hoc seculo, et vivificate iustos cum vult*” which, when translated literally, somewhat awkwardly reads “Because the wicked are in this world, and the just are brought back to life when he wishes.” As the text presently stands, the contrast is between the fates of the “wicked” (*iniqui*) and the “just” (*iustos*) with the “wicked” truly existing only in the present world and with the “just” having the added blessing of a resurrection to an unspecified post-mortem existence. Jacobson's translation of the text (*Commentary*, 1:177; see 2:1103 for his discussion of

can anticipate the experience of God's "light,"<sup>161</sup> and, through death, they can anticipate freedom.<sup>162</sup> In the scriptural Song of Hannah, Hannah refers to the dark silence to which the

---

this verse) followed this interpretation. Cazeaux (in Harrington, *Pseudo-Philo I*, 335) transformed the sentence into a conditional sentence: "Si (*Quoniam*) les impies demeurent en ce monde, Il donne aussi (*et*) la vie aux juste quand Il veut." He also inserted the word "demeurent" ("live") into the first half. James (*Biblical Antiquities*, 217), similar to Cazeaux, rendered the phrase "*Quoniam iniqui sunt in hoc seculo*" as a description of the dire status of the present world: "for the ungodly are in this world." However, unlike Cazeaux, James set the second half of the sentence in question in parallel to the first half of the next sentence: "therefore quickeneth he the righteous when he will (*et vivificat iustos cum vult*), but the ungodly he will shut up in darkness (*Iniquos autem concludet in tenebris*)." The solution of Dietzfelbinger, "*Pseudo-Philo* (1975)," 238, was similar to that of James. He bracketed *Quoniam iniqui sunt in hoc seculo* as a "gloss" (*Glosse*) and joined the second half of the sentence (*Iniquos autem concludet in tenebris*) to the first half of the next sentence as James did. Harrington ("*Pseudo-Philo*," 2:366) appended the words "he kills" to the end of his translation of "*Quoniam iniqui sunt in hoc seculo*" to complete the parallel with the second half of the sentence: God "kills" the "wicked in this world" and "brings the just to life."

<sup>160</sup> In *L.A.B.* 51:5, Pseudo-Philo offers only the "just" the prospect of resurrection from the dead. The post-mortem fate of the "wicked" is not clearly discussed in *L.A.B.* 51:5. The prospect that resurrection from the dead is limited only to the just also is suggested in Pseudo-Philo's discussion of the fate of Korah and his co-conspirators. They will remain alive (lit. "they will not die but waste away") in their "dwelling place" of "darkness" and "destruction" until the end of the present world. When God will "remember the world and renew the earth," Korah and his co-conspirators "will die and not live," "hell will no longer spit them back," and God "will not remember them." *L.A.B.* 19:12 describes a future time when God "will raise up" Moses and his ancestors (lit. "fathers," *patres*) and they will "dwell in the immortal dwelling place." It does not appear that Pseudo-Philo envisaged that all Israel will share in this resurrection since *L.A.B.* 19:13 seems to speak only of the fate of the just when it states that only some (lit. "all who can live") will be resurrected to life "in the place of sanctification." Presumably, Pseudo-Philo included Jair among those who would not share in this place. *L.A.B.* 38:4 does not state this specifically but its description of Jair's post-mortem fiery dwelling place does not leave much room for resurrection in the manner described in *L.A.B.* 19:12–13. The suggestion that the resurrection is limited only to some is also present in *L.A.B.* 25:7 in which Kenaz offers hope to those Israelites whose sinfulness had been revealed by the casting of the lot (*L.A.B.* 25:1–4). The hope offered these sinners is that, if they confess their sins prior to death, perhaps they will be raised from the dead at the end of time ("God will have mercy on you when he will resurrect the dead," *L.A.B.* 25:7). Only *L.A.B.* 3:10 appears to offer some hope that all humanity, just and wicked alike, might share in the resurrection: "But when the years appointed for the world have been fulfilled . . . And I will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth. And hell will pay back its debt and the place of perdition will return its deposit so that I may render to each according to his works . . ." This is not conclusive evidence that Pseudo-Philo believed that the wicked would be raised from the dead to face a final judgment since *L.A.B.* 3:10 does not specifically state that some of those whom God judged already for eternity (e.g. Jair in *L.A.B.* 38:4) would face further punishment.

<sup>161</sup> Jacobson (*Commentary*, 2:1104) suggested that, in *L.A.B.* 51:5, "light is God's reward for the righteous." In support Jacobson cited Ps 97:11, "Light dawns (נֹרָא, lit. "is sown") for the righteous." Jacobson did not explain how light could be a reward for the righteous but he drew a comparison to *L.A.B.* 11:9 with its reference to "light" as a reward for those who "love" and "honor" their parents. There is also some merit to Murphy's suggestion that the reference to "light" in *L.A.B.* 51:5 is an allusion to the Law (*Pseudo-Philo*, 193). Key in this regard are passages such as *L.A.B.* 11:1 and 33:3 in which Pseudo-Philo associated the Law with light.

“wicked” are destined (1 Sam 2:9), the shattering that awaits God’s “adversaries” (1 Sam 2:10), and the death that awaits others in the scriptural Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:6). This closely parallels the death and the prospect of being shut up in darkness that awaits the wicked in *L.A.B.* 51:5. Given Pseudo-Philo’s earlier declaration that the “underworld” (*inferno*) awaits those who do not obey God (*L.A.B.* 33:3; cf. also *L.A.B.* 21:4), the scriptural Hannah’s reference to “Sheol” (לִישׁוֹן; Vulg. *infernum*) as the abode of the dead (1 Sam 2:6) is conspicuous by its absence from Pseudo-Philo’s Song of Hannah.<sup>163</sup> Concerning the fate of the “faithful ones” (cf. the “just” in *L.A.B.* 51) in the scriptural Song of Hannah, Hannah says little other than that God will “guard” their “feet” (1 Sam 2:9).

Pseudo-Philo’s Song of Hannah demonstrates a greater openness toward non-Israelites than the scriptural Song of Hannah does. Pseudo-Philo’s Song of Hannah contains several positive references to ethnic outsiders. “Nations” (*gentes*) and “kingdoms” (*regna*) are entreated to “come” and “pay attention” to Hannah’s words (*L.A.B.* 51:3). A few sentences later, Pseudo-Philo declared that the “nations” (*gentibus*) will be shown (*ostendit*) God’s statutes (*terminos*; *L.A.B.* 51:3) and that “all men (*omnes homines*) will find truth” (*invenient veritatem*; *L.A.B.* 51:4). Some scholars also find an additional reference to the nations in the declaration (*L.A.B.* 51:2) that, through the birth of her son, Samuel, Hannah will “provide advantage (*proficuum*)<sup>164</sup> for the

---

<sup>162</sup> “And when the just (*iusti*) go to sleep, they will be freed (*liberabuntur*)” *L.A.B.* 51:5. For death as freedom, see also Kenaz’s hope for freedom from sin through death (*L.A.B.* 28:10, “We must die to the corruptible world so as not to see sins”). However, Pseudo-Philo more commonly spoke of being freed (*liberare*) from death and destruction (e.g. Israel in *L.A.B.* 9:16; 10:1; 19:9; 23:9, 12; 27:7; 32:14; 39:4, 11 or individuals in *L.A.B.* 6:9; 32:1; 38:4) rather than freedom *through* death.

<sup>163</sup> Although Pseudo-Philo did not state in *L.A.B.* 51:5 that the wicked have a post-mortem abode in the “underworld” (cf. *L.A.B.* 33:3), he did imply (as he stated in *L.A.B.* 33:3) that the wicked will not share in the same resurrection from the dead that the just will enjoy: “For the unjust exist in this world, but he brings the just to life when he wishes” (*L.A.B.* 51:5).

<sup>164</sup> The  $\pi$  group of manuscripts reads *proficuum*. Manuscript K reads *proficiam* and the *Editio Princeps* reads *profetiam*. Harrington’s critical Latin text adopts the K reading but the accompanying French translation and Harrington’s own English translation (“Pseudo-Philo,” 2:365) appear to follow the  $\pi$  reading.

peoples (*populis*)” (*L.A.B.* 51:2).<sup>165</sup> This identification is unlikely, however, since the parallelism between *populis* and *duodecim tribum* (“twelve tribes,” *L.A.B.* 51:2) indicates that the *populis* in *L.A.B.* 51:2 to whom Hannah’s womb will “give advantage” are those who belong to the twelve tribes of Israel.<sup>166</sup> By contrast, in the scriptural Song of Hannah, non-Israelites are, presumably, the “enemies” over whom God has granted Israel victory (v. 1) and the “adversaries” who will “be shattered” (v. 10). In addition, non-Israelites are undoubtedly included within the “ends of the earth” that the “Lord will judge” (v. 10).

Despite demonstrating a greater openness toward non-Israelites than her scriptural counterpart does, Pseudo-Philo’s Hannah does not advocate universalism in *L.A.B.* 51. Key in this regard is the declaration that the “nations” will be shown God’s “statutes” (*L.A.B.* 51:3). As observed in Chapter 3 of this study, Pseudo-Philo stated unequivocally in *L.A.B.* 11:2 that God will “judge (*iudicabo*) the whole world (*omnem orbem*)” by the “everlasting Law” (*legem sempiternam*) revealed to Israel at Sinai.<sup>167</sup> For all humanity, claims of an ignorance of God’s “everlasting Law” increases rather than mitigates culpability in the divine court. Defendants who use this argument are pronounced guilty of having “not learned” God’s “Law” (*L.A.B.* 11:2) in addition to their other transgressions. Pseudo-Philo’s belief that all humanity will be judged according to God’s Law, regardless whether they are cognizant of it or not, effectually places an almost impassable chasm between the Israelites who received God’s Law at Sinai and all of the

---

<sup>165</sup> Marc Philonenko, “Une paraphrase du cantique d’Anne,” *RHPR* 42 (1962): 162; Feldman, “Prolegomenon,” cxxxi.

<sup>166</sup> Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon II*, 230; Jacobson, *Commentary*, 2: 1098. The first to suggest this appears to have been Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo (1964),” 73 n. 491, who cited Philonenko’s universalistic interpretation of this phrase (“Cantique d’Anne,” 162) and the subsequent reference in *L.A.B.* 51:3 to the twelve tribes and then queries whether *populis* in *L.A.B.* 51:2 might refer to Israel. Feldman (“Prolegomenon,” cxxxi) rejected Dietzfelbinger’s identification on the grounds that the word *populis* likely is derived from the Hebrew word גוֹיִם (“nations,” “gentiles”). The difficulty with Feldman’s counter-claim is the fact that the Vulgate never uses the Latin word *populis* in places where the MT has the Hebrew word גוֹיִם.

<sup>167</sup> This contrasts with the tendency in early Jewish literature to teach that Israel and the nations will be judged by differing standards.



other nations on earth who did not receive God's Law.<sup>168</sup> Under such a system, the theoretical possibility exists that some non-Israelites might learn and obey God's Laws but the chances of this happening are very slim indeed. The prospect in *L.A.B.* 51:3 that "the nations" will be shown God's "statutes" (*L.A.B.* 51:3) increases the possibility that at least a few individuals from these nations will obey God's Law. However, this prospect does not circumvent the reality (i.e. in Pseudo-Philo's worldview) that God will "judge the whole world" by the "everlasting law" revealed to Israel at Sinai (*L.A.B.* 11: 2) in any way. Ultimately, as Pseudo-Philo somewhat cryptically observed in *L.A.B.* 11:1, God's "eternal statutes" (*excelsa sempiterna*) have an impact upon all humanity: they will be "a light" (*lumine*) for God's people (lit. "to them," *ei*; cf. "my people," *populum meum*, v. 1) and "a punishment" (*punitionem*) to the ungodly (*impiis*).<sup>169</sup> Put another way, the "just" will receive God's "light" and be "freed" while the "wicked" will be "shut up in darkness" and "perish" (*L.A.B.* 51:5).

The correspondence between *L.A.B.* 11 and *L.A.B.* 51 helps to clarify Pseudo-Philo's belief concerning the "wicked" and the "just" in his ostensibly universalistic Song of Hannah. Who, then, are the "wicked"? The antithetically parallel categories in *L.A.B.* 51:5 are delineated along "ethical" lines rather than along ethnic or covenantal lines. Nevertheless, the ethical categories (i.e. the "wicked" and the "just") of *L.A.B.* 51 are defined, essentially, along ethnic and covenantal lines. Of all the people on earth, only the Israelite people received from God the Law by which God will judge all people (*L.A.B.* 11:2). Unless the nations heed Hannah's call for them to "come" and "pay attention" (*L.A.B.* 51:3), become cognizant of God's "statutes" (*L.A.B.* 51:3) and "find the truth" (*L.A.B.* 51:4), there is no hope that they will be deemed anything other than "wicked" in God's court (cf. *L.A.B.* 11:2). Pseudo-Philo's use of ethical-based categories (i.e.

---

<sup>168</sup> Pseudo-Philo did not include traditions found elsewhere in early Jewish literature that the Law was offered to all nations but that only Israel accepted it.

<sup>169</sup> Given Pseudo-Philo's belief that all humanity will be judged by God's Law (*L.A.B.* 11:2), the "strange opposition" that Pseudo-Philo creates between Israel and all the rest of humanity in *L.A.B.* 11:1 (Jacobson, *Commentary*, 1:447) is not really that strange.

“wicked” and “just”) does leave the possibility open that some Israelites might be included among the “wicked” and that some non-Israelites might even be included among the just.<sup>170</sup> Despite possessing God’s Law, not all individual Israelites in *L.A.B* obey it. As has been seen in this chapter, the prospect that some Israelites might be included in the ranks of the “wicked” is a matter of some discussion in *L.A.B*. Who, then, are “the just”? Ultimately, this question remains unanswered in *L.A.B*. 51. Obviously, the Israelites have a distinct advantage over the citizens of all other nations through the possession of God’s Law although their possession of God’s Law does not automatically guarantee their obedience or their inclusion among the just.

***Conclusions the Impact of Reward and Punishment upon Individual Israelites in L.A.B.***

Our consideration of this matter had its starting point in the well-received hypothesis that Pseudo-Philo believed that the reward and punishment of individuals was governed by the principles of moral causality.<sup>171</sup> Murphy’s contention that Pseudo-Philo laid down moral causality based “rules for history”<sup>172</sup> in *L.A.B*. 3:9–10 has a much more solid footing at this point than it did at the start of this chapter. Most of the cases examined in this chapter in which individual Israelites receive punishment for sin from God showed clear evidence that Pseudo-Philo rewrote them through the lens of a moral-causality based ideology (see Table 4.8). In particular, Pseudo-Philo applied the present-world portion of the so-called “rules for history” (*L.A.B*. 3:9) more or less consistently throughout the cases examined in this chapter: when an individual Israelite commits a sin in the present world, the individual will receive punishment for the sin in the present world. There is only one exception to this rule: God delayed Gideon’s punishment until the world to come (*L.A.B*. 36:4). In all of the remaining cases, God meted out at least a portion of the sinners’ punishment in the present world.

---

<sup>170</sup> *L.A.B*. 35:4 states that “Israel is not just” (*Israel non est iustus*) but that God will “forgive” and later “rebuke” them and will use them at present to “take . . . vengeance” upon the Midianites. A youthful David proclaims himself to be “just” (*iustus*) and therefore puzzles over himself being in “danger of death” from King Saul (*L.A.B*. 62:5).

<sup>171</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 247–248.

<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, 247.

Table 4.8. Sin and punishment in *L.A.B.*

	<i>Sinner(s)</i>	<i>Sin</i>	<i>Present World Punishment</i>	<i>Post-mortem Punishment</i>
1	<i>Korah and his co-conspirators (L.A.B. 16:1–6)</i>	Challenging God’s law	Death – swallowed alive by the earth	Continuation of punishment in the same place
2a	<i>Gideon (L.A.B. 36:3–4)</i>	Idolatry	Nothing ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 36:4)	Unspecified chastisement ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 36:4)
2b	<i>Abimelech (L.A.B. 37:1–5)</i>	Murder of his brothers ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 37:1)	Death by stoning ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 37:2, 5) – punishment from God?	
3	<i>Jair (L.A.B. 38:1–4)</i>	Baal worship; persecution of those who refuse to worship Baal ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 38:1)	Death by fire ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 38:4)	Continuation of earthly punishment ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 38:4)
4	<i>Kenaz’s sinners (L.A.B. 25:1–15; 27:2–3, 15)</i>	Various	Death by fire ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 26:1–2)	To be determined ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 25:7)
5	<i>Micah and Dedila (L.A.B. 44:1–10)</i>	Idolatry; causing others to worship idols ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 44:1–5)	Death by fire and tortured by the idols for Micah and death by worms for Dedila ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 44:9)	Unspecified ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 44:9)
6	<i>King Saul (L.A.B. 64–65)</i>	Permitted Agag, the king of Amalek and his wife to live because of the offer of great riches ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 58:2); sought to “make a name for himself” by driving “wizards” from Israel ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 64:1)	Death in battle of King Saul and his sons ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 64:8; 65:1–5; cf. 58:3–4)	Uncertain ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 64:9)
7	<i>Jephthah and Seila (L.A.B. 39:10–40:8)</i>	Improper oath ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 39:10)	Jephthah would be forced to fulfill his improper oath on his own daughter ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 39:11; 40:8)	

	<b>Sinner(s)</b>	<b>Sin</b>	<b>Present World Punishment</b>	<b>Post-mortem Punishment</b>
8	<i>Eluma (L.A.B. 42)</i>	Not stated	Eluma is barren (L.A.B. 42:1–3)	
9	<i>Samson (L.A.B. 43)</i>	Sexual relations with Philistine women (L.A.B. 43:5)	Handed over to the Philistines and blinded (L.A.B. 43:5)	
10a	<i>Beel's concubine (L.A.B. 45:1–4)</i>	Unfaithful to her partner (L.A.B. 45:3)	Death by gang rape (L.A.B. 45:3)	
10b	<i>Some of the citizens of Nob (L.A.B. 45:1–6)</i>	Gang rape and murder (L.A.B. 45:3)	Death in battle (L.A.B. 45:6; 47:9–10)	
11a	<i>Eli and his sons (L.A.B. 52, 54)</i>	Eli's sons did "wicked things" and took the priestly share of the offerings "before they were offered" (L.A.B. 52:1); Eli's sin is not specified in L.A.B.	Death on the same day, the sons in battle (L.A.B. 54:3) and Eli of unexplained causes (L.A.B. 54:5; cf. L.A.B. 53:10)	
11b	<i>Priests at Nob (L.A.B. 63:1–4)</i>	"Profaning the holy things of the Lord and desecrating the first fruits of the people"; walking "in the ways of the sons of Eli" (L.A.B. 63:1)	Death at the hand of King Saul (L.A.B. 63:2)	

*Note:* The fourteen episodes are listed in the order in which they were mentioned in this chapter.

Even if we had broadened the scope of this examination and cases of reward and included the punishment of individual non-Israelites in the post-Sinaitic era (see Table 4.9), the five additional narratives that would have been included would not have influenced our conclusion concerning the supremacy of moral causality in L.A.B. The principles of moral causality continue to reign supreme in these five narratives. Four of the five individuals face an untimely demise as punishment for their actions. The sole exception is Orpah. The punishment of her sin does not come until several generations later when her offspring, Goliath, is killed by

Ruth's offspring, David (*L.A.B.* 61:6). Pseudo-Philo addressed the sinner's fate in the world to come in only one of these five narratives, that of Doeg (*L.A.B.* 63:2–4). Although Doeg's sins in *L.A.B.* 63:2–4 are less than those that he commits in the scriptural account,<sup>173</sup> he is condemned to the same fate as Jair, the Baal worshipper who sought to eradicate all Israelites who refused to worship Baal (*L.A.B.* 38:1–3).

Table 4.9. The Punishment of Individual Non-Israelite Sinners in *L.A.B.*

Sinner	Sin	Present World Punishment	Post-mortem Punishment
1 <i>Balaam</i> ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 18:1–14)	Attempting to curse Israel ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 18:12)	"I have lessened the time of my life" ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 18:12)	
2 <i>Sisera</i> ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 31:1–9)	Attack Israel; plot to plunder Israel of its riches; plot to seize the "beautiful women" in Israel as his concubines ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 31:1)	Death at the hand of a beautiful woman ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 31:7; cf. 31:3)	
3 <i>Goliath</i> ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 43:1–8)	Took the Ark of the Lord from Israel ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 61:2; cf. 54:3); ridiculed Israel ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 61:2–3)	Death by stone and sword ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 61:7–8)	
4 <i>Orpah</i> ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 61:6)	She chose "the gods of the Philistines" while her sister, Ruth, chose to follow the God of Israel ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 61:6)	Death of Orpah's descendant, Goliath, at the hand of Ruth's offspring, David ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 61:6)	
5 <i>Doeg</i> ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 63:2–4)	Informed King Saul that Abimelech had aided David ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 63:2)	Death by rotting away and "fiery worm" ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 63:4)	Eternal existence "in the inextinguishable fire" with Jair ( <i>L.A.B.</i> 63:4)

In most of the cases examined in this chapter (see Table 4.8 above), punishment was "intra-covenantal" (to use Sanders's term)<sup>174</sup> and without a stated impact upon the individual's

<sup>173</sup> Cf. 1 Sam 22:18.

<sup>174</sup> For Sanders's use of the term, see *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 234.

place in the Israelite covenant community in the world to come. Of the three cases in *L.A.B.* in which punishment explicitly extends into the afterlife (Table 4.8, rows 1, 2a, 3), only Korah and his co-conspirators (*L.A.B.* 16:3) and Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:4) are guaranteed no share in the Israelite covenant community in the world to come. At the end of the present world, God will “not remember” Korah and his co-conspirators (*L.A.B.* 16:3). So complete will be their demise that their “destruction will not be remembered” (*L.A.B.* 16:3). Likewise, Jair’s fiery post-mortem “dwelling place” (*L.A.B.* 38:4) will last “forever” (*L.A.B.* 64:4). Pseudo-Philo highlighted the completeness of these individual’s eternal exclusion from the Israelite covenant community by drawing parallels between their eternal fates and those of prominent non-Israelites. Pseudo-Philo stated that Korah and his co-conspirators shared the same fate as the Egyptians whom God destroyed in the Red Sea (*L.A.B.* 16:3; cf. *L.A.B.* 10:6). Pseudo-Philo also stated that Jair shared the same fate as Doeg the Syrian who, through the provision of information, aided King Saul in the destruction of the priests at Nob (*L.A.B.* 63:4; cf. Table 4.9, row 5).

In the case of Gideon (*L.A.B.* 36:3–4; see Table 4.8, row 2a), the sole remaining case in which an Israelite’s stated punishment in *L.A.B.* extends into the world to come, firm conclusions cannot be drawn concerning his place in the Israelite covenant community in the world to come. Pseudo-Philo’s added declaration that Gideon would be punished post-mortem for his descent into idolatry does not provide insight concerning his place in the Israelite covenant community in the world to come. Not only does Pseudo-Philo fail to state what post-mortem chastisement awaits Gideon, he does not indicate whether his punishment is eternal. In addition, Pseudo-Philo does not draw a parallel between Gideon’s fate and that of non-Israelites as he did for Korah and his co-conspirators (*L.A.B.* 16:3) and for Jair (*L.A.B.* 38:4; 64:4). Of the three cases in which the individual Israelite’s fate in the world to come was uncertain (Table 4.8, rows 4-6), only Micah and Dedila (*L.A.B.* 44:9; see Table 4.8, row 5) appear to be in grave danger of not sharing in Israelite covenant community in the world to come. Their fate is differentiated from that of the sinners in Kenaz’s era (*L.A.B.* 25:1–15) and that of King Saul (*L.A.B.* 64:9) by the way they go to

their deaths. Before the sinners in Kenaz's era are burned alive (*L.A.B.* 26:1–2), they freely confess their sins (*L.A.B.* 25:8–13). Before King Saul enters his final battle (*L.A.B.* 65:1–5), he appeals to God to accept his death as “atonement” for his “wickedness” (*L.A.B.* 64:9). However, as Micah and Dedila meet their grisly demise, they boast to each other concerning the sins they have committed. Their complete lack of contrition better parallels the defiance with which Korah met his fate (*L.A.B.* 16:4, 6) than the fate of the sinners in Kenaz's era or the fate of King Saul.

The two or three cases in *L.A.B.* in which punishment was not intra-covenantal and without stated impact upon the individual's place in the Israelite covenant community in the world to come clearly are exceptions to the norm. In Pseudo-Philo's account, Korah and his co-conspirators are not just challenging human leadership (i.e. Moses and Aaron; see Num 16:1–3) but they are challenging God's laws (*L.A.B.* 16:1). With the inclusion of his account of the selection of the priestly family (*L.A.B.* 17:1–4; cf. Num 17:1–8), Pseudo-Philo retained the issue of human leadership found in the scriptural account. Nevertheless, through his declaration that the rebellion primarily was against God's law, Pseudo-Philo leaves no doubt in the readers' minds that Korah and his co-conspirators deserved their ghastly fate. They openly rejected God's law and they were judged accordingly. In Pseudo-Philo's account, Jair is not just another minor judge (Judg 10:3–5); he is a leading proponent of Baal worship who seeks to destroy all who refuse to worship Baal (*L.A.B.* 38:1–3). Jair went far beyond the *mere* open rejection of the God's laws that merited Korah and his co-conspirators their eternal punishment. He utterly and completely rejected the God of Israel and he was judged accordingly. In Pseudo-Philo's account, Micah, with the assistance of his mother and at her insistence, does not just establish a small household shrine with a hired hand as the priest (Judg 17:1–6), he establishes a major cultic shrine with himself as the priest (*L.A.B.* 44:1–5). This major cultic shrine does not just serve his family (Judg 18:19), it serves the entire community and leads it astray (*L.A.B.* 44:3–5). All pretexts that God might approve of Micah's shrine are absent from Pseudo-Philo's account (cf. Judg 17:2, 13) and are replaced with descriptions of brazen polytheistic idolatry (*L.A.B.* 44:3).

Micah is a proud and ardent “worshipper of the gods” and his mother is the reason he has become this (*L.A.B.* 44:3). He has rejected, utterly and completely, the God of Israel. Although not stated explicitly in the text, it appears that Micah and his mother will share a fate similar to Jair’s fate.

Despite the consistency with which Pseudo-Philo applied the principles of moral causality to the punishment of individual Israelites, his creation of scenarios in which wayward Israelites may retain their share in the Israelite covenant community in the world to come through acts of contrition helps mitigate the potential harshness of his belief in moral causality. Chief among these created scenarios is Pseudo-Philo’s unparalleled Kenaz narrative (*L.A.B.* 25:1–28:10). At the heart of this narrative stands the prospect that individual Israelites who confess to harbouring and/or acting upon a desire to reject God, to reject God’s commandments, to challenge God, or to test God have hope in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 25:7) because, prior to their death, they confessed their sins (*L.A.B.* 25:8–13). This prospect stands tall in *L.A.B.* because many of the sins to which these Israelites confess are on par with those that result in the eternal condemnation of Korah and his co-conspirators (*L.A.B.* 16), Jair (*L.A.B.* 38), and possibly even Micah and Dedila (*L.A.B.* 44). Acts of contrition come to the forefront again in the words that Pseudo-Philo places upon King Saul’s lips prior his death (*L.A.B.* 64:9), in the call for repentance that Eli delivers to his wayward sons (*L.A.B.* 52:2–3), and in the last exhortation that Korah’s offspring deliver to their wayward father (*L.A.B.* 16:6). In the last two scenarios, the sinful individuals did not “heed” (*L.A.B.* 16:6) the wise words sent their way. However, the principle remains: there is room in Pseudo-Philo’s moral causality-based ideology for sinners such as these who repent.

Throughout the cases studied in this chapter, Pseudo-Philo only commented concerning the fate of the individual Israelite sinner in the world to come in three types of cases. First, Pseudo-Philo commented on individual fate in the world to come in cases where individual Israelites secured eternal punishment (see Table 4.8, rows 1, 3). Second, Pseudo-Philo



commented on individual fate in the world to come in cases where individual Israelites died uncertain of their fate in the world to come (see Table 4.8, rows 4, 6). Third, Pseudo-Philo commented on individual fate in the world to come in a case where punishment was delayed for the sake of God's reputation (see Table 4.8, row 2a). In many cases (see Table 4.8, rows 2b, 7-11b), however, Pseudo-Philo made no comment concerning the fate of the individual Israelite sinner in the world to come. Therefore, caution must be exercised when arguing from silence. Pseudo-Philo's silence in these cases does not necessarily mean that he believed that all of the individual Israelites discussed in these cases would share in the blessings of Israel in the world to come.

When these eight cases (Table 4.8, rows 2b, 7-11b) are considered individually in light of Sanders's theory, several observations come to the forefront. First, in four of these cases, Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of the scriptural narrative makes "room for one who is basically loyal . . . but who disobeys" or for "the basically righteous but not always obedient."<sup>175</sup> Eluma (*L.A.B.* 42; see Table 4.8, row 8) is a pious woman whom God rendered barren as punishment for an unspecified sin. Jephthah (Table 4.8, row 7) is a god-fearing man who is compelled to kill his pious daughter as punishment for an improper oath. Samson (Table 4.8, row 9), likewise, is a god-fearing man whose lust for foreign women is his undoing. Eli (Table 4.8, row 11a) is a pious priest whom God punishes for unspecified sins evidently connected to his wayward sons.

Second, in three of these cases, the individual Israelites under consideration are completely wayward, with no redeeming characteristics. In two of these cases (Abimelech, Table 4.8, row 2b; Eli's sons, Table 4.8, row 11a), the depiction of the individual sinners is entirely in keeping with the scriptural accounts. However, in one case (the citizens of Nob, Table 4.8, row 10b), the depiction is unique to Pseudo-Philo's rewriting of the scriptural account. In fact, the grisly gang rape and the murder of the Levite's concubine for which Pseudo-Philo condemned the citizens of Nob is credited to the citizens of Gibeah (*Judg* 19:14–28) in the scriptural account.

---

<sup>175</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 422.

It would seem that Pseudo-Philo's choice of Nob was anything but random for Pseudo-Philo also concluded that the priests of Nob were sinful and deserving of God's wrath (see Table 4.8, row 11b). Here, too, Pseudo-Philo did not discuss their fate in the world to come.

We may conclude, therefore, that all of the cases in which Pseudo-Philo made specific mention that the individual Israelites had merited eternal punishment, he depicted individuals committing what is tantamount to the denial of God and/or the covenant. In *L.A.B.*, Korah, Jair, and Micah are unregenerate and unrepentant people to their deaths who openly oppose the God of Israel. The sinners in Kenaz's era and King Saul appear to have been headed in the same direction until they take the one provision that clearly is available to individual Israelites seeking to avert eternal punishment in the world to come: prior to their deaths, they acknowledge their sinfulness. In addition, it seems that at least Eli's sons and perhaps the citizens of Nob along with the priests of Nob are headed in the same eternal direction but this is not discussed openly in *L.A.B.*

The homiletical sections considered briefly at the conclusion of this chapter help tie together some loose threads. Deborah's homiletical exhortation in *L.A.B.* 33 and Hannah's homiletical prayer in *L.A.B.* 51 highlight Pseudo-Philo's belief that individual Israelites are not impervious to loss of place in the world to come. The scenarios in which individual Israelites may experience post-mortem the undesirable "underworld" (*L.A.B.* 33:3) are not absolutely delineated. Although the scenarios in which this actually occurs in *L.A.B.* are restricted to those who have openly opposed and rejected God, Pseudo-Philo did not reject the theoretical possibility that others who have not committed sins that are tantamount to the denial of God and/or the covenant might also merit God's eternal wrath. Deborah's call to repentance is rather broad and open ended in its applicability (*L.A.B.* 33:1–5): individuals hearing her homiletical exhortation are left to determine whether they might be at risk. Likewise, Hannah's homiletical prayer paints broad, ill-defined categories of "wicked" and "just." Although the categories are primarily ethnic-covenantal in orientation, they are sufficiently open-ended to permit individuals

hearing her prayer to determine in which category they belong. Pseudo-Philo highlighted the precarious state of the individual in some homiletical sections of his text. He left enough uncertainty in the examples he selected to permit individuals to apply the teaching as they chose. However, when it came down to the discussion of the precise details, Pseudo-Philo ultimately highlighted the assured rather than the precarious. Therefore, in *L.A.B.*, the fate of the individual is not as precarious as these two homiletical sections might suggest.

5: Conclusion

Regarding Pseudo-Philo's view concerning the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel, we conclude that Heikki Räisänen was correct: Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* is a "prominent representative of covenantal nomism."<sup>1</sup> *L.A.B.* exemplifies E. P. Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in its depiction of the impact that reward and punishment has upon Israel. Two observations are fundamental to this conclusion. First, in *L.A.B.*, neither reward nor punishment ultimately had an impact upon Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors as they established and maintained covenant relationships with God (Chapter 2), upon Israel's establishment or continuance as the covenant community (Chapter 3), or upon an individual Israelite's establishment or maintenance of membership in the Israelite covenant community (Chapter 4). Re-phrased using Sanders's terminology, we observed that Pseudo-Philo consistently depicted the intra-covenantal application of reward and punishment.<sup>2</sup> Second, in *L.A.B.*, only one circumstance exists in which an individual Israelite would not maintain membership in the Israelite covenant community: if the Israelite clearly and unequivocally denied God and/or the covenant relationship.<sup>3</sup>

Pseudo-Philo's account of God's relationship with the chosen covenant community is one in which divine mercy is the constant refrain. Inexplicable divine mercy is *the* reason that in *L.A.B.* divine punishment for sin remains intra-covenantal. Pseudo-Philo consistently lets divine mercy overshadow any positive or redeeming aspects within the character of these groups or individuals. Pseudo-Philo is absolutely convinced that this relationship was founded upon *divine mercy* alone and that this relationship is sustained by divine mercy alone. No one, either divine

---

<sup>1</sup> Räisänen, *Paul*, 180 n. 92.

<sup>2</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 234.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 422.

or human, can ever do anything to change this situation. Whether God or Israel likes it, the nation of Israel is the perpetual and eternal covenant people.

Pseudo-Philo's strongest emphasis upon divine mercy within his depiction of the reward and punishment came in his depiction of its impact upon Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors (*L.A.B.* 1–8; see Chapter 2 of this thesis). Despite having been established by God in the context of the reward and punishment (*L.A.B.* 3:4–8; 6:17–7:5), the Noahic (*L.A.B.* 1–5) and the Abrahamic (*L.A.B.* 6–8) covenant communities in *L.A.B.* were dependent entirely upon inexplicable divine mercy for their very existence. Pseudo-Philo certainly depicted the namesakes of these covenant communities, Noah and Abraham, as individuals who did not merit the punishment that their peers' experienced (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:4; 6:2–4, 11) but Pseudo-Philo did not establish an unequivocal causal connection between their character and their election (i.e. was it a reward?). Instead, Pseudo-Philo emphasised his belief that God foreordained these communities long before their namesakes even drew their first breaths. The degree to which Pseudo-Philo in *L.A.B.* 1–8 downplayed reward and (especially) punishment became apparent, also, with the realization that, throughout *L.A.B.* 1–8, sinners continued to sin with apparent impunity with the exception of two events: the flood (*L.A.B.* 3:4–8) and the tower builders' fiery deaths (*L.A.B.* 6:17). The seemingly comprehensive program of reward and punishment encountered in *L.A.B.* 3:9–10 remains inactive throughout *L.A.B.* 1–8.

If any questions remained concerning our conclusion in Chapter 2 that reward and punishment ultimately had little or no impact upon the establishment and continuance of the pre-Sinaitic covenant communities in *L.A.B.*, these questions faded to the background with our consideration of the impact of reward and punishment upon the establishment and continuance of the Israelite covenant community as a whole in Chapter 3. Pseudo-Philo's consistent depiction of the Israelite covenant community as a whole (i.e. the children of Israel) as being habitually and perpetually wayward removed any possibility that the Israelite nation was any less deserving of punishment than those around them. Pseudo-Philo's message is clear: if Israel had

received what it deserved, it would have not only ceased to be God's covenant community, it would have ceased any longer to exist. Any punishment that Israel merited was overshadowed by God's decision prior to the creation of the world to choose Israel as the covenant community and by God's continued affirmation of its status as perpetual recipients of God's favour (e.g. *L.A.B.* 7:4).

Pseudo-Philo's belief that the nation of Israel most certainly will exist in the world to come stands central to our interpretation of Pseudo-Philo's view concerning the impact that reward and punishment had on the Israelite covenant community. After briefly introducing the concept of a world to come in *L.A.B.* 3:10, Pseudo-Philo deftly crafted his rewritten Moses narrative to have Moses's questions concerning Israel's long term survival and perpetuation as the covenant community climax with revelations concerning the world to come. The ultimate fulfillment of God's promises to Israel will be in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 19:10–13) when Israel is raised back to life to "dwell" (v. 13) in the heavenly "paradise" that God had shown Moses (v. 10). This revelation to Moses was a watershed in *L.A.B.* After it, the emotive questions Moses raised concerning Israel's survival and perpetuation as the covenant community are never raised again in *L.A.B.* The matter has been solved. Israel's survival and perpetuation henceforth are presupposed. As Gideon (*L.A.B.* 35:2) and Israel (*L.A.B.* 49:6) affirm, the nation of Israel will survive and will remain God's covenant people whether it likes to or not! Regardless of its experiences (and even its apparent destruction, cf. *L.A.B.* 21:4) in the present world, Israel *will* exist in the world to come and *will* finally experience the long anticipated rest (cf. *L.A.B.* 3:10) in the ultimate *Promised Land* (*L.A.B.* 19:10–13).

Of the three groups studied in our thesis (Israel's pre-Sinaitic ancestors in Chapter 2, the nation of Israel as a whole in Chapter 3, and individual Israelites in Chapter 4), the closest correlation between Pseudo-Philo's ideology and Sanders's theory occurred in our examination of Pseudo-Philo's views concerning the impact of reward and punishment upon the individual

Israelite in Chapter 4. Using Pseudo-Philo's well-documented belief in moral causality<sup>4</sup> as the starting point for our consideration of his views concerning the impact of reward and punishment upon the individual Israelite, the apparent freedom of individuals in *L.A.B.* 1–8 to sin with impunity that we observed in *L.A.B.* 9–65 is replaced with a closely regulated system in which every evil deed or thought is met with comparable punishment (see Table 4.8, p. 249). In many cases, the sinner in the present world receives his or her due punishment. Most of the time, punishment for sin remains what Sanders termed “intra-covenantal” and without impact upon the individual's place in the Israelite covenant community.<sup>5</sup> The prospect that individuals might, in accordance with *L.A.B.* 3:10, receive judgment in the world to come is raised usually only in cases when individuals rejected God and/or God's Law. Of these cases, only the most brazen rejection of God and the open embracing of an alternate deity results in the unequivocal declaration that these sinners face eternal punishment. Narratives containing less brazen rejections of God and/or God's Law that are not accompanied by an open embracing of an alternate deity (such as those by the sinners in Kenaz's generation in *L.A.B.* 25–27) do not conclude with such declarations. Instead, Kenaz, for example, extends to these sinners the hope that God might “have mercy” on them in the final resurrection if they confess their sins (*L.A.B.* 25:7).

We conclude that Pseudo-Philo's appropriation of moral causality does not stand outside the parameters of the view of reward and punishment, which, according to Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism, was pervasive within Judaism of the first centuries of the Common Era.<sup>6</sup> Pseudo-Philo's appropriation of moral causality presupposes that, in most cases, the individual Israelite sinner whom God punishes will remain within the Israelite covenant community. Pseudo-Philo's belief that individual Israelites face immediate and permanent

---

<sup>4</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 247.

<sup>5</sup> For Sanders's use of the term, see *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 234.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 75, 182, 421–423, 426.

punishment in exceptional cases and, by implication, a loss of share in Israel's blessings in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 19:10–13) parallels Sanders's conjecture that only those Israelites who exclude themselves from the Israelite covenant community through the rejection of God and the covenant will lose their place in the Israelite covenant community.

One case studied in Chapter 4 of this thesis, however, did not align clearly with Sanders's theory: the case of Gideon (*L.A.B.* 36:3–4). Gideon is *the* sole example in *L.A.B.* of a more-or-less god-fearing Israelite sinner who will receive punishment for sin in the world to come. Unlike Jair, for example, whose punishment for sin begins in the present world and extends throughout the world to come (*L.A.B.* 38:4), Gideon's unspecified chastisement for his idolatry does not extend into the world to come but, instead, is *delayed* until the world to come. Pseudo-Philo's strict adherence to moral causality does not permit him to let Gideon remain unpunished for his sin but he does not give any indication that Gideon's post-mortem punishment is on par with Jair's post-mortem punishment. The most logical conclusion is that Pseudo-Philo believed Gideon will be punished post-mortem for his sin but that he also believed Gideon will share in Israel's blessings in the world to come.

The long, ominous shadows cast over the fate of individual Israelites by *L.A.B.* 3:10 in some interpretations of *L.A.B.* are conjectured rather than real. In the many reward and punishment narratives in *L.A.B.* that focus upon individual Israelites, there is no indication that any more-or-less god-fearing Israelites need to fear what might take place at this final judgment. In particular, apart from *L.A.B.* 3:10 itself, there is no indication anywhere in *L.A.B.* that Pseudo-Philo believed that there will be a judgment "on the basis of works" in the world to come that will distinguish between the "just and the unjust" in Israel and, ultimately, determine their place in the world to come.<sup>7</sup> When *L.A.B.* 3:10 is considered in light of possible references to a time of reckoning in passages such as *L.A.B.* 25:7 and *L.A.B.* 64:9, it seems evident that Pseudo-Philo envisaged that, for Israelites, the time of reckoning at the start of the world to come offered

---

<sup>7</sup> Dietzfelbinger, "Pseudo-Philo (1964)," 143–144.



hope rather than fear. Within Pseudo-Philo's ideology, the final judgement in the world to come was a means by which wayward but repentant Israelites could go to their deaths with a measure of hope that they still might share in Israel's eternal abode in the world to come (*L.A.B.* 19:10–13).

And I will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth. And hell will pay back its debt and the place of perdition will return its deposit so that I may render to each according to his works and according to the fruits of his own devices, until I judge between soul and flesh. And the world will cease, and death will be abolished, and hell will shut its mouth. And the earth will not be without progeny or sterile for those inhabiting it; and no one who has been pardoned by me will be tainted. And there will be another earth and another heaven, an everlasting dwelling place.

Pseudo-Philo's reworked Song of Hannah (*L.A.B.* 51:3–6; cf. 1 Sam 2:1–10) divides humanity into two groups: the "wicked" and the "just" (*L.A.B.* 51:5). The "wicked" are "shut up in darkness" and are perishing and the "just" are freed. However, even this passage does not state that this determination will be made at a final judgment in the world to come. *L.A.B.* 51 offers condemnation in that it leaves the prospect open that some Israelites might be included among the "wicked." However, the chapter offers hope in that it leaves the prospect open that some non-Israelites might be included among the "just."

It is our hope that this study of *L.A.B.* has made a modest contribution to our understanding of the concepts of reward and punishment in late Second Temple period Judaism. Our conclusion that Pseudo-Philo exemplifies Sanders's theory of covenantal nomism in his depiction of reward and punishment represents the starting point for future research as much as it represents the conclusion of the present study. The further careful study of *L.A.B.* has the potential to reveal more information concerning Jewish religion in the late Second Temple period. For example, while Pseudo-Philo's statements concerning the nation of Israel's status as God's eternal covenant community provided the key to interpreting the concepts of reward and punishment in *L.A.B.*, the constraints of this present research project did not permit us to examine the concept of the covenant fully in *L.A.B.* In addition, much can also be learned about

the so-called *rewritten Bible*, of which *L.A.B.* remains a prime example. Our in-depth analysis of *L.A.B.* and scriptural texts and traditions raised many complex issues, but the exploration of these remains a task for the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Philip. "Retelling the Old Testament." Pages 99–121 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by Donald A. Carson and Hugh G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature." Pages 261–301 in *Justification and Variegated Nomism, Volume 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Donald A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament Series 2, 140. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Amaru, Betsy Halpern. *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as 'Midrash'." Pages 35–40 in *Gospel Perspectives III: Studies in Midrash and Historiography*. Edited by Richard T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paradise in the Biblical Antiquities of Pseudo-Philo." Pages 43–56 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Begg, Christopher T. "Rereadings of the "Animal Rite" of Genesis 15 in Early Jewish Narratives." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 36–46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Golden Calf Episode According to Pseudo-Philo." Pages 577–594 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction - Reception - Interpretation*. Edited by Marc Vervenne. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Transjordanian Altar (Josh 22:10–34) According to Josephus (*Ant.* 5.100–114) and Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.* 22.1–8)." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 35 (Spring 1997): 5-19.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Noah and the Flood at Qumran." Pages 199–231 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness." *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–196.
- Block, Daniel I. *Judges, Ruth*. New American Commentary 6. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.

- Boer, Martinus C. de. *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 22. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. *Apocalypse de Baruch: Introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire*. 2 vols. Sources chrétiennes 144–145. Paris: Cerf, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Luc et les Écritures dans l’Évangile de l’Enfance à lumière des Antiquités Bibliques.” Pages 243–270 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Boling, Robert G. *Judges*. Anchor Bible 6a. Garden City: Doubleday, 1975.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. Edited by Hugo Gressmann. 4th ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 21. Tübingen: Mohr, 1966.
- Brooke, George J. “Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 361–386.
- Brown, Cheryl A. “Judges.” Pages 123–289 in *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, by Gordon J. Harris, Cheryl A. Brown, and Michael S. Moore. New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament 5. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Brown, Walter E. “Noah: Sot or Saint? Genesis 9:20–27.” Pages 36–60 in *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*. Edited by James I. Packer and Sven K. Soderlund. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2000.
- Bultmann, Rudolf K. *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Repr., New York: Meridian Books, 1972.
- Burnette-Bletsch, Rhonda. “At the Hands of a Woman: Rewriting Jael in Pseudo-Philo.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 17 (1998): 53–64.
- Butler, Trent C. *Judges*. Word Biblical Commentary 8. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2009.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. “‘Rewritten Bible’ and ‘Parabiblical Texts’: A Terminological and Ideological Critique.” Pages 43–68 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003*. Edited by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons, and Lloyd K. Pietersen. Library of Second Temple Studies 52. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Cavallin, Hans C. C. *Life After Death: Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in I Cor. 15. Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 7:1. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster, 1974.
- Cohn, Leopold. “An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 10 (1898): 277–332.

- Collins, John J. *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 54. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Diaspora*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Conybeare, Frederick C., ed. *Philo about the Contemplative Life*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1895. Repr., New York: Garland, 1987.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Davila, James. "(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15 (2005): 3-61.
- Delcor, Mathias. "Philon (Pseudo-)." Pages 1354–1357 in vol. 7 of *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément*. Edited by Louis Pirot, André Robert, Henri Cazelles, and André Feuillet. 7 vols. Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1928–1966.
- Dietzfelbinger, Christian. "Pseudo-Philo. *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." Ph.D. diss., Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pseudo-Philo: Antiquitates Biblicae." *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* 2.2 (1975): 91-271.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Noah in Early Jewish Literature." Pages 123–150 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "Pseudepigrapha Notes II: 3. The Contribution of the Manuscript Catalogues of M.R. James." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (2008): 83–160.
- Eliade, Mircea. *From Gautama Buddha to the Triumph of Christianity*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Vol. 2 of *A History of Religious Ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Evans, Craig A. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Canon of Scripture in the Time of Jesus." Pages 67–79 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2007.
- Feldman, Louis H. Prolegomenon to *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*, by Montague R. James. London: SPCK, 1917. Repr., New York: Ktav, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Epilogomenon to Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB)." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974): 305–312.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Josephus' Portrait of Deborah." Pages 115–128 in *Hellenica et Judaica: hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. Edited by André Caquot, Mireille Hadas-Lebel, and Jean Riaud. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 58. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Portrayal of Phinehas by Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 92 (2002): 315-345.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Questions about the Great Flood, as Viewed by Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and the Rabbis." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 115 (2003): 401–422.

\_\_\_\_\_. *"Remember Amalek!" Vengeance, Zealotry, and Group Destruction in the Bible According to Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2004.

Fisk, Bruce N. "Scripture Shaping Scripture: The Interpretive Role of Biblical Citations in Pseudo-Philo's Episode of the Golden Calf." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 17 (1998): 3–23.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story, and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Gaps in the Story, Cracks in the Earth: The Exile of Cain and the Destruction of Korah in Pseudo-Philo (*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 16)." Pages 20–33 in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture; Volume 2: Later Versions and Traditions*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Library of Second Temple Studies 51. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Pseudo-Philo, Paul and Israel's Rolling Stone: Early Points along an Exegetical Trajectory." Pages 117–136 in *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Kenneth E. Pomykala. Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Frese, Pamela R., and S. J. M. Gray. "Trees." Pages 26–33 in vol. 15 of *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Edited by Mircea Eliade. 16 vols. New York: MacMillan, 1987.

Fröhlich, Ida. *'Time and Times and Half a Time': Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 19. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Gaster, Moses. *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel or The Hebrew Bible Historiale, Being a Collection of Apocryphal and Pseudo-Epigraphical Books Dealing with the History of the World from the Creation to the Death of Judas Maccabeus, Translated for the First Time from a Unique Manuscript in the Bodleian Library*. London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899. Repr., New York: Ktav, 1971.

Gathercole, Simon J. *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002.

Ph.D. Thesis - E. Engler; McMaster University - Religious Studies

Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends of the Jews*. Translated by Henrietta Szold and Paul Radin. 2 vols. 2d ed. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven: Yale, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Politics of Philo Judaeus: Practice and Theory*. New Haven: Yale, 1938.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Hadot, Jean. "Le milieu d'origine du '*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.'" Pages 153–171 in *La Littérature Intertestamentaire. Colloque de Strasbourg (17-19 octobre 1983)*. Edited by André Caquot. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985.

Hafemann, Scott J. "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 7 (1990): 79–104.

Harrington, Daniel J. "Text and Biblical Text in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 503–514.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33 (1971): 1–17.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Text Critical Situation of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *Revue bénédictine* 83 (1973): 383–388.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations 3. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques. I. Introduction et texte critiques*. Translated by Jacques Cazeaux. Sources Chrétiennes 229. Paris: Cerf, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Pseudo-Philo." Pages 2:297–377 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Bible Rewritten (Narratives)." Pages 239–247 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Hauser, Alan J. "Unity and Diversity in Israel before Samuel." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 22 (1979): 289–303.

Hayward, Robert. "The Vine and Its Products as Theological Symbols in First Century Palestinian Judaism." *The Durham University Journal* 82 [New Series 51] (Jan 1990): 9–18.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis: Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Some Ancient Jewish Reflections on Israel's Imminent Redemption." Pages 293–305 in *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson*. Edited by M. Daniel Carroll R., David J. A. Clines, and Philip R. Davies. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 200*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Horst, Pieter Willem van der. "Deborah and Seila in Ps.-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." Pages 111–117 in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.

Jacobson, Howard. "Biblical Quotation and Editorial Function in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 5 (1989): 47–64.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. 2 vols. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 31. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Thoughts on the Chronicles of Jerahmeel, Ps-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and Their Relationship." *Studia philonica Annual* 9 [*Wisdom and Logos. Studies in Jewish Thought in Honor of David Winston*; ed. David T. Runia and Gregory E. Sterling] (1997): 239–263.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Biblical Interpretation in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." Pages 180–199 in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2012.

James, Montague R. "Four Apocryphal Texts in Latin." Pages 164–188 in *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Apocryphal Books and Fragments*. Edited by Montague R. James. *Texts and Studies* 2.3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893. Repr., Nendeln: Kraus, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Notes on Apocrypha." *Journal of Theological Studies* os-VII (1906): 562–568.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. London: SPCK, 1917. Repr., New York: Ktav, 1971.

Kalimi, Isaac. "'Go, I Beg You, Take Your Beloved Son and Slay Him!' The Binding of Isaac in Rabbinic Literature and Thought." *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 13 (2010): 1–29.

Kisch, Guido. *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. *Publications in Mediaeval Studies* 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1949.

Klausner, Joseph. *The Messianic Ideal in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*. New York: MacMillan, 1955.



Klijn, Albertus F. J. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch." Pages 615–652 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

Kugel, James. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*. Translated by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. 2 vols. New York: Basic Books, [1958] 1963.

Levison, John R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Jewish Literature*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Prophetic Inspiration in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1995): 297–329.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Torah and Covenant in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." Pages 111–127 in *Bund und Tora: Zur theologischen Begriffsgeschichte in alttestamentlicher, frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Tradition*. Edited by Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr, 1996.

Machiela, Daniel A. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 79. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Marcus, David. *Jephthah and His Vow*. Lubbock, Tex.: Texas Tech University Press, 1986.

McCann, J. Clinton. *Judges*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox, 2002.

McGrath, Alister E. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*. 4th ed. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

McNamara, Martin. Review of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 5 (1979): 67–73.

Murphy, Frederick J. "Divine Plan, Human Plan: A Structuring Theme in Pseudo-Philo." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 77 (1986): 5–14.

\_\_\_\_\_. "God in Pseudo-Philo." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 3 (1988): 1–18.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Retelling the Bible: Idolatry in Pseudo-Philo." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988): 275–287.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Eternal Covenant in Pseudo-Philo." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 3 (1988): 43–57.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Korah's Rebellion in Pseudo-Philo 16." Pages 111–120 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge,

John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin. *College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Neusner, Jacob. "Comparing Judaisms: Review of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*" (review of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*). *History of Religions* 18 (1978): 177–191.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Judaic Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: A Systematic Reply to Professor E.P. Sanders*. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 84. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Newman, Judith H. "The Staff of Moses and the Mercy of God: Moses's Final Intercession in Pseudo-Philo 19." Pages 137–156 in *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Kenneth E. Pomykala. Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Good and Bad Leaders in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." Pages 49–65 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded." Pages 89–156 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. *Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2/2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Abraham the Convert: A Jewish Tradition and Its Use by the Apostle Paul." Pages 151–175 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Niditch, Susan. *Judges: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

Niehoff, Maren. *The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 16. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Perrot, Charles, Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, and Daniel J. Harrington. *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques. II. Introduction littéraire, commentaire, et index*. Sources Chrétiennes 230. Paris: Cerf, 1976.

Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism." Pages 285–306 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Petit, François. *L'Ancienne Version Latine des Questions sur la Genèse de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Berlin: Berlin Akademie-Verlag, 1973.

Philonenko, Marc. "Une paraphrase du cantique d'Anne." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 42 (1962): 157–168.

- Piñero, Antonio. "A Mediterranean View of Prophetic Inspiration: On the Concept of Inspiration in the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* by Pseudo-Philo." *Mediterranean Historical Review* 6 (1991): 5–34.
- Puech, Émile. *La croyance des esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien. I. La résurrection des morts et le contexte scripturaire*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1993.
- Räisänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 29. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Reinmuth, Eckart. "Beobachtungen zum Verständnis des Gesetzes im *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Pseudo-Philo)." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 2 (1989): 151–170.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Pseudo-Philo und Lukas: Studien zum Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum und seiner Bedeutung für die Interpretation des lukanischen Doppelwerks*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 74. Tübingen: Mohr, 1994.
- Reissler, Paul. *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel*. Augsburg: B. Filser, 1928. Repr., Heidelberg: F.H. Kerle Verlag, 1966.
- Runia, David T. "Philo of Alexandria." Pages 169–171 in *The Westminster Handbook to Origen*. Edited by John Anthony McGuckin. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Translated by John Elwolde. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Sanders, Ed Parish. "Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison." *Harvard Theological Review* 66 (1973): 455–478.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism." Pages 11–44 in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of William David Davies*. Edited by Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 B.C.E. - 66 C. E.* Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Comparing Judaism and Christianity: An Academic Autobiography." Pages 11–41 in *Redefining first-century Jewish and Christian identities: essays in honor of Ed Parish Sanders*. Edited by Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey, and Gregory Tatum. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Covenantal Nomism Revisited." *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 16 (2009): 23–55.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Genesis בראשית: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

- Schaller, Berndt. "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Ps.-philonischen Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum im Mittelalter." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 10 (1979): 64–73.
- Schneider, Tammi J. *Judges*. Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2000.
- Schürer, Emile. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1901.
- Segal, Michael. "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible." Pages 10–28 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Sichardus, Johannes, ed. *Philonis Iudaei Alexandrini Libri Antiquitatum, Quaestionum et Solutionum in Genesin, de Essaeis, de Nominibus Hebraicis, de Mundo*. Basel: Adam Petri, 1527.
- Siena, Sisto da. *Bibliotheca Sancta*. Venice: Franciscum Franciscum Senensum, 1566. Cited 30 December 2011. Online: <http://www.mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn=urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10142981-4>.
- Smits, Edmé Renno. "A Contribution to the History of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* in the Middle Ages." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 23 (1992): 197–216.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Judges: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981.
- Spiro, Abram. "Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo." *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 20 (1951): 279–356.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pseudo-Philo's Saul and the Rabbis' Messiah Ben Ephraim." *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 21 (1952): 119–137.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. München: Beck, 1922–56.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts." Pages 128–154 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 121. Tübingen: Mohr, 2008.
- Turner, Jonathan H. "Sociological Theory in the 21st Century." Pages 1: 45–57 in *21st Century Sociology: A Reference Handbook*. Edited by Clifton D. Bryant and Dennis L. Peck. 2 vols. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2007.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran." Pages 51–66 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001.

- Vanderkam, James C. "The Righteousness of Noah." Pages 13–32 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980.
- VanLandingham, Chris. *Judgment and Justification in Early Judaism and the Apostle Paul*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. 2d ed. Studia post-biblica 4. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Vette, Joachim. "Samuel's 'Farewell Speech': Theme and Variation in 1 Samuel 12, Josephus, and Pseudo-Philo." Pages 325–339 in *Literary Construction of Identity in the Ancient World. Proceedings of the Conference Literary Fiction and the Construction of Identity in Ancient Literatures: Options and Limits of Modern Literary Approaches in the Exegesis of Ancient Texts. Heidelberg, July 10–13, 2006*. Edited by Hanna Liss and Manfred Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- Vogel, Manuel. "Tempel und Tempelkult in Pseudo-Philos *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." Pages 251–263 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community Without Temple: Zur Substituierung and Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels and seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum and frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2 Reihe 118. Tübingen: Mohr, 1999.
- Wadsworth, Michael Phillip. "The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo: Doctrine and Scriptural Exegesis in a Jewish Midrash of the First Century A.D." 2 vols.; DPhil. diss., Oxford University, 1975.
- Weber, Ferdinand. *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*. Edited by Franz Delitzsch and Georg Schnedermann. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1897.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. Translated by John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- Winter, Paul. "Philo, Biblical Antiquities of." Page 795 in vol. 3 of *The Interpreter's dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia Identifying and Explaining All Proper Names and Significant Terms and Subjects in the Holy Scriptures, Including the Aprocrypha, with Attention to Archaeological Discoveries and Researches into the Life and Faith of Ancient Times*. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 4 vols. New York: Abigindon, 1962.
- Wolde, Ellen J. van. *Words Became Worlds: Semantic Studies of Genesis 1–11*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Yinger, Kent L. *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Zeron, Alexander. "Erwägungen zu Pseudo-Philos quellen und Zeit." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 11 (1980): 38–52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Swansong of Edom." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31 (1980): 190–198.