Abstract: Since its initial publication in 1984, the so-called Epistula Anne ad Senecam was believed to be a rare (possibly the only) instance of a Jewish prose text composed in Latin. Several studies analyzed the Epistula as a work of third- or fourth-century Jewish apologetics, meant to show the superiority of Jewish monotheism to philosophical speculations and pagan cult practices. Subsequent to this initial phase of investigation, a series of scholars raised doubts about identifying the text as a Jewish work. In 2001, the major edition and commentary of Rainer Jakobi made a sustained case that the Epistula is in fact a product of fifth-century Christianity. Subsequent scholars have treated Jakobi's arguments as conclusive. The present article summarizes the debate and proposes a new way of thinking about the Epistula's origin.

In 1984, Bernhard Bischoff published a text he had discovered in a ninth-century manuscript in the library of the Archbishops of Cologne. The 94-line work bears the superscription Incipit epistula Anne ad Senecam de superbia et idolis (henceforth simply Epistula). As the latter half of the incipit indicates, the text derides idolatry (idola) and criticizes the arrogance (superbia) of those who, for all their philosophical pretensions and investigations into the cosmos, fail to recognize the true God.

Bischoff judged the work to be a Jewish composition, noting that there are clear allusions to the Hebrew Bible (especially Genesis, Proverbs, Job), as well as to other Jewish writings (above all Wisdom of Solomon 13-15, and Sibylline Oracles 3-5, and fragment 1), but no clear references to the New Testament nor any distinctly Christian theologomena. Bischoff found further evidence of the text's Jewish origin in the name Anne of the superscription, which he argued was meant to be none other than Annas son of Annas, who served briefly as high priest in 62 CE and subsequently played a major role in the war with Rome.

1 Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözese- und Dombibliothek, MS. Dom 17 fol. 99r-102r. The work preceding the Epistula is an otherwise unknown commentary on the gospels (see further Jakobi 1n1).

2 Citations of the Epistula are from the critical edition of Jakobi. The spelling of the manuscript is Epistola, a fact reflected in the titles of several studies.

3 Momigliano thinks that the author "may have read [Wisdom] in Greek rather than in Latin" (Momigliano 203), and elsewhere notes (204) that the Epistula's "Latin was strongly influenced by Greek"; so Cracco Ruggini 302. Hilhorst 161n21 admits that if this were a translation from a Greek text, the likelihood of its being Jewish increases. The Epistula would benefit from the type of study G. Mussies gave to the Greek expressions in 4 Ezra ("When Do Graecisms Prove that a Latin Text is a Translation?" Vruchten van de Uithof: H. A. Brongers FS (Utrecht: Theologisch Institut, 1984), pp. 100-19).

4 Although Josephus spells the name of both father and son Ἀννας, the New Testament uses a shortened form, Ἀννᾶ, for his father (see BDAG s.v. Ἀννῆς). The Vulgate renders this Annes, with the genitive Anna (Luke 3:2). Given the number of errors in the manuscript, Anne could certainly be a mistake for Anna.

For discussion on the shortened form of the name in Latin, see Bischoff 3n14 and Wischmeyer 88n96. Wischmeyer claims that the name appears in Latin inscriptions, but his examples are actually of the female name Anna, which is in fact considerably more common than the shortened male name Annes ("Hannah" [1 Sam. 1.2, etc.] is rendered Ἀννα in the LXX and Josephus, and Anna in the Vulgate or Pseudo-Philo, LAB). So CIJ i 614=Noy 1995 vol. 1 pp. 125-27 no. 90: filiius Marcelli et Annae, "son of Marcellus and Anna." (On this "Greek" form of the genitive, see comments of Adams, Bilingualism, 483-85.) Anna is also a female name in CIJ i 634=Noy 1995 vol 1 pp. 274-77 no. 195. The gender of the ANA in CIJ 575=Noy 1995, vol 1 pp. 95-96 no. 72 (Τάφος Ἀννα) is unclear, but other Greek inscriptions also have the female name Ἀννα (e.g. CIJ 411=Noy 1995 vol 2, pg. 17 no. 10: Τίτινια Ἀννα is clearly a woman).
Thus, Bischoff argued, the document was a pseudepigraphical letter in the name of the High Priest Annas to his contemporary, Seneca. It had an apologetic and missionary intent of showing the superiority of the "true God" to idolatry, and was meant to foster the image of common ground between a leader of the Jews and the renowned Roman philosopher (Bischoff 5). Since Seneca was famous for having written critically of "superstition" and of cult images, a Jewish writer had picked him to feature in a fictional correspondence between Jerusalem and Rome.

The view that the Epistula was a work of Jewish apologetics was endorsed shortly thereafter by no less a scholar than Arnaldo Momigliano, and was then reinforced in detailed studies by Wischmeyer, L. Cracco Ruggini, and Leon Rutgers. Momigliano 203-204 thought it likely that the words "ad Senecam" were a later addition to what was originally a "letter or sermon" by an otherwise unknown Jewish writer named "Anna." Originally the work may have had nothing to do with Seneca or with the high priest of the year 62. Momigliano ventured that the addition of the name Seneca to the preexisting work was probably made prior to the creation of the Exile, and he thought it would be "ad Senecam" was a later addition to what was originally a "letter or sermon" by an otherwise unknown Jewish writer named "Anna." Originally the work may have had nothing to do with Seneca or with the high priest of the year 62. Momigliano ventured that the addition of the name Seneca to the preexisting work was probably made prior to the creation of the Exile, and he thought it would be

Inscriptional evidence for the shortened male name Annas is slender. For similar forms of the man's name, see Noy 1995 vol 2: no. 487: Ἀνασ, and no. 96: Ἀννίς, both of which Noy translates as "Annius." The name Annas does appear in Codex Theodosianus 16.9.3 (Annati Didascalo et maioribus iudaorum); 16.8.23 (noted by Rutgers, Jews, 254). Sterk thinks this Annas is the actual author of the Epistula (see further below).

For a full summary of the names "Hanan" and "Hananiah" (with their Semitic, Greek, and Latin permutations), see Ilan, Names, 99-108.

5 The only event of his high priesthood described by Josephus was his orchestration of the execution of Jesus' brother, James (Ant. 20.199-203). Josephus writes of his leadership with deep admiration (cf. the encomium at Bell. 4.318-25). For details on his career, see VanderKam, From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 476-82.

6 Detailed commentary on the exiguous remains of Seneca's De Superstitione can be found in Marion Lausberg, Untersuchungen zu Senecas Fragmenten (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 7; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970), pp. 197-227.


8 Goodman 1984:128 offered a reserved endorsement of this view.

9 Momigliano 202-204 proposes this was an otherwise unknown "Anna" who "wrote a letter of sermon in Latin for the benefit of fratres...." (Cf. Protevangelium Jakobi 15:1, where Annas is the name of a scripture scholar.) Momigliano points out (204) that the actual High Priest Annas, as a Sadducee, would not have believed in the immortality of the soul, an view the Epistula espouses.
of the Paul-Seneca correspondence (datable to between 325 and 392), and might even have "created the precedent for the idea of the correspondence between Seneca and St. Paul." Momigliano and Wischmeyer highlighted that the Epistula was free not only of any clearly Christian content, but also from any anti-Jewish polemical content that might have been expected in a Christian work originating in the third or fourth century (Momigliano 203; cf. Wischmeyer 80).

Wischmeyer sought to strengthen the case that the work was Jewish by noting that the citation of Gen 2:7 follows the wording of the Vetus Latina (Wischmeyer 81). This is not a strong argument. Aside from the fact that the use of a non-Vulgate Latin version is not be probative as to the work's date, some of the Epistula's biblical allusions appear to follow the Vulgate.

Epistula 93-94: Tunc autem tantum Deum invocatis, cum aliqua in mundo exorta calamitas aut angustia supervenerit.

Prov 1:27-28 (Vulg.): cum inruerit repentina calamitas et interitus quasi tempestas ingruerit quando venerit super vos tribulatio et angustia tunc invocabunt me.

Wischmeyer (81n65) also worked on the assumption that the Vetus Latina was a Jewish translation, a much contested and highly uncertain possibility and denied the existence of written Jewish Latin translations of the Hebrew Bible.

---

12 The terminus post quem is established by the fact that Lactantius, writing prior to ca. 325 (Bowen and Garnsey 203:1-3 put the composition of the Div. Inst. between 303-10), was unfamiliar with any such correspondence, since he does not mention them despite his appreciative use of Seneca (cf. Inst. 6.24.13-14: Seneca could have been a Christian had he had someone to guide him). The terminus ante quem is set by Jerome's inclusion (392) of Seneca among the saints on the strength of the correspondence (Vir. ill. 12: "I should not include him in the list of the Saints, if Paul's letters to Seneca and Seneca's to Paul, which are read by many, did not give me just cause."). The letters were mentioned shortly thereafter also by Augustine, Epist. 153.14. See Sevenster, Paul and Seneca, 10-11; Fürst, 6-8.

13 Momigliano 205; cf. Bischoff 5, who also argued that, based on content, the Epistula had the better claim to priority. The view is apparently endorsed by Cornelia Römer, "The Correspondence between Seneca and Paul" in W. Schneemelcher (ed.) and E. Hennecke (rev.), The New Testament Apocrypha (trans. R. McL. Wilson; Cambridge: James Clarke), II, p. 47. Momigliano conceded that the title could have been added by a Jewish "interpolator" who wished to compete with the Seneca-Paul correspondence.

14 So emphatically Wischmeyer 80, 93n114. Wischmeyer also tries to build a larger historical argument about when Jewish proselytism was most likely to have taken place: he settles on the third century.

15 Rutgers 255 rightly observed that the use of a non-Vulgate Latin version could not be probative as to the work's date; besides which, some of the Epistula's biblical allusions appear to follow the Vulgate.

16 As Jakobi notes, the Vetus Latina would not supply the allusions.

17 See the long list of advocates assembled by Wischmeyer 81-82n65, but several of them are not as confident of this hypothesis as he is.

David Blondheim, Les parlers judéo-latins et la Vetus Latina. Études sur les rapports entre les traductions bibliques en langue romane des Juifs au Moyen Age et les anciennes versions (Paris: Champion, 1925);
L. R. Palmer, The Latin Language (London 1954) 184-90; Encyclopaedia Judaica 4.856: "While it is hard to prove conclusively, it is possible that the starting-point of the OL was a Jewish translation."

Gen 2:7 (Vulg.): formavit igitur Dominus Deus hominem de limo terrae et inspiravit in faciem eius spiraculum vitae et factus est homo in animam viventem.

Gen 2:7 (Vetus Latina): finxit deus hominem de limo terrae et insufflavit (inspiravit v.l.) in faciem eius (in eum) spiritum (animam) vitae.

Wis 15:11: quoniam ignoravit qui se finxit et qui inspiravit illi animam... qui insuflavit spiritum vitalem.

b. "They mislead humankind with fables more obscure than the darkness itself, by which Babylon is crushed, through which will result the destruction not only of a tower but of this world! You [sing.] who see in the heaven the bow of peace, the cord of the rains, the eternal sign of mercy, the dread of fires—flee the Chaldean lands [fuge Chaldaeicos fines] by which the deceivers persuade the living with vain effort."

Isa 48:20: "Go out from Babylon, flee from Chaldea" (egredimini de Babylone fugite a Chaldeis).

For this to be a Jewish prose text in Latin ought to have made it quite a spectacular discovery, if for no other reason than that so little Jewish Latin survives. As Fergus Millar 2006 notes, Millar 2006:435: "The social, intellectual, and religious history of the Jews in the Latin-speaking environment of the western half of the later Roman Empire remains a largely unexplored field"; "there is very clear evidence for the existence of Jewish communities in many parts of the Latin speaking West" (Africa, Italy, Spain, and Gaul), and that "it is very likely" that they used Latin in ordinary life; yet "whether there was a Jewish Bible in Latin remains wholly uncertain"

---

Claude Aziza, Tertullien et le Judaisme (Paris 1977) 39: "Le problème est particulièrement délicat" (about Jewish Latin translations in Carthage). p. 40: "even if one cannot formally prove the presence of a Latin translation of the Bible in use among the Jews, there are indications that it could have existed."

Jean Daniélou, Les origines du christianisme latin .. (1978) 21.; 4


Adams, Bilingualism, 271-74 (on the Old Latin editions of the Psalms from a manuscript in Monte Cassino, translated directly from Hebrew).

Millar 2006:434. On Jewish Latinity, see Simon 1996 [1964]: 293-301; Latin "interference" in Jewish inscriptions in Greek is an indication that Latin was spoken; see Adams, Bilingualism, 483-85; Binder, p. 194.
(2006:435). There are of course many Jewish Latin inscriptions in Rome\(^{20}\)—occasionally exhibiting stylistic pretensions, as in the case of the famous epitaph for Regina written in dactylic hexameters (CLJ 476).\(^{21}\) But if the Epistula is indeed a Jewish text in Latin prose, it is extraordinarily rare. This potential significance has been noted by all scholars writing on the Epistula—including those who have argued that it is not Jewish after all. As Momigliano put it, "… a text in Latin written to attract proselytes to Judaism is not, as far as I know, something we encounter at every corner."\(^{22}\) In Leon Rutgers's study of Jews in late ancient Rome, the chapter devoted to Jewish "Literary Production" includes only two possible texts: the Epistula and the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum (about whose authorship—Jewish or Christian—scholars have been equally divided—although the Collatio has received a great deal more attention).\(^{23}\)

Such comments suffice to demonstrate that if this text is a Jewish work in Latin, it is ipso facto very precious, and the relative lack of scholarly interest—especially when contrasted with the abundant scholarship devoted to the Hellenistic Jewish literature\(^{24}\)—is perhaps somewhat surprising. But if the Epistula attracted little attention when it was heralded as one of the only pieces of Jewish apologetics in Latin, it becomes much less unique if its is a work of fifth-


\(^{22}\) Cf. Bischoff 3: "...einziges literarisches Denkmal jüdischer Mission in lateinischer Sprache..."; Wischmeyer 72: "...ein seltenes Beispiel lateinisch-jüdischer Missionsliteratur..."; Hilhorst 161: "No [Jewish] prose texts have come down to us in manuscript form and we cannot even be sure that they were ever written"; Fürst 179: "...wir besitzen keinen einzigen lateinisch-jüdischen Prosatext, und es ist mehr als unsicher, ob solche überhaupt je verfasst wurden." Cf. Runia, Philo, pg. 275n1: "It is remarkable that no Jewish literary Latin texts have been preserved, with the possible exception of the recently discovered Epistula Anne (but the Jewish attribution has now been disputed, see Hilhorst [1991] 159-161)."

\(^{23}\) See the extensive discussion and review of scholarship in Rutgers, Jews in Late Ancient Rome, 210-53; and see now R. M. Frakes, Compiling the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum in Late Antiquity (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), who argues strongly that the Collatio is a Christian work.

\(^{24}\) Holladay, Collins.
century Christianity, joining a host of well-known and, frankly, more sophisticated interactions with philosophy and pagan religious practices.

**Questioning the Jewish Provenance of the Text**

Subsequent to the studies of Bischoff, Momigliano, Wischmeyer, Cracco Ruggini, and Rutgers, important objections were raised to understanding the text as a Jewish composition. These seem to have persuaded most scholars, and this may have contributed to the relative lack of interest in the *Epistula* among scholars of ancient Judaism.25

To begin with, and as Momigliano was already aware, the text cannot in any straightforward way be interpreted as a pseudepigraphical epistle of Anna(s). The text is not presented as a letter. There is no epistolary prescript (e.g. *Anna Senecae salutem*26), and it begins instead as if it were a treatise or sermon: "That Father and Lord of all mortals...." Furthermore, here is no mention in the body of the text of either Seneca or Annas, nor are their personalities evoked.27 This contrasts starkly with the Paul-Seneca correspondence, where the letters, full of "insipid, exaggerated flattery,"28 do little other than entertain the thought that these two men knew and admired each other.

In fact, the speaker in the *Epistula* addresses no single individual but rather puzzling array of groups and individuals. For instance, he speaks to *fratres*, "brothers" (lines 29, 63)29 who are sympathetic to or already share his outlook, contrasting them with the idolators and philosophers whom he describes in the third person: "They boast... I am simply dumfounded, brothers, at [them]."

---

25 Fürst 181 captures the sense of deflation: what would have been a "sensation" had it been Jewish turns out to be merely a Christian text whose attack on pagan theology and practice is already quite familiar.

26 Or perhaps *Senecae Anna salutem*; see details in Fürst n26.

27 See Wischmeyer, 83-87. Possible allusions to Seneca's writings are another matter, and several of these have been detected. Wischmeyer 87 finds a possible allusion in "cruento ... furore" (line 129) to Seneca's *Herc. Oet.* 233. Jakobi finds several intriguing similarities to expressions in Seneca's works.

28 See Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca*, 13: "One of the fourteen letters is quite sufficient to display this correspondence in all its empty phraseology, its meaningless insignificance and insipid, exaggerated flattery." Sevenster appends a representative sample of similarly devastating verdicts (13n1); cf. Fürst 11; Ehrman 2013:522-23 notes that already Erasmus found them "feeble and inept."

29 Momigliano 203 proposes potential proelytes. Hilhorst 161 notes that "brothers" is exceedingly common in Christian texts, but Wischmeyer (87n90) rightly observed that *fratres* was widespread in a variety of contexts, including philosophical (Schelke, *RAC* 2.632, 635). Menahem Stern, *CPJ* 3, pg. 41, speaks of the "loose and widespread use of ἀδελφὸς among different parts of the population of Egypt, even when there are no religious or cultic reasons for this use...." He notes that "the use of ἀδελφὸς in the sense of coreligionists was by no means confined to Christians and it appears that Christianity took over its use from Judaism."

On pagan reaction to the use of *frater*, cf. Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 3.1 (used by Octavius of Marcus, his fellow Christian); *Oct.* 5.1 (used by the pagan Caecilius to *Marce frater*—but this usage may be ironical, especially given Caecilius's subsequent critique of this expression in *Oct.* 9.2); and finally *Oct.* 31.8, where the term is defended. Cf. Christine Mohrmann, "Problems," 22: "pagans made scornful remarks about" the ubiquity of Christian use of "brother."

See the extensive references in Clarke, *Octavius*, 176n21: Apul. *Met.* 1.17, 8.9, 9.7; Horace, *Ep.* 1.6.54; Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.66.155) Fronto, Naber 179; Quintillian, *Decl.* 321: when we want to flatter, we say "brothers." It was used by initiates (Mithras: F. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figures relatifs aux mystères de Mithra* 2 (Brussels 1896), no. 34, 324, 336, 351, 355).
But the speaker also addresses a singular "you," perhaps rhetorical, shares the outlook of the speaker and the "brothers": "What could you [sing.] rightly say to such people?" (line 37). Yet this is followed immediately by direct address to a plural "you" which now represents not the "brothers" but the misguided philosophers (line 37-38: "O fatuous people … you [pl.] who obsessively study the world… Why do you [pl.] go astray?"). Generally the first-person plural encompasses the speaker and the fratres and a "you" (pl.)/"they" designates the philosophers and idolators. "Receive [pl.] from us the true view …" (lines 50-51). "You [pl.] forge incoherent myths…. Our truth succinctly resolves your query" (57-62; cf. line 90: "our God"). But then the speaker addresses the idolator in the second-person singular: "you [sing.] are ignorant of the God by whom you were created…" (76-77), only to revert again to the plural in this very section: "You [pl.] are deceived by the false words of those who abandon the truth" (92). Thus the speaker addresses his allies in the second-person singular and plural, and addresses the idolators in the second-person (singular and plural) and names them in the third-person. All of this makes it difficult to determine what sort of setting is supposed to be encoded in the text.

Not only does the text not name or invoke Annas or Seneca, but it is possible that not even the incipit actually names an Anna(s). Divjak noted that epistula Anne ad Senecam may have resulted from a simple mechanical corruption of epistula Annaei Senecae de superbia et idolis, "A Letter of Annaeus Seneca on Arrogance and Idols." (Momigliano 205 had already raised the possibility that the name Anna reminded someone of Annaeus [Seneca], only to reject it: "I do not like puns."

This still leaves unanswered why the text is labeled an "epistle"; but if the title is secondary, it should not overly constraint interpretation.

Anton Hilhorst then argued (without recourse to Divjak) that the text is more likely a product of Christianity, noting that, in the absence of any indubitable evidence of its Jewish origin, "it is reasonable to attribute this text to an environment in which all other Latin writings of this kind originate, that is, Christianity" (Hilhorst 161). Hilhorst's cautiously worded conclusion was considerably strengthened by the work of Jakobi and Fürst.

Bringing together their arguments, they note:

0. Historical probability. The

1. The Epistula exhibits many points of contact with the Christian apologists, both in content and at times even in wording. (The use of Wisdom 13-15 fits here.)

2. Responding to the claim that the Epistula lacks any allusions to the New Testament, Jakobi argued that these can in fact be detected. For Hilhorst XXX (followed by Jakobi 11), the

---

30 The possibility is also rejected by Cracco Ruggini 306n10 and Wischmeyer 88n96. This emendation is defended by Divjak and Hilhorst, and accepted by Jakobi (8). One must still account for the preposition (ad Senecam). Jakobi 8 notes that the Seneca's De clementia in Bibl. Vatic. Pal. lat. 1547 (ca. 800 north Italy) has in the explicit: EXPL LIBER> ANNEI ASENEC. At the least this illustrates the sort of corruption that could occur around Seneca's name.

31 Divjak: "Auch scheint der Titel nicht ganz zum Werk zu passen." Hilhorst 159: the title is simply a "mistake which crept in somewhere during the textual transmission…" Momigliano already thought the title was the work of an interpolator, albeit a Jewish one.

32 Divjak; Hilhorst 160n16.
Epistula's argument that God could be known from creation, and that the failure to recognize him led to idolatry, is classically Pauline (Rom 1:18-25). But nothing in the wording of the Epistula clearly indicates knowledge of Romans 1. In fact, the points of contact are rather with the way this argument is presented in Wisdom 13, which Romans 1, of course, resembles.34

Jakobi 11-13 also perceives a quotation of Paul's Areopagus speech (Acts 17:28).

Epistula 15-17: Vivimus enim, quoniam vult et in iudicio illius reservamur; ut spiravit, spiritum trahimus; quod sumus et quod loquimur, ex illo est.


That the Epistula mentions God's "gift" (munus) in the next sentence suggests also Lactantius's paraphrase of Acts 17:28 (Opif. 19.5, noted by Jakobi 12-13): illius munus est, quod spiramus, quod vivimus, quod vigemus.

Again, it is difficult to see an allusion to Acts 17:28, which lacks any reference to God's "willing life," or to the gift of speech. Furthermore, the idea that humans get their life and everything from God was a common enough sentiment. The poem Paul is made to quote, Aratus's Phaenomena,35 was widely cited, including by Jews, such as Aristobulus.36 Indeed, Jakobi 9, 34 notes sentences from Seneca that preserve the more distinctive terminology of the Epistula,37 which calls into question whether any dependence on Acts 17:28 can be demonstrated.

Furthermore, the language sounds biblical:

ut spiravit, spiritum trahimus. "As he has breathed" resembles Gen 2:7 (inspiravit), which is cited explicitly in line XXX. The line might also draw on Job 34:14-15 (itself alluding to both Gen 2:7 and 3:19): If God "will draw his spirit and breath to himself (spiritum illius et flatum ad se trahet), all flesh shall perish together, and man shall return into ashes." Cf. Eccl. 12.7; Psa. 104.29;

cf. Job 12:10: "In his hand is the life of every living thing, and the breath of every human being" (NRSV).

Joseph and Asenath 12:1: "Who gave the breath of life [πνοὴν ζωῆς] to all your creation" ("breath of life" occurs in Philonenko and in Fink).

Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 3.33: God "filled all places with air, that all living things might be able to breathe safely so as to live."

For speech as a gift of God, cf. Sib. Or. 1.34-35; Augustine, Civ. 7.30; GenRab 8.11. Speech was often linked with reason (ratio and oratio) in defining humans as a species, but the context here, joined with an allusion to Gen 2:7, makes one think of Adam's naming of the animals (Gen 2:20), which provoked much linguistic reflection among Jewish and Christian interpreters.

33 Hilhorst notes that these might have been part of the text no longer preserved (160).
34 Fürst, Contrast Tatian, Or. 4, who draws unmistakably on the wording of Rom 1:20 when making the same point.
35 Wischmeyer (73n9) argued that the Epistula was quoting the source of Paul's speech, Aratus's Phaenomena.
37 Epist. 90.1: "quae dubitate ... potest, quia deorum immortalium munus sit quod vivimus?" Ben. 4.6.3: "negas te illum munus accepis? ... Unde tibi istum quem trahis, spiritum?" "Do you say that you have received no gift? ... Whence do you have that breath which you draw?" (Basore, LCL, adapted).
This was sometimes divided into ratio and oratio, logos endiathetos and logos prophorikos; note the mention of the gift of human speech below. (Plutarch, *Bruta* animalia ratione uti [Mor. 985D-992E]; Porphyry, *Abst.*). Philo also wrote a treatise De animalibus whose fuller title was "On Irrational Animals Having Reason": his nephew Alexander defended their having reason; Philo rebutted it (see Schürer, *History*, 4.865-66; A. Terian, *Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus: The Armenian Text with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (1981).


3. The very dearth of Jewish prose texts in Latin means that the onus probandi must really be with those who would claim the *Epistula* is a Jewish work.\(^{38}\) Indeed, Hilhorst's main argument is simply an appeal to historical probability, hence he concludes rather more cautiously than some writing after him: "it is reasonable to attribute this text to an environment in which all other Latin writings of this kinds originate, that is, Christianity" (Hilhorst 161).\(^{39}\)

The *Epistula*'s citations sometimes follow the Vulgate (Jakobi 15).

4. If the name of Seneca is in some sense integral to the *Epistula* (and is not simply an erroneous guess on the part an interpolator), it could be argued that Seneca is a figure more likely to have been taken up by a Christian than by a Jewish pseudepigrapher. Seneca's criticisms of traditional pagan worship were used by Christian writers such as Lactantius and Augustine in their apologetics (almost all that survives of Seneca's *De superstitione*\(^{40}\) comes from Augustine's *City of God*). Furthermore, some of Seneca's critical remarks about worship explicitly indicted Jewish practices (Stern, *GLAJJ* §§ 186-89),\(^{41}\) a fact not lost on polemically-minded Christians. (Wischmeyer (88-92) addresses Seneca's hostility to Jewish practices, and argues that a Jewish author might well have chosen Seneca in order to make this well-known critic of Judaism appear sympathetic, so as to win potential sympathizers by addressing possible anti-Jewish thoughts.\(^{42}\)

5. In addition to accumulating many parallels between the wording or ideas in the *Epistula* and in Latin Christian authors, Jakobi seems to offer definitive proof by demonstrating that the *Epistula* exhibits detailed knowledge of Jerome's exegetical works. The most impressive are the *Epistula*'s interpretation of the name "Babylon" that occurs in Jerome's *Commentary on Isaiah*.

\(^{38}\) Note the reservations of Jonathan J. Price, in his review of Rutgers: "Yet after Rutgers' vigorous efforts, the strongest argument for the Jewishness of both works [the *Collatio* and the *Epistula*] rests on the possibility that they are not Christian. These two strange and lonely works are no grounds for believing that a whole Jewish literature in Latin has vanished without a trace" (Price 1997:720).

\(^{40}\) Seneca, *De superstitione*. F. Haase, *L. Annaei Senecae Opera quae supersunt* III (Leipszig 1853, fr. 30-44).

K. Muenscher, *Senecas Werke, Untersuchungen zur Abfassungszeit und Echtheit* (Philologus, Suppl. Band.16.1 Leipzig 1922) 80 dates it late in Seneca's life; Momigliano, *Claudius, the Emperor and His Achievement*, Oxford 1933, 29 suggests it was written in 40 or 41).

\(^{41}\) Stern, *GLAJJ* 1.429: "Seneca was the first Latin writer to give vent to deliberate animadversions on the Jewish religion and its impact on Roman society." Cf. R. Turcan, *Sénèque et les religions orientales* (Bruxelles 1967).

\(^{42}\) Wischmeyer appeals here to Simon, *Verus Israel*, chapt. 10
Jakobi (followed by Fürst) finds this so striking that he uses the date of Jerome's commentary (408-10 CE) as the *terminus post quem* for the *Epistula*.

Lines 21-22: *ipsis tenebris obscurioribus, quibus Babylonia proteritur, per quam ruina non turris, sed mundi istius.*

The train of thought is cryptic: why the sudden transition from myths darker than "darkness" to "Babylon," the "tower" of Babel, and the "destruction of this world"? This becomes somewhat less mysterious in light of the etymology Jerome gives for "Babylon" as "darkness" (*tenebrae*), which he links closely in two places with "this world": *Illa enim Babylon, pro qua Aquila et Theodotion tenebras interpretati sunt, ut significarent mundum istum, qui in maligno positus est,* "Now this 'Babylon,' which Aquila and Theodotion translated as 'darkness,' to signify this world, which is set in wickedness" (Comm. Isa., ad Isa 21:4 [CC 73:291.12-14]). In Isa. 13.11 (CC 73 p. 163.3): "Some think the prediction is not about the ruin of Babylon but about the end of the world" (*quidam putant non de Babylonis ruina, sed de mundi consummatione praedici*).

Furthermore, Jerome calls "Babylon" the "confusion of this world" (*confusio mundi istius*) in his commentary on Isa 48:20, which is clearly the passing in view here in the *Epistula*: *ut egrediamur de Babylone, id est, confusione istius mundi,* "…that we come forth from Babylon, that is, from the confusion of this world" (Comm. Isa. ad Isa 48:20 [CC 73A:532.29-30]) (Jakobi 36-37).

---

At the outset it must be acknowledged that there is nothing in the text that could only have been created by a Jewish author, that could not possibly have been composed by a Christian. Furthermore, there are obviously an abundance of Christian Latin texts written against idolatry and philosophical pretensions, and like the *Epistula*. They draw on biblical texts cited were popular among Christians. (Besides, as the ongoing debates about various pseudepigrapha were Jewish or Christian, the pendulum has swung to regarding them as Christian until proven otherwise.)*

Joseph and Asenath* or *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are Jewish or Christian have rightly insisted, Christians could be interested in the characters and content of their "Old Testament," The *Epistula* does not clear meet *any* of criteria Davila devised, although of course the failure to meet some of these criteria—being composed in Hebrew, or composed prior to the Christian era—are not relevant in the case of a text *ex hypothesi* involving Seneca.

---


44 Most recent entry, Nir 2012.

45 See most recently DeSilva...

46 Davila, *Provenance*, pp. 65-66. Davila looks for some of the following: (1) evidence it was written in the pre-Christian era; (2) that it was composed in Hebrew; (3) interest in Jewish ritual cult; (4) interest in Jewish halakhic matters; (5) evidence of Jewish national interests or internal Jewish polemics. Numbers (1), (2) would not have entered the discussion in the first place.
Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to register a few reservations about the arguments raised by Jakobi, not because it is possible to prove that the Epistula is Jewish, but simply because the arguments he has adduced to prove it is Christian seem, for all their considerable erudition, not to be nearly as decisive as they first appear.

To take up the last, and ostensibly most impressive, argument first: the terminology shared by the Epistula and Jerome in interpreting "Babylon" as "darkness" (tenebrae), related to "this world" (mundus iste).

As striking as these parallels may first appear, it must be asked whether a shared etymology—-even a peculiar one—-is really sufficient to demonstrate that the Epistula must have been written with knowledge of Jerome?

That Christians made use of a Jewish Liber nominum is widely acknowledged. Furthermore, in this very passage Jerome states that he has this etymology "darkness" on the authority of Aquila and Theodotion. Jerome states elsewhere (Ep. 37.3) that interpretation of Hebrew was to be based on Origen's commentaries, the recentiores (i.e. Aquila and Theodotion), and Jewish consultants (that is, rabbinic sources). (Parenthetically, it could be noted that "confusion of this world" seems not to have originated with Jerome; it appears also in the fourth-century Commentary on Isaiah ascribed to Basil of Caesarea: Oikeiosis γὰρ καὶ τὴν σύγχυσιν τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον Βαβυλῶνα ἐν τις προσέποι, "For someone could appropriately say that 'Babylon' is the confusion of this world." When Jerome suggests that the prediction of the destruction of Babylon in Isaiah 13 pertains to the consummation of the world, again he follows existing interpretations (quidam putant) and appeals to an etymology (orbis, qui Hebraice dicitur thebel, et Graece οἰκουμένη, Babylon intellegenda sit [CC 73 p. 163.3]). The author of the Epistula need not have drawn on Jerome anymore than on Jerome's sources, or Isaiah itself.

---

47 The connection of Babel and "confusion" is, of course, already biblical (Gen 11:7, 9: Vulg.: ). Philo is rather restrained with "Babylon": he gives just one interpretation, noting that it signifies "change" or "alteration" (μετάθεσις, Gig. 66).
48 See Wutz, Onomastica Sacra, 14-24; On Origen's sources for etymologies, see Hanson 1956, who judges it "very unlikely" that Origen's sources were composed by Christians (1956:121-22); Kamesar, Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 103-26. Cf. also Alison Salvesen, "A Convergence of the Ways? The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome," in Becker and Yoshiko Reed, Ways that Never Parted, 248-57; Günter Stemberger, " in Saebö (ed), Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, 584): "It is often very difficult to ascertain whether such contacts [sc. of converging exegesis] are due to an exchange with Jewish teachers of the period, or are caused by the biblical text, similar mentality and comparable modes of interpretation."
49 Kamesar, Jerome, 174. Especially in his etymologies, as here, Jerome relies on the recentiores and not simply on the explanations received from the Liber nominum (Kamesar, Jerome, 103-75).
50 Encyclopedia of the Early church, 1.115: "The Commentary on Isaiah, written in Cappadocia in the 4th c., is not generally considered authentic."
52 Isaiah 13 casts the "oracle concerning Babylon" (13:1) as God's destruction of "the whole earth" (13:5)—-and silencing haughtiness (superbia, 13:11)!
Just as the etymology for "Babylon" originated prior to Jerome, the same holds for the line of thought in this section of the Epistula. The Epistula's juxtaposition of the name "Babylon" and "flee Chaldean lands" (fuge Chaldaeiocos fines) originates with Isa 48:20, where the two place names are found together in the injunction: "go out from Babylon and flee from Chaldea" (egredimini de Babylone fugite a Chaldeis). In the Epistula, as so often in Jewish texts, "Chaldean lands" stands for "astrology," and perhaps more precisely, for the error of studying the heavens without recognizing their creator: iactant sese creaturae signa cognoscere, cum ignorant ipsum Dominum creatorem mundi (ll. 27-28).

This is precisely what "Chaldaea" meant for Philo: regarding the physical universe as ultimate reality and thereby honoring creation above the creator. As Philo explains in On Abraham, "The Chaldeans were especially active in the elaboration of astrology and ascribed everything to the movement of the stars…. Thus they glorified visible existence, leaving out of consideration the intelligible and invisible" (Ab. 68-71). Indeed, Philo's "Chaldaea" represents the pattern of godless astrology that the Epistula decries, investigating the creation without learning from it about the creator.

Because of the widespread link of Chaldaea with godless astrology, Jewish works often treated Abraham's departure from Chaldea as his discovery that the stars' regularity betokens a creator. Josephus claims that Abraham discerned the creator from the regularity of the heavenly bodies (Ant. 1.155-57); in Josephus' telling, Abraham's philosophic recognition of God is virtually a narrative embodiment of what is argued for in philosophical terms in Wisdom 13. In short, for Philo and Josephus (among others), Abraham is "a paradigm for everyone's capacity to know God through nature" (Holladay, 4.182)—precisely the point the Epistula wishes to make...

Thus in the Epistula, the imperative to "flee Chaldean lands" (Isa 48:20) is treated as tantamount to "Lech lecha" (Gen 12:1), for just as Abraham's "leaving Chaldea" meant abandoning astronomy to worship the God who created the stars—to say nothing of breaking with

53 Jakobi 38 cites Ambrosius, Expl. in Psal. 1.23 [CSEL 64.17.8]: Chaldaei sunt, qui siderum cursus vanae studio superstitionis explorant, "Chaldeans are those who study the course of the stars in exertion of their pointless superstition." But there is no reference to Philo, Josephus, or the whole Hellenistic Jewish tradition associating Chaldeans with astrology.

54 This connection amply attested in Jewish works (cf. already Dan 2:10; Sib. Or. 3.227; cf. Pseudo-Orpheus, Recension B lines 27-31; see Holladay 4.182-85).

55 For Philo, the "Chaldeans" are those who engage in pompous investigations of the celestial bodies, and whose "land" must be quit by turning one's reflection elsewhere (Migr. 176-187; cf. Quaest. Gen. 3.1 [Gen 15:6]: "land of the Chaldaeans" is the math and astronomy that "persuades men to honour and worship the works of the world instead of the Creator of the world" [trans. Marcus, LCL]). Cf. Migr. 179; Quis Her. 97, 280; Congr. 49; Mut. 16; Abr. 69; Virt. 212.

56 There were other ways of addressing Abraham's knowledge of the stars: Pseudo-Philo LAB 18.5; Test. Abraham 10; Abraham and astronomy of Chaldæa was a constant theme: Jub 12:17; Pseudo-Eupolemus makes Abraham the founder of the Chaldaean science. Abraham's rejection of idols and turn to the one God is a common theme: Jubilees 12; Apocalypse of Abraham 1-8; Genesis Rabbah XXX.

57 Cf. also Philo, Virt. 212-18; on this, see Knox 1935; Feldman 1968.
idolatry—so the Epistula urges people to learn from the created order (the heavens in particular) that there is a creator, alone worthy of worship.

--Furthermore, the lack of clear reference to anything Christian is perhaps an unresolved problem. It is true that the cumulative effect of parallels of thought and phraseology in the Christian apologists writing in Latin—Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and especially Lactantius—is noteworthy. But why is there no clear allusion to the New Testament? Hilhorst and Jakobi make much of the structural similarity in thought to Romans 1:18-25, with its link between the failure to recognize God from creation and the subsequent descent into idolatry. But there is nothing in the vocabulary to suggest Romans 1 was being invoked. Furthermore, the argument of Romans 1 is hardly unique to that passage, even if, for Christian authors, it would become the locus classicus. We might be justified in turning the argument on its head: why does Epistula not evoke Paul's language from Romans 1, even when making the same point? This contrasts with its clear echoes of the particular terminology of Jewish scripture (including Wisdom and Sirach). To my mind, the arguments for the text's Christian origin are not nearly as decisive scholarship since Hilhorst has claimed.

Although Jakobi and Fürst have demonstrated that many of the ideas and even the wording in the Epistula has parallels in Latin Christian authors, their references could create the misleading impression that these same ideas and expressions lacked comparable parallels with older Jewish works. Already the parade example of Chaldaea and Babylon have been mentioned; but the same applies often even to individual phrases. God is "all light" puts one in mind of 1 John, yet it more nearly resembles Pseudo-Philo, LAB .

--Lack of Jewish in Latin (Hilhorst). Preserved in Latin. We don't know much about Jewish in Latin.

Main arguments against foolishness of idolatry are so ubiquitous that they offer little help in the search for a provenance. But perhaps we can note a few elements that stand out, and a few elements that are common in Jewish and Christian anti-idol discourse that are absent here.

0. The teaching on the soul is peculiar and demands further investigation. Asserting the soul's immortality and divinity, derived without further argumentation by appeal to Gen 2:7 (which is

58 Jubilees 12.12-14; Apocalypse of Abraham 1-8 (especially 8:4-6); further variations of Abraham's destruction of the idols are gathered by Louis Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews (trans. Henrietta Szold and Paul Radin; 2nd ed.; 2 vols.; JPS Classic Reissues; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2003), 1.175-86. In this context it is worth noting that in Pseudo-Philo, LAB 6-7 treats the tower of Babel as a story about idolatry, and re-casts Abraham's survival in the furnace here (see discussion in Murphy, 41-50).


not, however, identified as an authoritative text), is in keeping with the outlook of several Hellenistic Jewish texts.

(See Runia, Philo, pp. 279-80 on Tertullian and Philo (Leg. 1.42) making similar distinctions between "breath" (aurula spiritus; πνοή) and "spirit" (imago spiritus, πνεῦμα) in interpreting Gen 2:7). The Epistula, unlike Philo, does not treat the human mind. Neither does it, somewhat surprisingly given the criticism of imagines, does it develop the idea of humankind as the bearer of the divine image (cf. Pseudo-Phocylides 106; Philo, Opif. mundi 69: insisting it is the spiritual component of the person).

The claim that the soul, because it comes from God, returns for a heavenly "gift" (munus) is surprising.

The immortality of the soul is obviously not a prominent theme in the Hebrew Bible, but was often endorsed in Hellenistic Jewish texts: cf. 4 Macc 18:23: the martyrs receive ψυχὰς ἀθανασίας from God; Josephus, Bell. 3.372: the soul is immortal, a portion of God; Bell. 7.340: Eleazar gives a speech περὶ ψυχῆς ἀθανασίας—an immortality the soul possesses, as in the Epistula, because of its kinship with God (Bell. 7.349; cf. 7.346: it is "invisible" like God); Josephus also makes "immortality of the soul" a doctrine of the Essenes (Bell. 2.154-56; Ant. 18.18) and the Pharisees (Bell. 2.163, who also expect the souls of the good to pass to a different body). Philo's description of the souls' descent (Gig. 6-18) sounds almost Platonic, as does his description of the ascension of Moses' soul (cf. and Phaedr. 250c).


Neither Philo nor Wisdom of Solomon seem concerned to prove the immortality of the soul (Winston, Wisdom 30n42, noting that, by contrast, Albinus Didascalikos 25 is devoted to this proof).

The allusion to anamnesis (Phaedrus 247C-248E) is absent in Philo (Winston, Wisdom, 29, citing Wolfson 1948).

Separation of soul from body at death: 4 Ezra 7.78, which like the Epistula, echoes Eccl 12:7 and probably Gen 2:7: "Now concerning death, the teaching is: When the decisive decree has gone out from the Most High that a person shall die, as the spirit leaves the body to return again to him who gave it [recedente inspiratione de corpore ut dimittatur iterum ad eum qui dedit], first of all it adores the glory of the Most High" (NRSV). The peculiar use of inspiratio for anima (4 Ezra 7:78, 80) is a puzzle (Stone, 4 Ezra, 240), but in the present sentence an allusion to Gen 2:7 seems likely. Stone (4 Ezra, 240n12) notes similar allusions to Eccl 12:7 in Apoc. of Moses 31.4;

unlike the Epistula, insists on different destinies for the righteous and the unrighteous (so Tanh. Wayyiqa 8), and envisions time in "treasuries" (4 Ezra 4:35) and ultimately a resurrection in which souls are reunited to bodies (4 Ezra 7:32).

Elements missing:
1. The *Epistula* neither acknowledges nor exploits the *common ground* it shared with the older philosophical critique of the veneration of images. Not only did such critique have excellent pedigree, but many Greek and Roman opponents of representations of the gods praised the Jews for their aniconic worship, including Varro, Strabo, Livy (A burb. (apud Scholia in Lucanum 2.593 (Stren, 1.130), and even Tacitus. This common ground with the "best" of pagan thought, which was often happily noted (or invented) by Jewish and later Christian apologists, is nowhere mentioned in the *Epistula*—unless, of course, there was some clear reference to Seneca (either as recipient of the "letter," as its author, or in some other way) a portion of the work not included in the text.

For instance, Josephus insists that his criticism of popular gentile views of the gods are no different from the criticisms offered by "many illustrious people" (Ap. 2.168 [with Barclay 2007:264n648]; cf. 1.183-204=Pseudo-Mytho-Frag. 1; 2.236-38; 2.73-78). Already Aristobulus (Holladay frag. 4=Eusebius, Praep. ev. 9.6.6-8; 13.12.1-7) and Pseudo-Mytho-Aristobulus (Josephus, Ant. 1.159; Clement, *Strom. 5.113.1-2*) had made a similar case. (Of course, Aristobulus and Josephus add that these illustrious gentiles learned their own aniconism from Moses, and Pseudo-Mytho-Aristobulus forged a quotation from Sophocles to find an ally). Philo finds an ally in Plato.

---

60 E.g. Xenophanes fr. 167, 170 KRS; DK 21B14, 23 Clement, *Strom. 5.109.1-2*: mortals think gods resemble them; Heraclitus (fr. 241 KRS; DK 22 B 5); Zeno SVF 1.265. See Stern, *GLAJJ* 1, pg. 207. Plutarch attributed Rome's archaic aniconic worship to Numa and his agreement with the outlook of Pythagoras (Plutarch, *Numa* 8.7-8); cf. also Lucian, *De dea Syria*, XXX.

61 Varro praised the Jewish people when arguing that worship without *simulacra* was superior (fr. 18 Cardo; Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 4.31; Stern, *GLAJJ* §72a). Cf. Numenius (apud Origen, *Cels. 1.15*): "of the nations that believe God to be incorporeal, he also included the Jews"). In Celsus's own view, God does not resemble any visible being (*Cels. 6.63*), and in fact Christian interpretation of Gen 1:26 was mistaken or idolatrous (*Cels. 4.30*; 7.62) and undermined Christians' anti-idol rhetoric.

62 Geogr. 16.2.35; Stern GLAJJ § 115. On the influence of this passage, see Nock, *Essays*, 2.850-76 (Nock notes that "The ascription to non-Greeks of a feeling against anthropomorphism is familiar from the Phoenicians and became something of an ethnographic commonplace" [861]). See notes of van Kooten, 643n27.

63 *Hist. 5.5.4-5*; Stern GLAJJ § 281.


Older positive assessments of the Jews' worship were:

Theophrastus: (Apud Porphyry, *Abst. 2.26*; Stern, *GLAJJ* § 4): the Jews were "philosophers by race," but their sacrifices were grim. Hecataeus of Abdera, *Aegyptiaca* (apud Diodorus Siculus Bibl. hist. 40.3; Stern, *GLAJJ* §11) presents a view very close to that of the *Epistula*: Moses "had no images whatsoever of the gods made for them, being of the opinion that God is not in human form; rather the Heaven that surrounds the earth is alone divine, and rules the universe."

65 See Collins. On Josephus, see John M. G. Barclay, "Snarling Sweetly: Josephus on Images and Idolatry," in *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity* (Stephen C. Barton, ed.) 73-87. (Josephus addresses Jewish taboos against images in Ant. 15.267-91, 328-41; 17.149-63;
Aristides (Leg 24-25) is one of many instances of Christians doing the same. Any number of the Epistula’s points about the inadequacy of images had precedent in those with impeccable philosophical credentials. Was the author familiar with Seneca’s On Superstition? Seneca criticizes depicting the gods in materia vilissima atque immobils, and sounds not unlike the Israelite prophets when he mocks the way the statue of Jupiter must be clothed and bathed by its attendants (fr. 31 apud Augustine, Civ. Dei 6.10).

Lactantius and Augustine make much of this common ground. (If the Epistula is meant to be written by Seneca, then the actual author will have created the image of a common outlook by means of pseudepigraphy, in much the same way as the Jewish authors of the Letter of Aristeas or the Pseudo-Hecateaus fragments. Cf. the anti-idol comments of Pseudo-Hecateaus Fragments 1=Josephus, Ap. 1.183-204; Holladay 1.313] and frag. 3=Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 5.14.113.1-2=Holladay 1.319], and the effort to find common ground both through the mouthpiece of Hecateaus (a figure who had written favorably of the Jews), and even via him through Sophocles (these verses were quoted constantly by later apologists; see Doran in Charlesworth OTP 2.912.

2. The Epistula does not make much of the link between idolatry and immorality. The connection between idolatry and fornication is as old as Isaiah and Exodus, and is repeated at every opportunity in later texts, including one the Epistula seems clearly to have drawn from: Wis 14:12: “For the idea of making idols was the beginning of fornication.” Rabbinic texts designated idolatry, adultery, homicide as three sins that one must die rather than commit.

There are perhaps notes of disapproval of the pagans’ general level of morality (line 41: "your lascivias", lines 54-55: it is "bodily pleasure" that causes the soul to forget its origin). But the criticism is muted in comparison with much anti-idolatry polemic, and really only a version of the charge that their high-minded philosophical talk was shown to be empty by their undisciplined lives.


67 For the argument that copying is inherently dishonest and inferior (so Plato), cf. Lactantius, Inst. div. 2.18.3: "Anything copied must be false; nothing can ever be called true which fakes the truth by dye and imitation."

68 Images bring no benefit to gods (Josephus, Ap. 2.75, cf. 2.190-91: god is self-sufficient); gods do not desire sacrifice (Varro apud Lactantius Adv. nat. 7.1)

69 See Gillian Clark, "Augustine's Varro and Pagan Monotheism," 181-201, in Monotheism between Pagans and Christians. On the reception of Varro,

70 Exod 34:15; Isa 1:21; Jer 3:3.

71 Cf. T. Reub. 4.6; Tertullian, Idol. 1.4; Bindner, "Jewish-Christian," 203n68. Pseudo-Philo, LAB makes idolatry the root of all evil; see Murphy, Rewriting, 252; for the same idea in rabbinic thought, see Sanders, Paul and Palestinian, 113, 134-35, 174).

72 Tertullian, Idol. 1; Patientia 5.21; Spect. 2.9; Pudic. 5.5.

2.1: Similarly, the Epistula does not address the immorality of the content of pagan myths—a favorite topic of Philo and of the Christian apologists (Aristides Apol. 8), taken by them from the criticisms of Greek\textsuperscript{74} and Roman philosophers (cf. Varro fr. 19 Cardauns; Augustine, Civ. 4.32; fr. 7-11; Augustine, Civ. 6.5-6).

Twice the Epistula speaks of myths as "incoherent" and deceptive (fabulae: line 21; 57-58: fabulas non cohaerentes); but it does not criticize them as blasphemous for depicting incestuous couplings, abductions, and the like. The former resembles Tertullian's (and others') charge that the philosophers' ideas about the gods are inconsistent (incerta and varia); but where is the parallel to Tertullian's charge that the poets' inventions are indigna and turpia?\textsuperscript{75}

There is nothing about theriolatry, a favorite object of scorn among Jews as well as among Greeks and Romans (see references and literature in Barclay 2007:130-31n777.). The absence of the word superstitio is perhaps surprising (Tacitus, Hist. 1.11, of Egypt: superstitio et lascivia discordem et moebilem, "contentious and mercurial because of superstition and licence."(trans. Naphtali Lewis, Life in Egypt); Arist. 138.

3. More broadly, text never addresses any practical problems associated with idols; there is nothing "halakhic." This may be as much a function of its genre—that it is more or less a philosophical treatise (and the Wisdom of Solomon as well as other Jewish fragments are equally devoid of concrete questions); but nonetheless, we might contrast the Epistula's more abstract debating mode with the attention given in Tertullian (especially De Idololatria and De Spectaculis)\textsuperscript{76} and Mishnah Avodah Zarah to very concrete questions about conduct. May one have figurative shapes on faucets?\textsuperscript{77} Is it permitted to attend the games?\textsuperscript{78} Handling wine? What about attending the baths? What decorations are suitable on clothing? Can one enunciate the names of the gods, "which conversation requires us to say" (Tertullian, Idol. 20.2)?\textsuperscript{79} What about doing business that might foster idolatry among pagans?\textsuperscript{80} Such concerns are conspicuously absent from the Epistula, even though they are addressed in both Christian and Jewish texts in similar language. (Stéphanie E. Binder has demonstrated that on such matters Jewish and Christian responses in Carthage indicate significant contact.)

\textsuperscript{74} A complaint as old as Xenophanes (fr. DK 21B11; Sextus Empiricus, Against the Professors 9.193). Josephus, Apion, 2.239-40, noting that Greeks admired for their wisdom had all censured the poets for their false ideas about the gods.

\textsuperscript{75} See Ames, "Roman Religion," 463.

\textsuperscript{76} For a survey of Tertullian's view of pagan practices, see Cecilia Ames, "Roman Religion in the Vision of Tertullian," Pages 457-71 in A Companion to Roman Religion.

\textsuperscript{77} Tertullian, Idol. 15.6; (Tosefta Av. Zar. 6.5-6); Tertullian's norms and the Mishnah see T. D. Barnes, Tertullian, Oxford, 1985, 85-115.

\textsuperscript{78} Here Tertullian and the rabbis in fact cite the same text: Psa 1:1. See Binder, "Jewish-Christian Contacts," 204-205; cf. Didascalia Apostolorum 13.

\textsuperscript{79} Bindner, "Jewish-Christian Relations," 206-212 (addressing this as it pertains also to swearing by the gods and teaching or studying classical texts that name the gods).

\textsuperscript{80} Bindner, "Jewish-Christian Relations," 212-16. The bulk of Tertullian's Idol. is taken up with questions of professional life rather than worship.
4. The absence of any demonology is noteworthy. There are no mentions of demons as the
source of idolatry or the beneficiaries of the offerings made to idols. These are frequent in
Christian admonitions about idols and their sanctuaries, with older Jewish inspiration (1 En.
19.1; Jub 11.4; Deut 32:17; Psa 95:5 LXX; Isa 65:3 LXX; Pseudo-Philo, LAB 25.9; Test. Job 3-
4). Ginzberg notes that there was nothing of this idea in older rabbinic texts. But cf. GenRab
23.6 which connects worshipping images, human's loss of the imago dei, and susceptibility to
demons.

4.1: The Epistula does not engage with more sophisticated Greek or Roman defenses of the
useful function of representation in cult. The author of this work never entertains the outlook
expressed by Varro (Ant. div. fr. 225 Cardauns=Augustine, Civ. Dei 7.5), Dio Chrysostom (Or.
12.46-47), Celsus (Origen, Cels. 7.62), or Porphyry (Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων apud Eusebius, Praep. Ev.
3.7.1-3), and similar thinkers, who insisted that, while images ought not to be confounded with
that which was truly worthy of worship, representations could still helpfully direct the mind to
higher things (contrast Athenagoras, Leg. 18).

In fact, it seems to be precisely this rather rarified discussion that was addressed in Mekhilita de
Rabbi Ishmael, Ba-ḥodesh 6 (see Azzan Yadin, Rabban 149-59). Yair Furstenberg and Azzan
Yadin have demonstrated that the view of idolatry in late second- and early third-century CE
rabbinic texts "corresponds to features of Greco-Roman paganism, with which it was familiar
and alongside which it was created." Cf. also

81 E.g. Tatian, Or. 8, 12; Athenagoras, Leg. 24-25; Minucius Felix, Oct. 26.7-8.
82 Geffcken (Zwei Griechischen, 221) notes that there was no striking differences between Christian and
pagan views of the ways demons interacted with idols; cf. Porphyry, Abst. 2.37-43. Tertullian, Spect. 10,
13, 26 (here the demon even explains that he entered his unfortunate host because she had come into his
territory by approaching his shrine!); Jakobi 52 notes the (in fact superficial) resemblance between
Jerome's language of demons "attending" idols (in Isa. 8.26.13 (CC 73 pg. 336.6f)): daemones idolis
assidentes; Épist. 92.2.3 (CSEL 55, pg. 149n27) daemones ... adsidentes aris) and the Epistula's chiding
remark that humans "attend to" or "sit by" idols).
83 Cf. Maximus of Tyre, Or. 2 and 11: both tracts strongly deny the possibility of representing the divine,
but allow the retention of conventional names for the gods, and concede that that the visible celestial
bodies give guidance. On the utility of a statue, cf. Plotinus Enneads 4.3.11.
84 Arnobius, Adv. nat. 6.17 allows his pagan interlocutor to articulate a distinction. It is in
discussion with this more sophisticated defense of images that Augustine warns about
demons: En. Ps. 96.11: "Suppose some debater stands forth, one who seems learned, and says: 'I
do not worship the stone. I merely venerate what I see, but I worship him whom I do not see.'
Who is this? 'An invisible numen,' he says, 'that presides over that idol.' People who defend the
use of images in this way seem learned only to themselves: they may not worship idols, but they
still worship demons" (cited from Ando, Matter, 32).
85 Yair Furstenberg ("The Rabbinic View of Idolatry and the Roman Political Conception of Divinity"
Journal of Religion 90 (2010) 335-366) insists that the view of idolatry in late second- and early third-
century CE rabbinic texts "corresponds to features of Greco-Roman paganism, with which it was familiar
and alongside which it was created" (336). Rabbinic awareness of philosophical critiques of idolatry is
also identified by Abraham Wasserstein, "Rabban Gamliel and Proclus of Naucratis," Zion 45 (1980) 257-
67 (who thinks the "Proclus" of m. Avodah Zarah 3.4 is the philosopher); and Azzan Yadin, "Rabban
Gamaliel, Aphrodite's Bath and the Question of Pagan Monotheism," Jewish Quarterly Review 96 2
(2006) 149-79 (who sees awareness of subtle philosophical assessments of pagan worship); Halberthal
167-68.
Indeed, the Epistula does not address worship of the elements (or stars or sun, etc.) at all, often a theme. (Contrast Wis 13:1-9; Philo, Decal. 52-64; Vit. cont. 3-5; Apocalypse of Abraham 7; m. Avod. Zar 4.7; Aristides, Apol. 4-6), unless there is the faintest echo of such a charge in the Epistula's praise of God's creation of the various components of the world.

But none of these passages is apropos, for they are not about
5. Among its familiar litany of criticisms, the Epistula also includes two less common arguments. First, it claim that idols are the consecration of human emotions. "Your god is, in fact, the exertion of your unhealthy feeling and not of piety." When people make statues of soldiers or women, the Epistula asserts, they simply "consecrate" their "own zeal or languor." This calls to mind Wis 14:15: "For a father, consumed with grief at an untimely bereavement, made an image of his child, who had been suddenly taken from him." But although there is here a reference to the father's "grief," the talk is not so explicitly of the consecration of the emotion; he makes a statue of his son, not his sadness. Tatian (Or. 19) accuses people of turning to the oracles of the relevant gods out of their lust for war or sex. Cf. Josephus, Ap. 2.248: "They have even deified Terror and Fear, nay, Frenzy and Deceit (which of the worst passions have they not transfigured into the nature and form of a god?), and have induced cities to offer sacrifices to the more respectable members of this pantheon" (trans. Thackeray, LCL).

Second, it criticizes the sacrifice of animals in language that seems to uphold animals' inherent dignity as creatures of God (lines 70-76). To my knowledge, this passage has not been mentioned as a problem for the putative Jewish authorship of the Epistula. Although the Epistula does not categorically condemn animal sacrifice, the rhetoric is more at home with late antique authors such as Porphyry who did just that. (Porphyry had a range of arguments against sacrifice in the cult (Abst. 2.11-30). He actually praises the Jews of Syria, who, he says, do not eat their sacrifices, but burn them up "pouring over them much honey and wine … so that not even the All-Seeing should be a spectator of this terrible act" (Abst. 2.26). Porphyry (Abst. 2.26.5) also links the rejection of cult images and of sacrifice.)

My question is, do we know of Jewish comments of this sort?

Cf. E. E. Urbach, "Rabbinical Laws of Idolatry in the Second and Third Centuries," 151-93, and Saul Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950) "Rabbinic Polemics against Idolatry" 115-27, who argued that idol worship simply was not a pressing problem. Lieberman writes that the sort of polemics against idol worship found in Christian apologists "is almost not to be found in rabbinic literature" (116) since idolatry was not relevant to most Jews by this time, and they were not trying to win converts in the third and fourth centuries (120-21).

Wisdom's laconic explanation is given a more elaborate treatment Firmicus Maternus (De errore profanarum religionum 6), who explains the cult of Liber arose because, when Liber was killed as an infant, his disconsolate father, Jupiter, had an image of him made. Cf. also Fulgentius, Mitilogiarum 1.1, and Mekilta Pisha on Exod. 12:30 (Lauterbach 1.100): "When the first-born of one of the Egyptians died, they would make an image (eikonion) of him and set it up in the house" (quoted from Winston, Wisdom of Solomon, p. 276, with further examples).
Sib. Or. 4.27-29: "They will reject all temples when they see them; altars too, useless foundations of dumb stones (and stone statues and handmade images) defiled with blood of animate creatures, and sacrifices of four-footed animals." 87 (quoted approvingly by Justin, Orat. 16, in criticizing idolatry.)

Hypoth. mentions caring for animals.

There were certainly Christian criticisms of sacrifice—but is there anything like this description of the animals' capacity for love and knowledge to evoke the injustice of slaughtering them? (88) Arnobius (Nat. 7.9) points out that animals are morally innocent when compared with humans, and that they share plenty in common with humans, including loving their offspring.

Criticism of animal sacrifice:

The most sustained criticism of animal sacrifice is found in the Pseudo-Clementines,89 and this seem to cohere with reports of Ebionite rejection of sacrifice.90 And according to Gospel of the


87 But there were Jewish voices that would have disapproved of the slaughter of animals. Cf. Philo on the Essenes (Quod Omn. 75); cf. Jean Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity (John A. Baker, trans.; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), 371-72: Daniélou pg. 57 states too baldly that this is like the Essenes' "condemnation of the bloody sacrifices of the Temple, of which they substituted the praise of the lips." cf. 60-61

88 There were certainly Christian groups were opposed to the consumption of animal flesh, but the moral logic behind that seems to have been different. The Elkesaites were also said to be vegetarian and to reject sacrifice (Epiphanius, Pan. 19.3); see W. Brandt, "Elkesaites," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (New York: Scribner, 1914), 5.262-269; A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reinkink, Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects (Leiden: Brill, 1973) 54-77. Epiphanius describes the Nazareans as "Jews" who "would not offer sacrifices or eat meat" (18.1.3-4). For the Priscillianists, see Ferreiro, Alberto, "De prohibitione carnis: meat abstention and the Priscillianists," Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum 11 (2007): 464-78.

89 Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.37 (the place for God's sacrifice is wisdom); 1.39.2 (Latin): "... lest they think that with the ceasing of the sacrifices remission of sins could not be effected for them... they might remain in immortality, purified not through the blood of animals but through the purification of God's wisdom", so Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.54.1 (Christ would abolish sacrifices); 1.64.1 (God's anger over sacrifices continuing after "the time of sacrifices has already expired") (see Jones, Ancient, 148-49). Cf. Pseudo-Clem. Hom 3.26.5; 3.52.1).

Ebionites, Christ said: "I came to abolish sacrifices, and if you do not cease from sacrificing the wrath will not cease from you (ap. Epiphanius, Pan. 30.16.5).

7. The Epistula insists on the soul's heavenly origin and destination, but does not exploit this claim for perception of the divine. Contrast Justin, Dial. 4, who affirms (like the Epistula) that the soul is "divine and immortal," but adds that because of this kinship with the divine, it is capable of perceiving God (the Epistula, by contrast, does nothing epistemological with the soul's heavenly origin). Philo, Plant. 19-20; Seneca, Epist. mor. 41; etc.

8. no criticism of polytheism. Contrast Arist. 134. Perhaps because of the general victory of monotheism. The absence of "one" god, or "living god" is surprising.

In conclusion: …..

If it is a Christian product, a question that remains to be answered is why has it so studiously avoided references to Christian texts. In the case of works with pre-Christian settings, a Christian author might conceivably have sought to conceal his or her identity in the interest of verisimilitude, although even in those cases, "… the great bulk of Christian writings, including pseudepigraphy, are not reticent about their faith." All the more would we expect Christian writings to be used in the case of a work invoking Seneca, since no anachronism would have been involved.

(It is true that some Christian apologists limited their appeals to the Bible so as to argue with pagans on their own terms. An author such as Minucius Felix made very few references to scripture, and then only in terms most intelligible to interlocutors (Octavius 34:5 de divinis praedicationibus prophetarum; 35:1: de oraculis prophetarum; see Clarke, Octavius, 24-26, 347n557). But the Epistula differs strikingly from these authors in that it is strewn with close allusions to Scripture—just not to Christian scripture. Furthermore, the problem of the soul's divinity and immortality is "resolved" by quoting Genesis 2.
The *incipit* remains a puzzle. Although the text we have is not epistolary and does not present Seneca or "Anna's" in any clear way, it should be remembered that the text is a fragmentary, and parts not transmitted might have mentioned these figures. After all, the *Apology* of Aristides is presented in *Barlaam and Josaphat* as a speech of Nachor. Extended abstract discussions of God preserved in the slenderest epistolary framework in the *Letter of Aristeas* (Josephus). Perhaps even more suggestive, a Jewish critique of idols and paganism has been taken up in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* 4-6 as a debate between Clement and Apion (Simon, *Verus Israel*, 49-50). The use of such a source in the Pseudo-Clementine literature can suggest a way of imagining how the *Epistula* might have been drawn from a work called "Letter of Anna to Seneca": In this section,

1. there is a debate that includes an infamous critic of Judaism, namely, Apion.\(^94\)
2. this debate touches on content similar to the *Epistula* (and other portions of the Pseudo-Clementine literature treat virtually every point made in the *Epistula*).
3. the debate as we have it is being reported in an epistolary framework, as the writing of Clement to James. Yet obviously that framework is artificial and has nothing to do with *Hom.* 4-6. If only *Homilies* 4-6 were found excerpted under the title "Letter of Clement to James," we would be baffled by the series of debates between Clement and Apion. Might something comparable have occurred in the case of the *Epistula*?\(^95\)
4. some of this material, which originated in Greek, was transmitted in Latin, albeit in different form.

It seems at least possible that the lack of fit between the content of the *Epistula*, which sounds like one side of a debate in the presence of allies and adversaries, and the *incipit*, could be explained if our fragmentary text is excerpted from an "epistle" in which the author and addressee were more clearly identified.\(^95\)\(^96\)\(^97\)

Hilhorst 161 suggested that only an exploration of "the possible pagan, Jewish and Christian backgrounds" of the *Epistula* would determine whether it truly was, as Hilhorst suggested, a Christian work. Jakobi's commentary certainly demonstrates that, save for the absence of references to the NT, there are certainly ample parallels in the Latin apologists. Yet since Jakobi

\(^94\) For a summary of the ancient comments about Apion, see Barclay 2007: 170-71n7.

\(^95\) Divjak and Hilhorst mark a shift from seeing the text as Jewish to seeing it as Christian. Rutgers's study, although it postdates Hilhorst, does not seem to have been aware of their proposals, and cites primarily the studies of Bischoff, Wischmeyer, and Cracco Ruggini. Bart Ehrman 2013:523-26 finds the arguments of Hilhorst and Jakobi utterly convincing.

\(^96\) Divjak and Hilhorst mark a shift from seeing the text as Jewish to seeing it as Christian. Rutgers's study, although it postdates Hilhorst, does not seem to have been aware of their proposals, and cites primarily the studies of Bischoff, Wischmeyer, and Cracco Ruggini. Bart Ehrman 2013:523-26 finds the arguments of Hilhorst and Jakobi utterly convincing.

\(^97\) So at an earlier phase of investigation, Marcus Deufert: "Ob sich der Verfasser dabei zum christlichen oder jüdischen Glauben bekennen, ist dem unvermittelt abbrechenden Text nicht zu entnehmen." (Marcus Deufert "Zum Text des 'Anna'-Briefes (Ms. 17 Erzbischöfliche Diözesanbibliothek in Köln)." *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 17 (1991): pp. 249-50 [here p. 249]
does not note the equally striking parallels from Philo, Josephus, and other Jewish texts, it gives the impression that the Epistula only resembles the Latin apologists.

A critique of idolatry and the pretensions of philosophy that draws explicitly on Jewish scripture, yet has no equally clear allusions to Christian scripture, no distinctively Christian theologoumena, and no anti-Jewish polemic might have originated a Jewish apologetical work after all. At the very least, a verdict of non liquet would seem more in keeping with the data than the claim that the work is patently a fifth-century Christian pseudepigraphon in the name of Seneca.
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[Blurb from other speaker at SBL: The idea of Jewish Latin or, perhaps better, Latin used by Jews has languished since its proposal by Blondheim in his major work Les Parlers Judéo-Romains at la Vetus Latina of 1925. This has largely been because Jewish communities were not considered demographically sufficient to sustain any significantly distinct linguistic or literary activity in the Latin-speaking West. I argue however that recent archaeological and toponymic work, and the re-assessment of certain texts, including my own research on the Epistola Anne ad Senecam indicate a substantial Jewish community in the Latin West at all social levels including the highest, and that this would urge a reassessment of the historiographic and literary perspective of Latin OT pseudepigrapha and indeed the Vetus Latina; that such texts may be, or may be dependent, on Jewish translations, as evidence of which I present the hitherto overlooked Cassinese 557 Psalter.]

Günter Stemberger (in Saebø, *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, 584): "It is often very difficult to ascertain whether such contacts [converging exegesis] are due to an exchange with Jewish teachers of the period, or are caused by the biblical text, similar mentality and comparable modes of interpretation." *Ibid.* 585-86 on the very limited evidence of contacts in the Latin West.
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Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, 272-73: Throughout the African region, the theory of a strong Jewish contact and legacy is still unproven. It touches on a great uncertainty. West of Rome, in North Africa, Gaul and Spain, there is no sound evidence that there were any settled communities of Jews at all in the Apostolic age. There are a few incidental hints that this silence is significant." [his note 23 here: citing simply W. P. Bowers, *JTS* 1975:395; Barnes, *Tertullian* (1971) 282-85, 329-31; we could add Schindlers, *TRE* 1, 643 (?)
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Binder 2010. Stéphanie E. Binder, "Jewish-Christian Contacts in the Second and Third Centuries C.E.? The Case of Carthage; Tertullian and the Mishnah's Views on Idolatry," 187-230, who mounts a sustained argument that there was considerable social interaction between Jews and Christians in Carthage; 99 that they shared Latin as a common language100 (see her references to scholars of this view on pg. 220, including Horbury); and that Tertullian, in De Idololatria (as well as other works touching on idolatry), exhibits awareness of the Jewish treatment of the same questions as found, above all, in m. Abod. Zar.
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[From Joel Marcus]

For the contrast of the "true God" as an expression evoking anti-idolatry discourse, see 1 John 5:20-21, the discussion of Joel Marcus, "pg. 161-62), and the evidence for this epithet being used in anti-idolatry contexts by See Griffith, Keep Yourselves, 59-60, 80-1, citing 2 Chron 15:3-16; Isa 65:3-11; 3 Mace 6:11; Liv. Pro. 21:8-11; Jos. Asen. 11:7-11; Sib. Or. 1:20-22; 3:43-47; Philo, Embassy to Gaius 367; Special Laws 1.332; Preliminary Studies 159-60; 1 Thess 1:9 (1 quote this from Marcus).
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