JOSEPHUS (PERSON
Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary, vol. 3, 981–98

A 1st-century Jewish politician, soldier, and historian, whose writings constitute important sources for our understanding of biblical history and of the political history of Roman Palestine in the 1st century C.E.

Josephus was born in 37 C.E. and was given the Hebrew name Joseph ben Mattathias. His mother was a descendant of the Hasmonean family that had ruled Jerusalem a century earlier, and by birthright he was a priest. In Jerusalem he received a superb education, and at the age of 27 (in 64 C.E.) he led a delegation to the court of the Roman emperor Nero. Two years later he was pressed to serve as the general of the Jewish forces in Galilee in the revolt against Rome. He was captured and afterwards became a Roman citizen and pensioner of the Flavian emperors Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. He is most widely known by the Roman name he then acquired, Flavius Josephus (or simply "Josephus").

In Rome Josephus resided in an apartment within the emperor's house and devoted much of his time to writing. In part his works were addressed to his fellow Jews, justifying to them not only Roman conduct during the Jewish War, but also his own personal conduct in switching loyalties. However, his writings were also designed to justify Jewish culture and religion to an interested and sometimes sympathetic Roman audience. The earliest of his extant writings is the *Bellum Judaicarum* (or *Jewish War*), which was apparently drafted initially in Aramaic and then translated into Greek 5 to 10 years after the 70 C.E. destruction of Jerusalem. His second work, *Antiquitates Judaicae* (or *Jewish Antiquities*), was published more than a decade later; it was much longer, and recounts Jewish history from creation to the Jewish War, and contains some valuable historical information. His last two works, probably published shortly before his death, include the *Vita* (or *Life*), an autobiography intended primarily to defend his conduct during the Jewish War 30 years earlier, and *Contra Apionem* (or *Against Apion*), an apologetic defense of Judaism against a wave of anti-Semitism emanating from Alexandria. Josephus probably died ca. 100 C.E., several years after Trajan had become emperor in Rome. His writings, while generally ignored by fellow Jews, were preserved by Christians not only because they chronicled generally and so well the "time between the testaments," but also because they contained specific references to John the Baptist, Jesus of Nazareth, and Jesus' brother James.

A. Life

Josephus is the author of the first autobiography that has come down to us from antiquity, but this work *(Life)* is for the most part a defense of his mission as a general in Galilee and contains few other details about his life. Some scholars believe that the bulk of its content was actually written shortly after the war itself—prior to the publication of his *Jewish War* (ca. 75–79 C.E.)—but that it was revised, supplemented, and updated prior to its publication ca. 95 C.E. The only pagan writers who do refer to events in the life of Josephus—the 2d-century Suetonius (*Vespasian* 5.6) and Appian (fragment 17) and the 3d-century Dio Cassius (66.1)—mention only his prediction that the Flavian Vespasian would become emperor (though there are slight discrepancies in these accounts). Josephus is never mentioned in the Talmudic corpus, unless he is the anonymous philosopher in Rome whose aid was solicited by four rabbis intent on persuading Domitian to annul his earlier decision to exterminate the Jews of the Roman Empire (*Der. Er. Rab.* 5).

Josephus (*Life* 1 §5) indicates that he was born in the first year of the reign of Gaius Caligula (37 C.E.). He also says that he was descended on both his parents' sides from the first of the 24 courses of priests and, on his mother's side, from the royal Hasmoneans (*Life* 1 §2). Consequently, it has even been suggested that Josephus may have had ambitions to be not only high priest, but also king of Judea, though the fact that his opponents apparently never mentioned such ambitions militates against such a view.

The first event which Josephus mentions about his life occurred when, at the age of 14 (*Life* 2 §9), the chief priests and leaders of Jerusalem constantly came to him for information about the laws. The

motif of the precocious youngster who amazes his teachers is, however, commonplace, being found also in the biographies of Moses, Homer, Aeschines, Alexander the Great, Apollonius of Rhodes, Augustus, Ovid, Nicolaus of Damascus, Apollonius of Tyana, and Jesus. Likewise, the statement (*Life* 2 §10–12) that Josephus spent time (from the ages of 16 to 19) with the various sects of Jews (Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes) in order to select the best is similar to the motif found in the lives of Nicolaus of Damascus, Apollonius of Tyana, Justin, and Galen. Josephus also says that he spent three years with an otherwise unknown hermit named Bannus, but there is a problem in the text, since Josephus says that he was 19 when he completed both his experimentation with the sects and his sojourn with Bannus. Josephus then decided to join the Pharisees, though one would have expected him to favor the Sadducees, who were more closely affiliated with the priests and were more conservative than the Pharisees. But apparently Josephus realized that his ambitions would be better served by joining the Pharisees, since they were more popular with the masses (*Ant* 18.1.3 §15).

Josephus is silent about his activities between the ages of 19 and 26, but we may conjecture that it was particularly during these years that he made great progress in the study of Greek language and literature. In the year 64, when he was only 27, he was entrusted with the very delicate mission of securing the release of some priests who were imprisoned in Rome (*Life* 3 §13). Josephus' success was due to his resourcefulness in obtaining the help both of Aliturus, a Jewish actor in Nero's court, and of Nero's mistress, Poppaea Sabina, who was a "sympathizer" with Judaism (perhaps a so-called "semi-proselyte"). The fact that the emperor gave some gifts to Josephus (whereas we would have expected Josephus to send gifts to the emperor) could be explained most readily if we assume that Nero hoped thereby to persuade Josephus to use his influence to defuse the impending Jewish revolt against Rome. We do not know whether Josephus attempted such a mission, but in any case the revolt did break out two years later.

When the revolt did occur, the revolutionary council appointed Josephus to serve as general in Galilee, clearly the most important theater of the war since the Romans, who were based in Syria, were almost certain to strike there first in their march toward Jerusalem. It is remarkable that Josephus should have been chosen when he was a mere 29 years old and (as far as we know) without any military experience. Indeed, Josephus himself apparently has two contradictory accounts of this appointment. In the first (*JW* 2.20.3 §562–68), written apparently sometime between 75 and 79 (i.e., within a decade of the revolt), he indicates that he was named to conduct the war by the revolutionaries after they had won over to their side the moderates, whether by persuasion or by force. In the *Life* (4 §17), published approximately two decades later, Josephus declares that the coalition of Jewish leaders, who favored pacification, appointed him with the intention that he would try to induce the rebels to fight only in self-defense, whereas actually they hoped that the Roman general, Cestius Gallus, would prevail. Especially incriminating is Josephus' statement that he declined to give grain to the revolutionary leader John of Gischala since he intended to keep it either for his own use or *for the Romans* (*Life* 13 §72). If Josephus had really been sincere in opposing the Romans, we may suggest that he should have followed the model of the Maccabees in their war against the Syrian Greeks two centuries earlier and fought like a guerrilla. His decision instead to remain in Jotapata played to the Romans' strength, which was siege warfare. Moreover, if and when things seemed hopeless, he should have retreated toward Jerusalem and joined his forces with those defending that city, which was much better fortified than Jotapata.

The later account (in the *Life*) would appear to correct the earlier one (in *JW*); and Josephus could afford to tell the truth, since now he was famous and honored. In defecting to the Romans, he was merely following the wishes of the council which had appointed him. One possible way of reconciling the two versions is to say that initially Josephus sincerely attempted to fight against Rome, but that when he saw that it was hopeless, he went over to the Roman side. The fact that upon his surrender to the Romans at Jotapata he received a tract of land outside Jerusalem, some sacred books (presumably Torah scrolls), the liberation of some friends, Roman citizenship, lodging in the former palace of the Roman general Vespasian, and a pension would indicate that he had done something significant to ingratiate himself with the Romans. His prediction that Vespasian would become emperor has often been compared with that of Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai's prediction (*Git*Ω. 56a–b); however, the two should be differentiated, since Johanan asked and received nothing for himself. That two people

independently might have made the same prediction does not seem implausible in view of the fact that Vespasian was clearly the most experienced Roman general of the time; indeed, Josephus (*JW* 6.5.4 §312), Suetonius (*Vespasian* 4), and Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.13) all indicate that there was a prediction in the air that someone from Judea would become ruler of the world at that time.

Moreover, it is hard to believe that it was by mere chance that Josephus and another of his men were the last two who survived the suicide pact at Jotapata; it seems more likely, as the Slavonic version of *JW* (3.8.7 §391) would have it, that Josephus had carefully manipulated the lots. His action is hardly excused by the fact that Josephus was not alone in siding with the Romans (the Jewish king Agrippa II also did so) or that he felt that he had to survive in order to write the history of the period and in order to defend the Jews against anti-Semitic attacks. On the other hand, Josephus may have been sincerely convinced first, that the war was a terrible mistake, since an independent state was hardly a sine qua non for Judaism; second, that the Jews had been given considerable privileges by the Romans; and, third, that they were well on their way to converting the Empire to Judaism. If the revolutionary council had indeed been sincere in prosecuting the war, it should have made a greater effort to enlist the support of Jewish communities outside Palestine, especially in Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, and Babylonia (each of which had an estimated million Jews). It should also have attempted to entice the Parthians, the traditional and often successful opponent of the Romans, to coordinate the attack and to induce various other discontented rebel tribes to coordinate their revolts. However, the fact that we do not have the accounts of Josephus and his opponents, such as Justus of Tiberias, means that we have a one-sided view; yet the fact that Josephus himself did not destroy his own self-incriminating record leads us to believe in its essential truthfulness. And even if we did have Justus' work, there is no guarantee that it would be more reliable than that of Josephus; after all, Justus could hardly have served for so many years as court secretary to Agrippa II, a puppet of the Romans, unless he, too, had been a lackey of the Romans. Indeed, Josephus and Justus seem to have been rivals precisely because they were so similar in their outlook.

B. Other Works

1. *The Jewish War.* In the introduction to his *Jewish War* (= *JW*), Josephus, following the example of his model, Thucydides, presents a raison d'être for his work by vehemently criticizing his predecessors (none of whom is extant) for their inaccuracies, their bloated rhetoric, and their prejudice. He declares that he composed his work originally in his ancestral language—presumably Aramaic (though some have suggested that it was in Hebrew)—to be sent to the barbarians of the upper country (Babylonia and Parthia) apparently as a warning for them not to repeat the mistake of clashing with the Roman Empire (*JW* 1. Proem 1 §3). Not a single fragment of this Aramaic/Hebrew version has come down to us, presumably because of the bitterness felt by the Jews toward Josephus, whom they regarded as a despicable traitor. But the very title of his work, "Concerning the Jewish War," betrays that it was written from the point of view of the Romans (cf. other Roman works such as "Concerning the Punic War" and "Concerning the Gallic War"). Josephus himself, with the help of assistants, then proceeded to translate it into Greek. This help must have been considerable since very few Aramaisms or Hebraisms remain in our Greek text (which is written in an excellent Greek style, far superior to that of *Ant,* which was completed more than a decade later).

The date of the composition of *JW* has usually been given as the end of Vespasian's reign or the beginning of Titus' reign (ca. 79), since it has a negative attitude toward Alienus Caecina, who, after originally deserting to Vespasian, was put to death by Titus for conspiracy (*JW* 4.11.2–3 §634–44). There seems reason to believe, however, that the 7th and last book of *JW* was composed toward the end of the century during the reign of Domitian, inasmuch as it shows adulation for Domitian (7.4.2 §85–88; there is almost total disregard for him in the first six books) and inasmuch as the rate of elision of final vowels is also markedly different. The book is decidedly incoherent, and parts of it may even have been written in the reign of Nerva or in the early years of Trajan's reign at the end of the century. Moreover, Book 6, culminating in the poignant account of the destruction of the temple, provides an admirable close to the work.

As sources, Josephus, of course, drew upon his own experience as a general in Galilee and later as an adviser to Titus. He also utilized the memoirs of Vespasian and Titus (*Life* 65 §342, 358); it is

perhaps to these that Josephus owes his generally accurate topographical information. In addition, Josephus indicates that King Agrippa II orally had provided additional information. Though Josephus agrees with the Talmudic rabbis in condemning the revolutionaries, in stressing the internal division among the Jews, and in describing the terrible famine that afflicted the inhabitants of Jerusalem, he mentions by name only one of them, Rabban Gamaliel; and there is no direct indication of his indebtedness to Talmudic tradition concerning the war. In particular, he disagrees with the rabbis when he omits their mention of the courage of the Jewish captives and when he declares that Titus urged that the temple be spared (*JW* 6.4.3 §241); whereas the rabbis (in agreement with the 4th-century Christian historian Sulpicius Severus) declare that Titus favored its destruction. Josephus' bias may be indicated by the fact that he ignores altogether the fact that during the war many Romans sided with the Jewish revolutionaries (a fact even the Roman historian Dio Cassius noted).

As to the causes of the war, Josephus completely neglects the messianic element (as he does the messianic prophecies in Daniel), broad hints of which are to be found in Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.13) and Suetonius (*Vespasian* 4). Moreover, inasmuch as the other two great revolts against Rome (115–117 and 132–135) were messianic and inasmuch as even Josephus himself describes the appearance of Menahem, the rebel leader, as resembling that of a king (*JW* 2.17.8 §434)—hence like a political messiah—we may guess that there was indeed a messianic aspect to the revolt.

Josephus neglected two other causes of the war. One was the increasing power within Rome of anti-Semitic freedmen of Greek origin who resented the idea of a Jewish "nation within a nation." The second was the pagan resentment of the tremendous Jewish success in winning converts to Judaism, which seemed well on its way to becoming the major religion of the Empire. We may also guess that Josephus, in his eagerness to be apologetic, chose to de-emphasize as a factor the dissension between Jews and non-Jews in Palestine. It has also been suggested that Josephus, who was himself descended from the Hasmoneans, suppressed the connection between them and the revolutionaries he despised. Moreover, like most ancient historians, Josephus pays little attention to the social and economic causes of the war, such as overpopulation, uneven distribution of land, and heavy taxation. In addition, Josephus assigns the blame for the war to one sect, the Fourth Philosophy; whereas the Jerusalem Talmud (*SÁabb.* 10.5.29b) ascribes the fall of the temple to the existence of no fewer than 24 sects. Finally, to judge from Josephus, the revolt was foolhardy; whereas actually it would have had a good chance of success if it had enlisted more support among Jews throughout the Empire and in Babylonia and had coordinated its efforts with those of the Parthians and various barbarian tribes.

The turning point of the war was the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. According to Josephus (*JW* 6.4.3 §241) Titus, in a meeting with his staff, urged that the temple be spared. However, although the 4th-century Christian historian Sulpicius Severus was clearly aware of Josephus' account, he, nevertheless, states that Titus decreed the destruction of the temple (*Chronica* 2.30.6–7). Inasmuch as Sulpicius Severus used Tacitus in the chapter just before this, it has been suggested that his source was a lost part of Tacitus' *Hist.* and that this, in turn, was based on a lost work of Antonius Julianus, who was actually present at Titus' council (*JW* 6.4.3 §238). Both the Talmud (*GitΩ.* 56b) and Dio Cassius (6.65) support Josephus' account; and the proem to the poem of Valerius Flaccus likewise seems to accord with it, since it speaks of Titus' conquest of Jerusalem "as he hurls the brands and spreads havoc in every tower," the most prominent building in Jerusalem being the temple. Moreover, Josephus seems to contradict himself when he states that it was Titus who ordered the city and the temple to be burned (*JW* 7.1.1 §1) and when he likewise declares that Titus captured and set fire to the temple (*Ant* 20.10.5 §250). One cannot therefore avoid the conclusion that in his main account of the destruction of the temple in *JW* Josephus attempted to whitewash Titus by stressing his clemency.

Josephus' spectacular account of the capture of Masada has been the subject of much scholarly debate. The recent excavations of the site by Yadin have, on the whole, confirmed Josephus' reliability; indeed, the very name of the Sicarii leader who defended the fortress, Ben-Jair, has been found inscribed on a potsherd. There are some discrepancies, however: (1) Josephus says that Herod's palace was on the W slope, whereas actually it is on the N slope; (2) he says that the columns of the palace were monolithic, whereas in actuality they were made up of several sections; (3) the Roman siege works are much more complicated than those mentioned by Josephus; (4)

the fact that some of the casement apartments were found burned while others were not contradicts Josephus' statement that all of them were burned; (5) Josephus says that the food of the defenders had been burned, whereas Yadin found that some of it had been preserved; (6) Josephus says that there were 960 who committed suicide, whereas Yadin found only 25 skeletons; (7) Yadin found 11 ostraca with names inscribed on them, whereas Josephus (*JW* 7.9.1 §395) says that 10 were chosen by lot for the gruesome task of killing the rest; and (8) Josephus makes no mention at all of the connection between the Sicarii of Masada and the Dead Sea sect, whereas the discovery of a scroll of liturgies based on the peculiar calendar of the Qumran sect strongly indicates a connection.

Of course, Josephus was not present at Masada; and he admits that his account is based on the evidence of a single woman who had managed to hide and thus to survive (*JW* 7.9.2 §404). We may also note that Josephus, who hardly admired the intellectual power of women, describes her as "superior in sagacity and training to most of her sex." Moreover, Josephus was so fiercely hated that he had to be careful of what he wrote. In addition, there must have been many Romans (and Jewish captives who had assisted them) who had participated in the siege who could challenge any misrepresentation made by Josephus. If in this account Josephus intended to raise the stature of the Roman commander, Flavius Silva, a member of the same imperial family which had adopted him, he could have done so much more effectively by depicting the Jewish defenders as fighting to the last man instead of committing suicide. Finally, Josephus declares that the Romans, upon entering Masada, acknowledged the greatness of the daring of the Sicarii, the nobility of their resolve, and their contempt for death (*JW* 7.9.2 §405–6). Josephus would have been loath to make such a statement in view of his negative evaluation of the Sicarii as among the most despicable of the five revolutionary groups (*JW* 7.8.1 §262). Therefore his account of the fall of Masada is all the more likely to be true.

Of course, the two speeches which Josephus puts into the mouth of Eleazar ben-Jair are artificial and belong to the tradition of most classical historians. In ben-Jair's second speech the presence of passages closely corresponding to Posidonius, Euripides, and particularly Plato (e.g., on the relationship of body and soul and on the nature of immortality, especially as couched in Platonic and Stoic phraseology) support the view that these speeches were penned in Josephus' scriptorium, presumably with the help of his Greek assistants. It would seem unusual for Eleazar ben-Jair, a member of a sect known for its extreme piety, to have such an intimate knowledge of Plato, especially since, as Josephus says, pious Jews were utterly antipathetic toward the study of other languages and literatures (*Ant* 20.12.1 §264). The propriety of suicide was much debated at this very time in Greek and Roman philosophical circles; and Josephus' discussion may well be directed toward this audience.

As to whether the suicide itself actually took place, it has been objected that the Sicarii, as pious Jews, must have realized that suicide would be a terrible sin according to Jewish law—technically, no less than murder—and that it could only be justified when one was certain that he would be forced to worship idols, commit murder, or engage in an illicit sexual act (all this was later codified in Jewish law, but none of it applied at Masada). As guerrillas, moreover, the Jews should have fought to the last man, especially since they were well armed and had plenty of water and food. However, we should note that the number of defenders could hardly have exceeded 200 to 300 (since the 967 people at Masada included women and children) and that the Sicarii were pious in their own peculiar way and followed their own Halakah, just as they did when they engaged in a raid on Passover (*JW* 4.7.2 §402), when such attacks would normally be prohibited. There was, moreover, a precedent for the mass suicide, namely, that at Gamala (*JW* 4.1.10 §79–81), where more than 5000 took their own lives. Finally, we must remember that the Sicarii were fanatics who were no longer acting rationally. It has been suggested that perhaps the Romans murdered the defenders and that Josephus attempted to cover up for them as he did for Titus in connection with the burning of the temple. But the fact that the Sicarii were admired by the Romans—a statement one would never expect from Josephus—would seem to militate against such a theory.

2. *The Jewish Antiquities.* Written about a decade after *JW,* Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (= *Ant*) sets out to survey the history of the Hebrew people from their biblical beginnings up to the time of the Jewish War of 66–70 C.E. Josephus' treatment of biblical episodes is noteworthy insofar as it raises questions about the type of biblical text he used and the type of interpretation he practiced. His treatment of post-biblical events is noteworthy because it sheds some

light on an otherwise poorly attested period. His treatment of 1st-century events is noteworthy because in some places it overlaps with the early chapters of *JW* and because it provides independent testimony to important NT persons and events.

a. The Biblical Period. Josephus' opening statement, that he will set forth the "precise details" of what is written in the Scriptures, "neither adding nor omitting anything," (*Ant* 1. Proem 2 §5) has occasioned much amazement, since he has modified the Bible, sometimes drastically, on almost every page. The question of the meaning of Josephus' statement is of great importance, since it involves the issue of how much liberty one was permitted in interpreting the Bible during this period. It is unsatisfactory to say that Josephus was counting on the ignorance of his readers since the Jews of the Diaspora certainly knew the LXX, which they believed to be divinely inspired and which differs drastically in many places from Josephus' paraphrase. Moreover, Pseudo-Longinus' (9.9) highly laudatory—and casual—paraphrase of Gen 1:3, 9, 10 in a work of literary criticism dating presumably from the 1st century C.E., shows that the LXX was well-known; the vast number of converts to Judaism during the two centuries before Josephus would seem to indicate that it was widely used by Jewish missionaries.

Others have suggested that the phrase "neither adding nor omitting anything" is a traditional and meaningless way of affirming one's accuracy, as may be seen by its use by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the 1st century and by Lucian in the 2d century. That Josephus' phrase is not necessarily to be taken literally would seem to be indicated by the fact that the gospel of Matthew uses similar language (in 5:17–18), even though portions of the law *were* in fact abolished by Jesus' disciples in his own lifetime.

Actually the phrase is taken from Deut 4:2: "You shall not add to the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." Josephus understood the phrase in the sense which is apparent from this verse and which accords with rabbinic exegesis; namely, that one is not permitted to add to or subtract from the *commandments* and that one is permitted latitude in interpreting only the narrative portions of the Pentateuch. An alternative suggestion is that Josephus included in "Scriptures" not only the written Bible but also Jewish tradition generally. This would imply that some of the midrashic interpretation of the Bible had been committed to writing by Josephus' time, since we find midrashic materials in such Hellenistic Jewish writers as Artapanus, Eupolemus, Ezekiel the tragedian, and Philo. While such a statement four decades ago would have been considered most unlikely (inasmuch as the earliest rabbinic midrashic commentaries on the Bible date from a century after Josephus', we now have midrashim among the Dead Sea Scrolls dating from the century *before* Josephus which he parallels at several points. To this may be added the midrashim in the work ascribed to Philo entitled *Biblical Antiquities,* which is apparently contemporaneous with *Ant*.

Moreover, there would seem to be a precedent for modifying the sacred LXX text which Josephus (*Ant* 1. Proem 3 §10) cites as justifying his presentation of biblical history to gentiles. Even the rabbis (*Meg.* 9a), in obvious praise, refer to the miraculous way in which the translation was accomplished, despite the fact that deliberate changes were made in the process of translation. The fact that three major recensions had emerged by the time of Jerome, despite the curse placed on those who ventured to add, or transpose, or subtract (*Let. Aris.* 306), shows that the curse was not taken too seriously.

When we examine how Josephus handles the actual biblical narrative, we find that he had two audiences in mind. The fact that he cited the LXX as a precedent for his work shows that he was directing his work to gentiles with apologetic intent, since that translation originally had been commissioned by King Ptolemy Philadelphus. Indeed, he specifically declares (*Ant* 1. Proem 2 §5) that his work was undertaken in the belief that the whole Greek world would find it worthy of attention. Again, at the very end of the work, he boasts that no one else would have been equal to the task of issuing so accurate a treatise for the Greeks (*Ant* 20.12.1 §262). On the other hand, we should also expect that Josephus would seek a Jewish audience for his work, since it would seem that the majority of the Jews in the Mediterranean world were Greek speaking; hence they would be a natural audience for his work. Indeed, that Josephus has a Jewish audiences in mind for his treatise is indicated by the fact that he highlights certain episodes—notably the incident of Israel's sin with the Midianite women (Num 25:1–9), which he expands greatly (*Ant* 4.6.7–12 §§131–35), and Samson's relations with foreign women (Judg 14:1–16; *Ant* 5.8.5–12 §§285–317)—in order to

combat the increasing assimilation of Jews with gentiles.

In this portion of his narrative, there are many details shared with his presumed contemporary Pseudo-Philo, apparently indicating a common source used by both (whether written or, more probably, oral). Josephus' tendency to give names and other such details which are missing in the Bible (e.g., the name of the man who inspired the building of the Tower of Babel [Nimrod], and the name of Pharaoh's daughter who adopted Moses [Thermuthis]) may be due to the influence of rabbinic midrashim. The same details are sometimes found in certain pseudepigraphic works such as *Jub.* and *L.A.B.* and in such sectarian works as the Samaritan Asatir and 1QapGen. In addition, Josephus seems to have employed a Hellenistic Jewish tradition. In particular the Hellenistic Jewish writers might have provided Josephus both with an excellent precedent for rewriting the Bible and with a stylistic model (though he does not cite their works as a forerunner for his own). This would have been especially true of Philo, who writes such excellent Greek. However, Josephus mentions Philo only once (*Ant* 18.8.1 §259–60) and refers to other Jewish writers on only one other occasion (and even then he refers to them as if they were pagans; *AgAp* 1.23 §218). Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that Philo's question as to why the Torah begins with creation rather than with the laws (*Op* 1.1–3) is paralleled in *Ant* 1. Proem 4 §21 and also that Philo's description of Abraham's attack on the Assyrians (*Abr* 40.230–35) is paralleled in *Ant* 1.10.1 §177. Furthermore, Philo's interpretation of the names Abel and Ishmael (*Migr* 13.74; *Mut* 37.202) is paralleled in *Ant* 1.2.1 §52 and 1.10.4 §190, while Philo's allegorical interpretation of the tabernacle and priestly garments (*Vita Mos* II.18, 21, 24) is closely paralleled in *Ant* 3.7.7 §179–87. Hölscher (PW 9) held that Josephus' single source was a Hellenistic Jewish midrash, a claim that seems extreme, especially since we have no trace of such a work.

We must not, however, exclude the possibility that Josephus introduced details of his own, particularly for apologetic reasons. In particular the fact that his portraits of such biblical personalities as Abraham, Moses, Samson, Saul, David, and Solomon are consistent in emphasizing their cardinal virtues (as well as the dramatic and erotic elements) and in de-emphasizing theological and magical elements would seem to indicate a personal imprint rather than a stage in the development of the midrashic tradition. In view of the fact that during the many years he lived in Rome Josephus apparently had no occupation other than writing and that he apparently composed an average of only about ten lines a day, we should expect a careful and consistent composition. We may also discern the influence of contemporary events upon Josephus' reconstruction of the biblical past. For example, his elaboration of the sacrifice of Isaac seems to have been influenced by the martyrdom during the Maccabean revolt. In his elaboration of the story of his namesake, Joseph, who likewise was accused falsely, Josephus seems to have portrayed himself. He likewise appears to have identified personally with the prophet Jeremiah, who also suffered at the hands of his fellow Jews, as well as with Daniel, Esther, and Mordecai, who suffered for their convictions. Moreover, he seems to have identified himself with King Saul, whom he viewed as a martyred general like himself.

An important question centers around the issue of the biblical text that Josephus had at his disposal. It is important because the answer would help shed significant light on the state of the text in 1st-century Palestine, almost a millennium before our first extant complete Hebrew manuscript. Josephus seems to have had in his possession texts in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek; and he varied in his use of them from biblical book to book. In view of the fact that in Josephus' time there were a number of divergent Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible, we cannot be sure which version he used at any given time, especially since he usually paraphrased and elaborated rather than translated. Nor must we discount the possibility that Josephus followed a tradition independent of both the MT and the LXX, as may be seen from the fact that he agrees with Pseudo-Philo in some places that diverge from both the MT and the LXX.

The fact that Josephus was himself writing in Greek would make it seem likely that his chief textual source was the LXX, especially since he cited it as a precedent for presenting the history of the Jews to a non-Jewish audience (*Ant* 1. Proem 3 §10–12) and since he devoted so much space paraphrasing the account of the translation given in *Let. Aris.* (*Ant* 12.2.1–15 §11–118), hardly what one would expect in a work which is essentially a political and military rather than a cultural and religious history of the Jews. And yet, the very fact that he paraphrased the Bible in Greek would seem to indicate that he hoped to improve on that rendering, since there would hardly be much point otherwise in a new

version. Hence it is not surprising that where the style of the LXX is more polished, as in the Additions to Esther or in 1 Esdras, he adheres more closely to its text. And yet, to have ignored the LXX, in view of the tremendous regard in which that version was held, would have been looked upon as an attempt to hide something. Nevertheless, even when Josephus agrees with the LXX, this is not necessarily an indication that he had the LXX text before him, since he may have incorporated an exegetical tradition which had been known earlier to the translators of the LXX. Finally, the biblical texts found at Qumran indicate that the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek texts were not so great as had been previously thought.

As to Josephus' possible use of an Aramaic Targum, we must not forget that Aramaic was Josephus' mother tongue, as it was for Jews generally in Palestine at that time. While it is true that the earliest Targum, that of Onkelos, dates from the 2d century C.E., no doubt the practice of translating the Bible into Aramaic was much older; indeed, the fact that its origin is attributed to Ezra in the 5th century B.C.E. (*Meg.* 3a) meant that it had the sanctity and the authority associated with the great Ezra, the second Moses (*t. Sanh.* 4.7). The very fact that the Targums, at least as we know them, permit themselves considerable latitude in paraphrasing the text must have attracted Josephus to them. If Josephus is indeed much freer in vocabulary, style, order, and content in his rendering of biblical material in the first five books of *Antiquities* than in Books 6–11 (as seems to be the case), it may well be that the reason for this is the availability of Targums for these earlier books. Josephus probably utilized a Hebrew text and/or an Aramaic Targum as a basis for his elaboration of the books of the Pentateuch, especially since Josephus probably heard a portion of the Pentateuch read weekly in the synagogue, along with a Targum. And yet, where he seems to be following the Hebrew, this may be due merely to an attempt to avoid using the same word as the LXX (cf. his paraphrase of *Let. Aris.,* where he is almost pathological in avoiding the same language).

In the book of Joshua, Josephus seems closer to the MT; whereas for Judges and Ruth he is relatively free, perhaps because he was using a Targum. The most interesting case is that of the book of Samuel, where, to judge from the Dead Sea fragments, Josephus favored a Greek text in a Proto-Lucianic version, though not to the total exclusion of the Hebrew, since, at the very least, he heard portions from Samuel during readings of the *haftaroth* in the synagogue on seven Sabbaths and holy days. To say, as does Kahle (1959: 229–37), that Josephus agrees with Proto-Lucian because Christian copyists modified his text (as they presumably did Philo's quotations from the Bible) is to fail to explain why these copyists restricted their revisions to only certain books of the Bible. For Ezra, Josephus particularly (but not exclusively) employed the apocryphal book of Esdras because of its superior Greek style, its elimination of some chronological difficulties, and its romantic interest in the debate as to whether wine, the king, or a woman is most powerful. For Esther, Josephus used a Greek text, notably because he found it to be stylistically more polished than the rest of the Greek Bible.

As to the changes which Josephus made in his version of the biblical narrative, Josephus declares in his preface that he proposes to set forth the details in their proper order *(taxin),* using a military term implying a battle array (as if he were about to marshal troops in literary battle, presumably against anti-Semites). Whereas Moses, he says, had left his writings in disarray, just as he had received them from God (*Ant* 4.8.4 §197), we see that Josephus rearranged them following the "thematic" school of a number of Hellenistic historians, thus juxtaposing those items which belonged together on the basis of subject, regardless of chronology and source, and removing theological difficulties and contradictions inherent in the narrative. For example, he substitutes the verb *ektisen,* "founded" for the LXX's *epoieœsen,* "made" to avoid the impression that God created the world out of preexistent matter (*Ant* 1.1.1 §27). Similarly, he omits the plural verb in "let us make man in our image," since it would seem from this that God was a plurality of powers or had assistants (*Ant* 1.1.1 §32). Again, when he deals with chronological difficulties in the biblical ascription of unusual longevity to the patriarchs, he cites precedents in Greek and non-Greek literature and furthermore rationalizes by noting other factors, such as their diet, which contributed to their long life spans (*Ant* 1.3.9 §107–8); yet even here he closes as do Herodotus and other ancient historians, with the formula, "On these matters let everyone decide according to his fancy." Again, he often seeks to avoid anthropomorphisms, such as the one implied in the Hebrew word *měraḥepet,* "moving" (Gen 1:2; cf. *Ant* 1.1.1 §27). Sometimes his goal is to provide better motivation or to eliminate obscurity, as in his explanation of the "strange" fire (Lev

10:1) which Nadab and Abihu brought (*Ant* 3.1.7 §209). Sometimes he is concerned with how his work will sound to the ear; hence, for example, he says that he is inclined to omit the names of the 70 descendants of Jacob who went down to Egypt because they would sound strange to a Greek ear but that he includes them, nonetheless, only in order to refute the anti-Semitic charge that the Israelites were of Egyptian rather than of Mesopotamian origin (*Ant* 2.7.4 §176–77). Another goal is to enhance the sense of drama, so that, for example, he adds that Samuel was tossing with sleeplessness the night God instructed him to select a king (*Ant* 6.3.3 §37). Moreover, Josephus increases the irony, for example, by using the word for happiness on five occasions in the brief pericope describing Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac (*Ant* 1.13.1–4 §222–36). Josephus uses allegory only occasionally, perhaps in reaction to Philo; one case, however, where he does appeal to allegory is in explaining various articles in the temple (*Ant* 3.7.7 §179–87). Finally, Josephus, in reformulating the biblical narrative, focuses to an even greater degree on certain key personalities, such as Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Samson, Saul, David, and Solomon.

As to Hellenizations in *Ant,* Thackeray (1929: 100–124) devised a kind of Documentary Hypothesis for the later books, postulating that for Books 15 and 16 Josephus had an assistant who had a particular love of Greek poetry, especially Sophocles, and for Books 17 through 19 another assistant who had a penchant for Thucydides. The truth is, however, that there are many Sophoclean and Thucydidean elements in the earlier books as well. Moreover, while Josephus (*AgAp* 1.9 §50) admits that he had helpers for *JW* (presumably his first published work), he says nothing about such for *Ant.* Indeed, many of the Sophoclean and Thucydidean phrases may have come to him through other writers he knew, notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Finally, whereas he may have needed assistants to help him with the Greek of *JW,* which he wrote shortly after his arrival in Rome, he must have improved his knowledge of Greek during the intervening years preceding his completion of *Ant.*

In his rewriting of the Bible, Josephus is clearly indebted to the Greek tragedians. Thus the paradoxical juxtaposition of *apora* and *porima* (*Ant* 1.14 Proem 3 §14) is found in only one other ancient author (Aesch. *PV* 904). Josephus' indebtedness to Sophocles is seen in his extrabiblical statement, so reminiscent of *Oedipus the King,* that all were mentally blinded as by a riddle in finding a solution to the problem confronting King Solomon. We may add that especially in the account of the binding of Isaac (*Ant* 1.13.1–4 §222–36) there are many reminiscences of Euripides (esp. Eur. *IA*), who was the most popular dramatist of the Hellenistic period.

Josephus' developed picture of the original bliss of mankind (*Ant* 1.1.4 §46) is clearly indebted to Homer and Hesiod, as is the phrase that Isaac was born on the threshold of Abraham's old age (*epi geœroœs oudoœi; Ant* 1.13.1 §222). The concept of a periodic destruction of the earth alternately by fire and water has its parallel in Plato (*Ti.* 22C), though it is found in rabbinic sources as well. Josephus' indebtedness to Herodotus (2.75) is manifest in his description of the ibis that helped put to flight the winged serpents encountered on the march through the desert to Ethiopia (*Ant* 2.10.2 §247). Occasionally direct comparisons with pagan sources are possible. Thus Josephus would have his readers compare Noah's Flood with that of Deucalion, implied by the fact that he used the same word for God's giving of advice to Noah (*hypothemenou; Ant* 1.3.2 §76) as is employed for Prometheus' giving of advice to Deucalion (Apollodorus 1.7.2); this is confirmed by the fact that instead of LXX *kiboœtos,* Josephus uses the word *larnax* for Noah's ark, the same word Apollodorus used for Deucalion's ark.

The most striking form of Hellenization occurs in Josephus' description of biblical heroes (Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Samson, Saul, David, Solomon, Esther) in terms of the four cardinal virtues, the external qualities such as good birth and handsome stature, and the spiritual attribute of piety. Josephus' motives may well have been apologetic since the Jews had been accused of being misanthropic and of having failed to produce marvelous men (*AgAp* 2.12 §135). Thus, for example, Josephus omits the scene where Hagar weeps after having been cast out by Sarah (Gen 21:16; cf. *Ant* 1.12.3 §218), since such a scene might support the charge that Abraham lacked piety. In response to the blood libel with which the Jews had been charged (*AgAp* 2.8 §91–96), Josephus inserts a speech wherein God declares that he does not crave human blood, in direct contrast to Artemis, who rejoices in human sacrifice (Eur. *IA* 1524–25).

Moreover, in his biblical modifications, Josephus appeals to political, military, and geographic interests. Thus, in his version of the rebellion of Korah (*Ant* 4.2.1 §12), he stresses the theme of civil strife

(stasis), so familiar to readers of Thucydides (3.82–84). Likewise, Josephus' graphic description of the sequence of luxury, voluptuousness, love of gain, gross recklessness, disdain for order and for the laws, and grave sedition corrupting the aristocracy (*Ant* 5.2.7 §132–35) is one familiar to readers of Polybius and Livy.

Josephus likewise appeals to the philosophical interests of his readers by comparing the religious groups of the Jews to the Greek philosophical schools (*Life* 2 §12; *Ant* 15.10.4 §371). In particular, since Stoicism was the favorite philosophy of Hellenistic intellectuals, he frequently employs Stoic terminology; thus the key Stoic word *pronoia,* "providence," appears no fewer than 74 times in the first half of *Ant.* Moreover, Josephus goes out of his way in his paraphrase of the book of Daniel to note how mistaken are the Epicureans, who exclude providence *(pronoian)* from human life (*Ant* 10.11.7 §278).

Josephus also introduces a number of typical dramatic motifs, in particular the concept of *hubris* ("insolence," "overweening pride") and its consequences. For example, he describes the generation of the Tower of Babel in terms of the typical tragic sequence of prosperity, insolence, and punishment (*Ant* 1.4.2 §113). Likewise, he condemns Haman for not bearing his good fortune wisely and for not making the best use of his prosperity with prudent reason (*Ant* 11.6.12 §277), terms familiar to Greek tragedy. An indication that Josephus is thinking of the language of tragedy may be seen in his comment (in connection with Saul's slaughter of the priests of Nob) that it is characteristic of men, when they attain power, to lay aside their moderate and just ways "as if they were stage-masks" (*Ant* 6.12.7 §264).

Finally, to make his narrative more appealing, Josephus introduces romantic motifs reminiscent of Homer, Herodotus, Xenophon, and Hellenistic novels. The erotic motif is particularly evident in Pharaoh's meeting with Sarah (*Ant* 1.8.1 §165), in the infatuation of Potiphar's wife with Joseph (*Ant* 2.4.2–5 §41–59), in Moses' marriage to the Ethiopian princess (*Ant* 2.10.2 §252–53), and in the account of Ahasuerus' actually falling in love with Esther (*Ant* 11.6.2 §202).

On the other hand, despite the fact that Josephus admits his theological and moralistic purpose in his preface, he actually downplays the theological element in *Ant.* Thus he gives a purely practical reason for circumcision—namely, the desire to prevent assimilation—rather than the connection with the covenant between God and Abraham (Gen 17:10–11; cf. *Ant* 1.10.5 §192). Again, whereas the rabbis have Abraham appeal to Isaac to sacrifice himself for the sanctification of God's name, in Josephus Abraham makes no such appeal (*Ant* 1.13.3 §228–31). Moreover, in his version of Samson, Josephus omits miraculous details and thus diminishes the role of God. In addition, most strikingly, in his entire adaptation of the narrative of Ruth, Josephus nowhere mentions God, whereas there are 17 references to God in the biblical story. That Josephus does not de-emphasize the role of God in his account of Moses may be due to the fact that the Greeks believed that great leaders, such as the Spartan Lycurgus, had to be divinely directed. Again, whereas in the book of Esther there is not a single reference to God, the LXX and Josephus, for apologetic reasons, supply this lack in several places. As to miracles, Josephus frequently tells his readers to make up their own minds—a formula found in Herodotus, Thucydides, and many other ancient historians.

b. The Postbiblical Period. Josephus' account of the postbiblical period is very uneven. There are some figures (such as Herod) or events (such as the accession of the Roman emperor Claudius) for which he provides extraordinary detail; there are others—e.g., the period from Ezra to Alexander—for which he is extraordinarily skimpy. This brevity may be explained most simply by postulating that Josephus had few sources for this period; but two other factors may have been at work: (1) the Jews had achieved almost nothing of importance; and (2) Josephus, bearing in mind that his history would consist of only 20 books, sought to emphasize the period of the Hasmoneans, his ancestral family, and their rivals, the Herodians.

As for Alexander, the fact that Josephus' account of Alexander's meeting with the high priest (*Ant* 11.8.5 §329–39) is closely paralleled by the account in the Samaritan. Second Chronicle of the meeting between Alexander and the Samaritan high priest would seem to confirm its historicity. The notion that Jerusalem was at that time hardly worth visiting is not convincing; the fact that the oldest Gk and Lat sources do not mention such a visit and the suggestion that Josephus introduced it for merely apologetic reasons are hardly conclusive, since the Talmud and Samaritan sources quite independently have a similar tradition.

Josephus' extensive summary of *Let. Aris.* is remarkable for the fact that although it closely adheres to the content of the original, it constantly modifies the language, particularly with Stoic terminology, so that there is only one instance where as many as 12 words of the original have been retained. We may wonder why Josephus, in a history of the Jews, devotes such an inordinately long space to what is, at best, a peripheral historical incident; but Josephus' aim may well have been to provide a precedent for an appeal to the Flavians to allow the Jews to practice their ancestral religion (this time after the disastrous revolt against Rome). The changes that are made are intended primarily to render the account less offensive to non-Jews.

Josephus likewise closely parallels 1 Maccabees (*Ant* 12.5.2–13.6.6). Differences may be explained either by the hypothesis that Josephus had both a Hebrew and a Greek text, or that he had only a Greek text, probably in a more accurate and full form than ours, which he adapted for his Greco-Roman readers. In addition, however, as a descendant of the Hasmoneans, Josephus must have had access to oral traditions and was, at times, more objective than the author of 1 Maccabees, who was closer in point of time to the events themselves. Josephus' additions are generally geographical and topographical; and they supply the names of participants, the number of casualties, and motives, perhaps obtaining this information from a Hellenistic historian (presumably Nicolaus of Damascus). Josephus has also increased admiration for his ancestors Mattathias and Judas. Finally, Josephus, in his attempt to differentiate between the Maccabees and the revolutionaries of his own day, has emphasized the ideal of martyrdom; whereas 1 Maccabees attributes the victory to God, Josephus attributes it to the piety of the soldiers. One mystery is Josephus' failure to use the last three chapters of 1 Maccabees, whether because they were missing from Josephus' copy or because Josephus viewed Nicolaus of Damascus as a superior source from that point on. And yet, it is surprising that Josephus used Nicolaus as much as he did, since the latter (as Herod's secretary) was presumably opposed to Josephus' Hasmonean ancestors. To say, as some scholars have, that Josephus has no independent value for this period is to deny what seems most reasonable, namely that Josephus, as a direct descendant of the Hasmoneans, had oral traditions from his family.

Among Josephus' major sources for the Roman period were the decrees apparently available either from the imperial archives in Rome, or through Nicolaus of Damascus, or through Josephus' close friend Agrippa II. Most scholars accept their authenticity, even though Josephus' version often does not correspond with the style known to us from inscriptions and despite the invitation to the reader to check their accuracy (this is a mere formality, since in antiquity it was very difficult to locate any given piece of information because of inadequate filing systems).

There is no figure in all antiquity about whom we have more detailed information than Herod; and by far our chief authority is Josephus, whose main source was Nicolaus of Damascus. Josephus himself, as a Hasmonean, is clearly prejudiced against Herod, particularly in *Ant,* basing himself perhaps on oral traditions derived from his Hasmonean ancestors, Herod's bitter opponents. Most studies have confirmed the disparaging picture rendered by Josephus; but the recent magisterial work by Schalit (1968) attempts to rehabilitate him as one who sincerely believed that the Jews could attain peace and prosperity only through cooperating with the Pax Romana. However, despite Josephus' judicious comments, we may question whether or not the Jews were, in fact, far more prosperous at the end of Herod's reign (4 B.C.E.) than they were at the beginning (37 B.C.E.) and whether or not his vast building program solved the problem of unemployment. If Herod was really well-disposed toward Rome, we may well ask why Josephus, who was similarly so loyal, should have been so negative toward him. Also if Herod claimed to be the Messiah, as seems clear from Epiphanius, we may ask why Josephus, in his bitter and exhaustive account, did not mention this, since a political messiah by definition would be a rebel against the Roman Empire, and this would have defamed Herod's reputation completely. Yet we would seem to be justified in viewing skeptically Herod's account of how Cleopatra had attempted to seduce him and how he was dissuaded only with difficulty from killing her (cited in *Ant* 15.4.2 §97–103). Such a story may well have arisen when Herod attempted to enter the good graces of Octavian, who had come to power after defeating Antony and Cleopatra.

Occasionally we are fortunate enough to be able to check Josephus' account of specific incidents. One example is in connection with the expulsion of the Jews from Rome in 19 C.E. (*Ant* 18.3.5 §81–84). Josephus would have us believe that the Jews were expelled because four Jewish scoundrels pocketed

for themselves the gifts for the Jerusalem temple which a certain noble Roman proselyte named Fulvia had entrusted to them. It seems hard to believe that Tiberius, who was the emperor at this time and who was noted for his strict adherence to legal procedure, would have expelled all the Jews without a trial because of the misdeeds of a few. More credible is the account of Dio Cassius (57.18.5a) that the Jews were expelled because of their success in converting to Judaism so many Romans, including some of high birth. In view of the offense, Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.85) seems to imply more plausibly that the expulsion was restricted to proselytes—those "tainted with this superstition." In view of the fact that the Jews had on an earlier occasion (139 B.C.E.) likewise been expelled from the city because of proselyting activities (Val. Max. 1.33), Dio's account seems preferable to that of Josephus; thus the key to the incident is what Josephus mentions only incidentally—the fact that Fulvia was a proselyte.

As for the period of the procurators (1st century C.E.), we are fortunate to have another account with which to check Josephus' report of an incident associated with Pontius Pilate (*Ant* 18.3.1 §55–59; *JW* 2.9.2–3 §169–74). However, this second account (Philo *Gaium* 18 §299–305) is so different that the question has been raised as to whether it refers to the same incident as Josephus. In Philo, Pilate brings into Jerusalem shields without images; whereas in Josephus he brings in standards with images. In Philo the incident occurs after several years of misrule by Pilate, whereas in Josephus it comes at the beginning of his procuratorship. In Philo the people appeal unsuccessfully to Pilate, apparently in Jerusalem; whereas in Josephus they appeal successfully in Caesarea. In this case, though Philo is contemporary with Pilate and less involved, he is probably less reliable than Josephus, since he is writing, presumably from hearsay, an apologetic work about events which occurred some distance from his home.

We may well wonder why Josephus devoted so much space to an account of the assassination of the emperor Caligula and the accession of Claudius (*Ant* 19.1.1–4.6 §1–273), events only tangentially related to Jewish history, especially in light of the fact that there is not much of a parallel account in *JW* (2.11.1–5 §204–14; there are usually extensive parallels to almost all other incidents). We may suggest that the key is Josephus' friendship with Agrippa II, the son of the man (Agrippa I) who, according to Josephus, was responsible for Claudius' assumption of the throne. To some degree the length of the narrative may be due simply to the availability of an extensive narrative, whether by Cluvius Rufus, as Mommsen (1870) conjectured, or in other sources, notably details derived orally from Agrippa II.

c. Josephus and Christian History. The chief reason why Josephus' works have survived in their entirety is that they contain references to John the Baptist, to James the brother of Jesus, and, above all, to Jesus himself (the so-called *Testimonium Flavianum;* see below).

There can be little doubt as to the authenticity of Josephus' reference to John the Baptist (*Ant* 18 §116–19), especially since the language is particularly typical of this part of *Ant,* since it contains two different forms of the word *baptism* (which an interpolator would almost certainly have avoided), since it is approximately twice as long as the Jesus passage and yet has no reference to the connection between John and Jesus, and, above all, since the reason given for John's death contradicts the Gospels. Moreover, the 3d-century Origen, who explicitly states that Josephus did not believe in Jesus as Christ, cites this passage. As to the relative lengths of the passages about John and Jesus, it may be that John was originally the more important of the two or that Josephus was wary of speaking about messianic movements, such as the one connected with the name of Jesus, inasmuch as this ipso facto involved revolt against Rome. As to the discrepancy between Josephus and the Gospels, one possible solution is to suggest that the two accounts supplement one another: the Christians, as moralists, emphasized that John had provoked Herod Antipas with his moral rebuke (Mark 6:17–18); but Josephus, as a political historian, stressed that John had been executed because it was feared that, with his ability to attract crowds, he would lead a revolt. In any case if the passage about John had been interpolated by a Christian, we would have expected some reference to John's connection with Jesus. Finally, Josephus' account seems to be historically valid; since he praises him as a "good man," we should have expected Josephus to agree with the Gospels in giving the cause of John's death; whereas the political charge against John clearly embarrassed Josephus, who so fiercely opposed all revolutionary stirrings.

Most scholars have regarded the so-called *Testimonium Flavianum*—Josephus' reference to Jesus

Christ—as interpolated, at least in part. In this passage (*Ant* 18.3.3 §63–64) Josephus notes that during the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate "there lived Jesus, a wise man, if indeed one ought to call him a man." He reports that he accomplished surprising feats, and taught many people, and "won over many Jews and many Greeks." The text then baldly claims that "he was the Messiah" and reports how Pilate had him crucified and how, on the third day, he appeared alive to those who loved him, as had been previously prophesied. We should note, however, that aside from this passage and possibly those about John and James, there are no other passages in Josephus the authenticity of which has been questioned; therefore the burden of proof rests upon anyone who argues that these are later interpolations.

Though this passage is found in all the Gk mss of Josephus (the earliest of which, to be sure, dates from the 11th century) and in all the versions (including the Lat translation of Cassiodorus, which dates from the 6th century), Origen, who cites five passages also from Book 18 of *Ant,* expresses wonder that Josephus did not admit "Jesus to be the Christ" (*comm. in Mt.* 10.17) and elsewhere states that Josephus "disbelieved in Jesus as Christ" (*Cels.* 1.47). The implication of these statements is that in the 3d century Origen could find in *Ant* some passage about Jesus but that it was basically neutral (if it had been negative, Origen probably would have attacked Josephus sharply instead of merely expressing wonder). Moreover, the fact that Josephus refers to Jesus in his reference to James the brother of "the aforementioned Christ" (*Ant* 20.9.1 §200)—a passage the authenticity of which has been almost universally acknowledged—indicates that Jesus had been mentioned previously.

The fact that there are no fewer than 11 Christian writers prior to the 4th-century Eusebius (who quotes it in three different forms) and no fewer than 5 between Eusebius and Jerome, all of whom knew Josephus' works and yet did not refer to the *Testimonium,* constitutes a strong argument that the passage originally did not exist in its present form. If it had been original, it would have been a powerful argument in polemics against the Jews, especially since one charge (as early as the middle of the 2d century) was that Jesus had never lived at all and was, in fact, a figment of Christian imagination (Just. *dial.* 8). The fact that there was a passage about Jesus in *Ant* may help to explain the Talmud's silence about Josephus, since the very mention of Jesus in a neutral sense would most probably have been frowned upon by the rabbis. Further indications that the original version of the *Testimonium* was different from its present form come from Agapius, a 10th-century Christian Arab, whose version of the *Testimonium* does not read "if indeed we ought to call him a man," omits references to Jesus' miracles and to the role of Jewish leaders in accusing Jesus, states not that Jesus appeared to his disciples on the third day but that his disciples reported this, and (most important) that he was "perhaps the Messiah," rather than "he was the Messiah." This is further reinforced by the fact that another Christian, Michael the Syrian, says, in his (12th-century) version of the *Testimonium,* that Jesus "was thought to be the Messiah" (so also Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 13; though one wonders how a believing Christian could have cited such a text without recording a strong reaction against it).

Furthermore, we may note that the passages about John, Jesus, and James (see below) do not appear in the parallel passages in *JW;* and we may therefore be suspicious that the lines about them in *Ant* were interpolated. However, this may be due to the fact that the Christians had become more important in the interval between the publication of the two works. As to the language of the *Testimonium,* Thackeray (1929: 141) has noted the remarkable fact that the phrase "such people as accept the truth gladly" *(heœdoneœi)* is characteristic of precisely this portion of *Ant* since we find it eight times in Books 17–19 (allegedly the work of Josephus' Thucydidean assistant) and nowhere else in Josephus. The word *heœdoneœi* could hardly have been interpolated by a Christian, since it has a pejorative connotation, though we must be careful not to impute too much significance to the choice of individual words in a passage which consists of two short paragraphs (there are also other places in the *Testimonium* which are characteristic not of Josephus but of Eusebius).

However, if Josephus did insert a passage of some sort about Jesus, we may well ask what his motive was. Laqueur suggested that, having alienated the Jews by his behavior in the war against Rome and by his use of the LXX, Josephus turned to the Christians, who had not participated in the rebellion against Rome and who believed that the LXX was divinely inspired, in the hope that they would purchase his work (1920: 274ff.). But there is no evidence that Josephus needed any further financial support, since he apparently had a very comfortable imperial pension. Furthermore, it seems unlikely

that Josephus would have sought to gain the very small Christian audience when it would probably have meant alienating the much larger potential audience of Hellenistic Jews (who also regarded the LXX as authoritative).

As a Jew, Josephus might well have acknowledged someone to be the Messiah without necessarily being excluded from the Jewish fold; but since the concept of messiah at this time had definite overtones of revolution and political independence, Josephus, as a loyal member of the Roman royal family, could hardly have recognized Jesus as such. Indeed, Josephus avoids the use of the term *messiah,* except here and in *Ant* 20.9.1 §200 (also in connection with Jesus).

The passage about the death of James the brother of Jesus (*Ant* 20.9.1) has been regarded as authentic by almost all scholars, since the language is thoroughly Josephan; yet it sharply diverges from the eulogy of the high priest Ananus, as found in *JW* 4.5.2 §319–20. But there are numerous contradictions between the *JW* and the *Ant* passages; and, in any case, Origen in the 3d century did have a text about James, since he explicitly says (*comm. in Mt.* 10.7) that Josephus bore witness to so much righteousness in James (though our *Ant* text has no such direct encomium).

A word may be said about several other passages in Josephus which are paralleled by the NT. Josephus speaks of a census by Quirinius, governor of Syria, at the time when Archelaus was removed from his position as ethnarch in 6 or 7 C.E. (*Ant* 17.13.5–18.1.1); whereas Luke 2:1–5 speaks of the census as taking place at the time of Jesus' birth, near the end of the reign of Herod (4 B.C.E.). It seems hard to believe that there had been an earlier census under Quirinius, since Quirinius is not listed in any source as one of the governors of Syria during the reign of Herod and since, moreover, Josephus (*Ant* 18.1.1 §3) declares that the census shocked the Jews (this implies that it was unprecedented). Moreover, if there had been an earlier census, Josephus would most probably, in accordance with his custom, have made a cross-reference to it.

Furthermore, Josephus mentions a certain Theudas, an impostor who persuaded the masses to follow him in the expectation that he would fulfill his promise that the Jordan river would part at his command but who, together with many followers, was slain by the armed forces of the procurator Fadus (*Ant* 20.5.1 §97–98). Luke likewise mentions a Theudas who was slain and whose followers were dispersed, presumably after attempting a revolutionary movement (Acts 5:36). Despite the chronological discrepancy (Acts sets it before Judas' revolt in 6 C.E., while Josephus sets it ca. 44 C.E.), it is tempting, especially in view of the unusual nature of the name Theudas, to identify the two. Another parallel occurs in connection with the false prophet from Egypt (*JW* 2.13.5 §261–63; *Ant* 20.8.6 §169–72), 400 of whose followers were killed by the soldiers of the procurator Felix (the passage in *JW* gives the number of his followers as 30,000); Acts 21:38 speaks of the Egyptian revolutionary but gives the number of his followers as 4000. See EGYPTIAN, THE.

3. Against Apion. In writing his work *Against Apion* (= *AgAp*), published in the last years of his life, Josephus followed the precedent of other Greek apologists. A work attacking the Greeks might well have made a positive impression upon chauvinistic Romans, since Roman intellectuals had ambivalent feelings toward the Greeks, who had been their mentors in almost every field. It has also been conjectured that Josephus was particularly eager to defend his Jewish countrymen against anti-Semitic movements in order to win his way back into their good graces after his disgraceful surrender to the Romans. A third purpose may have been to supply a handbook to Jewish missionaries and propagandists in their efforts, which in Josephus' day were notably successful, though there was no way in antiquity for books to be produced in large numbers.

Josephus was not the only Jewish apologist of his day, as is clear from the fact that Philo wrote similar works (*In Flaccum* and *Hypothetica*); indeed, the latter work, in its brief summary of Jewish law, seems to have served as a model for the second part of *AgAp* (2.14 §145–41, §295). In addition to Philo, another forerunner of Josephus was Dionysius of Halicarnassus, whose *Roman Antiquities*—especially its encomium of Rome (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.4–2.29)—apparently served as a model for *Ant* (at least in title and in number of books). Both Dionysius and Josephus, in turn, follow the standard rhetorical pattern for such encomiums as described later and more fully in a handbook by Menander of Laodicea (3d century). Inasmuch as this handbook prescribes the same order of topics in both encomiums and invectives, Josephus is apparently following the order of topics which his opponent Apion, who was a grammarian, presumably adopted.

One of the charges of the anti-Semites was that the Jews had come late to civilized life. Josephus, like other Oriental intellectuals and like the Greco-Jewish historian Demetrius in the 3d century B.C.E., challenges this hypothesis by modifying biblical chronology so as to make the Jews contemporary with personalities and events of Greek history. It has been debated whether Josephus actually found the selections which he cites from numerous Greek authors or whether he invented them. However, we must assume that the citations are authentic unless proven otherwise, not only because it would have been difficult, with Josephus' admittedly limited knowledge of Greek, to forge passages in various styles, but also because he himself was under constant attack from his numerous enemies and therefore had to take precautions to avoid the damning charge of falsifying his sources.

C. Josephus on Jewish Law

Inasmuch as Josephus' works were issued more than a century before the codification of the Mishnah by Rabbi Judah the Prince, they, together with the works of his older contemporary Philo, are a most important source for our knowledge of the state of Jewish law in the 1st century. Moreover, since Josephus was born in Jerusalem and, according to his own report, had such an excellent education in Halakah (Jewish law) that by the age of 14 he was constantly consulted about the laws by the chief priests and the leaders of Jerusalem (see above), he is a much more valuable source than Philo, who lived in Alexandria, who (so far as we can tell) possessed a minimal knowledge of Hebrew, and who apparently never studied with the great sages of his era, such as Shemaiah, Abtalyon, Hillel, and Shammai. Josephus' knowledge of Jewish law was apparently acknowledged by the other Pharisees, since they comment that if the Galileans' devotion to him was due to his expert knowledge of Pharisaic laws they, too, were learned (*Life* 39 §198). Likewise, Josephus boasts (*Ant* 20.12.1 §263) that his fellow Jews admit that he far excelled them in Jewish learning, the most important component of which was clearly law. Finally, the fact that he indicates his intention to write a work on the laws (*Ant* 20.12.1 §268) in which he proposes also to explain the reasons for the laws (*Ant* 1. Proem 4 §25) further indicates how well versed in law he considered himself to be. The very fact that he included a long summary of the laws in Books 3 and 4 of *Ant,* which is a historical work (whereas other historians, such as Dion. Hal. and Livy, did not) is an indication that he was directing his survey to non-Jewish readers for apologetic purposes (since, as he self-consciously says [*Ant* 4.8.4 §196], the survey is consonant with Moses' reputation for virtue). We may also suggest that his summary might have proved useful to Jewish missionaries. Indeed, if we are to take Josephus at all seriously when he promises neither to add to nor to subtract from Scripture, which certainly includes Jewish law, his presentation should be of great value.

There are many instances in *Ant* where Josephus agrees with the system of Jewish law as we have it codified in later rabbinic writings. A few of the many examples are: (1) he agrees with *m. Para* 5.3 that a lamb to be offered for sacrifice should be one year old (3.9.1 §226); (2) he agrees with *m. Sanh.* that blasphemers are not merely to be stoned (Lev 24:14–16) but also to be hanged (4.8.6 §202); (3) he agrees with *Ber.* 27b that there are two required daily prayers (4.8.13 §212); (4) he declares (with *Sipre* 109b) that women's testimony is unacceptable (4.8.15 §219); (5) he concurs with *Sanh.* 2a, 20b that a king must consult the Sanhedrin of 71 before entering upon a voluntary war (4.8.17 §224); (6) like *Mak.* 22a he states that the number of lashes to be inflicted upon a lawbreaker is not 40 but 39 (4.8.21 §238); (7) like *GitΩ.* 90a he believes that divorce is permissible for any reason whatsoever (4.8.23 §253); and (8) he states (4.8.27 §271) that one must pay double not only for the theft of animals but also for the theft of money (*B. Qam.* 64b). Concerning lost property, Josephus differentiates on the basis of whether the object is found in a private or public place (4.8.29 §274) and indicates that one must proclaim publicly where the object has been found (cf. *m. B. MesΩ.* 2.1). Also, one should not be punished if the person he injured lives for several days before dying (*Ant* 4.8.33 §277; cf. *t. B. Qam.* 9.5–6). Josephus opposes costly shrouds (*AgAp* 2.26 §205; cf. *Mo{ed Qat.* 27b; *Ketub.* 8b), and he even agrees with the oral tradition (*t. B. MesΩ.* 2.29) in placing the law concerning pointing out the road to a lost traveler immediately after the law concerning lost objects (*Ant* 4.8.29, 31 §274, 276).

There are, however, a number of places where Josephus disagrees with the rabbis; and this raises the question whether Josephus reflects an earlier stage of the oral law. Such an hypothesis would apparently be supported by the fact that Philo (*Spec Leg* I–IV), CD, and especially 11QTemple likewise record laws, including much oral law, in a systematic

way. Indeed, the newly discovered manuscript of the Talmud (*ʿAbod. Zar.* 8b) states that Rabbi Judah ben-Baba, a younger contemporary of Josephus, records laws of fines. Again, the fact that Josephus breaks down each biblical law into more precisely defined cases would seem to reflect a written legal code.

There are a number of possible explanations for Josephus' deviations from the rabbinic formulation of the oral law. In the first place, since Josephus wrote *Ant* in Rome many years after his departure from Jerusalem and had little or no contact with Talmudic rabbis there, he may have forgotten what he had learned; but this seems unlikely because memories were so carefully cultivated in those days and because Josephus had so many enemies that he had to be careful not to give occasion for a charge of heresy. Apologetic reasons seem to lie behind many of Josephus' revisions of Jewish law, just as they lie behind his recasting of the biblical narratives. Thus, whereas the Bible (Lev 19:14; Deut 27:18) declares that one must not put a stumbling block in front of the blind, Josephus extends this by declaring that one must point out the road to those who are ignorant of it (*Ant* 4.8.31 §276). Here Josephus would seem to be responding to the charge of those anti-Semites, such as Juvenal (*Satires* 14.103), who had accused the Jews of failing to point out the road to non-Jews. Similarly, by adding the detail that those who dig wells must cover them not to prevent others from drawing water but rather to protect passersby from falling into them (*Ant* 4.8.37 §283), he is answering the charge of those—such as Juvenal (14.104)—who had declared that Jews direct "none but the circumcised to the desired fountain."

Apologetic motives likewise seem to lie behind Josephus' nonbiblical and non-Talmudic equation of abortion with infanticide (*AgAp* 2.24 §202), since otherwise the law applicable to Jews would appear to be more lenient than the Noachian law applicable to gentiles, which (*Sanh.* 57b), through an interpretation of Gen 9:6, forbids killing a fetus in utero. In particular, Josephus must have felt uneasy that Jewish law on this subject was more lenient than that of Plato (*Ap.;* Plutarch, *De Placitis Philosophorum* 5.15), who states that a fetus is a living being (the rabbis [*Sanh.* 72b] declared that an abortion is permissible if the fetus is endangering the life of the mother).

Likewise, Josephus may have had an apologetic motive both in stating that the law with regard to the rebellious child applied to daughters no less than to sons (*Ant* 4.8.24 §263; the rabbis [*m. Sanh.* 8:1] restrict the law to sons alone) and in declaring that the mere intention of doing wrong to one's parents is subject to immediate punishment by death (*AgAp* 2.30 §217). Here his motive may have been to show that the Jews were no more permissive toward children than were the Romans, who were noted for their strictness. Josephus' statement (*AgAp* 2.27 §207) that it is a capital crime for a judge to accept bribes (there is no such law in the Talmud) similarly was occasioned apparently by the fact that it might appear that Jewish law was less severe than both Noachide law, which required the death penalty, and Roman law (*Lex Cornelia testimentaria,* 81 B.C.E.), which inflicted the penalty of exile upon such a judge.

Again, especially in light of the very successful Jewish missionary movement, Josephus' omission of the prohibition of converting Ammonites and Moabites to Judaism until the tenth generation (Deut 23:4) and Edomites and Egyptians until the third generation (Deut 23:7–8) may be explained by Josephus' eagerness to answer the anti-Semitic charge that the Jews were exclusivistic and misanthropic. If, indeed, Josephus also omits the child sacrifice to Moloch (Lev 18:21)—whereas one would expect him to mention this in order to contrast it with the Jewish opposition to human sacrifice—this may be due to the fact that it was no longer being practiced. Likewise, if Josephus does not omit the seemingly embarrassing law that one may charge interest from a non-Jew but not from a Jew (Deut 23:21; cf. *Ant* 4.8.25 §266), which would appear to play into the hands of anti-Semites, the reason may be that he was eager to attract non-Jews to Judaism; and interest-free loans may well have proved a major attraction.

Another possible explanation for Josephus' deviations is that he had sectarian leanings. Indeed, Yadin has noted that there are parallels between Josephus' classification of the laws and that of the author of 11QTemple and recalls that Josephus himself stated that he had spent several years with the Essenes and with a hermit named Bannus (*Life* 2 §9–12). Indeed, there are even parallels in detail: e.g., both 11QTemple (63.5) and Josephus (*Ant* 4.8.16 §222) declare that the public officers of the nearest town are to wash their hands in holy water over the head of a heifer in expiation for an undetected murderer, whereas the Bible (Deut 21:6) does not specify the head. Again, whereas the Bible (1 Kgs 21:13) says

that there were two false witnesses against Naboth, Josephus (*Ant* 8.8.8 §358) mentions three, apparently in accord with CD (9.17, 22), which likewise requires three witnesses in capital cases.

Still another explanation for Josephus' version of Jewish law is that he may be following Philo. Indeed, there are no fewer than four instances where Josephus' interpretation of law agrees with that of Philo in the latter's *Hypothetica* (even though so little of this work has survived): (1) the public reading of the Torah on the Sabbath (*AgAp* 2.17 §175), (2) the death penalty for abortion (*AgAp* 2.24 §202), (3) the prohibition of concealing anything from friends (*AgAp* 2.27 §207), and (4) the prohibition of killing animals that have taken refuge in one's home (*AgAp* 2.29 §213). While it is true that these are also paralleled in rabbinic sources, the rabbinic parallels are not quite so precise as those in Philo. In particular we may cite the striking parallel in language between Philo (*Hypothetica* 7.9) and Josephus (*AgAp* 2.29 §213) in the statement of the law concerning the animal that has taken refuge in one's home as a suppliant.

As we have suggested above, Josephus may likewise have been influenced by Roman law in an effort to smooth his way with his Roman audience, though admittedly he nowhere indicates that he had studied or admired Roman law and, indeed, insists on the unique excellence of Jewish law (*Ant* 1. Proem 4 §22–23; *AgAp* 2.16 §163). We may, however, note that Josephus' statement that a thief, if unable to pay the penalty imposed upon him, is to become the slave of the aggrieved party (*Ant* 4.8.27 §272) is paralleled neither in the Bible nor in the Talmud, but rather in Roman law.

Another explanation of Josephus' deviations may be that he confuses commands with advice. Thus his statement, which is without parallel, that the law commands *(keleuei)* that in seeking a spouse one should not be influenced by a dowry (*AgAp* 2.24 §200) may be mere advice, since the verb *keleuei* (like the Latin *iubeo* to which it corresponds) may mean "recommends" or "advises," as indeed it seems to mean in *Life* 75 §414. The Talmud (*Qidd.* 70a) has similar advice, that one should not choose a wife for the sake of her money.

We may be surprised that Josephus is occasionally less liberal than the rabbis, notably in his attitude toward artistic representation. Thus he is ready to lead the Jews of Galilee to destroy the palace of Herod the Tetrarch because it had been decorated with images of animals (*Life* 12 §65); and he condemns King Solomon for placing the images of bulls and lions in the temple (*Ant* 8.7.5 §195), whereas even the Bible itself (1 Kgs 7:25; 10:20) contains no such rebuke and the rabbis actually state that all faces are permissible except that of a human (*ʿAbod. Zar.* 43b). The explanation here may be that the rabbis were realistic enough to perceive that the masses of the people were liberal in their interpretation of the laws concerning art work, as indicated by the artistic representation that has come down to us; hence they made no attempt to stop them. Josephus, on the other hand, had no "constituency" and hence felt that he could afford to maintain an unyielding posture; indeed, he may have felt a necessity to do so while among the Galileans, who were known for their religious zealotry.

D. Language and Style of Josephus

With the completion of K. H. Rengstorf's (1973–83) concordance of Josephus (except for the small portion of *AgAp* [2.5–9 §51–113] which is extant only in Latin), we are now in a position to examine Josephus' language against the backdrop of that of his predecessors and contemporaries. This concordance, we may remark, lists every occurrence of every word (with the exception of a very few common words), has a very high degree of accuracy, is very generous in quoting lemmas, lists noteworthy textual variants, and often cites the Latin translation of Josephus. Unfortunately, unlike the truncated dictionary of Josephus by Thackeray and Marcus (1930–55), it usually does not give the meaning of the word in a given passage but merely lists all the meanings at the beginning of the entry. Moreover, it omits the context for prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns, numbers, and particles, though it is precisely such words that are often the key to the appreciation of the author's style; and it is not sufficiently analytical with regard to Josephus' grammar.

Ladouceur (1977) has demonstrated that in declensional and conjugational forms, Josephus, far from being dependent upon any single author, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, fluctuates freely between classical and postclassical usage; and much of his grammatical usage is paralleled in Polybius and in Attic inscriptions of the first century B.C.E.

As to Josephus' employment of assistants, it is ironic that no one has been able to pinpoint the

influence of assistants in *JW,* Josephus' earliest work, in which he himself says he received such help (*AgAp* 1.9 §50); but while Josephus says nothing of obtaining such assistance for *Ant,* Thackeray (1929: 115) claims to have found signs of it in *Ant* 15 and 16 (an assistant well versed in Sophocles) and 17–19 (an assistant steeped in Thucydides). Moreover, there is no indication of the work of assistants in *AgAp,* Josephus' final and most polished work. In addition, the influence of Sophocles and of Thucydides was so pervasive in other Greek writers of this period, notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that it is at least as likely that Josephus' language was influenced directly by those writers as indirectly through the alleged assistants. The fact that Josephus used Strabo as a major source in *Ant* 13–15 shows that there is no sharp dividing line at the beginning of Book 15, as Thackeray claims. In addition, we may note that Nicolaus of Damascus, who was Josephus' main source for *Ant* 14–17, was steeped in Sophocles and thus may have been a source of the Sophoclean element in Josephus. Inasmuch as Josephus wrote *Ant* after spending over 20 years in Rome in a Greek-speaking environment, we may suppose that during this interval he perfected his knowledge of Greek to the point where assistants were not needed; in any case if he needed assistants for *Ant,* he should have required them also for the *Life* and *AgAp,* which were written immediately thereafter. As to the occurrence of poetic words and Ionic prose forms in Josephus, they may simply represent a non-Attic dialectical contribution to the *koine,* as seen in the papyri, and should not be used as unambiguous evidence of the literary influence.

In his narrative style Josephus appears to have followed the pattern of his Greek predecessors. Thus his use of double narrative—i.e., two stories on the same theme (e.g., *Ant* 18.3.4 §66–80; and 18.3.5 §81–84)—is in accord with the literary technique of the tragic school of Hellenistic historians. Again, in his suicide narratives, he follows the pattern found in many Greek and Roman writers; and this, we may suggest, would tend to impugn the historical value of such accounts.

Book 7 of *JW* presents a special problem. On the basis of a study of crasis and elision, Morton and Michaelson (1973) have concluded that there is a marked difference between Book 7 and the other books of *JW,* though, of course, this may indicate only that Book 7 did not benefit from the careful editing that the other books received. Moreover, there are sharply different rates of elision for the various parts of *AgAp,* whereas no one has seriously doubted the unity of that work. In the most recent study of Book 7, Schwartz (1985) concludes, on the basis of content rather than of style, that the book consists of three strands, the first composed in 79–81 C.E. (the date usually assigned to the whole work), the second in 82–83 C.E., and the third early in Trajan's reign (ca. 100 C.E.). One other interesting result of the work of Morton and Michaelson is that *Life* and *JW* have a definite stylistic relationship and presumably a common source; this would appear to suggest an answer to a persistent question in Josephan scholarship, namely, whether the *Life* is largely based upon a work which was utilized by Josephus for *JW* many years earlier.

As we have noted, we do not have a single fragment of any Aramaic version of *JW;* and there is no evidence that the Slavonic version is dependent on it. Indeed, despite Josephus' statement (*JW* 1. Proem 1 §3) that he originally composed the work for the benefit of the Jews of the "upper country" (presumably in Aramaic, the language of the Babylonian Jews), doubt has been expressed that he composed such a version at all. But Josephus seems to have been fully at home in Aramaic, since he apparently used a source in that language (presumably in the Babylonian dialect) for his extended account of Asinaeus and Anilaeus (Schalit 1965).

Despite his long residence in Rome, there is no conclusive evidence that Josephus knew Latin. Indeed, since such a large percentage of the intellectuals there were fully conversant in Greek, he probably saw no need to learn Latin. The only Roman writer he mentions by name is Livy (*Ant* 14.4.3 §68). Mommsen (1870) suggested that Josephus' source for the lengthy account of the assassination of Caligula and the accession of Claudius was a Latin history by Cluvius Rufus, since Cluvius (according to an emendation, *Ant* 19.1.13 §91–92) is said to have given an apt quotation from Homer, an anecdote which would seem to be derived from Cluvius himself. It has also been noted that Josephus' style in Book 19 is more metaphoric and more highly colored than is usual for him. But aside from the fact that there is no indication that Cluvius' history (which is now lost) covered the period of Caligula and Claudius, the rhetorical style may have come from another writer within the same rhetorical tradition; and the fact that Josephus' account places such stress on the role of Agrippa I in these events would seem to indicate the likelihood that his source

(or one of his major sources) was an oral tradition from the family of Agrippa, with which Josephus was very close.

E. Josephus' Influence

Josephus seems to have been ignored by classical writers; indeed, the only pagan writer who definitely knows the works of Josephus is the 3d-century Porphyry, who (*De Abstinentia ab Esu Animalium* 4.11) refers (*Abst.* 4.11) to Josephus' discussion of the Essenes in *JW, Ant,* and *AgAp* (there is no allusion to them in our text of *AgAp,* however).

Josephus' influence becomes most noticeable in the Church Fathers. In particular we may cite his influence upon the Greek Hegesippus, Hippolytus, Origen, Theophilus, Eusebius, John Chrysostom, and Pseudo-Kaisarios, as well as upon the Latin Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine. Indeed, for writers such as Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, Josephus was the most useful source for confirming the Bible. Jerome (*Epistula ad Eustochium* 22.35 = *Patrologia Latina* 22.421) praises Josephus as a second Livy; and, in fact, so marked was his favor for Josephus that during his lifetime it was thought that he had translated *JW* into Latin. Indeed, the Church Fathers found in *JW* a strong affinity with NT themes, especially the significance of the destruction of the temple and its connection with the passion of Jesus.

During the Middle Ages Josephus was regarded as an authority in such diverse fields as biblical exegesis, allegory, chronology, arithmetic, astronomy, natural history, geography, military tactics, grammar, etymology, and theology. For Christians who were cut off from the direct Jewish tradition, it was Josephus who supplied pilgrims with their knowledge of the Holy Land. In catalogues of medieval libraries his works commonly appear with the Church Fathers. In the monastery of Cluny, Josephus is listed as one of the authors whose works were read during Lent. His influence was even greater then than it has been in modern times because he was said to have written certain works which are generally regarded as spurious, notably *4 Maccabees* and *Hegesippus,* as well as, of course, the paragraphs about Jesus in *Ant.* We may note, in particular, the influence of Josephus upon such medieval Latin authors as Bede, Rabanus Maurus, Fulcher of Chartres, and, above all, Peter Comestor, whose *Historia Scholastica,* written in the 12th century, soon became the most popular book in Europe. An indication of Josephus' influence upon this work is the fact that Comestor is often a clue to restoring the original text of the Latin translation of Josephus, and vice versa. Josephus' influence may also be seen in the popularity of the legend of Josephus the physician who cured Titus of a swollen leg (cited in Landolfus Sagax's *Historia miscella* [ca. 1000] and in the 13th-century *Sachsenspiegel*).

Among Byzantine Greek authors whom Josephus influenced we may cite George Hamartolos, Malalas, Zonaras, the anonymous author of *De obsidione toleranda,* Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, and the anonymous author of *Palaea Historica.* Josephus was unknown among Jewish writers during the Middle Ages; but the influence of Josippon (see below) was profound on such Jewish commentators as Rashi in the 11th century and the Franco-German Tosafists in the two centuries thereafter.

During the Renaissance the enormous popularity of Josephus may be gauged from the fact that between 1450 and 1700 there were more editions of *Ant* (73) and of *JW* (68) than of any other historical work in Greek. The 14th-century Nicolas of Lyre was greatly indebted to Josephus in his biblical commentary. During this period, as in the Middle Ages, Josephus was ignored by Jewish writers, with the notable exception of Abrabanel in the 15th century and Azariah dei Rossi in the 16th century. As to the popularity of Josippon, it has even been suggested that this paraphrase was a link in the chain of events which culminated in the readmission of the Jews to England by Cromwell.

The influence of Josephus upon modern literature has been profound but has been documented fully only for Spanish literature (in an unpublished study). Until our own days a common sight in many homes was a copy of Josephus alongside the Christian Bible since his works bridged the chronological gap between the OT and NT. Among strict English Protestants only Josephus and the Bible were permitted to be read on Sunday. The growing sanctity of the Hebrew Scriptures in England by the end of the 16th century led playwrights to turn to the Apocrypha and Josephus for source material, in particular for plays about Herod. In the period before the American Revolution, the earliest book by a Jewish author (other than the Bible) printed in America was L'Estrange's 1719 translation of *JW.* The second book of Jewish authorship printed in America was Morvvyne's 1722 translation of Josippon.

In French literature we may note Josephus' influence on Corneille, Racine, and Voltaire. In Italian he was particularly influential on Petrarch. In Spanish literature he especially influenced such writers as Alfonso the Learned, Lope de Vega, and Tirso de Molina. Josephus' popularity was particularly great among Spanish Conversos (the so-called Marranos), who practiced their Judaism secretly after their conversion to Christianity in the 14th and 15th centuries and who found in Josephus an author who was both accepted by the Church (because of the *Testimonium Flavianum*) and proud of his Jewish heritage and faith. In German literature his influence is particularly to be seen in the 20th-century Lion Feuchtwanger's very popular, and largely autobiographical, trilogy about him (1932, 1936, 1942).

F. The Text of Josephus

So far as we can tell, all the writings of Josephus have been preserved, thanks to the interest of the Christian Church. There are 133 manuscripts of some or all of his works; but the earliest of these dates from the 11th century; and the text, especially of *Ant,* is often in doubt. Only one papyrus fragment of his works has been found (of *JW* 2.20.6–7 §576–79; and 2.20.7–8 §582–84), but it consists of only 38 complete words and 74 words in part. The fact, however, that there are no fewer than nine places (several of them, to be sure, based on somewhat shaky conjectures deriving from the number of letters in a line) where the fragment differs from known manuscripts leads one to think that the text of *JW,* which is in much better shape than that of *Ant,* is even less secure than has been supposed. The fact that the papyrus agrees now with one group of our extant manuscripts and now with another leads one to suggest that a century ago the editor of the definitive text of Josephus, Benedictus Niese, relied excessively on one family of manuscripts. Hence, for example, in the famous episode at Masada (in *JW* 7), we should now have less confidence in the reliability of the text. Another clue to the unreliability of the text that we possess may be found in the fact that the Church Fathers of the 3d and 4th centuries (Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome) declare that, according to Josephus, Jerusalem was destroyed because of the murder of James the Just, a statement nowhere to be found in our present text of Josephus. While such statements may represent tendentious writing, they may also reflect a text different from ours. Similarly, as Shlomo Pines has noted, there are statements in the 10th-century Arabic historian Agapius allegedly drawn from Josephus which are not in our texts (1971: 49–63).

The best modern edition of the Gk text remains the *editio maior* of Niese (7 vols., 1885–95), which has a much more conservative and full apparatus criticus than his *editio minor* (6 vols., 1888–95). Of the complete or partial Gk mss mentioned by Schreckenberg (1972), 50 were unknown to Niese, though only 2 of these are apparently of any major significance. Naber's edition (1888–96), which appeared almost simultaneously with that of Niese, has a smoother and more readable text than that of Niese but is too free with emendations and has numerous errors in the apparatus criticus.

G. Paraphrases and Translations

There are two translations into Latin, the first a free paraphrase of *JW* dating from the 4th century and ascribed to a certain Hegesippus, and the second a more literal translation of the works (with the exception of *Life*) made under the direction of Cassiodorus in the 6th century. Inasmuch as our earliest Greek mss date from the 11th century, these Latin versions, especially that ascribed to Cassiodorus, are of considerable value for the reconstruction of the text; they have not been fully exploited hitherto for this purpose, partly because we have critical editions solely for *AgAp* and the first five books of *Ant* (the latter, moreover, is based on only a few of the 171 manuscripts, its stemma is less than careful, and manuscripts are cited irregularly and inconsistently).

We have a Syriac version of Book 6 of *JW.* Its editor, Heimann Kottek (1886), has conjectured that the translator had before him a portion of the Aramaic original; but inasmuch as that original is completely lost, it is difficult to substantiate this claim.

A Hebrew paraphrase of *JW* was apparently prepared in S Italy in the 10th century (though Zeitlin [1962–63] has dated it as early as the 3d or 4th century). Its author is known as Josippon, and this paraphrase has come down to us in three very different recensions; the work has now, for the first time, been scientifically edited by D. Flusser. See JOSIPPON. Josippon's chief source was, it seems, Hegesippus, though he also shows knowledge of the Apocrypha and of the Latin translation of the first 16 books of *Ant.* In terms of purpose, whereas Josephus views the war between the Jews and the Romans as one for national liberty, Josippon looks

upon it as a holy war. He thus emphasizes two opposite trends—submission to the Romans and willingness to suffer martyrdom. The sole translation of this work into English is that of Peter Morvvyne in 1558, but it was based upon an abbreviated Latin version. A translation of the full text from the original Hebrew is now being prepared by Steven Bowman of the University of Cincinnati.

Another paraphrase, dating from the 11th century, was made into Old Russian, the definitive edition of which has been issued by Meščerskij (1958). Eisler (1929–30) suggested that this version is at least partially based on Josephus' original Aramaic version of *JW,* but this is problematic since its grammatical constructions only occasionally deviate from the Greek text. There are translations of this version into French and German, but not into English. It has been suggested, though hardly conclusively, that this version was used in the ideological struggle against the Khazars, who had been converted to Judaism in the 8th century.

What is of particular interest in the Slavonic text is the additions pertaining to John the Baptist and Jesus, though, curiously, neither of them is mentioned by name. It seems hardly likely that a Jew (i.e., Josephus) could have written "according to the law of *their* fathers" or "they [i.e., the Jews] crucified him," as we find in the Slavonic text. (An English translation of the passages pertaining to John and Jesus is to be found at the end of the 3d volume of the Loeb Library translation of Josephus.)

For many years the standard translation of Josephus' works into English was that of William Whiston in 1737, which has been reprinted at least 217 times. The translation has undoubted virility, but is based on Haverkamp's inferior 1726 text, is full of outright errors, and in its notes has such strange notions as that Josephus was an Ebionite Christian and a bishop of Jerusalem.

The Loeb Classical Library edition, by Henry St. J. Thackeray et al. (originally in nine volumes, now reprinted in ten volumes [London, 1926–65]) contains an eclectic Greek text which is dependent on Niese and Naber, with relatively few original emendations. The translation is often rather free, the commentary (frequently indebted to Reinach's French edition) is increasingly full, and there are a number of useful appendixes, especially bibliographical, in the last four volumes. Geoffrey A. Williamson's 1959 translation of *JW* (revised by E. Mary Smallwood in 1981) is popular and readable, having removed passages which appear to interrupt the narrative. Gaalya Cornfeld's 1982 translation of *JW* is often closely related to Thackeray's Loeb version; it has an extensive commentary and lavish illustrations but contains many errors.

H. Scholarship on Josephus

There is no classical or Jewish author for whom we have more complete or more fully annotated bibliographies than Josephus. Schreckenberg (1968), covering the period from the appearance of the editio princeps of the Latin translation in 1470 to 1965, lists 2207 entries; but the arrangement is year by year instead of by subject matter; there are numerous omissions; summaries are missing from a large number of items; and there are many errors, as is inevitable in this kind of work. His supplement (1979), arranged alphabetically by author, in which he attempts to be complete through 1975, has 1453 entries. Feldman (1986) has approximately 2600 entries, arranged alphabetically by author, of which about 900 cover the period from 1976 through 1984, while approximately 1900 are items that Schreckenberg missed, and the remainder contain summaries where Schreckenberg lacked them. This work also supplies indexes of citations and of Gk words in Josephus, both of which are missing from Schreckenberg's second volume. It also lists nearly 300 corrigenda for Schreckenberg's first volume and about 200 for his second volume.

Feldman (1984) also lists 5543 entries, arranging the subject matter according to 29 major topics and 428 subtopics and presenting not only summaries but, in most cases, criticisms, often at length, of the various items and, for all major problems, an evaluation of the state of the question. He also gives a list of desideratums in the field and the reasons why such works are needed. (Corrigenda to this volume will be found in Feldman 1986.) The most recent critical bibliographies of Josephus are those by Bilde (1988) and Feldman (in Feldman and Hata 1989: 330–448).

As to works about Josephus, Hölscher (PW 9: 1934–2000) has written the most influential general survey, in which he deals especially with Josephus' sources. His theory that for *Ant* Josephus made uncritical use of an intermediate lost Hellenistic midrash is based on the hypothesis, popular with scholars of his era, that ancient authors would have found

it most difficult to consult more than one source at a time; this is largely contested today.

The most original and most challenging work on Josephus remains that by Laqueur (1920), who concludes that Josephus' works reflect the circumstances of the time when he wrote, a point that has now been further developed by Schwartz (1985). The fairest and most comprehensive overall survey remains the semipopular series of lectures delivered by Henry St. J. Thackeray (1929). His most original theory, developed at some length in the work, that Josephus employed an assistant who was well versed in Sophocles for Books 15 and 16 of *Ant* and another assistant who was well acquainted with Thucydides for Books 17 through 19, has been challenged, since Sophoclean and Thucydidean words appear throughout Josephus' works (see above). Moreover, in his chapter on the *Testimonium Flavianum,* Thackeray was unduly influenced by the irrepressible Eisler (1929–30).

Shutt (1961) is concerned primarily with the relationship between Josephus' language and style and those of Nicolaus of Damascus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Polybius, and Strabo. His conclusions are hardly convincing, however, since many of the words cited are hardly unique with those authors.

Cohen (1979) has written the most challenging and most influential book since Laqueur (1920), to whom he is much indebted. Cohen suggests that Josephus used a preliminary draft for both *JW* and *Life* but that he modified it less in *Life;* however, such a theory is hard to substantiate, since we do not have a single fragment of the memoir; and we may well ask why Josephus did not use such a document for all the material common to *JW* and *Life.* Moreover, Cohen is hypercritical of Josephus' credibility except when it fits into his own theory that Josephus indeed originally backed the revolt against the Romans as he admits. Cohen argues that after Josephus surrendered, he invented a moderate faction to make it appear that he had not been alone in his defection.

Rajak (1983) in a useful, if less challenging, corrective to Cohen, interprets Josephus' social, educational, and linguistic background in the light of what can be known of his contemporaries and their attitudes. The book focuses on the Jewish revolt against the Romans, which the author interprets in the comparative light of other revolutions. Two collections of essays by various scholars have also appeared (Feldman and Hata 1987, 1989).

Bibliography

Bilde, P. 1988. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome.* Sheffield.
Cohen, S. J. D. 1979. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome.* Leiden.
Eisler, R. 1929–30. *Iesous Basileus ou Basileusas.* 2 vols. Heidelberg.
Feldman, L. 1984. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980).* Berlin.
———. 1986. *Josephus: A Supplementary Bibliography.* New York.
Feldman, L., and Hata, G., eds. 1987. *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity.* Detroit.
———. 1989. *Josephus, the Bible, and History.* Detroit.
Feuchtwanger, L. 1932. *Der jüdische Krieg.* Berlin.
———. 1936. *The Jew of Rome.* Trans. W. and E. Muir. New York.
———. 1942. *Josephus and the Emperor.* Trans. C. Oram. New York.
Kahle, P. 1959. *The Cairo Geniza.* 2d ed. Oxford.
Kottek, H. 1886. *Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum.* Diss., Leipzig and Berlin.
Ladouceur, D. J. 1977. Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus. Ph.D. diss., Brown University.
Laqueur, R. 1920. *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus.* Geissen.
Mes¥c¥erskij, N. 1958. *History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian.* Moscow and Leningrad (in Russian).
Mommsen, T. 1870. Cornelius Tacitus and Cluvius Rufus. *Hermes* 4: 295–335.
Morton, A. Q., and Michaelson, S. 1973. Elision as an Indicator of Authorship in Greek Writers. *Revue de l'Organisation Internationale pour l'Etude des Langues Anciennes par Ordinateur* 3: 33–56.
Pines, S. 1971. *An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications.* Jerusalem.
Rajak, T. 1983. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society.* London.

Rengstorf, K. H. 1973–83. *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus.* 4 vols. Leiden.
Schalit, A. 1965. Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' "Antiquities of the Jews." *ASTI* 4: 163–85.
———. 1968. *König Herodes.* Berlin.
Schreckenberg, H. 1968. *Bibliographie zu Flavius-Josephus.* Leiden. Supplementary volume, 1979.
———. 1972. *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter.* Leiden.
Schwartz, S. 1985. Josephus and Judaism from 70 to 100 of the Common Era. Diss., Columbia University.
Shutt, R. J. H. 1961. *Studies in Josephus.* London.
Thackeray, H. St. J. 1929. *Josephus the Man and the Historian.* New York. Repr. 1967.
Thackeray, H. St. J., and Marcus, R. 1930–55. *A Lexicon to Josephus.* 4 fascicles. Paris.
Zeitlin, S. 1962–63. Josippon. *JQR* 53: 277–97.

LOUIS H. FELDMAN