

# *Flavius Josephus*

Translation and Commentary

*Edited by Steve Mason*



Volume 10

*Against Apion*

*Translation and Commentary by*  
John M.G. Barclay

BRILL

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS

VOLUME 10

*AGAINST APION*



# FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

EDITED BY

STEVE MASON

---

VOLUME 10

## *AGAINST APION*

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

BY

JOHN M.G. BARCLAY



BRILL  
LEIDEN · BOSTON  
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Detailed Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data are available on the Internet at <http://catalog.loc.gov>

ISBN 10: 90 04 11791 1  
ISBN 13: 978 90 04 11791 4

© Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands  
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill,  
Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For

Joel Marcus

an outstanding Mensch,  
scholar, and friend



## CONTENTS

Series Preface: The Brill Josephus Project.....	IX
Abbreviations and Sigla .....	XIII
Acknowledgements .....	XV
Introduction.....	XVII
Josephus, <i>Against Apion</i>	
Book 1 .....	3
Book 2 .....	167
Appendix 1: Manetho .....	335
Appendix 2: Pseudo-Hecataeus.....	338
Appendix 3: Exodus Narratives in Cultural Context.....	341
Appendix 4: The Judeans and the Ass .....	350
Appendix 5: The Sources of the Apologetic Encomium (2.145-286) .....	353
Appendix 6: Judaism in Roman Dress? .....	362
Bibliography .....	371
Indices	
Ancient Texts .....	391
Places and Names mentioned by Josephus.....	421
Greek and Latin Words .....	424
Modern Scholars .....	425





## SERIES PREFACE

### THE BRILL JOSEPHUS PROJECT

Titus (?) Flavius Josephus (37–ca. 100 CE) was born Joseph son of Mattathياهو, a priestly aristocrat in Judea. During the early stages of the war against Rome (66-74 CE), he found himself leading a part of the defense in Galilee, but by the spring of 67, his territory overrun, he had surrendered under circumstances that would furnish grounds for endless accusation. Taken to Rome by the Flavian conquerors, he spent the balance of his life writing about the war, Judean history and culture, and his own career. He composed four works in thirty volumes.

If Josephus boasts about the unique importance of his work (*War* 1.1-3; *Ant.* 1.1-4) in the fashion of ancient historians, few of his modern readers could disagree with him. By the accidents of history, his narratives have become the indispensable source for all scholarly study of Judea from about 200 BCE to 75 CE. Our analysis of other texts and of the physical remains unearthed by archaeology must occur in dialogue with Josephus' story, for it is the only comprehensive and connected account of the period.

Although Josephus' name has been known continuously through nearly two millennia, and he has been cited extensively in support of any number of agendas, his writings have not always been valued as compositions. Readers have tended to look beyond them to the underlying historical facts or to Josephus' sources. Concentrated study in the standard academic forms—journals, scholarly seminars, or indeed commentaries devoted to Josephus—were lacking. The past two decades, however, have witnessed the birth and rapid growth of “Josephus studies” in the proper sense. Signs of the new environment include all of the vehicles and tools that were absent before, as well as K. H. Rengstorf's *Complete Concordance* (1983), Louis Feldman's annotated bibliographies, and now a proliferation of Josephus-related dissertations. The time is right, therefore, for the first comprehensive English commentary to Josephus.

The commentary format is ancient, and even in antiquity commentators differed in their aims and

methods. Philo's goals were not those of the author of Qumran's *Commentary on Nahum* or of the Church Father Origen. In order to assist the reader of this series, the Brill Project team would like to explain our general aims and principles. Our most basic premise is that we do not intend to provide the last word: an exhaustive exegesis of this rich corpus. Rather, since no commentary yet exists in English, we hope simply to provide a resource that will serve as an invitation to further exploration.

Although we began with the mandate to prepare a commentary alone, we soon realized that a new translation would also be helpful. Keeping another existing translation at hand would have been cumbersome for the reader. And since we must comment on particular Greek words and phrases, we would have been implicitly challenging such existing translations at every turn. Given that we needed to prepare a working translation for the commentary in any case, it seemed wisest to include it with the commentary as an efficient point of reference. A few words about the translation, then, are in order.

Granted that every translation is an interpretation, one can still imagine a spectrum of options. For example, the translator may set out to follow the contours of the original language more expressly or to place greater emphasis on idiomatic phrasing in the target language. There is much to be said for both of these options and for each interim stop in the spectrum. Accuracy is not necessarily a criterion in such choices, for one might gain precision in one respect (e.g., for a single word or form) only at the cost of accuracy elsewhere (e.g., in the sentence). Homer's epic poems provide a famous example of the problem: Does one render them in English dactylic hexameter, in looser verse, or even in prose to better convey the sense? One simply needs to make choices.

In our case, the course was suggested by the constraints of the commentary. If we were preparing a stand-alone translation for independent reading, we might have made other choices. And certainly if Josephus had been an Athenian poet,

other considerations might have weighed more heavily. But Greek was his second or third language. His narratives are not great literature, and they vary in quality considerably from one part to another. Since the commentary bases itself upon his particular Greek words and phrases, it seemed necessary in this case that we produce a translation to reflect the patterns of the Greek as closely as possible. We can perhaps tolerate somewhat less clarity in the translation itself, where the Greek is ambiguous, because we intend it to be read with the commentary.

We happily confess our admiration for the Loeb translation, which has been the standard for some time, begun by Henry St. John Thackeray in the 1920s and completed by our colleague on the Brill Project (responsible for *Ant.* 1-4) Louis H. Feldman in 1965. For us to undertake a new translation implies no criticism of the Loeb in its context. The older sections of it are somewhat dated now but it still reads well, often brilliantly.

The chief problem with the Loeb for our purpose is only that it does not suit the needs of the commentator. Like most translations, it makes idiomatic English the highest virtue. It renders terms that Josephus frequently uses by different English equivalents for variety's sake; it often injects explanatory items to enhance the narrative flow; it collapses two or more Greek clauses into a single English clause; it alters the parts of speech with considerable freedom; and it tends to homogenize Josephus' changing style to a single, elevated English level. Since we have undertaken to annotate words and phrases, however, we have required a different sort of foundation. Our goal has been to render individual Greek words with as much consistency as the context will allow, to preserve the parts of speech, letting adjectives be adjectives and participles be participles, to preserve phrases and clauses intact, and thus to reflect something of the particular stylistic level and tone of each section.

Needless to say, even a determined literalness must yield to the ultimate commandment of basic readability in English. Cases in which we have relinquished any effort to represent the Greek precisely include Josephus' preference for serial aorist-participle clauses. Given the frequency of complicated sentences in Josephus, as among most of his contemporaries, we have dealt quite freely with such clauses. We have often broken a series

into separate sentences and also varied the translation of the form, thus: "After X had done Y;" "When [or Once] X had occurred," and so on. Again, although in a very few cases Josephus' "historical present" may find a passable parallel in colloquial English, we have generally substituted a past tense. Thus we have not pursued literalness at all costs, but have sought it where it seemed feasible.

In the case of Josephus' personal names, we have used the familiar English equivalent where it is close to his Greek form. Where his version differs significantly from the one familiar to Western readers, or where he varies his form within the same narrative, we have represented his Greek spelling in Roman characters. That is because his unusual forms may be of interest to some readers. In such cases we have supplied the familiar English equivalent in square brackets within the text or in a footnote. Similarly, we keep Josephus' units of measurement and titles, giving modern equivalents in the notes.

We do not pretend that this effort at literalness is always more accurate than an ostensibly freer rendering, since translation is such a complex phenomenon. Further, we have not always been able to realize our aims. Ultimately, the reader who cares deeply about the Greek text will want to study Greek. But we have endeavored to provide a translation that permits us to discuss what is happening in the Greek with all of its problems.

The commentary aims at a balance between what one might, for convenience, call historical and literary issues. "Literary" here would include matters most pertinent to the interpretation of the text itself. "Historical" would cover matters related to the hypothetical reconstruction of a reality outside the text. For example: How Josephus presented the causes of the war against Rome is a literary problem, whereas recovering the actual causes of the war is the task of historical reconstruction. Or, understanding Josephus' Essenes is a matter for the interpreter, whereas reconstructing the real Essenes and their possible relationship to Qumran is for the historian—perhaps the same person, but wearing a different hat. These are not hermetically sealed operations, of course, but some such classification helps us to remain aware of the various interests of our readers.

To assist the reader who is interested in recovering some sense of what Josephus might

have expected his first audience to understand, we have tried to observe some ways in which each part of his narrative relates to the whole. We point out apparently charged words and phrases in the narratives, which may also occur in such significant contexts as the prologues, speeches, and editorial asides. We look for parallels in some of the famous texts of the time, whether philosophical, historical, or dramatic, and whether Greco-Roman, Jewish, or Christian. We observe set pieces (*topoi*) and other rhetorical effects. Even apparently mundane but habitual features of Josephus' language and style are noted. Where puzzling language appears, we discuss possible explanations: rhetorical artifice, multiple editions, unassimilated vestiges of sources, the influence of a literary collaborator, and manuscript corruption.

A basic literary problem is the content of the text itself. Although we decided against preparing a new Greek edition as part of the project, we have paid close attention to textual problems in translation and commentary. The translation renders, essentially, Benedictus Niese's *editio maior*, since it remains the standard complete text with apparatus. But we have tried to take note of both the significant variants in Niese's own critical apparatus and other modern reconstructions where they are available. These include: the Loeb Greek text, the Michel-Bauernfeind edition of the *Judean War*, the current Münster project directed by Folker Siegert for Josephus's later works, and the ongoing French project led by Étienne Nodet. Niese's reconstructed text in the *editio maior* is famously conservative, and we have felt no particular loyalty to it where these others have proposed better readings.

Under the "historical" rubric fall a variety of subcategories. Most important perhaps are the impressive archaeological finds of recent decades in places mentioned by Josephus: building sites, coins, pottery, implements, inscriptions, and other items of material culture. Reading his stories of Masada or Herodium or Gamala is greatly enriched by observation of these newly identified sites, while in return, his narrative throws light on the history of those places. The commentary attempts to include systematic reference to the relevant archaeology. Other major historical categories include the problems of Josephus' own biography, his social context in Rome, and the historical reconstruction of persons, places, events, and social conditions mentioned by him. These issues can

only be explored by reference to outside texts and physical evidence. Alongside questions of interpretation, therefore, we routinely discuss such problems as they appear in particular passages.

In preparing a commentary on such a vast corpus, it is a challenge to achieve proportion. Some stretches of narrative naturally call for more comment than others, and yet the aesthetics of publication requires a measure of balance. We have attempted to maintain both flexibility and a broad consistency by aiming at a ratio between 4:1 and 8:1 of commentary to primary text. This commitment to a degree of symmetry (cf. *Ant.* 1.7!) has required us to avoid too-lengthy discussion of famous passages, such as those on Jesus or the Essenes, while giving due attention to easily neglected sections.

A different kind of challenge is posed by the coming together of ten independent scholars for such a collegial enterprise. To balance individual vision with the shared mission, we have employed several mechanisms. First is simply our common mandate: Having joined together to produce a balanced commentary, we must each extend ourselves to consider questions that we might not have pursued in other publishing contexts. Second, each completed assignment is carefully read by two experts who are not part of the core team, but who assist us in maintaining overall compliance with our goals. Third, each assignment is examined by the same general editor, who encourages overall consistency. Finally, for the *War* and *Antiquities* we use a system of double introductions: the general editor introduces each of Josephus' major works, to provide a coherent context for each segment; then each principal contributor also introduces his own assignment, highlighting the particular issues arising in that section. The *Life* and *Against Apion* have only one introduction each, however, because in those cases the individual assignment corresponds to the entire work.

Thus uniformity is not among our goals. Committees do not create good translations or commentaries. We have striven rather for an appropriate balance between overall coherence and individual scholarly insight—the animating principle of humanistic scholarship. The simple Greek word *Ioudaios* affords an example of the diversity among us. Scholars in general differ as to whether the English "Judean" or "Jew" comes closest to what an ancient Greek or Roman heard

in this word, and our team members reflect that difference. Some of us have opted for “Judean” as a standard; some use both terms, depending upon the immediate context; and others use “Jew” almost exclusively. For the modern translator, as for Josephus himself, any particular phrase is part of an integrated world of discourse; to coerce agreement on any such point would violate that world. We hope that our readers will benefit from the range of expertise and perspective represented in these volumes.

It remains for the team members to thank some central players in the creation of this work, *amici* in scholarship whose names do not otherwise appear. First, many scholars in Josephan studies and related fields have offered encouragement at every step. Though we cannot name them all, we must express our debt to those who are reading our work in progress, without thereby implicating them in its faults: Honora Howell Chapman, David M. Goldenberg, Erich Gruen, Gohei Hata, Donna Runnalls, and Pieter van der Horst.

Second, we are grateful to the editorial staff at Brill for initiating this project and seeing it through so professionally. In the early years, Elisabeth Erdman, Elisabeth Venekamp, Job Lisman, and Sam Bruinsma provided constant encouragement as the first volumes appeared,

even as we announced unavoidable delays with much of the publishing schedule. More recently, Loes Schouten, Jan-Peter Wissink, Anita Roodnat, and Ivo Romein have absorbed these delays with grace, working with us patiently, flexibly and with unflagging professionalism to ensure the success of this important project.

Finally, in addition to expressing the entire group’s thanks to these fine representatives of a distinguished publishing house (not least in Josephus) I am pleased to record my personal gratitude to the various agencies and institutions that have made possible my work as editor and contributor, alongside other demands on my time. These include: York University, for a Faculty of Arts leave fellowship and then successful nomination as Canada Research Chair (from 2003), along with encouragement from various directions; the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for funding throughout the project; the Killam Foundation of Canada, for a wonderful two-year leave fellowship in 2001-2003; and both All Souls College and Wolfson College for visiting fellowships in Oxford during the Killam leave.

Steve Mason, York University  
General Editor, Brill Josephus Project

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

In general, the abbreviations are those used by the *SBL Handbook of Style For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*, ed. P.H. Alexander et al. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). Additional abbreviations are as follows:

BJP	Brill Josephus Project. <i>Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary</i> , general ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2000-)
Boysen	C. Boysen, <i>Flavii Iosephi Opera ex Versione Latina Antiqua. VI: De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive Contra Apionem</i> (Vienna: Tempsky, 1898)
Blum	L. Blum, author of French translation in T. Reinach, <i>Flavius Josèphe, Contre Apion</i> (Paris: Société Edition “Les Belles Lettres,” 1930)
Calabi	F. Calabi, <i>Flavio Giuseppe: In Difesa degli Ebrei (Contro Apione)</i> (Venezia: Marsilio, 1993)
DK	H. Diels and W. Kranz, <i>Fragmente der Vorsokratischer</i> (6 <sup>th</sup> edition; Berlin: Weidmann, 1952)
Gutschmid	A. von Gutschmid, <i>Kleine Schriften. Vol. IV</i> (ed. F. Rühl; Leipzig: Teubner, 1893)
Labow	D. Labow, <i>Flavius Josephus Contra Apionem, Buch 1. Einleitung, Text, Textkritischer Apparat, Übersetzung und Kommentar</i> (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005)
Müller	J.G. Müller, <i>Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion. Text und Erklärung aus dem Nachlass von J.G. Müller</i> (eds. C.J. Riggenbach and C. von Orelli; Basel: Bahnmeier, 1877)
Naber	S.A. Naber, <i>Flavii Iosephi Opera omnia</i> (Leipzig: Teubner, 1896)
Niese	B. Niese, <i>Flavii Iosephi Opera edidit et apparatu critico instruxit. Vol. 5: De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive Contra Apionem libri II</i> (Berlin: Weidmann, 1889) = Niese maior
Niese minor	B. Niese, <i>Flavii Iosephi Opera recognovit. Vol. 5: De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive Contra Apionem libri II.</i> (Berlin: Weidmann, 1889)
Münster	F. Siegert, H. Schreckenberg, and M. Vogel, <i>Flavius Josephus, Über das Alter des Judentums (Contra Apionem)</i> (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006)
PCG	R. Kassel and C. Austin, <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> (2 vols.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983-)
Reinach	T. Reinach, <i>Flavius Josèphe, Contre Apion</i> (Paris: Société Edition “Les Belles Lettres,” 1930)
Schürer revised	E. Schürer, <i>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)</i> . Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, and M. Goodman (3 vols., Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973-87)
Stern	M. Stern, <i>Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism</i> 3 vols. (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-84)
Thackeray	H. St. John Thackeray, <i>Josephus. Vol. I: The Life / Against Apion</i> (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926)
Troiani	L. Troiani, <i>Commento storico al ‘Contro Apione’ di Giuseppe. Introduzione, Commento storico, traduzione e indici</i> (Pisa: Giardini, 1977)
Whiston	W. Whiston, <i>The Works of Josephus</i> (New updated edition, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995; first published 1736).

E	Codex Eliensis (15th century)
ed. princ.	Editio princeps (Arlenius, 1544)
Excerpta	Excerpta Constantiniana (10th century; ed. Büttner-Wobst, 1906)
L	Codex Laurentianus 69, 22 (11th century)
Latin	Latin translation (6th century; ed. Boysen, 1898)
S	Codex Schleusingensis (15th /16th century)



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The origins of this volume lie in earlier research on Diaspora Judaism: of all the texts I studied in that connection, the one that intrigued me most was Josephus' *Against Apion*. I was fortunate to hear at that time of the Brill Josephus Project, and then to be commissioned by its editor, Steve Mason, to write the *Apion* commentary. Steve and a succession of Brill editors have been patiently waiting for this outcome ever since, and I am immensely grateful to them for granting me the privilege of joining the Josephus team and for bearing with me through countless missed deadlines. Steve's editorial advice, encouragement, and scrutiny have been outstanding. He has read every sentence in this book with extraordinary care, and he has generously supplied good advice on translation and commentary, and many corrections of my errors or misunderstandings. At the same time, I have been exceptionally fortunate to have Erich Gruen read the whole work, in the midst of all his other academic duties. I could not have asked for a more knowledgeable or more judicious critic, whose encouragement has also sustained me along a lengthy and sometimes dispiriting road. Both these readers have helped me to correct and improve much; for my remaining errors, and my stubbornness in holding to controversial judgments, I remain solely responsible.

The project was started while I worked at Glasgow University, and was aided by support from the Arts and Humanities Research Board (now Council), which provided an extra semester of leave. That time was spent in the congenial context of the University of Otago (New Zealand), where the friendship of Paul Trebilco

enabled an exceptionally happy and intellectually fertile period of research. Since then, a move to a new academic context, at Durham University, has brought me into the orbit of wonderfully supportive colleagues, whose interest and gentle enquiries about "Apion" have kept me pressing on. Throughout this period, I have been in touch with the Münster Josephus project, led by Folker Siegert. We have shared drafts of our work on *Apion*, and I am extremely grateful to the Münster team for kindly sending me preliminary versions of their text, a major new advance in *Apion* scholarship and the basis for the new translation here. For numerous other matters, Josephan and other, I gratefully acknowledge the advice and help of Paul Spilsbury, Jamie McLaren, Stephen Moore, and two Durham postgraduates, Matthew Scott and Naomi Jacobs. Another postgraduate, Dean Pinter, has kindly assisted me with the indices—a herculean task.

There have been many times when this large and demanding project has threatened to overwhelm me. That it has not (quite) is in large measure thanks to the support, patience, and good humor of my family, who have suffered from my preoccupation with Josephus more than I like to think. To my wife, Diana, and my children, Robert, David, and Frances, I express my deepest thanks; they will be as relieved as I am that "Josephus" is done. Finally, a special word of thanks is due to Joel Marcus, a one-time colleague and long-time friend. At a difficult period in my career Joel stood by me and gave me the best possible advice. Without his support this project would probably have collapsed, and I am pleased to dedicate this volume to him with the deepest respect and the warmest thanks.





## INTRODUCTION

Josephus' *Against Apion*<sup>1</sup> is the last, the shortest, but in many respects the most skillful of his three major compositions. Settled in Rome after the debacle of the Judean Revolt (66–70 CE), Josephus devoted himself to writing on behalf of his fellow Judeans, composing first the 7-book account of the *Judean War* and then, with extraordinary dedication, the enormous *Judean Antiquities* (21 books, including its appendix, *Life*). Neither of these works is, in its own terms, incomplete, but Josephus did not consider his life's work finished. He proceeded to write an additional treatise, the 2-volume *Apion*, in a different, apologetic genre. Here he responds to doubts about Judean antiquity, puncturing inflated claims for Greek historiography and providing, in reply, a long parade of "witnesses," Egyptian, Phoenician, Chaldean, and Greek (1.6-218). He then turns to his second task, the refutation of insults levelled against the Judean people. He first demolishes derogatory versions of Judean origins (as leprous or polluted refugees from Egypt), found in Manetho, Chaeremon, and Lysimachus (1.219-320), then rounds on Apion, citing an array of accusations and scurrilous stories, and answering his opponent with bitter invective (2.1-144). Finally, in response to further critics, he composes an encomium on the Judean constitution, with a summary of its laws, crafted to show its superiority over the very best in the Greek tradition (2.145-286).

In this work we encounter Josephus at his rhetorical best: he displays an impressive cultural range in knowledge of Greek history, historiography, and philosophy, and his interlocking arguments in defense of Judeans are spiced with acute literary analysis and clever polemics. From *Apion* we also learn precious information about the reputation of Judeans in antiquity through the critics and commentators cited by Josephus,

many otherwise obscure. Above all, we discover the apologetic substance of a Judean author culturally aware and politically experienced in late first-century Rome. Josephus' proof that the Judeans were an independent and ancient people, his refutation of cultural slurs and political accusations, his demonstration of the superior "constitution" enjoyed by Judeans—each of these reveals much about ancient competitions for cultural honor and how Judeans could position and advance their own tradition under the hegemony of "Greek" canons of knowledge and Roman political power. Josephus' treatise, capped by his sparkling encomium of the Judean constitution (2.145-286), is the finest sample of Judean apologetics from antiquity, and stands as a brilliant finale to his long literary career.

### 1. *Structure*

*Apion* is designed as a single rhetorical complex, its various arguments gathered in the conclusion (2.287-96). Since interpretation depends on comprehending each segment within the framework of the whole, it is important that we establish, at the outset, the structural design of the treatise.<sup>2</sup>

Josephus signals the topics of his treatise in his *exordium* (1.1-5) and describes the structure of the work in his secondary introduction at 1.58-59. Responding to those who doubt the antiquity of Judeans (1.2), he sets out to prove the malice and falsehood of detractors, and to correct and instruct the ignorant (1.3). He promises to employ reliable witnesses and to explain the comparative silence of Greek authors, while

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter, *Apion*. On its title, see below, § 4.

---

<sup>2</sup> Of course the observations here offered "at the outset" represent conclusions drawn from examination of each segment of the text in context. Structural analysis and detailed exegesis operate in a hermeneutical circle, and the value of this structural overview can be proved (or disconfirmed) only in the commentary to follow.

highlighting those who mentioned Judeans (1.4-5). At the same time he will show that “those who have written about us slanderously and falsely are convicted by themselves” (1.4). It is not easy to discern any structure in this jumble of themes, though two main topics are clearly present—evidence for the antiquity of Judeans and refutation of slander directed against them. The topics become more clearly distinguished when the structure of the work is described in 1.58-59. There Josephus signals the order of his material. First he will reply briefly to those who argue from Greek silence to the late establishment of the Judean people; then he will cite evidence of Judean antiquity from the literature of others, before demonstrating that those who slander Judeans are devoid of reason. From this point it is not difficult to trace where the promised discussions take place, or at least begin. The first occupies 1.60-68 (Greek silence is based on Greek ignorance). The second comprises 1.69-218 (evidence for Judean antiquity from the literature of others). The start of the third is clearly signalled at 1.219: “one topic still remains from those proposed at the start of my argument: to prove false the libels and insults that certain people have aimed at our people, and to invoke their authors as witnesses against themselves.” This clearly echoes 1.4 and 1.59, while the reference to *one* remaining topic suggests that all that follows in this treatise is meant to fall under this head. 1.219–2.144, at least, clearly does so: it contains detailed refutation, in turn, of Manetho, Chaeremon, Lysimachus, and Apion. The transition from book 1 to book 2 does not interrupt this flow or mark any change of topic; at the start of the second book, Josephus summarizes the contents of the first (2.1) and promises to “refute the rest of the authors who have written something against us” (2.2). The treatment of Apion (2.1-144) thus falls under the heading of 1.219.

Thus far, the structure of the work is clear and relatively uncontroversial:

- 1.60-68: reasons for Greek silence on Judeans  
 1.69-218: evidence for Judean antiquity: subdivided into Egyptian (1.73-105), Phoenician (1.106-27), Chaldean (1.128-60), and Greek (1.161-214)

1.219–2.144: refutation of slanders: Manetho (1.227-87), Chaeremon (1.288-303), Lysimachus (1.304-20), and Apion (2.1-144)

What remains less clear, and still contested, is the status of the material in 1.6-59 (more precisely 1.6-56) and in 2.145-286. The role of the first is not clearly signalled by Josephus, and the second is seen by many as a new departure, even a new main topic in the treatise, previously unannounced. However, neither is as awkward as is sometimes thought.

a) 1.6-56: In this passage Josephus exposes the inadequacies of Greek historians (1.6-26) and argues for the superiority of non-Greek historiography, especially that practiced by Judeans (1.27-46). This latter discussion moves seamlessly into a description and defense of Josephus’ own historiography, especially in his composition of *War*, regarding which he answers personal criticisms (1.47-56). He draws his conclusion on comparative historiography (1.58) in apologising for a “digression” (1.57). Although it has been suggested that this “digression” is constituted by the whole of 1.6-56,<sup>3</sup> it is better to limit the “digression” to Josephus’ defensive remarks (1.53-56?),<sup>4</sup> with the larger opening segment (1.6-56) forming the extended introduction (*prolegomenon*) to the discussion of Judean antiquity. Before citing the evidence (1.69-218), Josephus needs to establish why the vaunted Greek testimony (the presenting issue in 1.2) is actually the *least* significant for the topic of Judean antiquity. In the same cause 1.60-68 further punctures the balloon of Greek self-importance. Thus, all of 1.6-68 lays the foundation for the argument for Judean antiquity, moving readers from the presumption that the (comparative) silence of Greek historians about Judeans is damaging to Judean honor to the conviction that they are more likely to hear the truth from non-Greek sources. It thus justifies the *proportion* in the evidence to be cited in 1.69-218: far

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Mason 1996: 209; 2003a: 132-33. But it would be an unusual procedure to *begin* a treatise with a self-designated “digression.”

<sup>4</sup> See note to “digression” at 1.57.

more from non-Greeks (1.73-160) than from Greeks (1.161-214).

b) 2.145-286: It is frequently noted that the style, tone, and content of this segment of the treatise are different from the preceding segments, a shift summarized in the perception that here, after being defensive, Josephus offers a “positive” portrayal of the Judean tradition, its constitution and laws. The differences are certainly striking. In the preceding response to critics (1.219–2.144), Josephus had cited the critics’ narratives or answered their charges in detail and in sequence. Here, after initially naming Apollonius Molon and others as his target (2.145-50), larges swathes of the following text pass without explicit reference to such opponents. Indeed, Josephus rarely here answers criticism of Judeans *directly*: most of the text is spent in eulogy of the Judean constitution, and the critical remarks are mostly those issued by Josephus himself, against others. In fact, although he seems reluctant to name it so, the tone is that of an *encomium* (2.147, 287) in praise of Moses, his unique constitution, and the virtues inherent in his laws. Josephus also broaches topics hitherto unannounced and largely unrelated to what has gone before. The virtues enshrined in the constitution become the chief focus of discussion, while the antiquity of Moses seems suddenly uncontroversial (2.156). For such reasons, and since this segment seems largely self-contained, lacking reference to the preceding segments but equipped with its own introduction (2.145-50), scholars regularly treat this as the *third* main part of the treatise, after the first on Judean antiquity (1.6-218) and the second on the refutation of slanders (1.219–2.144).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> See especially Gerber 1997: 67-70, 94-99, with many acute observations on the paucity of inner cross-reference within *Apion* and on the tensions between the arguments deployed by Josephus in different parts of the work. She labels 2.145-286: “Dritte Hauptteil: Verteidigung des Judentums anhand seiner Gesetze”; cf. Labow 2005: lxxvi–lxxxi. Mason also distinguishes this segment, but as a “Peroration” (2003a: 133). But, as Gerber notes (1997: 70, n. 24), this is an unusual label for so long and significant a segment, which introduces new material; the true “peroration” is

Despite such evidence, there are strong reasons to resist this separation of 2.145-286 from the preceding sequence of refutations, at least as signalled by Josephus’ rhetoric. To distinguish 2.145-286 as a third main section (*Hauptteil*) would leave this climactic segment of the work unannounced in 1.1-5 and in 1.58-59; more seriously, it would mean that the explicit announcement of *one* remaining task (1.219) was incorrect, since there were in fact two, one negative (1.219–2.144) and one positive (2.145-286).<sup>6</sup> When he comes to summarize the work (2.287-95), Josephus indicates no category distinction between the material in 2.145-286 and the earlier parts of the treatise. He says he has successfully refuted doubts on the antiquity of the Judeans (2.287-88), answered slanders on their supposedly Egyptian origin (2.289), and countered insults against the legislator and his laws (2.290-91): all of these are described as his response to *critics*. In fact, these concluding comments (2.290-91) mirror the introduction to 2.145-286, which is ushered into the treatise not as a “positive portrayal” of the constitution, but as a response to additional slanders levelled by Apollonius Molon, Lysimachus, and others (2.145, 148). Apollonius is explicitly compared with Apion (2.148),<sup>7</sup> and the language of “libel” and “insult” (2.145, 148) matches the announcement of the “one remaining” topic in 1.219. Thus, whatever the origin and original focus of his material, Josephus labors hard to introduce 2.145-286 as a continuation of the *defensive apologetic* begun in 1.219. Indeed, he

in 2.287-95. Bilde (1988: 117-18) and Levison & Wagner (1996: 5) divide 2.145-286 into two sections, with the break between 2.219 and 2.220. This obscures the inner coherence of 2.145-286 and leaves unclear the relationship of the whole to the earlier parts of the treatise. On whether the language of 2.144 suggests that the treatise, in an earlier version, finished there, see note to “end” at 2.144.

<sup>6</sup> Gerber (1997: 95, n.5) rightly recognizes this problem, but overrides it in distinguishing 2.145-286 as a separable entity.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. 2.2, which promises treatment of “the remaining authors [plural] who have written something against us.” This implies that Apion will not be the last.

explicitly labels it an ἀπολογία (2.147), and it seems unwise to ignore his rhetorical signals by isolating this segment as a new and unannounced departure. Nor is his effort to integrate this segment confined to the introduction: reference to critics or criticism of Judeans recurs throughout 2.151-286 (see 2.156, 161, 182, 236-38, 255, 258, 262, 270, 278, 285), and is completely absent only from the summary of the laws (2.190-218). In some cases, to be sure, the mention of critics (Apollonius Molon and others) may be relatively superficial, a rhetorical excuse for an argument shaped by other factors. Certainly, the odium potentially caused by Josephus' comparative boasts can be more easily deflected if others are accused of forcing him into this strategy (2.150, 236-38). But elsewhere the apologetic motif cannot be removed by literary surgery: in 2.236-86 the whole argument revolves around the refutation of a specific accusation (2.258). Thus, even if Josephus' content is sometimes only loosely connected to its present apologetic use, this is not always the case, and *even if it were*, our understanding of the work in its final, Josephan form must pay primary attention to *his* depiction of his aims and argumentative structure.<sup>8</sup> The fact that he, to some degree, forces other types of material into an apologetic mold is itself significant for our understanding of the genre of the treatise and its rhetorical purpose (see below, §§ 5 and 7).

Thus the treatise, as designed by Josephus, has only two main parts: the discussion of

Judean antiquity (1.6-218) and the refutation of slanders (1.219-2.286). 2.145-286 is neither a third part, previously unannounced, nor, in its present form, the introduction of a new genre; it is the refutation of slanders issued by Apollonius Molon and others.

The internal structure of 2.145-286 is perhaps the hardest to unravel: only the introduction (2.145-50) and the summary of the laws (2.190-218) are clear in their limits and focus.<sup>9</sup> The discussion of the merits of the constitution (2.151-189) is sometimes difficult to divide into paragraphs, not least because Josephus often closes one paragraph by mentioning the theme of the next. After the summary (2.190-218), the multiple comparisons between the Judean and other constitutions could be variously grouped, but there are good reasons to distinguish 2.219-35 (on the virtue of endurance) from the following lengthy discussion of Judean religious difference (2.236-86), whose core and originating cause is Apollonius' charge of Judean separatism (2.258).<sup>10</sup>

We may conclude that the treatise is best understood according to the following structure:<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> My reference to "final, Josephan form" is an acknowledgement that a good deal of the material in 2.151-286 may be derived from earlier sources; see Appendix 5. Even so, there is no reason to think that Josephus has adopted material wholesale or without reflection: whatever he has used he has adapted and supplemented for his own ends. Josephus' use of the segment as a whole (2.145-286) may parallel his use of material within it: he is not solely responsible for its content and shape, which transcend his immediate purposes in this treatise, but he still exercises some rhetorical control, and bends it, to varying degrees, to his own ends.

<sup>9</sup> Even the latter is disputed; for my reasons for regarding the summary as concluded at 2.218 (not, with the consensus, at 2.219), see note to "now" at 2.219.

<sup>10</sup> See note to "sort" at 2.236.

<sup>11</sup> I omit here the refinement that descends to the level of individual sections, or to subdivisions beyond the third level; for those, see the opening paragraphs of the "Reading Options" that introduce each major segment. In some cases it is a tiny difference in judgment whether to take transitional sections as belonging to what precedes or to what follows. For the interpretation of the treatise as a whole what matters is not such trivial drawing of lines, but decisions on the larger context to which whole arguments belong. For other structural diagrams see Bilde 1988: 117-18; Levison & Wagner 1996: 2-5; Kasher 1997: 6-8; Gerber 1997: 68-70; Dormeyer 2001: 250, 253; Labow 2005: lxxxii; Siegert, Schreckenberger, & Vogel 2006: 10.

- 1.1-5: *Introduction (exordium)*
- 1.6-218: *Part One: The Antiquity of the Judeans*
- 1.6-56: Prolegomenon: Comparative Historiography
    - 1.6-27: The inadequacies of Greek historiography
    - 1.28-56: The superiority of non-Greek/Judean historiography
  - 1.57-59: Preliminary Conclusion and Announcement of Agenda
  - 1.60-68: Reasons for Greek Ignorance of Judeans
  - 1.69-218: Evidence for Judean Antiquity
    - 1.69-72: Introduction
    - 1.73-105: Egyptian evidence
    - 1.106-27: Phoenician evidence
    - 1.128-60: Chaldean evidence
    - 1.161-214: Greek evidence
    - 1.215-18: Conclusions
- 1.219–2.286: *Part Two: Refutation of Slanders*
- 1.219-26: Introduction
  - 1.227-87: Manetho
    - 1.227-31: Introduction
    - 1.232-51: Manetho’s story
    - 1.252-87: Josephus’ reply
  - 1.288-303: Chaeremon
    - 1.288-92: Chaeremon’s story
    - 1.293-303: Josephus’ reply
  - 1.304-20: Lysimachus
    - 1.304-11: Lysimachus’ story
    - 1.312-20: Josephus’ reply
  - 2.1-144: Apion
    - 2.1-7: Introduction
    - 2.8-32: Apion on the exodus
    - 2.33-78: Apion on Alexandria
    - 2.79-144: Apion on temple ritual and other rules
  - 2.145-286: Apollonius Molon and others
    - 2.145-50: Introduction
    - 2.151-89: Moses and the structure of the constitution
    - 2.190-218: Summary of key laws
    - 2.219-35: Judean endurance for the law
    - 2.236-86: Judean religious difference and its rationale
- 2.287-96: *Conclusion (including peroratio)*

In the commentary, the following nomenclature is employed:

“Part” refers to the two main Parts into which the treatise is divided (see above);

“section” refers to Niese’s division of the text into numbered sections (320 in book 1, 296 in book 2);

“segment” refers to a subdivision of the text smaller than a Part but larger than a section.

In most cases this correlates with the second-level divisions outlined above (i.e., 2.1-144 is one segment, 2.145-286 another), but in the case of the Part on Judean antiquity I have subdivided the collection of evidence into



four segments (Egyptian, Phoenician, Chaldean, Greek). This does not override the above structural analysis, but has been adopted for the convenience of the commentary and the provision of introductory overviews along the way. At the start of most segments, the commentary is interrupted by an introduction labelled “Reading Options” (on whose rationale, see below, §13). These segment introductions occur at eight points: 1.6, 1.73, 1.106, 1.128, 1.161, 1.219, 2.1, and 2.145; “paragraph” is used occasionally to refer to a portion of the text within a segment that is demarcated in the translation as such.

## 2. *Apion in the Context of Josephus' Literary Career*

Although *Apion* is very different in content and genre from his first work, the *Judean War*, Josephus draws attention to that historical treatise in the context of his opening remarks on comparative historiography (1.47-56). Using himself as a model of Judean historiography, he insists on his eyewitness credentials and his care in ascertaining the facts, as was recognized by the recipients of his work. A strong note of personal defense creeps into this account, as he alludes to criticisms levelled against his account of the war (1.53-56). It is clear from this passage, and from the parallel apologetic in his *Life* (336-67), that Josephus remains sensitive to criticisms of his historiography.<sup>12</sup> In this respect, and to this degree, an element of personal apologetic is wrapped up within his wider apologetic on behalf of the Judean people.<sup>13</sup> Further motifs in the context contain echoes of *War*: the sharp critique of Greek historiography (1.6-26) extends the polemics of *War* 1.13-16, while the praise of Judean heroics unto death (1.42) is reminiscent

of many narratives in his account of the Revolt and its aftermath (e.g., *War* 2.152-53, 169-77; 7.341-88, 416-19). This latter is symptomatic of a consistent characteristic of *Apion*: motifs that were earlier placed in a narrative context are here dehistoricised and portrayed as general Judean virtues (e.g., endurance and contempt for death, 2.146). At the same time, the internal Judean divisions, both political and religious, which were so strikingly illustrated in *War* are here smoothed over with the impression of total Judean harmony (2.179-81) and *aversion* to factionalism (2.294).<sup>14</sup> Josephus thus never refers to the *content* of *War*, even when mentioning the “occupation” of the temple (e.g., *Apion* 2.82); for his present purposes, portraying concord between Judeans and Romans (2.61, 73, 134), it would not be wise to dwell on memories of the Judean Revolt.

By contrast, *Apion* shows a much closer relationship to *Antiquities*, to which it is expressly a sequel (1.1) and with which it shares its dedicatee, Epaphroditus (1.1; 2.1, 296; cf. *Ant.* 1.8-9). Josephus introduces *Apion* as a response to doubts attending his claims in the earlier work: although he had there shown sufficiently both the integrity and the antiquity of the Judean people, some had doubted his claims on the basis of the Greek historians' silence on the subject (1.1-2). Similarly, at the very end of his work, Josephus refers back to *Antiquities* for a fuller depiction of the laws; here he has cited only what was necessary to answer critics (2.287). By bracketing the treatise in this way, Josephus indicates that the two works are closely linked: he claims here not to supplement what he has previously achieved (as if it were insufficient) but to refocus his arguments for a particular purpose. In between, he makes occasional reference to *Antiquities* as an example of

<sup>12</sup> On the relationship between the two passages (that in *Life* directed against Justus of Tiberias, that in *Apion* against unnamed critics), see note to “history” at 1.53.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Gruen 2005, though he exaggerates the personal element as a proportion of the whole, since he finds the defense of the Judean people largely artificial; see further below, § 7.2.

<sup>14</sup> If the Essenes are, in some respects, idealized Judeans in *War* (see *War* 2.119-61), demonstrating the philosophical ideals of frugality, endurance, the shunning of pleasure, and commitment to the common life, those ideals, in modified form, now characterize the laws, and thus all Judeans, in *Apion* 2.145-286; see Mason (forthcoming c).

his accurate historiography (1.54) and for its full account of Judean history (1.127) and Judean cultural heroes (2.136). Although he does not presume knowledge of the contents of *Antiquities*, he portrays *Apion* as a wholly complementary addition to his earlier composition.

However, this rhetorical depiction understates the degree of overlap between the two works and simultaneously masks the difference in their depiction of Judean law and life. There are a number of passages in *Apion* that more or less repeat material previously used in *Antiquities*. For instance, several of the sources that Josephus employs as evidence for Judean antiquity had earlier been cited in *Antiquities*: he reuses without acknowledgement his citations or paraphrases of Menander and Dios (1.112-20; cf. *Ant.* 8.141-49), Megasthenes and Philostratos (1.144; cf. *Ant.* 10.227-28), Herodotus (1.169-71; cf. *Ant.* 8.262), and Agatharchides (1.209-212; cf. *Ant.* 12.6). Elsewhere, arguments used in *Apion* substantially repeat the reasoning found in *Antiquities*, such as the proof from Moses' leprosy laws that he could not himself have been a leper (1.279-83; cf. *Ant.* 3.265-68), or the evidence of the Septuagint project that Ptolemy II was interested in Judean culture (2.45-47; cf. *Ant.* 1.10-11; 12.11-118). At numerous other points Josephus could have referred back to narratives in his *Antiquities*, but we can hardly be surprised if he did not do so. The silences just noted reflect his desire to maintain the integrity of each work; the narratives of *Antiquities* 12-20 rarely refer back to *War* even on points of substantial overlap, and *Life* only twice declares its close relationship to *War* (*Life* 27, 412). But in this case there may be a special reason to maintain silence: if a treatise ostensibly on the same subject as its predecessor (1.1) substantially reduplicates its content, its composition is hard to justify. In fact, it adds very much more material than it copies, but Josephus understandably declines to draw attention to those occasions when it duplicates the previous work.

At the same time, *Apion* differs from *Antiquities* not only in its focus and genre, but also in its emphases, even, indeed especially, when both offer summaries of the law and the constitution. To some degree, the apologetic interests of the later work are already adumbrated in the

earlier. In *Antiquities* Josephus was sensitive to narratives depicting Judeans as Egyptians, evicted because of their leprosy (*Ant.* 2.177; 3.265-68); he was likewise concerned to dispel notions that Moses was a charlatan (*Ant.* 2.284-87; cf. *Apion* 2.145, 161). Judean citizenship of Alexandria, and other eastern cities, was claimed in terms equally strong (and equally exaggerated) as those used in *Apion* (2.33-42; cf. *Ant.* 12.119-26; 19.278-91), while the special friendship between Judeans and Romans (e.g., *Ant.* 14.185-267) is part of the same strand of political apologetic (*Apion* 2.61-64, 73-77, 125-34). The specific charges of Judean impiety ("atheism," *Apion* 2.148) and misanthropy (2.121, 148, 258) are also known and refuted, even directly, at particular points in the narrative of *Antiquities* (e.g., *Ant.* 3.179-80; 4.137-38; 8.116-17; 11.212; 16.41-42).<sup>15</sup> On all these points *Apion* is, as one might expect, more direct in addressing and more fulsome in answering the criticisms concerned. On one point, and that very central, it introduces an issue that we could not have expected from the earlier work. That the Judeans' extreme antiquity was in doubt, and from the direction of Greek historiography (1.1-2), is not something we might have guessed from *Antiquities*; even when he there cited corroborating evidence, Josephus had given no indication that the biblical account of Judean history was subject to fundamental doubt. We shall have to consider (below, § 6) to what extent this doubt was real and to what extent artificially concocted for the sake of this new treatise.

But it is in the depiction of the constitution and the summary of the law (2.145-286) that Josephus differs most substantially from *Antiquities*, although this is the point at which their subject matter coincides the most. In describing the structure of the constitution (2.151-89), Josephus coins the term "theocracy," a label for the government of God understood primarily in philosophical rather than political terms.<sup>16</sup> This is not incompatible with his depiction of the

<sup>15</sup> See further Spilsbury 1996 for a survey of the continuities in Josephus' apologetic.

<sup>16</sup> For Josephus' use of this term, and its relation to



Judean state in his *Antiquities*, but the emphasis, in its philosophical generalization, is quite different from the descriptions given in *Antiquities* 4 or elsewhere. Similarly, Josephus' discussion of the nature and providence of God (2.166-68, 179-81, 190-92) shows an interest in philosophical matters that had remained only on the margins of *Antiquities* (e.g., 1.15, 18-21; 10.277-80). Even in passages that show some debt to *Antiquities*, Josephus adds a new twist: the regular hearing of the law that is so essential to the constitution is now not every seven years (*Ant.* 4.209-11) but every seven days (*Apion* 2.175-78). Even in the summary of the law (2.190-218), Josephus does more than select and rearrange laws previously collected in *Ant.* 4.196-301, although there are many laws in common. In his arrangement of the material and his emphases (e.g., on inexorable capital punishment; on openness to strangers), Josephus strikes out in fresh directions, and there are some laws listed here that have no parallel in his previous work (e.g., on sharing fire and water, praying first for the community, and not picking up what one did not put down, 2.196, 208, 211). Thus the impression given in 2.287 that Josephus has merely selected material from the fuller exposition in *Antiquities* is hardly correct.

We are bound to ask why this should be so. Two answers suggest themselves: that he has incorporated new sources beyond the material he wrote or used in *Antiquities*, and/or that he has developed new ideas. It has often been claimed that *Apion* is largely made up of sources that Josephus has derived from Alexandrian Judeans. Josephan scholarship in the early twentieth century frequently made such claims, which survive to this day.<sup>17</sup> There are certainly striking parallels between parts of 2.145-286 and texts known

from the Hellenistic Judean tradition (*Hypothetica*; Ps.-Phocylides; Philo, *Moses* book 2), a phenomenon discussed elsewhere (Appendix 5). There is good reason to think that Josephus has been influenced by such texts (including many we cannot now trace), but we should not imagine him adopting passages wholesale. Even where the evidence for influence is most strong, he appears to have adapted and supplemented his inheritance in his own hand (see Appendix 5: Conclusions). His argument with Apion (2.1-144) may also be influenced by Alexandrian sources, but Josephus' own imprint is evident throughout (e.g., 2.33-47, 102-9). Josephus' cultural range in *Apion* is certainly impressive, but not so extensive as to deny that he could have acquired this knowledge himself or learned it from assistants.<sup>18</sup> His style is sophisticated and his polemics nicely turned, a contrast to the stylistic simplicity of the near contemporary *Life*; but variations in style are evident throughout his work and open to various explanations. While *Apion* contains a number of *hapax legomena* in the Josephan corpus (240 all told), many of these derive from the new sources he cites, or the new topics he addresses; others reflect his new polemical genre, or show an increasing confidence in the flexible range of the Greek language.<sup>19</sup> None of these facts requires us to

---

rating tiny snippets of Josephus' own work. The argument depends largely on incongruities in the text (cf. Gerber 1997: 97-99), which suggest only that Josephus was not the tidiest author or editor of his work. O'Neill's solution is ingenious, until it comes to explaining why such an unlikely task was undertaken in Josephus' name. On the linguistic distinctiveness of the work, see below.

<sup>18</sup> S. Schwartz (1990: 23) exaggerates in his assertion that if *Apion* were attributed to Josephus "it would show that in the few years separating the publication of AJ [*Antiquities*] from that of CAp [*Apion*], Josephus became a master of classical tradition on par with an Athenaeus or a Plutarch." Whatever we conclude about his use of "collaborators" in the writing of *War* (see note to "language" at 1.50), he surely could have accessed advisers on Greek history after living in Rome for 25 years.

<sup>19</sup> For the distinctive language of *Apion* see van der Horst 1996. Of the 240 *hapax legomena*, 79 appear in his citations, and many others are technical terms re-

---

his earlier depictions of the Judean constitution, see note to "theocracy" at 2.165. On the political thought of *Apion* in relation to Josephus' earlier works, see Rajak 2002: 195-217.

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., Hölscher 1916: 1994-97; Belkin 1936; 1936-37; Cohen 1987: 425-26; S. Schwartz 1990: 21, 23, 56 n.127. An even more radical version is advanced by O'Neill 1999: that most of our treatise was assembled by "schoolmen" after Josephus' death, incorpo-

conclude that the treatise is “closely based on one or two Alexandrian-Jewish apologetic pamphlets probably written during the Jewish-Greek disturbances of the thirties and forties.”<sup>20</sup> Josephus remains the author of this text in a strong sense, however influenced by other materials.

Some light on this influence, and the direction of his thought, may be shed by Josephus’ descriptions of a project he earlier intended but (as far as we know) never brought to completion. Several times during *Antiquities* 1-4, and once at its very end, he declares that he intends to write another work “after this.”<sup>21</sup> His description of this work is somewhat varied: it will concern the laws (*Ant.* 3.223), or the sacrifices (3.205, 230), “customs and reasons” (4.198), or the essence of God and the reasons for commands and prohibitions in the law (20.268, in four books). A common thread running through most of these notices, however, is that of etiology: whatever the subject matter, it will be treated with a view to *explanation* (*Ant.* 1.25, 29; 3.143, 257, 259; 4.198; 20.268, in many cases using αἰτία). Thus, if *Antiquities* is concerned mostly with the description of Judean laws and customs, the following work will seek to give the *sense* of such rules—a practice well developed in Hellenistic Judaism and traceable back at least as far as the second century BCE (*Letter of Aristeas*). At one point Josephus hints that the mode of explanation will be “philosophical”: in relation to the forthcoming project, he speaks of enquiry into the reasons for the law as “extremely philosophi-

cal” (λίαν φιλόσοφος, *Ant.* 1.25), and immediately thereafter alludes to Philo’s explanation for the wording of Gen 1:5 (*Ant.* 1.29). His claim elsewhere that the work would discuss the “essence” (οὐσία) of God (20.268) points in the same direction. Such notices indicate that, while writing *Antiquities*, Josephus was becoming interested in the tradition of philosophical (moral and metaphysical) explanations of Judean beliefs and customs. While including small elements of that tradition already within his description of the laws (e.g., *Ant.* 3.179-87), he reserves till later a full-dress treatment of Judean culture in these terms.<sup>22</sup>

As far as we know, Josephus never wrote this projected work, and *Apion* is too different in genre and focus to be precisely the project envisaged in *Antiquities*.<sup>23</sup> Interestingly, while writing *Apion* (after *Antiquities*) he no longer looks forward to the proposed work. But the two projects are not entirely unconnected. Within *Apion*, and especially within 2.145-286, Josephus offers his most “philosophical” treatment of Judean beliefs and laws: concerning God’s nature (2.165-68, 180-82, 190-92, including reference to his οὐσία, 2.167); concerning the laws regarding worship and sacrifice (2.192-98); concerning the purity rules (2.202-3, 205); and concerning the rationale for sabbath rest (2.174, 234).<sup>24</sup> These are gestures, rather than full etiologies, but they indicate a development in Josephus’ thinking or a new set of sources that answered to his interests. Other features link *Apion* especially closely to the preface to *Antiq-*

lated to his new subject matter (e.g., ἀμβλόω, 2.202; δέιμος, 2.248; μύδρος, 2.265) or terms appropriate to his new polemical style (e.g., εὐχέρεια, 1.57, 301; καταγέλως, 1.212; φλυαρία, 2.22). The increasing confidence is manifested in the adoption of compound words (e.g., ἀναπολόγητος, 2.137; καινολογέω, 1.222; συμπλάσσω, 1.298), or even their invention (θεοκρατία, 2.165).

<sup>20</sup> S. Schwartz 1990: 23.

<sup>21</sup> Unambiguous references to this work (citing it as a separate work and/or with a title) are made at *Ant.* 1.25, 29; 3.94, 205, 223, 230, 259; 4.198, 302; 20.268. Possible references (mentioning future intentions) occur at *Ant.* 1.192, 214; 3.143, 218, 257, 264.

<sup>22</sup> For discussion of Josephus’ knowledge of Judean literature in Greek at the time of writing *Antiquities*, see S. Schwartz 1990: 51-55; he rightly disputes the thesis that Josephus had direct knowledge of Philo at this time.

<sup>23</sup> Pace Petersen 1958: 263-65. The partial overlaps in content are instructive (see below), but the four-book work envisaged as recently as *Ant.* 20.268 is hardly identical to our *Apion*; see Feldman 1981: 143, n. d.

<sup>24</sup> Here is the measure of truth in Altshuler’s claim (1978-79) that Josephus redeemed his promises of an additional work in writing *Apion* (and in his own additions to *Antiquities* at 3.224-86 and 4.67-75); but he exaggerates the extent to which *Apion* meets Josephus’ expectations of the projected work, and overlooks its chief characteristic, the provision of αἰτία.

uities, suggesting a common strand of more theological interests only partly expounded in his historiography and awaiting development in subsequent work.<sup>25</sup> A little source-critical detective work indicates some of the reading that Josephus has undertaken prior to writing *Apion*: Aristobulus, Philo, and other Hellenistic Judean traditions shared with *Hypothetica* and Ps.-Phocylides (see Appendix 5). He has also learned a good deal about Plato, especially his *Laws*, either directly or at second hand.<sup>26</sup> These surely guided, or stimulated, his “philosophical” interests. If he decided to abandon his plans for his four-volume treatise on Judean beliefs and laws, he found a way to incorporate relevant material, reflecting some of his interests, in the summary of the constitution that he offered in response to Apollonius Molon (2.145-286). *Apion* is thus both a natural sequel to *Antiquities* and a (partial) substitute for the once-planned treatise on philosophical etiology; and it reveals the breadth of the new sources to which Josephus was exposed during and after the composition of his *Antiquities*.

### 3. Date

Four criteria have been used in the dating of *Apion*. As we shall see, only the first provides any degree of certainty, and that only for a *terminus post quem*. But all four are canvassed here since they have surfaced in debate and raise important questions about the context of the treatise, to which we will return (below, § 6).

1. The relationship to *Antiquities*. As noted above, *Apion* expressly locates itself in the aftermath of *Antiquities* (1.1; 2.287), as its sequel and supplement. Fortunately, we know very precisely from *Antiquities* itself the date of its composition:

<sup>25</sup> In the preface, Josephus speaks of the special significance of “piety” (εὐσεβεία, *Ant.* 1.6, 21), Judean obedience to the laws (1.14), the proper conception of the nature of God, free from mythology (1.15, 19, 22), God’s omniscience (1.20), and inexorable punishment (1.23). All of these themes are prominent in *Apion* 2.145-286.

<sup>26</sup> For a full assessment of this matter see Gerber 1997: 226-43.

in *Ant.* 20.267 Josephus dates the conclusion of the work to the 13<sup>th</sup> year of Domitian and the 56<sup>th</sup> year of his own life, that is, 93/94 CE.<sup>27</sup> What is unclear is how great an interval we should allow between the publication of *Antiquities* and the completion of *Apion*. Josephus speaks of negative reaction to the claims of his *Antiquities* (*Apion* 1.2), but we do not know how quickly this set in, if indeed it was real and not merely a rhetorical construct (see note to “historians” at 1.2). As we have seen (above), Josephus had originally planned to write a different work (a four-volume explanation of Judean beliefs and laws) immediately after his *Antiquities* (20.268). Thus we must allow some time for this plan to be changed and a rather different writing project to take shape in his mind and in actuality. If he took (roughly) 12-13 years to write the 20 books of the *Antiquities*, he was clearly able to write speedily, though how long it took to research and gather the materials in *Apion* we cannot tell. It is possible to imagine the completion of *Apion* before the death of Domitian (18<sup>th</sup> September 96 CE), though this would require a rapid change of plan and fairly swift composition. It is equally possible that the work came to completion after this date, either during the brief reign of Nerva (from 18<sup>th</sup> September 96 CE to 27<sup>th</sup> January 98 CE) or during the reign of Trajan (from 27<sup>th</sup> January 98 CE to 8<sup>th</sup> August 117 CE). The *terminus ante quem* is simply the death of Josephus; if he was 56 in 93/94 CE, he is unlikely to have lived long into the second century, but we have no means of fixing this date.

2. The relationship to *Life*. Since Josephus’ *Life* is clearly an appendix to his *Antiquities*, it is reasonable to consider whether *Apion* can be dated in relation to it. Unfortunately, the dating of *Life* is a complex and controversial matter. One fixed point is its assumption that Agrippa II is no longer alive (*Life* 359), but the date of his death is a matter of some uncertainty. Photius, summarizing Justus of Tiberias, states that Agrippa died in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of Trajan (100 CE),

<sup>27</sup> For the calculation here, and the uncertainty as to which side this falls in our calendrical reckoning of the years 93 and 94 CE, see Mason 2001: xv, n. 1.

but this is a late and unreliable source.<sup>28</sup> The hard, external, evidence is supplied by coins and inscriptions, but here much depends on what one presumes to anchor the dating of these coins, the varying start-point of Agrippa's reign (in some cases 61 CE, in others 56 or even 49 CE). After decades of dispute on this matter, the balance of the ambiguous evidence seems to fall on an early dating of Agrippa's death, perhaps around 88/89 CE.<sup>29</sup> This puts no obstacle in placing *Life* immediately after *Antiquities*,<sup>30</sup> but there are other factors that complicate the issue, not least Josephus' remarks about the patronage he received from Domitian and Domitia (*Life* 429). Since he mentions no subsequent imperial patronage, and since the reputation of Domitian plummeted after his death (the Senate decreed a *damnatio memoriae*), such remarks might be best placed within the lifetime of Domitian. But it is not impossible that they could be written after 96 CE, and Justus' attack on Josephus, which lies behind *Life*, might be best dated after Josephus' imperial patron had died.<sup>31</sup> Thus it remains unclear on which side of the watershed

of Domitian's death we should date *Life*. And for our purposes, in dating *Apion*, this is not, in any case, decisive. Although he refers to *Antiquities*, Josephus makes no allusion to the contents of *Life* in the course of *Apion*; while his self-defense (1.47-56) bears many similarities to his digression against Justus in *Life* 336-67, it is not clear which is prior to the other. Thus it is not certain that *Apion* must have been written after *Life*: if there was an interval between *Antiquities* and *Life*, and even if *Life* was written after 96 CE, it is possible that *Apion* was written within that interval and before Domitian's death.

3. The patron Epaphroditus. *Apion* shares the same patron, Epaphroditus, with *Antiquities* and *Life* (*Apion* 1.1; 2.1, 296; cf. *Ant.* 1.8-9; *Life* 430). Considerable debate has taken place on the identity of this Epaphroditus, and since one possible candidate was exiled from Rome by Domitian and then killed in 95 CE, this issue is potentially important for the date of our treatise.<sup>32</sup> However, since we cannot identify Josephus' Epaphroditus with any certainty, this cannot be used as a criterion for dating *Apion*; there are perfectly good options for a patron called Epaphroditus who outlived Domitian.<sup>33</sup> To date *Apion* and *Life* by the identity and life-span of Epaphroditus is to attempt to fix one unknown by means of another.

4. Social and political conditions reflected in *Apion*. Given the lack of hard evidence, can we infer from the contents of *Apion* the social and political circumstances in which it was written? As we shall see (below, § 6), the years around and after the publication of *Antiquities* were turbulent times in Rome. Besides expelling philosophers whom he suspected of political opposition (93 CE), Domitian put on trial some prominent members of his own court, notably

<sup>28</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca* 33 (9<sup>th</sup> century CE); for his possible confusion with Clement's death in this same year, learned from Jerome, see Schürer (revised) 1.481-82, n. 47.

<sup>29</sup> The evidence is fully discussed in Schürer (revised) 1.480-83; cf. Smallwood 1981: 572-74. For more recent discussion, see Mason 2001: xvi-xix. Kokkinos (1998: 396-99) gives a spirited defense of the alternative view, that Photius was right in placing Agrippa's death no earlier than 100 CE. In the latest twist to the debate, the dating of the coins has been wholly reassessed by Kushnir-Stein 2002, on which C. Jones 2002 relies in dating Agrippa's death as early as 88/89 CE. This would also make sense of a series of remarks in the last books of *Antiquities*, which seem to imply that Agrippa was no longer alive, or at least no longer powerful (e.g., *Ant.* 17.28; 18.128, 145-54; 20.143-46, 211-18).

<sup>30</sup> The later dating of Agrippa's death (in 100 CE) would require a considerable interval, to which some have connected the possibility of a second edition of *Antiquities*. At least in their present form, the two works are very closely related (*Ant.* 20.266; *Life* 430).

<sup>31</sup> See Krieger 1999, with the contrary, but cautious conclusions of C. Jones 2002: 118-20.

<sup>32</sup> For the identity of Epaphroditus, and the two main options canvassed in scholarship, see note to "Epaphroditus" at 1.1.

<sup>33</sup> E.g., M. Mettius Epaphroditus, who lived into the reign of Nerva; see note to "Epaphroditus" at 1.1; see Jones 2002: 114-15, cautioning against fixing the dates of Josephus by reference to either of the well-known Epaphroditus, considering the numerous other possible candidates.



Flavius Clemens and Flavia Domitilla, on a charge of “atheism,” the same charge levelled against others who “drifted into Judean customs” (Dio 67.14.1-2). In the same context, Domitian appears to have encouraged legal proceedings against people accused of dodging the “Judean tax” (*fiscus Iudaicus*), an issue which he pursued with “special severity” (*acerbissime*, Suetonius, *Dom.* 12.2). This appears to have caught out not only Judeans who pretended not to be so, but also non-Judeans whose lifestyle could be considered “Judaizing” to some degree. In the atmosphere of terror encouraged by Domitian and in this heyday of informers, slurs against Judean culture may have been particularly common, and sympathy with Judean practices politically charged. All this changed dramatically in September 96 CE when Domitian was assassinated. Nerva signalled the change of regime by, among other things, abolishing all proscriptions on the charge of “impiety” or “Judean lifestyle” (Dio 68.1.2); and he advertised the end of the tax-trials, and their perversions of justice, by issuing coins with the legend *FISCI IUDAICI CALUMNIA SUBLATA* (“The cessation of malicious accusations concerning the Judean tax”).

Knowing these circumstances, we might scan the contents of *Apion* to find contemporary allusions, reflecting conditions either before or after the death of Domitian. Unfortunately, whatever inferences we might draw from the text are too weak to help us fix the date. One might conclude from Josephus’ decision to write this apologetic treatise, instead of his intended project, that he was influenced by the hostile conditions at the end of Domitian’s reign.<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, his relatively confident tone, not least in parading the adoption of Judean customs by non-Judeans (2.282-86) might lead one to conclude that the treatise was written *after* the death of Domitian. Does his dismissal of slurs against Judeans, such as the charge of “atheism” (2.148), indicate that these were a live (legal) issue, or that they had been in the recent past, or simply that they could be levelled against

Judeans and had been by Apollonius? Does Josephus take care to tone down his use of philosophical language in relation to Judean culture in view of Domitian’s action against philosophers, or do his remarks about “tyrants” (2.158-59) reflect a safer period after Domitian’s death?<sup>35</sup> Do Josephus’ descriptions of the temple, in the present tense (e.g., 2.193-98), reflect a rise in hopes for its reconstruction, with the new post-Flavian era inaugurated by Nerva? Or do they reflect a timeless conception of the temple as integral to the constitution?<sup>36</sup> One has to conclude that all such chronological inferences are extremely precarious; none can be ruled out altogether, but they point in different directions and are weakened by the lack of reference in *Apion* to present political circumstances, whether oppressive or not. While a reasonable case could be made for reading the text as influenced by the difficulties of 95-96 CE, it is equally plausible to see it as responding to chronic issues concerning the reputation of Judeans in Rome, not a specific period of crisis.

We are left with a simple, though disappointing conclusion. Only one criterion is certain in dating *Apion*, and that is its backward reference to *Antiquities*. *Apion* was certainly written no earlier than 94 CE; how much later than that, we simply cannot tell.

#### 4. Title

A literary work in antiquity acquired a “title” when given such by its author, by readers, by copyists, or by cataloguers; there was rarely an indication within the work itself as to what its “proper” or “authentic” title should be.<sup>37</sup> Look-

<sup>35</sup> For the first option, see Haaland 2005; for discussion of the second, Goodman 1999: 50 and Mason 2003b: 581-88.

<sup>36</sup> The Nerva option is canvassed by Goodman 1999: 50, 57; on the use of tenses with regard to the temple, see note to “God” at 2.193.

<sup>37</sup> For cases where titles were lacking, see *PWSup* 12.1108-9 (regarding Thucydides); on the addition of titles to the manuscript of a book, see Schreckenberg 1996a: 75 (with reference to Schubart). Titles might be needed when two or more works were collected in a

<sup>34</sup> So Troiani 1977: 26-29.

ing back on his *War* and *Antiquities*, Josephus gives them names, though the fact that these labels vary slightly indicates that even he had not given them precise titles.<sup>38</sup> In the case of *Apion*, Josephus never refers to the work by any label, and thus the work has no “original” title. In such cases, books were generally labelled by readers or others in accordance with their perceived genre and content, though attention might be paid to authorial statements about the work at its beginning or end, or at strategic places in between (e.g., transitions between books). In the case of *Apion*, in the absence of Josephus’ own designation, readers could be drawn to the beginnings of book 1 (1.1-5) and book 2 (2.1-2), and the very end of the work (2.296). Unfortunately, these do not give unambiguous signals. 1.1-5 begins by describing the contents not of the present treatise but of *Antiquities*, including the great age of the Judean people, its integrity, and its manner of acquisition of the land (1.1). Then, after outlining the doubts he faces, Josephus says he will write briefly “on all these matters” (1.3). At the end of the statement of purpose (1.3) he specifically mentions “our antiquity” (ἡ ἡμετέρα ἀρχαιότης), and that term will recur at transition points throughout the first Part of the treatise (1.59, 93, 160, 215, 217). Book 2 begins by recapping the evidence produced for “our antiquity,” but also signals the second main task of the treatise, Josephus’ “counter-statement” (ἀντίρρησις) to Manetho, Chaeremon, and others (2.1), now to be supplemented by a “counter-statement” to Apion (2.2). This indicates that the treatise has two main foci (see above, § 1), such that either label, “on antiquity” or “counter-statement,” would be inadequate on its own (and the latter would need clarification of its target[s]). In the conclusion (2.287-95) Josephus rehearses the various top-

ics he has handled in response to critics, without any single overarching label. In his very last statement, he dedicates the work to Epaphroditus and to those who wish to know “about our people” (περὶ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν, 2.296).

Schreckenberg has recently suggested that this final statement indicates Josephus’ own title for his work, “On our People.”<sup>39</sup> But as a title this would be somewhat misleading, suggesting a more comprehensive discussion of the Judean people than *Apion* actually provides; moreover, as it happens, none of the known early readers of this treatise used this phrase in entitling the work. The four (or five?) early readers who referred to this work by some title did so as follows:

*Tertullian*? (died ca. 240 CE) alludes to our treatise in *Apology* 19 when giving the sources of evidence for the antiquity of the Judeans: after a list of authors closely matching those in *Apion* he refers to “the Judean Josephus, the native vindicator of the Judean antiquities” (*antiquitatum Iudaicarum vernaculus vindex*), who refuted or authenticated the others. This must be an allusion to our *Apion* and this language *might* indicate that the work was known to him by a title such as “Judean antiquities.”<sup>40</sup>

*Origen* (died 253/4 CE) refers to our work on two occasions as περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχαιότητος (“On the Antiquity of the Judeans,” *Cels.* 1.16; 4.11). This clearly picks up the term Josephus uses for the subject matter of the first Part of his work, and it is natural for Origen to highlight this since his argument with Celsus is on this theme.

*Porphyry* (233–305 CE) cites Josephus’ works (*Abst.* 4.11) as “Judean History” (Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἱστορία), “Ancient History” (ἀρχαιολογία), and “Against the Greeks” (πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, in two books). Although he cites from *Apion* 2.213, this label may derive from the opening segment (1.6-56).<sup>41</sup> That he used a title for *War*

---

single codex, or when rolls or codices were placed on library shelves.

<sup>38</sup> For *War*, see *Ant.* 1.6, 203; 13.72, 173, 298; 18.11, 259; *Life* 27, 412, 413; normally “War” or “Judean War.” For *Antiquities*, see *Ant.* 20. 259, 267; *Life* 430; *Apion* 1.1, 54, 127; 2.136, 287; normally, but not always, ἀρχαιολογία, better translated “Ancient History.”

---

<sup>39</sup> Schreckenberg 1996a: 75-77; cf. *idem* 1998: 778. He cites other uses of γένος in the treatise, though its first use (1.1) refers to the contents of *Antiquities*, not of *Apion*, and it is absent from the statement in 2.1-2.

<sup>40</sup> See S. Price 1999: 115.

<sup>41</sup> Niese (1889a: iii) suggests that Porphyry applies

different from Josephus' own indicates the freedom of readers to label literature according to their own interpretation of its contents.

Eusebius (260–340 CE) twice in his *Praeparatio evangelica* quotes from *Apion* under the label *περὶ τῆς [τῶν] Ἰουδαίων ἀρχαιότητος* (“On the Antiquity of (the) Judeans,” 8.7.21; 10.6.15), the same as that used by Origen. Elsewhere he gives the same title, but supplements it by saying that in this work Josephus issued *ἀντιρρήσεις* against Apion the grammarian (*Hist. eccl.* 3.9.4). This clearly echoes *Apion* 2.1–2, and reflects Eusebius' awareness that the single label “On the Antiquity of the Judeans” did not cover the full contents of the work.

Jerome (died 420 CE) displays a similar ambiguity (regularly missed in discussions of this topic). In *Epist.* 70.3 (CSEL 54, 704), Jerome writes: *Iosephus antiquitatem adprobans Iudaici populi duos libros scribit contra Apionem*. This represents the same duality as found in Eusebius, though it puts equal weight on both elements (proof of antiquity and response to Apion). It is not clear that Jerome intends the phrase *contra Apionem* to be the “title” of the work, though he does take both books as directed against Apion. Elsewhere (*Vir. ill.* 13) he says that Josephus *scripsit autem et ...duos [libros] ἀρχαιότητος adversus Apionem grammaticum Alexandrinum*. Here the two themes are again juxtaposed, and the use of the Greek term might suggest that Jerome also knew this work primarily under *that* title.<sup>42</sup>

We may conclude that *Apion* was most commonly known in Christian circles (even by Jerome) under the title “On the Antiquity of the Judeans,” but it was recognized that this reflected only part of its content, and the opening statement of book 2 justified adding some reference to its element of response (to Apion). Porphyry indicates that in non-Christian circles

there was no such convention in labelling the work or describing its contents. There was clearly a problem. The treatise has two distinguishable Parts (see above, § 1), and any label which fits one does not obviously suit the whole. It is even unclear what one might label the second Part, since “counter-statement” (*ἀντίρρησις*) requires some description of target, and although Apion is the largest target selected by Josephus (2.1–144) he is not the only one. Since Josephus himself gives no comprehensive title for the work, we are left to select a partial title (“On the Antiquity of the Judeans”; or “Against Apion”), or combine the two (as in Jerome, or the Latin manuscript tradition, *De Iudaeorum vetustate sive contra Apionem*), or invent one of our own. If we take the last option, we may follow Porphyry (“Against the Greeks”), or Schrekenberg (“On our People”), or Niese (“On behalf of Judeans,” ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων, 1889a: iv). But all of these are interpreters' constructs and none is clearly signalled by Josephus himself; since the work has no “original” title, we may retain, for convenience, that which is now most commonly used (*Against Apion*), inadequate as it is.

## 5. Genre

The discussion of the genre and rhetorical mode of *Apion* is entangled with disputes about the place of 2.145–286 within the treatise as a whole, and is beset by the vagueness of the label “apologetic.”<sup>43</sup> There is also often confusion between the *rhetorical genre* of the treatise (the way the argument is packaged and presented) and its *pragmatic purpose* (what Josephus intended to be its effect). The former (rhetorical genre) is a feature of the text itself, the latter (its purpose) concerns what lies behind the text, the intentions of the author in the context of its composition. In the ancient world, it was well recognized that a gap might exist between rhetoric and reality, between what an author said he was doing (as a rhetorical performance) and

to Josephus' treatise the title “against the Greeks” that he knows for works from the Christian tradition.

<sup>42</sup> The use of *adversus Apionem* in this case, rather than *contra Apionem*, also suggests that *contra Apionem* was not Jerome's standard label for the work, though it is used in his other reference to the treatise, at *Jov.* 2.14 (PL 23, 343, col. 317).

<sup>43</sup> For an important attempt to address this latter issue, see the (varied) essays in Edwards, Goodman, and Price 1999. See further below.

what he was really doing (in the production and circulation of the text). He might speak, for instance, in another's voice, or to a fictive audience, while intending this exercise to address a real audience different from that inscribed in the text. Our discussion here concerns the rhetorical (and literary) genre of the text; later we will assess Josephus' audience and purpose (§ 7), after we have established the historical and cultural context of the work (§ 6).

Before deciding the appropriateness of the disputed label "apology," we must first trace the signals of the text itself. When referring to the work as a whole, Josephus uses rather bland labels. As a written document it is simply a "text" (γραφή, 2.147, 288), in two "books" (βιβλία, 1.320; 2.1, 296); as a rhetorical event, it is an "argument" (λόγος, 1.219; 2.144). As we shall see, he uses more precise language in two places, speaking of his provision of a "counter-statement" (ἀντίρρησης, 2.1, 2) and "defense" (ἀπολογία, 2.147). But before fixing on these terms, it is best to trace his language in sequence through the treatise, following the structure outlined above.

*Introduction* (1.1-5): one would expect authors to give the clearest signals of their genre, raising reader-expectations, at the very outset of the work (and again at its conclusion). Here Josephus indicates that the work is a response, in particular to doubts about the antiquity of the Judean people (1.2). These could have been introduced as merely intellectual doubts, requiring correction and instruction; indeed, of his three statements of purpose (1.3), the second and third concern the correction of ignorance and the instruction of those who desire to know the truth. But more importantly, and more prominently, the doubts are placed in the context of *hostility*: they arise because "a considerable number of people pay attention to the slanders (βλασφημίαι) spread by some out of malice (δυσμένεια)" (1.2). Thus, the first task is to "convict those who insult us (τῶν λοιδορούντων) of malice and deliberate falsehood" (1.3); and it is suggested that even the "ignorance" of some is feigned, a product of prejudice (1.5). This sets the tone for the work as a whole: it is not simply an intellectual exercise in establishing the truth (though it is that, cf. 2.296), but is set within a conflict, a response to antagonism.

Although, as we shall see, the first Part (1.6-218) is only lightly colored in such terms, this introduction will be matched by a conclusion (2.287-95) that describes each part of the treatise as a reply to critics.

*Part One* (1.6-218): Josephus' tone in the prolegomenon (1.6-56) is aggressive, challenging what he portrays as the self-importance of Greeks and their empty claims to historical knowledge (e.g., 1.6, 15, 44-45). Although he does not portray the doubts on Judean antiquity as "charges" (see the neutral terms of 1.58), he does include within this segment a strong element of *self-defense* against accusations and slanders directed against his own historiography (1.47-56), using the classic language of "charge" (κατηγορία, 1.53) and "insult" (δισβολή, 1.53). This gives to the whole discussion of historiography an air of legal conflict (note the "witnesses" on Josephus' side, 1.50, 52), matching the language of "accusation" and "proof" used of disputes among Greek historians themselves (1.18, 25). Thus when he comes to cite the evidence from "barbarian" and Greek literature (1.69-218), Josephus uses a legal metaphor, repeatedly referring to such material as "witness" or "testimony" (μαρτυρία and cognate terms). After opening remarks that use this language (1.59, 69, 70), Josephus introduces Manetho very explicitly as if he were "bringing him into court as a witness" (καθάπερ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον παραγαγὼν μάρτυρα, 1.74). Thereafter the "witness" language recurs in every segment of this Part (Egyptian: 1.93, 104; cf. 1.227; Phoenician: 1.106, 112, 115, 127; Chaldean: 1.129, 160; Greek: 1.200, 205; cf. 2.1; in summary: 1.217, 219; 2.288).<sup>44</sup> Thus even though this Part is only lightly touched by references to hostility (e.g., 1.70, 72, 214), the witness language keeps alive the sense that this treatise concerns a matter of quasi-legal dispute. And the whole parade of witnesses is prefaced by the claim that this takes the ground from under the

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the use of τεκμήριον ("proof") in 1.2, 26, 69, 213 (later, 2.183, 261). The "witness" language recurs in the second Part, but much less frequently (witness for the Judeans: 2.53, 61, 62, 84, 107; witness to Moses' doctrine or virtue, 2.168, 279, 290).



feet of the Judeans' "detractors" (οἱ βασκαίνοντες) and "the case they have against us" (ἡ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀντιλογία, 1.72).

*Part Two* (1.219-2.286): here the polemical tone is notably heightened, and the language of "slander" and "insult," prominent in the introduction, is again at the forefront (1.219-22; cf. 1.59). In the introduction, Josephus places the slanders against Judeans in the context of ancient polemics between city-states: Theopompos' assault on Athens, Polycrates' attack on Sparta, etc. (1.221-22). He locates these within the genre of historiography (1.220), though he does not cite any examples of *response* to such slanders comparable to his own on behalf of Judeans. In responding to the stories of Manetho, Chaeremon, and Lysimachus (1.227-320), Josephus uses the general language of "slander" and "insult" rather than specifically legal terms (1.223, 279, 319); in truth, the stories at issue hardly concern legal matters, but the honor of Judeans and their supposedly ignominious origin.<sup>45</sup> With Apion, however (2.1-144), the language becomes notably more legal. While Josephus gives a "counter-statement" (ἀντίρρησις) to Apion, as he had to the others (2.1-2), he explicitly presents Apion's comments as legal accusations: "he has composed a charge against us as if in a lawsuit" (κατηγορίαν ἡμῶν ἀντικρὺς ὡς ἐν δίκη γεγραφότα, 2.4). In this context the language of "accusation" is extremely prominent (κατηγορία and cognates: 2.4, 7, 33, 117, 132, 137, 142; ἐγκαλέω, 2.137, 138; *accuso* and cognates: 2.56, 63, 68, 79), alongside that of "slander" (βλασφημία and cognates: 2.5, 32, 143; *blasphemia*, 2.79, 88) and "insult" (λοιδορία and cognates: 2.4, 30, 32, 34, 49, 142, 144; cf. *impropero*: 2.56, 71; *calumniator*: 2.56; *derogo* and cognates: 2.73, 89; *detraho*: 2.90, 111). Some of this may derive from the fact that elements of Apion's remarks about the Judeans (their citizenship and their relationship to Rome) originated in real legal proceedings before the emperor (cf. *Ant.* 18.257-60). But Josephus lets the legal language spread across the whole of Apion's material, as

if he were defending a multifaceted legal case; within this context he also uses the language of "defense" in insisting that some of Apion's charge might be best left "undefended" (ἀναπολόγητα, 2.137; cf. *defensio*, 2.73). While the defense sometimes takes the shape of a counter-narrative, extolling the merits of the Judean people (e.g., 2.42-64), Josephus' focus is on a set of "accusations," refuted one by one, with frequent personal invective against the "Egyptian" Apion.

The final segment of Part Two (2.145-86; see above, § 1) is introduced as a further stage in Josephus' response to "accusation" and "insult," this time from "Apollonius Molon, Lysimachus, and others" (2.145, 147, 148). Most of the *content* of this segment concerns the merits of Moses, his constitution, and his laws; as Josephus himself signals (2.148), he does not deal with accusations here in the same way as before, and only rarely does he engage in direct polemics against his opponent (e.g., 2.270). In extolling the Judean constitution, Josephus gives a summary of the laws (2.190-218) without explicit reference to "accusations" and often engages in comparisons with other constitutions or city-states, to show the superiority of Judeans (e.g., 2.171-78, 219-35, 255-75). As Josephus himself half-acknowledges, this gives to this segment of the treatise the flavor of an "encomium" (2.147, 287), but he insists that his real purpose is to *defend* his people against scurrilous attacks, and describes his strategy as "the most just form of defense" (δικαιοτάτη ἀπολογία, 2.147). It accords with this that he intersperses his portrayal of the virtues of Judeans with frequent reference to Apollonius Molon or other "accusers" (2.156, 161, 182, 236-38, 255, 258, 262, 270, 278, 285) so that the apologetic character of this segment is never lost from view. This strategy may owe much to rhetorical convenience: it was well recognized in antiquity that self-praise, particularly if it involved comparison with others, was an obnoxious procedure, liable to evoke envy and hatred rather than admiration.<sup>46</sup> A standard way to avoid this problem was to wrap self-

<sup>45</sup> There is a remote legal echo in 1.275 with the use of ἐγκαλέω (parallel to ὀνειδίζω).

<sup>46</sup> See Plutarch's tractate *De Laude Ipsius* (especially, *Mor.* 540c-f); cf. Demosthenes, *Cor.* 3-4.

praise within rhetorical defense, to portray oneself as *having to* trumpet one's merits as the only means of self-defense.<sup>47</sup> Josephus more than once signals this tactic, blaming Apollonius Molon for instigating the strategy of (invidious) comparison, which *requires* him to reply in equal terms (2.150, 236-38). But the fact remains that Josephus packages his laudatory account of Judean culture within the wrapping of apologetics: however much the encomiastic features might appear to strain the apologetic structure, Josephus' self-description signals clearly enough his chosen rhetorical genre.<sup>48</sup>

*Conclusion* (2.287-96): in summarizing his achievements, Josephus presents all he has done as response to "accusations" (κατηγορίαί, 2.285-88) and "insults" (λοιδορίαί, 2.290, 295). Now even the first Part, on antiquity, is described as response to "accusers" (κατήγοροι) who charged that the Judean people were very recent (2.288). The second Part has replied to claims that the Judeans were Egyptians, lies regarding their departure from Egypt, and insults regarding Moses and his laws (2.289-90). Thus the whole work has "refuted" (ἐξελέγχω) the Apions and Molons who delight in lies and insults (2.295).<sup>49</sup> The conclusion thus makes clear what was suggested in the introduction and became increasingly clear as the work progressed, that it is to be understood primarily as a *response* to a varied set of criticisms and accusations.

We may draw two conclusions from this survey of the rhetorical signals in the treatise:

1. Although the material in *Apion* is varied in

content (and perhaps in origin), it is presented within a unifying structure as a response to slanders against the Judean people. Taken out of that framework, the citation of evidence for Judean antiquity (1.6-218) could have been read simply as proof of a historical fact, and the description of the law (2.190-218) could have been understood merely as a summary of the Judean constitution. In isolation, such material would demand a rhetorical classification germane to its own character (historical proof, or encomium), but *within this treatise* all the material is presented, more or less successfully, as *response to critics or slanderers*.

2. The criticisms addressed are sometimes described in legal terms as "accusations," and the work is sometimes enlivened by a legal metaphor, in relation to "witnesses" (Part One), or, most forcefully, in response to Apion's "charges" (2.1-144). Often the legal vocabulary of "accusations" (κατηγορίαί, etc.) is juxtaposed with non-legal language of "slanders" and "insults," so that the specifically *forensic* character of the work is of variable prominence. Similarly, although the work is clearly addressed to people outside the debate between Josephus and the critics named (2.296), they are not explicitly allocated the role of judge. These facts do not undermine the fact that the *whole work* is in some sense a "defense" (ἀπολογία), but they mean that the legal connotations of this term are sometimes strong, sometimes comparatively weak. But, as we shall see, even a fairly tight definition of "apologetic" can encompass this extension of the original legal context of the genre.

In terms of rhetorical genre, this survey thus supports the conclusions of those scholars who characterize our treatise as primarily a work of *defense*.<sup>50</sup> The inclusion of other (e.g., enco-

<sup>47</sup> Plutarch recommends this as one way of making self-praise bearable (see previous note). Isocrates' speech *Antidosis* is an extended narrative of self-praise wrapped up in the (explicitly fictional) genre of self-defense (see *Antid.* 8-13). On the symbiosis of apologetic and encomium, see further below.

<sup>48</sup> This case for the apologetic character of the whole treatise has been made extensively and well by Gerber 1997: 78-88, 250-52; cf. *eadem* 1999: 259-64.

<sup>49</sup> For the use of ἐλέγχω and compound verbs earlier in the treatise, see 1.3, 4, 15, 23, 73, 105, 253, 303; 2.2, 5, 30, 138, 149, 183, 194 [in a legal context], 238, 280, 287.

<sup>50</sup> See especially van Henten & Abusch 1996: 295-308; Gerber 1997: 78-88, in disagreement with Mason 1996, who considers the work "protreptic." I would here revise my earlier analysis in Barclay 1998a: 196-200. Mason and I reached different conclusions as to whether the work is primarily deliberative or epideictic, but both of us perhaps gave too much weight to the *content* of 2.145-286 (as against its rhetorical *context*),

miastic) material within this structure does not alter this judgment, and a decision about Josephus' real intentions (to encourage Judean readers, to win converts, or whatever, see below, § 7) is not determined by, and cannot itself determine, this decision about the *rhetorical genre* of the work. To what extent this places the work within a genre (rhetorical or literary) that could be called "apologetic" is a matter to which we now turn.

The rhetorical genre of "apology" (ἀπολογία) has its origins in the legal defense speech, the response of the accused to the charges or suspicions raised by the prosecution.<sup>51</sup> From here it became a *literary* form both by straight transference (defense speeches written up as literary works, such as those of Demosthenes, Cicero, and Apuleius) and by imitation (e.g., Lysias' artificial defense speeches; Isocrates, *Antidosis*). Plato's hugely influential *Apology* also demonstrated how a legal defense speech could be expanded and manipulated into a wider defense of a (philosophical) way of life, as much positive promotion of a cause as negative refutation of its detractors. Given the popularity of forensic rhetoric as a form of entertainment, and as a training exercise for budding orators, it is not surprising that set-piece defense speeches found their way into numerous literary genres, including historical narratives and novels.<sup>52</sup>

---

and both could have distinguished more clearly between the question of the author's intentions (whether to gain converts or to win sympathy/support) and that of the rhetorical genre. For a clear analysis of the distinction between authorial intention and rhetorical/literary genre, see Alexander 1999 (in relation to Acts).

<sup>51</sup> See the definition and discussion in Ps.-Aristotle [Anaximenes], *Rhet. Alex.* 1426b 22–1427b 11. The question here is not whether *Apion* precisely fits a standard category, but the extent to which it participates in, and expands, the tradition of "apologetics" established in rhetorical and literary practice.

<sup>52</sup> For a survey, see Veltman 1978; there are examples in Acts, in Chariton, *Chaereas*, and in Josephus, *Antiquities* (e.g., *Ant.* 16.100–26). See further Berger 1984: 1287–91, with discussion of apologetic letters, defined by Demetrius as "that which adduces, with proof, arguments that contradict charges that are being made" (cited in Stowers 1986: 167).

From its origin in this legal setting, the apologetic genre (direct response to accusations) could encompass not just legal charges, but also slurs, insults, and slanders, and it could be applied to contexts where what was at stake was not the legal standing of the debaters but, more broadly, their honor. Even in legal contexts, reference to "charges" (κατηγορίαί or αἰτίαί) was often juxtaposed with mention of "slanders" (βλασφημίαί), "insults" (λοιδορίαί), and "libels" (διαβολαί),<sup>53</sup> and in non-legal contexts all such terms could be mixed. While *individuals* might defend their reputation in apologetic mode (e.g., Isocrates, *Antidosis*), the genre was also influential on the way that *city-states* competed for honor. As we have seen, Josephus places his work in the context of the polemics of the ancient world, particularly those between Greek city-states (*Apion* 1.220–22), and in that context we find numerous cases of self-promotion that also defend the relevant city against slurs and accusations. Thus Isocrates' panegyric on Athens rebuts Spartan accusations against the Athenian empire, and in an extended comparison with Sparta levels charges against Sparta in return (*Panath.* 37, 61–73, 88–111). Dionysius of Halicarnassus opens his eulogy of the city of Rome with reference to hostile claims that it was founded by barbarians and vagabonds (*Ant. rom.* 1.4.2; 1.5.2–3; cf. 1.89.1), claims that he rebuts with a long alternative narrative.<sup>54</sup> Similar apologetic elements appear in Aristides' defense of Athens (*Or.* 1.282, 302–12). In this extended, non-legal, sense, "apologetic" seems a suitable label for such explicit and direct response to rhetorical assault, although in all these works it is only one element within a larger (encomiastic) whole, not the defining characteristic of the text as a whole.

---

<sup>53</sup> E.g., Demosthenes, *Cor.* 3–8; Ps.-Aristotle [Anaximenes], *Rhet. Alex.* 1436b–1438a. Within a Josephan passage, note the juxtaposition of αἰτία (*Ant.* 16.100, 104, 117, 119) and διαβολή (*Ant.* 16.101, 108, 112, 113, 121, 134); cf. *Apion* 1.53 (κατηγορία καὶ διαβολή).

<sup>54</sup> See Balch 1982, though he exaggerates the extent to which this account of Rome's origins is apologetic. Apart from this opening comment, references to critics of Rome are extremely rare (cf. 2.8.3–4).

Although it is common for scholars to use the term “apologetic” in looser and more nebulous ways, it seems sensible to operate with a tighter definition along the lines discussed thus far. When the term becomes used for *any form* of self-justification or explanation, whether addressed to outsiders or to one’s own group, it has become too vague to be useful.<sup>55</sup> It seems best to define “apologetic” as defense that is a) directly formulated against explicit accusations (legal charges or non-legal slurs), and b) directed towards observers (rather than “insiders”), at least at the level of the rhetoric (the actual or intended audience is another matter).<sup>56</sup> We should note that, in these terms, “apologetic” motifs/passages may be present within a text that is not itself defined by this genre; only where a text is *dominated* by this strategy of defense is it suitable to describe it as an “apology” in the proper sense.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Mader 2000: 147-57 speaks of *War* as “two-way apologetic” (to both Romans and Judeans), but only in the broad sense that it addresses their various misconceptions. F. Young 1999 operates with an extremely broad definition in order to include all the products of the Christian Greek “apologists” of the second century; but it would be better to clarify that many of them did not write “apologies” in anything like the technical sense. Sterling’s definition of “apologetic historiography” (in which he includes Josephus’ *Antiquities*) is similarly broad: “the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group’s own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world” (1992: 17). This has lost touch with the core notion of response to criticisms or charges. Cf. the discussion in Schröder 1996: 138-41.

<sup>56</sup> S. Price 1999 insists on this “exoteric” criterion as essential for a work to be classed as “apologetic.” This makes good sense, as it stays close to the context of the defense speech before a judge or jury, though we should note that such address to outsiders may be a fiction constructed by the text. But it is possible to argue that this second criterion is not essential to the notion of “apologetic.”

<sup>57</sup> Of course, the passion for classification can itself become a straightjacket. As Newsom comments: “Texts do not ‘belong’ to genres so much as participate in them, invoke them, gesture to them, play in and out of

By the nature of the case, works that are primarily apologetic (as defined above) are likely to contain elements of polemics and encomium (“propaganda”). As rhetoricians recognized, an effective method of self-defense is to go on the offensive against one’s accusers, such that apologetic will often *include* invective (though not all invective is “apologetic”). It was also recognized that to stand always on the back foot, defending oneself against criticism, could be seen as a sign of weakness; sometimes it was appropriate to take a more positive stand and to promote or eulogize what the opposition had attempted to denigrate.<sup>58</sup> Thus, although “apology” and “encomium” were distinct rhetorical genres, as part of a total apologetic strategy it was not surprising to find defenders of a cause waxing lyrical on whatever was under attack.<sup>59</sup>

With these observations, and on the basis of this definition, we may conclude that *Apion*, as analysed above, may be classified as an example of “apology.” That it contains polemics and an extended passage whose content is most like an encomium (2.145-286) is no obstacle to this classification; the work as a whole is placed within the framework of, and dominated by, defense against explicit accusations (some legal, some not), and is directed, at the rhetorical level, at “outsiders” (1.3; 2.296). It stands in the tradition of the defense speech (real or fictional), as adapted for use in the rivalries between city-states of the Mediterranean world, though it is

them, and in so doing continually change them. Texts may participate in more than one genre, just as they may be marked in an exaggerated or in a deliberately subtle fashion” (2003: 12). Nonetheless, in order to appreciate this flexibility and creativity, one has to identify first the genre(s) in which the relevant text participates.

<sup>58</sup> See again, Demosthenes, *Cor.* 3-4; cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 5.13.53 (first refute the opposition, then present one’s own case). Plato’s *Apology* spends as much time advocating Socrates’ philosophy as defending him against charges. Josephus reports the combination of “apology” and “encomium” in Nicolas’ account of the life of Herod (*Ant.* 16.86).

<sup>59</sup> Conversely, an encomium could contain many elements of apologetic; Isocrates complained that Gorgias’ *Encomium of Helen* would be better termed an “apology” (*Hel. Enc.* 10.14).



the only known example of such inter-state rivalry that is *dominated* by this defensive stance and classifiable, as a text, as an “apology.”<sup>60</sup> We know of no Judean precursor: none of the fragments of Philo (?) sometimes mentioned in this connection would fit our definition of “apology.”<sup>61</sup> Of later Christian works, the closest parallel is Origen’s *Contra Celsum*, in its direct rebuttal of specific accusations, though some other works bear more or less “apologetic” features.<sup>62</sup>

To class Josephus’ *Apion* as an “apology” is not yet to say anything about the reality of the charges here addressed, or of the audience here implied. In principle it is quite possible for an author to *invent* accusations in order to rebut them, or to rake up old issues that have no current impact, for the sake of a rhetorical treatise; such was the staple of rhetorical exercises (*controversiae*) in the schools. It is also possible

<sup>60</sup> One could speculate why: would it have appeared a sign of weakness to spend so much of one’s time refuting accusations against one’s city or nation? The appearance of whole texts dominated by this strategy, such as *Apion* and some later Christian examples, may be a reflection of the vulnerability of the causes they represent.

<sup>61</sup> We know nothing about the work Eusebius entitles “On Behalf of Judeans” (*Hist. eccl.* 2.18.6). Eusebius introduces a passage from Philo on the Essenes (*Praep. ev.* 8.11.1) as derived from his “apology on behalf of the Judeans” (8.10.19), but nothing in the text cited even remotely fits the genre (there is no mention of criticisms at all). Fragments from the *Hypothetica* (on their authorship, see Appendix 5) are introduced by the claim that Philo makes this argument “on behalf of Judeans as if towards their accusers” (ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ὡς πρὸς κατηγοροῦς αὐτῶν, *Praep. ev.* 8.5.11), but this may be Eusebius’ own loose categorization of the work. The fragments themselves display a *diatribe* style (raising possible objections in the form of “you may say” or “you may ask,” e.g., 6.2; 7.11). There is one report of insults against Moses (6.2), but the author does not speak as an advocate of the Judeans (they are spoken of in the third person, not the first), and the work does not seem to be structured or dominated by response to criticism. The genre is that of a philosophical dialogue, not an apology. See Keeble 1991: 44-52; Goodman 1999: 48-49.

<sup>62</sup> See the essays by Rajak, Young, Price, Frede, and Edwards in Edwards, Goodman, and Price 1999.

that the implied audience, constructed in the text, is different from the intended audience (the people whom Josephus really hoped to hear or read this work). Such matters cannot be judged adequately from within the text itself, whose constructed world might or might not correspond to social reality. To approach such questions, we need to know about the historical context in which *Apion* was written, and the likely intentions of its author within that context.

## 6. Political and Social Context in Rome

Given the uncertainty concerning the date of *Apion* (see above, § 3), its political context certainly includes, but cannot be limited to the last years of Domitian (94-96 CE). Attention must also be paid to the reign of Nerva (96-98 CE) and the early years of Trajan (98-117 CE) since the treatise could have been written at any time between 94 and ca. 105 CE. In the absence of precise chronological markers, the work must be placed in a general context regarding the perception of Judeans in Rome since the Judean Revolt. Thus our discussion will include the special place of Judeans within Flavian ideology, the particular circumstances of Domitian’s rule, the changes after his assassination, and the reputation of Judeans in Rome throughout this period.

The Flavian dynasty, founded by Vespasian (69-79 CE) after the chaos of the Civil War, drew considerable political capital, even a degree of its legitimacy, from the military success of Vespasian and Titus in the Judean War. Although the War had not expanded the empire’s boundaries but merely suppressed a provincial revolt, the lavish celebration of a triumph in Rome in June 71 CE (fully described by Josephus in *War* 7.123-62) indicates the importance of this War in establishing the new imperial era. The Flavians exploited to the full the propaganda benefits of the victory in Judea. The issue of *Judea Capta* coins, the celebration of the War in prose and poetry, the construction of the Temple of Peace (75 CE), in which were displayed the objects from the Jerusalem Temple, the construction of a triumphal arch in the Circus Maximus, whose inscription lauded Titus’ subjugation of the Judean people, and of a sec-

ond triumphal arch to Titus on the Velia (very near to the Forum), with its panel depicting the triumph and the apotheosis of Titus, even the construction of the Colosseum “from the spoils of war”—all these signal how Flavian honor was built on the foundation of Judean defeat.<sup>63</sup> This is not to say that *every* Judean shared equally in the disgrace. Agrippa II continued to be honored in the imperial court, the Herodian princess Berenice was favored by Titus (until he became emperor, 79 CE), and Josephus himself was given minor favors by Vespasian, continued by his successors, no doubt for predicting Vespasian’s rise to power and assisting the Romans at the difficult siege of Jerusalem.<sup>64</sup> But Josephus’ effort to write a more “balanced” account of the Judean War was occasioned, at least in part, by the strong current of vilification that Judeans endured in the aftermath of the Revolt (*War* 1.2). Although Domitian was not personally involved in the War, his accession to power (81 CE) did not lessen the Flavian bias in this respect: he had written poetry on the destruction of Jerusalem (Valerius Flaccus, *Arg.* 1.12-13), was responsible for completing and dedicating the arch to Titus on the Velia, and energetically propagated the mythologies of the Flavian *gens*.<sup>65</sup> The political atmosphere did not favor respect for the Judean people and their culture.

The particular conditions of Domitian’s rule (81-96 CE) are not easy to evaluate: our sources

are highly problematic, being written mostly in hindsight, out of grievance, in the aftermath of a *damnatio memoriae*, and in justification of a new regime interested in exaggerating the crimes of a discredited “tyrant.” It is even hard to establish a sense of chronology: for some sources there are turning points, after which the regime descended into a reign of terror, for others Domitian’s rule constituted one long 15-year era of “slavery.”<sup>66</sup> It is likely that Domitian’s meticulous and sometimes oppressive attention to detail was a constant feature of his reign, but his sense of insecurity and his autocratic reaction to hints of criticism probably increased in the last years of his rule.<sup>67</sup> For our purposes, two phenomena are of particular importance, the exaction of the *fiscus Iudaicus* and the high-profile trials and executions of the last years of the regime.

In humiliating the Judean people after the Revolt, Vespasian had diverted the annual Judean temple tax to the coffers of the *fiscus Iudaicus*, and made it now payable by all Judeans, male and female, throughout the empire.<sup>68</sup> According to Suetonius, Domitian took care to apply this mode of taxation with great severity (*acerbissime*, *Dom.* 12.2) and used informers to root out those who had hitherto evaded it.<sup>69</sup> Suetonius mentions two categories of supposed tax-dodgers: i) those considered to live the “Judean life” without admitting themselves to be Judeans (*qui inprofessi Iudaicam viverent vitam*); and ii) those who hid their origins to avoid the

<sup>63</sup> See now Millar 2005 for a full discussion. Barnes describes the Judean victory as providing “the equivalent of a foundation myth for the Flavian dynasty” (2005: 129).

<sup>64</sup> On the Herodians in Flavian Rome, see D. Schwartz 2005; on Agrippa II and Berenice, Dio Cassius 66.15.3-4; 18.1 (Barclay 1996a: 308-9). Josephus’ own privileges are listed in *Life* 422-29 and discussed by Mason 2001 ad loc. Apart from political protection against a number of opponents, they amount to relatively little in terms of imperial favor (citizenship, land, house, and pension; see Mason 1998: 74-78; Cotton and Eck 2005: 38-40). Josephus was known to Roman authors as the Judean who predicted Vespasian’s rise to imperial power (Suetonius, *Vesp.* 5.9; Dio 66.1.4). On his relationship to Titus, see Yavetz 1975.

<sup>65</sup> On his temples to the Flavian *gens*, the *Templum Vespasiani et Titi*, and the *Templum Divorum* see Griffin 2000a: 57.

<sup>66</sup> Tacitus, *Agr.* 2-3. Suetonius, *Domitian*, divides the reign into two parts, with the revolt of Saturninus (89 CE) as the turning point. The notorious senatorial executions, which Suetonius groups into a single list (*Dom.* 10), may have been spread more evenly across the period than he suggests.

<sup>67</sup> For recent discussion see Jones 1992; Southern 1997; Griffin 2000a. Jones 1996 provides an historical commentary on Suetonius, *Domitian*.

<sup>68</sup> Josephus, *War* 7.218; Dio Cassius 66.7.2; see Barclay 1996a: 76-78.

<sup>69</sup> He relates the trial and stripping of a 90-year old man (to see if he was circumcised) when he himself was *adulescentulus*; since he was an *adulescens* in 88 CE, this probably suggests that the tax regime was tightened from the mid 80s (Jones 1992: 76; Williams 1990: 204).

tax levied on their people (*dissimulata origine imposita genti tributa non pependissent*). Although these two categories have been variously interpreted, it is most likely that the first includes people who adopted Judean customs, with however great or little interest in Judean culture, or could be conveniently charged with doing so; the second seems to embrace Judeans by birth who had become apostates.<sup>70</sup> The rigorous exaction of this tax may have something to do with Domitian's passion for administrative efficiency and the financial needs of a regime that had greatly increased military pay and was committed to massively expensive building works.<sup>71</sup> But that *this tax* was so enthusiastically pursued, and applied to those suspected of being closet Judaizers, indicates an atmosphere in which Judean culture was the target of particular and hostile attention, and where it was no longer a joke to be thought of as "Judean" by abstaining from pork or not working on the sabbath/day of Saturn.<sup>72</sup> When we find Nerva issuing coins immediately after his accession (96 CE) celebrating the end of malicious accusations relating to this tax (*FISCI IUDAICI CALUMNIA SUBLATA*), it becomes clear that informers' enthusiasm for "unmasking" non-payers had affected a suffi-

cient number of the Roman population to be widely known and considered (retrospectively) a public scandal.<sup>73</sup> During Domitian's principate it appears that the adoption by Romans of Judean customs (in appearance or reality) could be costly, both financially and socially.

This impression is strengthened by some aspects of the trials and executions that took place at the end of Domitian's reign. There can be no doubt that the motivations for these trials was primarily political: Domitian was particularly ruthless in snuffing out threats to his rule or criticisms of his person. At possibly quite an early point in his principate he had T. Flavius Sabinus executed; as a cousin and the husband of Titus' daughter, he was a potential rival for power.<sup>74</sup> After the revolt of Saturninus (January 89 CE), Domitian had good reason to fear a challenge to his power, and his position as the childless representative of a dynasty now losing popularity began to look dangerously similar to that of Nero. The trials in 92/93 CE of Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio, both senior senators, concerned their publication of eulogistic biographies of Thrasea Paetus (condemned to death by Nero) and Helvidius Priscus (executed by Vespasian); any advocacy of opposition to the principate could be heard as opposition to its present occupant.<sup>75</sup> By the same token, philosophers who took their Stoicism to license "freedom of speech" or withdrawal from the political domain came under suspicion, and a number were expelled from Rome in the early 90s.<sup>76</sup> A farce taken to be a criticism of the emperor's

<sup>70</sup> For further discussion, see Barclay 1996a: 311; Smallwood 1956; 1981: 371-75; Williams 1990. An alternative reading of Suetonius, which has both categories refer to circumcised *peregrini* and apostate Judeans (who hid either their Judean practices or their Judean origins) has been advanced (Thompson 1982, followed by Goodman 1989), but makes less sense.

<sup>71</sup> Suetonius places the Judean tax issue in the context of Domitian's economic policies (*Dom.* 12.1). On Domitian's finances, see Jones 1992: 72-79; Griffin 2000a: 69-76.

<sup>72</sup> The point is rightly emphasized by Williams 1990. In an earlier age Augustus could quip that he fasted on the sabbath as rigorously as a Judean (Suetonius, *Aug.* 76.2). In a more hostile atmosphere, Seneca's father was worried lest his son's vegetarianism be interpreted as sympathy with a foreign cult (*Ep.* 108.22). On the persistent possibilities for confusion between the Judean sabbath and "Saturn's day" (increasingly regarded as an unlucky day for work), see Barclay 1996a: 296-97.

<sup>73</sup> For the coins, see Mattingly 1936 (nos. 15, 17, 19); for recent discussion, Goodman 2005.

<sup>74</sup> Suetonius, *Dom.* 10.4; see Jones 1992: 44-47, 187; 1996: 94-95; Southern 1997: 42-44; on the date, Syme 1983: 131.

<sup>75</sup> Suetonius, *Dom.* 10.3; Tacitus, *Agr.* 2.1; 45.1-2; Dio 67.13.2. Cf. the banishment and execution of Epaphroditus, the freedman of Nero who had helped him commit suicide (Suetonius, *Dom.* 14.4; Dio 67.14.4-5; see note to "Epaphroditus" at 1.1).

<sup>76</sup> Suetonius, *Dom.* 10.3; Tacitus, *Agr.* 2.2; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 15.11.4 (Epictetus); Pliny, *Ep.* 3.11.3 (Artemidorus). For the date (perhaps 93 CE), see Jones 1992: 119-20, 189; 1996: 93. As Jones points out,

marriage, criticism of his gladiators, even jokes about his baldness, could be punished severely by an increasingly sensitive and capricious emperor.<sup>77</sup>

In this context we should understand the trials of T. Flavius Clemens and his wife Flavia Domitilla (95 CE), and the exile then execution (95 CE) of M. Acilius Glabrio, as a reflex of the emperor's political vulnerability. Flavius Clemens was another cousin of Domitian's, and married to Flavia Domitilla, Domitian's niece; more importantly, two of their sons had been adopted by Domitian as his heirs, placing their parents in a precariously prominent position. Clemens was made consul at the start of 95 CE (for the second time), but later that year was executed, according to Suetonius "on the slightest of suspicions" (*ex tenuissima suspicione*, *Dom.* 15.1). We owe to Dio the notice that the charge against them was of "atheism" (ἄθεότης), a charge on which many others were condemned who drifted into Judean customs (ἐς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἥθη ἐξοκέλλοντες, 67.14.1-2). In the same connection, Dio adds reference to the execution of Glabrio, who was accused of "the same crimes as most of the others" and of fighting with wild beasts as a gladiator.<sup>78</sup> It is hard to make much of such disparate remarks, though it seems that if "Judean customs" were

at issue here, they were a *pretext* for trials motivated by political insecurity.<sup>79</sup> But when Dio adds later that Nerva released those who were on trial for ἀσέβεια (Latin equivalent: *maiestas*) and forbade accusations regarding either ἀσέβεια or "the Judean life" (Ἰουδαϊκὸς βίος, 68.1.2), we have the sense that a number of treason trials in the last years of Domitian's reign were bound up in some way with accusations of closet Judaizing.

The precise connection here is not easily discerned. Was it charged that Judaizing encouraged refusal to recognize the Roman Gods, and thus also the imperial cult assiduously cultivated by Domitian?<sup>80</sup> Or was adoption of Judean culture regarded as an affront to the representative of a dynasty that had come to power by defeating these rebellious subjects? In any case, amidst the political (and perhaps financial) motivations for such trials, we must include the perception by informers and imperial agents that the emperor found "Judean customs" a despicable attribute of high-status Romans.<sup>81</sup> Litera-

---

Domitian was opposed not to philosophy as such, but to the use of Stoicism as a vehicle for insolence or a rationale for defiance (1992: 121-22; cf. Griffin 2000a: 67). For this reason, the argument of Haaland (2005) that Josephus toned down use of "philosophical" language in describing Judean culture in *Apion*, in reaction to the Roman atmosphere in the last years of Domitian's reign, is not wholly convincing.

<sup>77</sup> The farce was composed by Helvidius Priscus (younger), of notorious senatorial pedigree (Suetonius, *Dom.* 10.4; Jones 1996: 93-94). For criticism of Domitian's gladiators, see Pliny, *Pan.* 33.3-4; of his baldness, Suetonius, *Dom.* 18.2. But such stories, emphasizing trivial causes of offense, may have been invented or exaggerated when it became politically opportune to contrast "freedom" under the new regime with the "slavery" endured under its predecessor.

<sup>78</sup> Dio 67.14.3; cf. Suetonius, *Dom.* 10.1-2 (suspected of revolutionary intentions); see Jones 1992: 184; 1996: 88.

---

<sup>79</sup> Williams suggests (1990: 208, n. 89) that Suetonius' comment on Clemens' *contemptissima inertia* may reflect some tenuous connection with the observance of the Judean sabbath; cf. Jones 1992: 47-48, 117-18 and Griffin 2000a: 68, who also take the connection with Judean customs to have been relatively superficial.

<sup>80</sup> ἀσέβεια could reflect any sleight to the dignity of the emperor. ἀθεότης suggests a disavowal of Roman cults, but we do not know how this was connected to charges of "Judean customs," especially when the victims were senators or even consuls who regularly displayed their loyalty to Roman rites. But Tacitus' perception that proselytes learned (among other things) *contemnere deos* (*Hist.* 5.5.2) may be relevant here; see further below. On Domitian's cultivation of the Flavian *gens*, see above; he was also particularly devoted to the goddess Minerva (Jones 1992: 99-100). To what extent he promoted recognition of his own divinity ("Dominus ac Deus") is a matter of some dispute (Jones 1992: 108-9; Griffin 2000a: 81-82); the issue may have been exaggerated by later sources.

<sup>81</sup> See the cogent analysis of Williams 1990, who points out that the treason trials, in which lives were lost for "drifting into Judean ways," concerned people of a very different social level than those affected by the tax-trials for the *fiscus Judaicus*.



ture produced during the reign of Domitian to flatter or amuse the emperor bears out this impression: Martial makes persistent mockery of Judeans, and especially their habit of circumcision,<sup>82</sup> while Quintilian, tutor to Domitian's adopted heirs, remarks on the hatred directed at Moses, the founder of "the Judean superstition," who formed a people "ruinous to others" (*perniciosa ceteris*, 3.7.21). We do not have to postulate some imperial conspiracy against Judeans, but may still surmise that the emperor harbored and encouraged a "deep antagonism towards the Jews and their ways."<sup>83</sup>

The assassination of Domitian (18<sup>th</sup> September 96 CE) and the installation of Nerva as emperor brought some immediate changes, advertised by the new emperor in condemnation of his predecessor. Many of those expelled (e.g., philosophers) were recalled, the tax-trials for the *fiscus Iudaicus* were halted, with public announcement on imperial coinage (see above) and, according to Dio, Nerva "released all who were on trial for ἁσέβεια and restored the exiles, ... and no persons were permitted to accuse anybody of ἁσέβεια or of a Judean mode of life" (68.1.2). This public reversal of policy was part of the dramatic repudiation of the "tyrant" Domitian, but it does not appear to represent a particularly *favorable* stance towards Judeans.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>82</sup> For Martial on circumcision, see especially the poems in Book 7 (dedicated to Domitian): 7.30.5; 35.3-4; 82.5-6. Williams rightly emphasizes the prevalence of his abuse of Judeans, male and female, in relation to the destruction of Jerusalem, the sabbath, and poverty, as well as circumcision (1990: 197, 205).

<sup>83</sup> Williams 1990: 211. The rabbinic evidence concerning the vulnerability of a proselyte, Onkelos, the death of a senator, Ketī'ah bar Shalom, and the visit of four rabbis to Rome (on hearing of a threat to expel all Judeans from the Roman empire) is discussed in Smallwood 1956: 8-10. Its historical value is doubtful, but it *may* reflect the memory of an atmosphere in Domitian's Rome particularly hostile to Judeans.

<sup>84</sup> On Nerva's wide-ranging reversals of his predecessor's abuses, the advertised arrival of "Libertas Restituta," and his cherished reputation for "mildness," see Griffin 2000b: 84-88. But the propagandistic emphasis on change masks the degree of continuity between the principate of Domitian and that of his

It reassured senators that their private lives would not be subject to the same scrutiny, or charges trumped up against them, but there was no change in imperial policy towards Judeans as such: the *fiscus Iudaicus* continued to be collected (without the use of "malicious charges"), and the Jerusalem temple remained in ruins. It is hard to imagine a sudden swelling of Judean hopes. Although Nerva was not bound to the Flavian celebration of the Judean War, he was hardly likely to allow the reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem, a central focus for Judean national loyalty whose reconstruction could diminish the assimilation of Judeans throughout the empire.<sup>85</sup> In any case, everyone knew that the ageing Nerva was a temporary stop-gap, and when he adopted his heir, Trajan, as early as November 97 CE, Judeans could hardly anticipate bias in their favor: the coming emperor was the son of M. Ulpius Trajanus, a legionary commander in the Judean War alongside Titus.<sup>86</sup>

We have two main literary sources for conservative opinion about Judeans in Rome during the last years of the first century CE and the beginning of the second: the satirist Juvenal and the historian Tacitus. For all their differences they reveal in common an attitude of scorn and amused disdain, sometimes shading into resentment directed at the "contrary" and "absurd"

successors, Nerva and Trajan (Griffin 2000b: 98, 106-8).

<sup>85</sup> See Rives 2005 on the rationale for the Roman policy towards the Jerusalem temple. The notice in Barn. 16:3-4 regarding future reconstruction of the temple has been taken by some to reflect Judean hopes during the reign of Nerva (e.g., Carleton Paget 1994: 17-28). But the hopes expressed there seem vague, and the connection with Nerva is made only via a questionable reading of Barn. 4:3-5. Nerva's cessation of the trials did not signal the end of the tax itself, which seems to presuppose the non-existence of the temple in Jerusalem (to which the equivalent tax was formerly directed). For general Judean hopes regarding the temple, see note to "God" at 2.193.

<sup>86</sup> See Goodman 2005: 176-77. The father was made a consul by Vespasian and governed Syria 73-77 CE; the son gained military experience in the East (as military tribune) under his father during the early 70s. On Nerva's reign and the question of succession, see Grainger 2003.

Judean customs that they took so little trouble to understand.<sup>87</sup> Juvenal associates Judeans with the “effluent” from the East, and typecasts them as impoverished beggars and fortune-tellers (*Sat.* 3.10-18, 296; 6.542-47). The Herodian family are in a different social class, but they too can be mocked for their peculiar customs regarding sabbaths and pork (6.153-60). In a neat vignette (14.96-106), Juvenal weaves a composite critique of Judean peculiarity: they worship nothing but the heavens, abstain from pork, laze around on the sabbath, and practice circumcision. All of these customs Juvenal traces to Moses and his “arcane volume” of law that teaches Judeans to be hostile to anyone apart from themselves (14.103-4), and induces converts to despise the Roman laws.<sup>88</sup>

Tacitus raises all these issues, and adds more.<sup>89</sup> He opens his mini-ethnography (written ca. 107 CE) with an account of Judean origins, a topic of not merely “academic” interest, since certain versions conferred honor, while others (including the one he describes at length) depict a diseased offshoot of the Egyptian people, whose desert wanderings explain bizarre customs such as worship of an ass and abstention from the scabrous pig (*Hist.* 5.2-4).<sup>90</sup> Tacitus’ report is not all invective: he inserts subtle admiration of the more “philosophical” features of Judean religious tradition (their contempt for death and imageless worship of God, 5.5.3-4). But he shows no respect for Moses, who sneakily gained unique influence over future generations by introducing customs totally at odds with

other cultures (5.4.1). Indeed, it is this sense of contrariety that is most prominent throughout Tacitus’ account: the Judeans regard as profane all that “we” hold sacred, and permit all that “we” abhor (5.4.1). Sabbath rest (indolence), fasting, abstention from pork, anti-Egyptian rites, and worship of the ass are all brought under this heading, and connected via ludicrous etiology to an Egyptian account of the exodus. Other features, too, emphasize Judean isolationism: they use circumcision only to *distinguish* themselves from others (5.5.2), and they fortified Jerusalem heavily in anticipation of the wars that would arise from their policy of *difference* (5.12.2). This difference is in fact a sign of hostility: they will neither eat nor sleep with others, being extremely loyal to one another, but displaying towards all others an aggressive hatred (*sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium*, 5.5.1). In this connection, Tacitus particularly excoriates the “worst people” (*pessimus quisque*) who abandon their own traditions and used to send money to Jerusalem: such *change* from ancestral customs, repudiating the Gods and disowning country and family, was bound to shock a conservative mind that put such premium on religious, national, and familial tradition (5.5.2).

It would be misleading to suggest that such xenophobia and snide disdain were directed uniquely, or even to an atypical degree, against Judeans. One could cite more and equally damning comments about Egyptians, Greeks, and Germans: in fact, almost any ethnic group could form a convenient target for satirical ire or conservative outrage.<sup>91</sup> Nor should we assume that the hostility towards Judeans displayed by these sources was representative of Romans in general. From the very fact that it caused them annoyance, we can tell that there were other Romans who found Judean customs attractive, who observed sabbaths, abstained from pork and even, after a time, got themselves circumcised (to become proselytes). It is often difficult to tell how much such “Judaizing” was actual and how much simply the interpretation of others (hostile

<sup>87</sup> See Barclay 1996a: 313-15; Schäfer 1997a: 183-92. Gruen (2002: 41-53) rightly questions whether these sources express fear or alarm about Judeans, but notes their mocking tone.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. the fortune-teller’s interpretation of “the laws of Solyma” (*Sat.* 6.564). The contemporary Epictetus also notices Judean food laws (*Diss.* 1.11.12-13; 22.4; cf. Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 4.5).

<sup>89</sup> Besides the commentary in Stern, see Bloch 2000 with further bibliography.

<sup>90</sup> Of the six version he outlines, only this last is treated at length and implicitly accorded credence, in explaining Judean customs. Of the other options, mention by Homer (as the famous “Solymi”) would give the Judeans an “illustrious origin” (*clara initia*, *Hist.* 5.2.3).

<sup>91</sup> See Isaac 2004 on the range of ancient prejudice (though his label “racism” is anachronistic).

charge or wishful thinking), and where it was actual, to what degree it expressed genuine attraction to Judean culture and to what degree a skin-deep, selective, or socially convenient fashion. But we need not doubt that there was a penumbra of supportive non-Judeans in Rome, and some real proselytes, the fruit of a sustained and profound engagement with Judean culture. Nevertheless, the witness of Juvenal and Tacitus, following the evidence from the principate of Domitian, suggests that there was a strong intellectual current of hostility towards Judeans, that it was socially respectable to ridicule Judean culture, and that there was no sea-change in this mood after the death of Domitian, however much the change of emperor brought to an end particular causes of nuisance or danger.

We may conclude from this and from other relevant evidence that Judean culture was most interesting, and most controversial, in Rome in relation to three topics:

1. *Judean origins*: Tacitus' canvassing of six variants regarding Judean origins indicates that multiple versions circulated in intellectual circles, many convenient because they served etiological purposes, "explaining" unusual or amusing Judean habits (see Appendix 3). Behind Tacitus' account we can detect the influence of Egyptian tales regarding a diseased element of the Egyptian population, stories with long pedigrees and complex accretions that are also partly visible in Josephus' *Apion*. These tales could be significant simply for the honor or dishonor they conveyed, but they could also bear the burden of a particular philosophical concern. There is patchy but sufficient evidence to suggest that the late first century CE witnessed an upsurge of interest in purportedly ancient eastern nations, whose records could predate and correct those of Greece: alternative accounts of the Trojan War were circulating in Josephus' lifetime, and Philo of Byblos (64–141 CE) gained credence for his claim to "discover" an ancient Phoenician source.<sup>92</sup> For contemporary Stoic philosophers this was a matter of particular importance: ancient peoples might preserve a truer

and purer form of wisdom, however enigmatically expressed.<sup>93</sup> If Judeans were merely an offshoot of the Egyptian populace, they had no independent claim to wisdom; if they were a distinct ancient nation, their challenging cultural claims had the right to be treated very seriously. In other words, Judean antiquity and origins were not merely a matter of historical interest, but carried significant implications for the value of the Judean tradition as a whole.

2. *Judean customs*: Judean cultural difference was certainly noted in Rome, often derided, and sometimes regarded as a sign of moral depravity. As we have seen, certain customs were stock topics for comment: sabbath-observance, abstinence from pork, fasting, aniconic worship, and circumcision. These could be variously explained, by reference to the exodus or to the peculiar Judean penchant for difference. While they could bear a harmless interpretation, they were vulnerable to negative judgment: the sabbath rest could be represented as mere laziness, aniconic worship a snub to the Gods. Moral opprobrium could fall on Moses, the founder of the nation and originator of these laws, or on his contemporary followers who were stupid or contrary enough to maintain his traditions. In either case, Judean culture was an alien phenomenon, always potentially laughable, and sometimes the object of moral disgust.

3. *Judean exclusiveness*: That Judeans were not only different, but were deliberately so, was noted, and sometimes resented, by Roman observers. This could rankle at various levels. Socially, their isolationism, in meals and marriage, could be taken to represent rank incivility, a stubborn rejection of normal rules of social intercourse; the rumor could circulate that Judeans could never be trusted to show you the way. Politically, their famous aniconism could pass unnoticed, or could be turned against Judeans as a sign of their insubordination: not paying re-

<sup>92</sup> See Bowersock 1994: 43-48; Attridge & Oden 1981.

<sup>93</sup> For Chaeremon, see Frede 1989. The point is developed, in application to Judeans, in Boys-Stones 2001, who shows that this development in Stoic philosophy has direct relevance to the questions about Judean antiquity lying behind *Apion*; see further note to "historians" at 1.2.

spect to the emperors in the normal way (*non Caesaribus honor*, Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.4) may not be treated as a gross offense by Tacitus, but it could be turned into a charge of “atheism” or *maiestas* in hostile political circumstances, or used as evidence of Judean disaffection from the Roman state. The *change* required of proselytes—their adoption of utterly new loyalties and laws—suggested that Judeans were intractably unassimilable in the Roman empire, representatives of laws and customs that could not be “Romanized” and might be regarded as fundamentally “unRoman.”

Placed in this context, Josephus’ *Apion* is clearly of some contemporary relevance, even if not evenly or always directly so. We cannot assume that every issue addressed by Josephus is of live importance to his contemporaries: the rhetorical practice of apologetic can thrive through the construction of artificial or outdated targets. Indeed, there are several features of the text that might make us suspect that Josephus’ “critics” are sometimes straw men, and his polemics manufactured.<sup>94</sup> Those accused of doubting Judean antiquity (1.2) are suspiciously anonymous, and their charge (that Judeans were not *worthy* of mention, or that they were “recent” or “very recent,” 1.2, 58; 2.288) is variously worded. The inclusion of an encomium on Judean culture within the genre of apologetic (2.145-286) lends itself to the concoction of possibly spurious “charges,” justifying a reply and otherwise invidious comparisons (see 2.150, 236-38). None of the critics named in the treatise (most prominently Manetho, Chaeremon, Lysimachus, Apion, and Apollonius Molon) was alive in Josephus’ day, and none were Roman; some of the authors he cites in his defense were remarkably obscure. Some of the issues addressed in reply to them (e.g., the legend of an annual ritual slaughter of a Greek, 2.89-96) had, as far as we can tell, no currency in Josephus’ context, and some of the issues noted above, as of live interest in Rome (notably circumcision, food laws, and sabbath) receive little direct treatment in this apology. Moreover, there is evi-

dence for Josephus’ dependence on previous sources (see Appendix 5), and thus some grounds for suspecting that his choice of topics is influenced by issues important in another time and place.

Nonetheless, a moderate case can be made for the claim that *Apion* is partially attuned to contemporary issues affecting Judeans in Rome, as outlined above:

i) As Tacitus indicates, there were several versions of Judean origins current in Rome, but that most widely believed (*Hist.* 5.3.1) related an expulsion from Egypt by a diseased segment of population. The tradition that Josephus discusses (represented by Manetho, Chaeremon, Lysimachus, and Apion) was thus of contemporary intellectual importance (there are especially close parallels between Tacitus’ version and that of Lysimachus) and not simply an antiquarian or “Alexandrian” phenomenon.

ii) Even the question about Judean antiquity, though unattributed in Josephus’ text, can be shown to be more than an artificial construct (even if it is rhetorically manipulated). The question of honor that it entails, and its philosophical importance for contemporary Stoics, are both of general relevance in Josephus’ day.<sup>95</sup>

iii) Both Chaeremon and Apion were active and influential in Rome in the mid first-century CE. As well as channeling their versions of Egyptian legends into Roman literary circles, they both brought Alexandrian complaints about Judeans, social and political, to the attention of Roman figures of power.<sup>96</sup> Moreover, Alexandrian issues continued to concern Roman politicians in the aftermath of the Judean War, as can be dimly perceived in the fragmentary “Acts of the Pagan Martyrs.”<sup>97</sup>

<sup>95</sup> See note to “historians” at 1.2.

<sup>96</sup> On the roles of Apion and Chaeremon in Alexandrian delegations to (respectively) Gaius and Claudius, see note to “scholar” at 2.2 and to “Chaeremon” at 1.288.

<sup>97</sup> See Musurillo 1954; these might suggest a growing exasperation in Rome with Alexandrian civic leaders, lending persuasive force to Josephus’ denigration of Apion and dismissal of his complaints against Judeans.

<sup>94</sup> See Goodman 1999: 52-53; Gruen 2005.



iv) As we have seen, Judean customs were the target of amusement and moral critique in Josephus' Rome: the opinion of Apollonius Molon that the Mosaic law taught vice rather than virtue (2.145) was very relevant to Josephus' contemporaries. In some cases, Josephus spends less time than we might expect on the hottest topics of debate. Circumcision is not treated as a Judean distinctive because Josephus is here committed to Herodotus' view that it was derived from Egypt (1.168-71; 2.142). Criticism of Judean food laws, including abstention from pork, is alluded to (2.137), but is wrapped up more generally within the discussion of Judean discipline in the daily habits of the home (2.174, 232-35). Sabbath observance is discussed in the same context (2.174, 234), but is also defended in relation to Agatharchides' critique of Judean passivity (1.209-12). On neither issue is Josephus as defensive as we might expect; rather, he is pleased to point out how such customs (including fasting) have been adopted by others (2.282).

v) Judean exclusiveness, a matter of serious critique in Rome, is addressed directly by Josephus in the course of his treatment of the constitution (2.145-86). There he sets himself to answer Apollonius Molon's charge that Judeans are "misanthropes" and "atheists" (2.148) and the last third of this segment (2.236-86) is devoted to a philosophical and historical defense of Judean policy towards non-Judeans and their Gods. Correspondingly, the notable emphasis on Judean φιλανθρωπία in the summary of the laws (2.209-14) places stress on Judean openness to outsiders who wish to share their customs, in full accord with the basic rules of civility in everyday life (2.211).

vi) The political sensitivities of Judean abstention from the imperial cult are handled in connection with Apion's complaints (2.71-78), and some effort is made to align Judeans with Rome and the interests of the Roman empire (e.g., 1.66; 2.33-64, 125-34). More generally, there is evidence of a partial alignment in Josephus' presentation of Judean culture to the values and virtues of *Romanitas* (see Appendix 6), indicating awareness of the particular Roman context in which this apologetic is staged.

vii) Given the sensitivities at the end of Domitian's reign to the association between Ju-

deans and "atheism," there is very immediate relevance in Josephus' citation of this charge in relation to Apollonius Molon (2.148) and his lengthy response (2.236-86). At the same time, his glowing account of those who adopt Judean customs in every city of the world (2.282-86) clearly had contemporary relevance in Rome, though it is impossible to tell whether this was written when such Judaizing could render individuals liable to the *fiscus Iudaicus* (i.e., before September 96 CE), or represents a rise in confidence after that date.

All this suggests that when Josephus decided to write and publish *Apion*, rather than the projected four-volume work on *Customs and Causes* (see above, § 2), he was not simply rehashing older material irrelevant to his contemporary context. But the argument should not be pushed too far in the other direction. As we have seen, Josephus does not often address Roman issues *directly*: he cites no Roman historians in his discussion of historiography,<sup>98</sup> mentions no Roman critic of Judeans, compares Judeans with no Roman legislation or constitution, and discusses the social location of Judeans in Alexandria, not Rome. The text appears to be located *partly* in the social and political conditions of late first-century Rome, and *partly* in debates and problematics of a different era and different place.<sup>99</sup> Such ambivalence should keep us alert to the *possible* contemporary relevance of all aspects of the treatise, but not driven to prove that *every* detail has a Roman slant. This will help us recognize the influence of earlier Hellenistic issues, and earlier Judean responses, within Josephus' work, while also noting its special resonances within a Roman and a late first-century context. It will also be germane to our reconstruction of the audience and purpose of the work, a matter to which we now turn.

<sup>98</sup> Reference to any Roman authors is rare in the Josephan corpus as a whole, but not wholly absent (cf. Livy in *Ant.* 14.68). It is questionable to what extent Josephus was able to read Latin; cf. Mason 2003b: 566.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. the balanced conclusion on the relevance of 2.145-286 in Gerber 1997: 224-25.

### 7. Audience and Purpose

Even when we have defined, as closely as possible, the social and political context of *Apion*, it is another matter to determine its audience (readers and/or hearers).<sup>100</sup> To what circles did Josephus have access in promulgating his work? For which of these did he write it? And for what purpose? These are remarkably difficult questions to answer, and not just because of the paucity of information about Josephus himself and his social location in Rome. Although the *logical* intentions of the treatise are reasonably clear—to prove the antiquity of Judeans, and to answer a range of criticisms and derogatory stories—its *pragmatic* intentions (whom it was designed to persuade of these matters, and for what reason) are much harder to deduce. Contemporary readers have offered widely differing suggestions. Was *Apion* written to the Gentile world in general, or specifically to Roman readers, or rather to fellow Judeans (in each case, primarily or exclusively)? Was it designed to remove the doubts and criticisms current among non-Judean readers and to defend a beleaguered Judean population in Rome against anti-Judean slanders? Or was its purpose primarily positive, to sing the praises of the Judean tradition, and to earn it respect and admiration? Was it designed to bolster the confidence of Judeans, and provide them with replies to their critics? Was it to demonstrate the superiority of the Judean constitution and to win proselytes? Or does the text have a personal agenda, in self-defense against critics and skeptics?<sup>101</sup>

<sup>100</sup> The oral production of texts (normally read aloud) reminds us that “audience” involves “hearers” as well as “readers.” But it is not clear that Josephus moved in sufficiently exalted circles to have his works “published” in literary readings, as was common in the case of elite literature; see J. Price 2005: 104-5 and, on the “publication” of literature in Rome, Fantham 1996.

<sup>101</sup> Kasher 1996b: 150-57 (cf. Kasher 1997: 8-12) proposes an extremely wide set of possible audiences and purposes: to refute “the libelers of Jews in Josephus’ day”; to correct readers adversely affected by such libels; to instruct the innocent who did not know the facts; to inform sympathetic Gentiles, by providing “propaganda” about Judaism; to supply elite Judean readers with “a manual of instruction in the defense of

Since the question of audience and intention are logically separable, though related, I shall discuss the issue of audience first; that should at least clarify, and may reduce, the options regarding Josephus’ possible intentions.

#### 7.1 Audience

If we distinguish, as we should, between the world of the text (the implied author speaking to an implied audience), and the world outside the text (the real author with intentions to speak to a real audience), we must immediately clarify the different kinds of audience to which this treatise may be directed. As a text strongly influenced by the rhetorical conventions of “apologetic,” we should expect it to function with many layers of address: it may address opponents directly through rhetorical apostrophe, but may also speak beyond them to the “audience as jury,” who are invited to judge the case being discussed. Since the trial here is fictional, this address to “the jury” may construct readers with some freedom, choosing a particular set of values and perspectives to shape an ideal implied audience. And this *implied* audience may or may not correspond to the *intended* audience, those Josephus the writer actually hoped might hear/read this text.<sup>102</sup> Ancient readers were entirely familiar with such a multilayered phenomenon: it was obvious that those addressed *in* the text (in its dramatic or fictional setting) were not necessarily those addressed *by* the text (in the

---

the Jewish people and their values”; to head off slander against Judeans in “government and administrative circles throughout the Roman empire”; and to provide Hellenized Judeans throughout the Greco-Roman world with “a guide in their arguments with enemies of the Jews.” A specifically Roman focus is suggested by Goodman 1999; a proselytizing purpose by Mason 1996; a more personal agenda by Gruen 2005. We shall return to these options below. For what follows, see also Gerber 1997: 89-93, although, in common with others, she wrongly assumes that the implied audience and the intended audience are one and the same.

<sup>102</sup> Of course, in the event, none of these might correspond to the *actual* audience, a matter beyond the power of the text or of the author to determine; that is certainly important for the afterlife of this text, but it is a topic we can defer till later, § 8.

real-life world of the author).<sup>103</sup> We should thus distinguish at least three layers, or types, of audience, and will initially leave open the question of the extent to which they did or did not coincide:

- the *declared audience*: those addressed by the text, or spoken about as readers in the third person;
- the *implied audience*: the ideal readers presupposed or “constructed” by the text through its assumptions about readers’ prior knowledge, interests, and values;
- the *intended audience*: those whom Josephus hoped would read this treatise, either immediately or in the course of time.

It will be noted that the first two are deduced from, indeed products of, the text; they concern what is encoded in the text, which is logically distinct from (though it may overlap with) a real audience, as anticipated by the author. To deduce the third, the evidence of the text itself is uncertain (the implied audience could be an artificial construct); here we need to step out of the text into the real world and (with all due caution) into the mind of the author. Thus for the first two our evidence will be purely text-immanent; for the third, our reconstruction (above) of the historical and social context of the work will be important, as will our assessment of Josephus’ relationship to that context. Since the relationship between the implied audience and the intended audience is not certain, since an author’s real intentions are always a matter of conjecture, and since Josephus’ relationship to his environment is, as we shall see, somewhat unclear, this third audience, the intended audience, will be subject to the greatest uncertainty. But since it is immediately relevant to the question of purpose, some attempt at reconstruction must be made. We may take each of these audiences in turn.

A. *The Declared Audience*. The apologetic genre naturally lends itself to dramatic apostrophe, a direct retort to critics as if standing together in the same court. In fact, Josephus uses

this form of direct address extremely rarely; only once does he construct a dialogue between Apion and himself (2.65-67; cf. 1.314). Otherwise he speaks of the critics always in the third person: he is speaking *about them* to others. The work is dedicated to Epaphroditus (1.1; 2.1, 296) who is addressed as one who “especially loves the truth” (2.296); but appended is a dedication “on your account, to those who may likewise wish to know about our people” (2.296). This is a category of *outsiders* (they are not “our people” themselves), but they are given no ethnic definition and their expected stance is simply a desire “to know” about Judeans. This is strikingly vague, but it corresponds with the opening statement of the aims of the text (1.2-3), which more or less declares what readers it is expecting. Here Josephus notes that “a considerable number of people” pay attention to slanders and disbelieve his account of Judean history, so he has written: i) “to convict those who insult us as guilty of malice and deliberate falsehood”; ii) “to correct the ignorance of others”; and iii) “to instruct all who wish to know the truth on the subject of our antiquity.” From the first it is clear that “those who insult us” will be the object of discussion, but their conviction will take place before an audience of *others* who will be led to judge them rightly convicted (ἐλέγχω; cf. 2.295).<sup>104</sup> The second and third aims appear more or less identical (distinguished for the sake of the rhetorical tricolon); the “ignorant” constitute the only category of readers here envisaged, “those who wish to know the truth” on Judean antiquity.<sup>105</sup> Thus 1.3 and 2.296 concur in declaring the audience to be

<sup>104</sup> Cf. 1.58-59; 2.238, 287-88, where the “slanders” or critics are similarly spoken of as the objects of refutation, but not as the direct recipients of this work. 1.160 anticipates readers who are “not excessively contentious.” Kasher’s claim that the treatise is directly addressed to “the libelers of Josephus’ day,” unnamed out of convenience or cowardice (1996b: 151-52), misreads such data.

<sup>105</sup> While detractors of the Judean people can be convicted in their absence, the “ignorant” and those “who wish to know the truth” can be instructed only if they themselves encounter this text.

<sup>103</sup> The distinction in apologetics between the text’s implied audience and its real situation is rightly emphasized by Alexander 1999: 20-23.

(Epaphroditus and) non-Judeans who do not know but want to learn “the truth” about the Judean people.

On one occasion the text makes an explicit appeal to readers: “I appeal to those who will peruse this text to conduct their reading without envy” (2.147: μή μετὰ φθόνου ποιείσθαι τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν). The context is an explanation of the fact that what follows is more or less an encomium of the Judean constitution, an exercise that would clearly cause no offense to Judeans, but might annoy others (cf. 2.287). This confirms the signals given elsewhere, that the text is declared to be for non-Judeans. Whether this declared audience is a rhetorical fiction or corresponds to Josephus’ real intentions is, of course, another matter.<sup>106</sup>

B. *The Implied Audience*. Every text implies a certain type of readership, through the language used and the knowledge, interests, and values presupposed. These consciously or unconsciously construct a certain kind of audience, which can be deduced by observation of what the text takes for granted for its successful re-

ception.<sup>107</sup> *Apion* presupposes understanding of Greek at a moderately advanced level. It also displays a broad cultural and historical range, only some of whose items are provided with explanation. Thus it mentions a number of Greek historians, and the disputes between them (1.15-27), and implies that readers will be as well, even better, informed on these matters (1.16). It similarly presupposes familiarity with famous cities and events in ancient Greek history. No explanations are offered regarding Sparta or Athens, or their legislators Lycurgus and Solon, and allusions are made, without elucidation, to the Spartans’ system of military training, their reputation for courage, and their famous military defeats (2.225-31). In criticizing Greek mythology (2.239-49), Homeric and other myths are alluded to as if well-known; there are no names given to identify the deities involved, and stories are evoked with the slightest detail. It is assumed that Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato are familiar names, and even lesser-known philosophers (Anaxagoras, Diagoras, Protagoras) are given minimal introduction or none at all (2.168, 262-67, including the obscure case of Ninus). Roman history is also taken as known. No introductions are given to “Pompey the Great” or Quintilius Varus (1.34); the battle of Actium is alluded to as if thoroughly familiar (2.59), and the scandals affecting Cleopatra’s life are discussed with the merest allusions (2.56-60).

Some of the more obscure authors cited by Josephus are given an introduction (e.g., Menander [1.116], Berosus [1.129], Choerilus [1.172] and Hieronymus [1.213]), and topics concerning “eastern” culture and history are sometimes explained: the implied readers need to be informed about Artaxerxes (1.40) and Nabopalassar (1.131). Regarding Judean culture and history, while the Judean War is presumed to be known (1.36; 2.82), the name “Galilean” is taken to be strange (1.48), Noah needs an introduction (1.130), and the Corban oath is given some explanation (1.167). In general, the sum-

<sup>106</sup> *War* and *Antiquities* make slightly more explicit declarations about their audience, though in both cases these are (usually) said to be non-Judeans. *War* is offered “to the subjects of the Roman empire” (1.3), especially to “the Greeks and those of the Romans who were not involved in the campaign” (1.6). *Antiquities* is, like *Apion*, dedicated to Epaphroditus (1.8-9; cf. *Life* 430), but is also declared to be aimed at “all Greeks” (1.5) or just “Greeks” (20.262), of whom Ptolemy II stands as a model “lover of learning” (1.10-12). Within the body of the text, the indicators are more mixed: the history is for the sake of the ignorant (14.1-3), has the interests of Greek readers in mind (1.128-29), and is chiefly (τὸ πλείον) designed to reach “the Greeks” (16.174); but it is meant to remove causes of hatred from both non-Judeans and Judeans (16.175), and once explicitly raises the possibility that “someone from [my] fellow countrymen” (τις παρὰ τῶν ὁμοφύλων) may read this work and find fault with it (4.197). The potential disparity between the *declared* audience and the *intended* audience is indicated by the fact that *War*, declared to be written for non-Judeans and non-participants in the War (1.6), was then given or sold to both Judeans and Romans, including some who *were* participants (*Life* 361-63; *Apion* 1.51).

<sup>107</sup> For discussion of this topic in relation to *Apion*,

see Gerber 1997: 89-91; regarding *War*, see Mason 2005a. For fuller discussion of each of the passages cited below, see commentary ad loc.



mary of the constitution and laws (2.145-286) presumes no prior knowledge of Judean culture, and while the Judean “sacred books” are often referred to and assumed to be authoritative (see below), biblical knowledge is not presupposed. Regarding Josephus himself, the work begins with no self-introduction (only partially provided in 1.54-55).<sup>108</sup> While referring back to his previous works (see above, § 2), nothing in *Apion* is incomprehensible for those who have not read them. The work thus appears to presuppose some prior knowledge *about* Josephus (or at least sufficient interest to read/hear this work), without presuming familiarity with his prior publications.

Regarding interests, attitudes, and values, *Apion* implies a complex stance on the part of its audience. It is implied that they are *interested* to learn about the Judean people (2.296): they are willing to recognize their own ignorance and consider the evidence supplied in the text—something that cannot be presupposed of all non-Judeans (1.5). The evidence for Judean antiquity they need to learn is that derived from non-Judean sources (they will not be persuaded by a repetition of the biblical evidence), with some premium on the Greek material (a presumption Josephus acknowledges, partly combats, and partly accommodates, 1.3-5, 58, 161). The citation of obscure “barbarian” sources, with long lists of names and dates (1.73-160), demands considerable patience in the reader, although the explicit adoption of a more “popular” rhetorical technique, in the response to Apion (2.3-5), indicates awareness of the need for a more accessible style. The text thus implies a *sympathetic* non-Judean stance, needing persuasion on non-Judean grounds, but open to it and ready to enjoy the text’s polemical tirades against a variety of critics. To be more specific, the easy and repeated denigration of Egyptians

and their animal cults presumes automatic assent and minimal sympathy for Egypt. The condemnation of Greek pretensions in historiography implies readers at least open to persuasion on this front (probably not self-identifying as “Greeks”), while the automatic honor accorded to Greek “wisdom” (e.g., 1.51, 73) suggests respect towards some aspects of the Hellenistic intellectual tradition. In particular, the “philosophical” heritage of Greece is treated as evidently superior to her myths and even her laws (2.239, 250). It is assumed to be to Moses’ credit that “the wisest of the Greeks” (i.e., philosophers) learned from him (2.168), and readers are expected to acknowledge, without argumentation, that Plato and others were correct to censor Greek mythology (2.236-57). At the same time, Romans are always treated with the greatest of respect (see Appendix 6), and no justification needs to be made for claims about Roman “benevolence” and “magnanimity” (2.40, 75). A Roman perspective on Cleopatra is presupposed in 2.56-60, and no faults are ever found in Roman laws or customs (cf. 2.74, 252).

Regarding Judean culture, the text presupposes that the readers need to have doubts assuaged and criticisms answered, but also that, on some matters at least, they are open to relatively simple forms of persuasion. None of this treatise would be necessary if no questions or criticisms needed to be overcome; but in the *means* used to provide the defense the text seems to presuppose a relatively easy conquest. The assault on Greek historiography anticipates little resistance, and far-reaching claims for the accuracy of Judean records, and the inspiration of the scriptures by God (1.37-41), are advanced with no justification. Often the argumentation of the text seems valid only for those already willing to grant it credence. To accept the identification of Manetho’s Hyksos with the Judeans, on the grounds supplied here; to hear reference to Solomon’s temple and superior wisdom in Menander and Dios, on Josephus’ word, against the evidence of the cited texts; to find reference to the Jerusalem temple, as Josephus claims, in the witness of Berosus; to take Choeirilus’ tonsured warriors as Judeans; to accept some of the specious arguments advanced by Josephus against Apion—all of these require an audience willing to be persuaded, even allowing

<sup>108</sup> Of course, it would be difficult to dedicate one’s work to a patron and *at the same time* introduce oneself as if unknown; Josephus’ self-introductions (*War* 1.3; *Life* 1-6) take place in contexts where no dedications are present. But the fact that Josephus opens *Apion* with a dedication, and not a self-introduction, seems to imply an audience who already know of him, perhaps through Epaphroditus himself (cf. 2.296).

for the logical shortcuts employed by rhetoric in the ancient world. More strikingly, in the course of citing witnesses on his side, Josephus includes events or Judean characteristics that might provide strong ammunition for determined opponents: the Hyksos' (that is, Judeans') aims in Egypt were genocidal (1.82); the Judeans' king, Solomon, was a "tyrant" (1.114); they destroyed pagan temples and altars (1.193); and they let an invader capture Jerusalem because of their total inactivity on the sabbath (1.205-11). Only in the last case does the text acknowledge a problem in the representation of Judeans, but its brief response implies that the issue is not particularly pressing (1.212). At some points, argumentation relies on accepting the credibility of the Judean scriptures (e.g., 1.279-86, 299). And the fulsome praise of the Judean land (1.273) and the Judean constitution (2.145-296), including its imitation by non-Judeans (2.282-86), suggests confidence in a sympathetic audience, who would not find such Judaizing a scandalous or disreputable phenomenon.

One may conclude that the text constructs an implied audience familiar with many famous features of the Greco-Roman tradition, impressed by its "philosophical" traditions, more likely to identify with "Romans" than with "Greeks" or "Egyptians," and generally sympathetic to the strong claims and sometimes tenuous arguments advanced. The text does not anticipate a hostile audience, nor does it set out to persuade a thoroughly skeptical opposition. Neither does it imply that its audience is Judean, although such readers might fit within its parameters of attitudes and interests. In fact, the text constructs something very similar to its *declared* audience: a non-Judean readership that wishes to know "the truth" about the Judean people, and is willing to take this text as their guide.

C. *The Intended Audience.* We should note, again, that we cannot draw simple conclusions regarding the intended audience from the observations above. There is always a potential gap between the audience implied by the text, and that intended by the author. An author might wish to portray an argument as directed to one target, for rhetorical impact, while only expecting a small subset of that group, or even a dif-

ferent group, to be its actual readers. In relation to the knowledge presupposed, the text might display a range of allusions for rhetorical show, or might wish to flatter readers *as if* they knew more than is likely, without damaging the core elements of the argument.<sup>109</sup> For this reason, it may be more revealing of the author's intentions to note what information has to be explained, than what remains unexplained; and, as we have noticed, the text does explain a few details that a Judean audience would not need to be told. But in general, because of the rhetorical factors at play on the surface of the text, this criterion of "knowledge presupposed" may be less revealing of the author's intentions than the more basic assumptions of the text regarding sympathy and interest. Here, if its author was a competent communicator, one might expect that he would shape the text, consciously or subconsciously, by reference to the attitudes he would anticipate in his intended readers. We must proceed cautiously here. If an author presupposes *more* sympathy than he/she is likely to receive, the text could badly misfire, as readers might fail to accord the text the interest or support it expects. On the other hand, if an author presupposes *less* sympathy than he/she is likely to receive, the text will win its audience easily enough, while *pretending* to persuade a more extensive range of readers.

If Josephus' literary instincts were correct, our study of the declared and implied audiences suggests that:

- a) Josephus is unlikely to be writing for a truly hostile audience;
- b) his intended audience is likely to fall *within* the parameters of the sympathy and interest outlined above;
- c) we cannot yet tell whether the intended audience fits *precisely* the implied audience (sympathetic, interested non-Judeans) or whether it is actually (or also) another group *within those*

<sup>109</sup> If it draws on prior materials, the text might suggest more knowledge in the author himself than he actually possesses. Did Josephus really know about Thermus' arrival in Egypt (2.50), or has he learned this only from Apion's argument?

*parameters of sympathy*, such as Josephus' fellow Judeans.<sup>110</sup> Thus nothing we have seen so far would exclude an intended audience of non-Judeans (of the particular type described above), but neither can we exclude the possibility that the intended audience might be really (or also) Judeans, who would be encouraged by the impression that what persuades them would also persuade a non-Judean audience.

Ultimately, observations on the implied audience, even when hedged about, can be only *one* factor in determining the intended audience of *Apion*. Other factors include our knowledge of the author himself, his history, social contacts, aims, and context. Given the impossibility of penetrating any author's mind, we can proceed here only by uncertain inference and hypothesis. In assessing the general context of the treatise (above, § 6), we noted the controversial status of Judean culture in Flavian and post-Flavian Rome, the criticism and disdain that it received from some quarters, *but also* the presence of a penumbra of interested and supportive non-Judeans, some of whom went so far as to become proselytes, while others "drifted" more or less deliberately into "the Judean lifestyle." Thus the audience declared and implied by the text has some historical plausibility: from what we know of Rome at this period, one can imagine a sympathetic Epaphroditus, with access to circles of other interested individuals in Rome, who were themselves aware of the poor reputation of Judeans in intellectual circles. It is thus plausible to imagine Josephus intending to reach such figures, hoping to bolster their interest in Judean culture and their support for the Judean community, and giving them cause to disregard the opprobrium brought by others on Judeans and Judean customs.

<sup>110</sup> Thus, on the basis of the text alone, it is very difficult to *rule out* an intended Judean audience, even if the declared and the implied audience is non-Judean. There seems to be nothing here wholly unacceptable to Judeans. Although the depiction of the Judean constitution might appear too simplistic for a Judean audience (see Goodman 1999: 51), they would surely welcome Josephus' purportedly public encomium on their tradition, however idealistic it might sound.

But could Josephus entertain realistic hopes of reaching such a target audience, and if so, at what social level? Josephus' social contacts have recently been analyzed at length, and every possible inference drawn from the meager evidence.<sup>111</sup> One might have expected a client of Domitian and Domitia (*Life* 429) to be socially well-connected within the court and among the elite circles that drew prestige from imperial contacts. But when one looks more closely at the benefactions listed (citizenship, land in Judea, a house, and a pension, *Life* 422-25) one realizes that these amount to comparatively little, and certainly do not entail frequent contact with the court.<sup>112</sup> Nor is there evidence to suggest that he enjoyed much interaction with elite circles in Rome. Josephus very rarely indicates the names of people he knew in Rome, and never mentions contacts among the military commanders he must have met at the siege of Jerusalem.<sup>113</sup> Nor do we find reference to him among Roman authors, beyond the single notice of his role as a prisoner who predicted the rise of Vespasian (Suetonius, *Vesp.* 5.9 ; Dio 66.1.4). In the 70s he had been important enough to form the target of a dangerous accusation by Catullus (*War* 7.447-50), but he gives no indication of wielding any influence thereafter. The one link we can be sure of is that with the dedicatee, Epaphroditus; it is likely that he was a person of some influence for him to be worthy of mention by Josephus, and it is possible that he was a freedman scholar, with literary, though perhaps not political, contacts.<sup>114</sup> He could have channeled Josephus' works to those in Rome who had an intellectual or practical interest in the Judean tradition (those sympathizers mentioned above), perhaps even at the social level of T. Flavius

<sup>111</sup> See Mason 1998: 74-79; J. Price 2005; Cotton and Eck 2005.

<sup>112</sup> See Mason 2001 ad loc.; Cotton and Eck 2005: 38-40. If Josephus had had more extensive or more frequent contact with the imperial family he would surely have mentioned it.

<sup>113</sup> These included M. Ulpius Trajanus, the father of the emperor Trajan; for details see Cotton and Eck 2005: 41-44.

<sup>114</sup> But even his identity is uncertain; see note to "Epaphroditus" at 1.1.

Clemens.<sup>115</sup> At the same time we may assume that Josephus had some contacts with the Judean community in Rome, though we do not know how warm or how extensive was the connection. When he speaks of “Judean accusers” from whom he was protected by Domitian (*Life* 429), we sense that he had enemies in that community as well as friends. When he had finished *War*, he had given or sold it to (among others) a number of Judean figures, including members of the Herodian family (*Life* 362; *Apion* 1.51). His contacts with this family are intriguing, and one may suspect that Josephus moved more easily among the few wealthy and well-educated Judeans in Rome than among his fellow compatriots in the Trastevere.<sup>116</sup>

We may conclude that Josephus could have intended *Apion* to be read by sympathetic non-Judeans, accessed through Epaphroditus, but also by fellow Judeans of a social and intellectual status similar to his own. In the case of *War*, a work declared to be for “the Greeks and those Romans not involved in the campaign” (*War* 1.6), and with an implied audience of non-Judeans, the work was actually (also) sold by the author to high-status Judeans (*Apion* 1.51). If this is anything to go by, even if Josephus intended non-Judeans to read *Apion*, and even if the implied audience is non-Judean, he probably expected and ensured that fellow Judeans read it as well.

Although this conclusion on Josephus’ intended audience is hesitant and cautiously inclusive of both non-Judeans and Judeans, it should influence our own reading strategies in relation to the treatise. As a piece of communi-

cation from a specific historical context, we want to ensure that we do not read it “against the grain,” but that at least some of our reading perspectives match those intended by the author. To read it without any regard to his intentions may result in misconstruing the force of the text, missing its intent or falsely “discovering” a message never intended. For the reasons given above we cannot be certain about Josephus’ intentions, but it is likely that its intended audience was *sympathetic non-Judeans and, perhaps, fellow Judeans of Josephus’ social and intellectual status*. Given the uncertainties in this matter, it would be unwise to exclude *either* of these possible audiences from our own reading strategy. They may not limit our possible reading stances: as we shall see, other ancient and present-day reading perspectives are legitimate aids in exploring the meaning potential of this text. But here we may content ourselves with allowing both educated, sympathetic non-Judeans *and* educated Judeans as possible intended audiences for this work.<sup>117</sup>

## 2.2 Purpose

If he was writing for *Judeans*, Josephus may have presented his work in the form of an apologetic treatise, addressed to non-Judeans, both to instruct fellow Judeans on the certainty of their convictions and to encourage them with the sense that the grounds for those convictions were persuasive to non-Judeans as well. As is regularly noted, apologetic works explicitly directed at outsiders often have their most appreciative audience among insiders, and operate all the more successfully among them by conveying the impression that *even outsiders* would find these arguments compelling. If Judean culture was, as we have seen, treated with some disdain in certain intellectual circles in Rome, the treatise might have been designed to boost Judean self-confidence and to equip Judeans to

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Cotton and Eck 2005: 45: “it remains true that Flavius Clemens, his wife, and others who hankered after ‘Jewish ways’ could have provided an audience for Josephus”; Mason 2000: xxxiv-xxxv. It is possible that Josephus himself was endangered by an accusation of *maiestas* like that of the elite Romans mentioned above: the accusation of a slave against him (*Life* 429) might have involved some charge of *maiestas* against the Roman people (see Mason 2001: 171, n. 1771).

<sup>116</sup> On Josephus’ connections with the Herodians, see Mason 1998: 78-79; 2005a: 84-87. On Judeans in Rome, see Barclay 1996a: 282-319; Williams 1994 (on their lack of homogeneity).

<sup>117</sup> The educated Judeans here in view are primarily, if not exclusively, those resident, like Josephus, in Rome. Since many may have developed a Romanized stance like his, the ethnic distinction we have drawn between Judeans and non-Judeans does not preclude overlapping cultural interests and sympathies.



ignore, or even themselves to counter, the slanders sometimes directed against them.<sup>118</sup> The positive portrait Josephus conveys, of a Judean culture equal to, even excelling, the Greek philosophical tradition, and fully compatible with the political conditions of the Roman empire, might have been intended to enable educated, and partly Romanized, Judeans to feel “at home” in their Roman conditions (see Appendix 6). A more personal factor, Josephus’ self-defense, in the face of doubts and charges levelled against him (1.2, 47-56), may have played a subsidiary role within this wider purpose, especially if it was important for Josephus that *he* should be seen as capable of countering the enemies of the Judeans and defeating them all by his consummate rhetorical skill.<sup>119</sup>

If he was writing for *non-Judeans*, of the type described above, we may posit a number of related purposes. Even a sympathetic audience might require confirmation that the questions regarding the antiquity and integrity (and therefore intellectual value) of the Judean nation could be answered in full. They could be usefully instructed on the difference between the Judean and Egyptian traditions, and the stupidity of the derogatory stories about the Judeans currently circulating in Rome.<sup>120</sup> The sheer bravado of Josephus’ rhetorical performance might

be intended to encourage interest and support for the Judean cause. The encomium on the Judean constitution could be designed to reassure non-Judeans concerning its harmlessness and instruct them on its value. One may speculate on the forms of support or sympathy that Josephus may have intended to encourage, both social and political, but the breadth of focus in the text does not encourage greater specificity. If it is possible to detect a particular “Roman” slant in his presentation of Judean culture, he may have wanted to demonstrate the compatibility of Roman and Judean customs (see Appendix 6). Although it has been suggested that Josephus intended to gain proselytes through this work, there are several reasons to doubt that hypothesis.<sup>121</sup> As we have seen, the treatise is written in the genre of apologetic, not protreptic: it does not appeal to readers to join the Judean people, and its description of converts (2.123, 209-10, 261) is designed to demonstrate Judean benevolence, not the benefits of conversion itself.<sup>122</sup> One cannot rule out the possibility that Josephus may have wished to see non-Judeans who presently sympathized with Judean culture come to “live under our laws,” but nothing in the text points to that as an intention of the treatise,

<sup>118</sup> Cf. Rajak 2002: 197.

<sup>119</sup> Gruen, who proposes *only* fellow Judeans as Josephus’ intended addressees, stresses the artificiality of the argument, with opposition exaggerated and even contrived; Josephus’ personal agenda, his desire to respond to critics of his *War* and his *Antiquities*, was here “transmogrified into a retort to attacks on Jewish values and Jewish character generally” (2005: 48). One cannot dismiss the element of personal pique in Josephus’ response, though it seems exaggerated to insist that “his own agenda prevails” (2005: 50). Siegert proposes that Josephus hoped to present himself “als Kandidat für einen Patriarchen” (Siegert, Schreckenberg & Vogel 2006: 41), but there is no indication of any connection with the emerging rabbinic institutions.

<sup>120</sup> Goodman (1999: 55) considers that Josephus’ aim was “to counter the great weight of anti-Jewish propaganda produced by and for the Flavian dynasty” after 70 CE. On Josephus’ insistence on the distinction between Judeans and Egyptians, see Barclay 2004.

<sup>121</sup> The hypothesis has been advanced most fully by Mason 1996. After discussing the historical context of the work in Rome (where proselytism is well evidenced) and its close relationship to *Antiquities* (where the Izates story offers a lengthy account of a conversion), Mason argues that *Apion* stands in the “protreptic” genre and displays the comparative superiority of the Judean constitution both to gain sympathizers and “to encourage potential converts to Judaism” (1996: 222). Bilde also includes these aims as part of the appeal of the work: it was “primarily addressed to the ‘Gentiles’, who were interested in the Jewish faith, in an effort to attract them even closer to Judaism as ‘God-fearing’ [sic] or as actual proselytes” (1998: 120-21). Cf. Lambers-Petry 2001.

<sup>122</sup> So, rightly, Gerber 1997: 38-40, 92, 374; Goodman 1999: 55; Gruen 2005: 47-48; cf. Barclay 1998a: 196-200. Mason is right to note that *Apion* “expected a benevolent, already partially committed audience” (1996: 211), but there are not sufficient clues, in either the genre or the content of the work, to conclude that Josephus intended to take them *further*, into proselytism.

and nothing in the context requires it. Even where the Judean constitution is compared favorably with that of (select) others (2.145-286), its climax is a description of Gentiles' imitation of particular Judean customs (2.282-86), not full-scale conversion. Thus it seems safer to attribute to Josephus the more modest ambition to boost sympathy and support for the Judean people, in a context where their culture was subject to very varied judgments and was controversial enough to be used to vilify and even indict individuals thought to be "drifting into Judean ways."

### 8. *Early Influence and Effects*

We know nothing about the influence of this treatise on Josephus' contemporaries, and very little about its effects in the following centuries.<sup>123</sup> Its initial circulation probably depended on the efforts of Epaphroditus and the reputation of Josephus. As noted above, Josephus is mentioned by two Roman authors (Suetonius, *Vesp.* 5.9; Dio 66.1.4), but only as the prisoner who predicted Vespasian's rise to power; they make no reference to the works he authored. Eusebius' claim that a statue of Josephus was erected in Rome and his books deposited in a library (*Hist. eccl.* 3.9.2) cannot be relied upon: it was in his interests to inflate the significance of an author whose works he used so heavily. Early Christian writers sometimes imply that his *War* was readily available (e.g., Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 33.4-5), but that might indicate its accessibility only in Christian circles. The fact that Porphyry (died ca. 305 CE) could refer to all Josephus' three major treatises, and cite from *Apion* (2.213, in *Abst.* 4.14, after a lengthy citation from *War*), indicates that pagan authors *could* gain access to Josephus' works.<sup>124</sup> But it

is notable that this is the *only* reference to *Apion* in pagan literature; otherwise it had no discernible influence on pagan opinion.

The evidence for Judean use is even slimmer. Although Josephus' *War* was known, and attacked, by Justus of Tiberias (*Life* 336-67; cf. *Apion* 1.46-57), there is no evidence regarding the appreciation or use of *Apion* among Judeans. He is never cited in the rabbinic tradition, and although one can conjecture his possible value to the thriving Diaspora communities of the 2<sup>nd</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> centuries CE, they have left no literary record, and thus no indication of their sources of inspiration and education.<sup>125</sup> Since Josephus (like Philo) came to be serviceable to Christians, not least in their polemics against Judeans, it is possible that he became an unwelcome figure among Judeans, but the evidential silence reduces us to guesswork.

Thus, there is no evidence that Josephus' treatise had any effect on either of the two intended types of audience suggested above, with the single exception of Porphyry. But, ironically, his work did influence and instruct an audience neither implied nor intended—the early Christians.<sup>126</sup> As the Christian movement established itself in the Roman empire, it adopted apologetic forms of argument that could draw benefit from some of the themes and tactics of Josephus' *Apion*.<sup>127</sup> The earliest known use is in Theophilus' *Ad Autolyicum* (ca. 180 CE), where reference is made to Josephus' citation of evidence for Judean antiquity from Egyptian and Phoenician sources (3.20-21). In common with other Christian apologists, Theophilus needed Judean antiquity as the historical foundation of the

<sup>123</sup> We trace here in outline its effects up to the 4<sup>th</sup> century CE. For a longer and wider perspective on the influence of Josephus' works up to the late middle ages see Schreckenberg 1972.

<sup>124</sup> On Porphyry's use see Stern ad loc. and Schreckenberg 1972: 76-77. It is possible that he discovered Josephus only through his extensive research into Christian beliefs and practices. On the unlikely

claim that Tacitus used Josephus' *War*, see Schreckenberg 1972: 69 (with bibliography); the issue has been reopened by Shahar 2004. The claim by F. Gerber (1991) that Plutarch (*Caes.* 3.1) responds to Josephus' slurs on Apollonius is extremely tenuous.

<sup>125</sup> On Josephus in the "Hebraic tradition," see Schreckenberg 1977: 48-53.

<sup>126</sup> See Hardwick 1996, and, on the use of Josephus generally in the first four Christian centuries, Hardwick 1989; Schreckenberg 1992.

<sup>127</sup> For more specific comments on the early Christian use of each segment of *Apion*, see the "Reading Options" at relevant points in the commentary.

Christian religion: the fact that this Judean root was not just old, but could be proved to be so, on the basis of non-Judean sources, was perfect for apologetic purposes. At the same time, Theophilus takes some inspiration from Josephus for the attempt to construct a universal world chronology, onto which biblical history, and the history of the Judean-Christian tradition, could be mapped. Although Theophilus maintains a critical distance from some aspects of Manetho's history (3.21), Josephus' use of Manetho to place Moses a thousand years before the Trojan War and his co-ordination of Babylonian and biblical history enabled the formation of a single chronological scheme (3.21, 29).<sup>128</sup>

These twin goals—the proof of (Christian-) Judean antiquity and the creation of a comprehensive historical framework—continued to play an important role in early Christian self-understanding and apologetics, right up to the fourth century. Josephus was not the only possible resource for such tasks (Tatian manages well without him), but the first Part of *Apion* was certainly noted, and occasionally deployed. Thus, Tertullian refers to Josephus' arguments in his *Apologetica* (19-20; ca. 200 CE), to prove the antiquity (and thus the superiority) of Moses. Origen (ca. 185–253 CE) has his own battles to wage with Celsus, which overlap in part with Josephus' agenda. He refers to *Apion* (“On the Antiquity of the Judeans”) on two occasions, as proving the antiquity of Judeans (*Cels.* 1.16) and the historical precedence of Moses over the Greeks (4.11). Partial parallels with Josephus' argument can be found elsewhere, arising either from Origen's adaptation of Josephus or from his use of similar traditions.<sup>129</sup> Origen's huge cultural range and his sophisticated intellect often render his

argument quite different from that of Josephus, even on the same topics, but one senses here how *Apion* could be congenial to the early Christian cause.

Finally (within our time frame) we find Eusebius (ca. 265–340 CE) making by far the most extensive use of *Apion* (as of much else from Josephus), including lengthy citations.<sup>130</sup> The case for Judean antiquity remains important in his argumentative scheme (why Christians follow Judean, rather than Greek traditions). Excerpts from Josephus' citations of Egyptian, Phoenician, and “Chaldean” sources are deployed in *Praeparatio Evangelica* books 9 and 10, and he finds useful Josephus' clever tirade against Greek historiography (*Apion* 1.6-27 in *Praep. ev.* 10.7.1-21). He employs the same texts for a different purpose in his *Chronikon* (drawing on Julius Africanus); here they help anchor and connect his large-scale survey of world chronology. Elsewhere, he notices Josephus' discussion of the canon (*Apion* 1.37-42 in *Hist. eccl.* 3.10), but also shows the first known Christian interest in Josephus' description of the Judean constitution, from which he quotes at length (*Apion* 2.163-228 in *Praep. ev.* 8.8.1-55). Josephus is here, for Eusebius, only one witness to the virtues of the Judeans, and Eusebius offers no commentary on the passage quoted. But his citation suggests that the whole of *Apion* was read by some early Christians, who were not averse to its praise of Judean culture when that served their own, increasingly supersessionist, agenda.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>128</sup> See further Hardwick 1989: 7-14; 1996: 371-78.

<sup>129</sup> See Feldman 1990b, though the connections he draws are sometimes tenuous. If Origen dates Moses before the Trojan War (*Cels.* 4.36), that need not display dependence on Josephus (*Apion* 1.104); for the possible allusion to Josephus' claims concerning Hermippus, see note to “following” at 1.165. When Origen describes the superior morality of the Judean constitution (*Cels.* 5.42) he does so in terms quite different from those of Josephus.

<sup>130</sup> For a table showing Eusebius' usage of Josephus, see Schreckenberg 1972: 79-84 (in simplified form, regarding *Apion*, below, § 10); for discussion, see Schreckenberg 1979: 63-71; Hardwick 1989: 69-109 (use of Josephus as a whole); Hardwick 1996: 384-96 (use of *Apion*).

<sup>131</sup> Cf. *Praep. ev.* 9.4-9, where some of Josephus' collection of Greek witnesses serve to illustrate how Greek philosophers admired Judean culture. Hardwick suggests (1996: 391) that Eusebius' affirmation of Josephus' constitution is possible only because he understood the laws in an allegorized form, but the argument (based on *Praep. ev.* 8.8.56) is not secure: there Eusebius mentions allegory only in connection with other Judean texts.

After Eusebius, in the Christian empire, Josephus' apologetics became less interesting to Christian authors, although Josephus himself was adopted almost as an honorary Christian.<sup>132</sup> This loss of interest in *Apion* may account for the fact that we have no complete Greek text extant (see below, § 10).<sup>133</sup> We are fortunate that sufficient interest in Josephus in the Christian West induced Cassiodorus (d. 580 CE) to commission a Latin translation of both *Apion* and *Antiquities* (to supplement that already available for *War*); his Latin thus fills the lacuna in our Greek textual tradition (*Apion* 2.52-113). But it is clear that without this lingering Christian interest, Josephus' *Apion*, and probably all of his works, would have been lost altogether. Since the meaning of this text has necessarily evolved through its interpretation in different communities, we should include this early Christian use among the kaleidoscope of reading options germane to this treatise (see below, § 13).

### 9. Judean Identity in *Apion*

In defending his people and praising their constitution Josephus produces a particular profile of the Judean nation for the rhetorical needs of this treatise. One cannot assume that this will be the same image of Judeans that he projects elsewhere, or that it represents his "real" understanding of the Judean tradition, but since his argument requires him to say so much about Judeans and to place them on the stage of the Mediterranean world, *Apion* provides an unusually full portrait of Judean identity.<sup>134</sup>

Since Josephus depicts Judeans as a nation, alongside others like "Egyptians" and "Phoenicians," it might be thought that he had little choice in his depiction of their identity; one might expect there to be standard features of "ethnicity," inevitable and irreducible. In fact,

however, ethnicity is a highly malleable phenomenon, changeable over time, adaptable to different social conditions, and adjustable in accordance with rhetorical context. Since F. Barth's famous essay on this topic (1969), anthropologists have questioned essentialist conceptions of ethnicity—its definition by "natural," primordial features like blood-kinship, or by apparently core characteristics such as language or religion—and have emphasized instead how ethnicity is "constructed," ascribed, a matter of perspective or rhetoric, fabricated in particular historical and political circumstances, not least to organize the relations between one population group and another. This is not to say that the historically significant features of ethnicity are invented out of nothing: they are not *made*, but they are *made salient*, and it is in making them salient that authors, orators, politicians (and anthropologists) enjoy some freedom in the "construction" of ethnic groups. The point is easily illustrated in relation to labels employed in this treatise. It was not at all self-evident in Josephus' day who could count as a "Greek," or how one might apply the label "Roman";<sup>135</sup> and Josephus can exploit the ambiguity in the label "Egyptian" (as descriptor of origin, ancestry, legal status, or culture) in denigrating his opponent Apion.<sup>136</sup> Thus we need to attend carefully to the precise ingredients of the image of "Judeans" in this treatise, without prior assumptions about what must, or must not, be embraced by this term.<sup>137</sup>

The opening section of *Apion* (1.1) already signals many of the features that will recur throughout the work: there Josephus speaks of "our people" (τὸ γένος ἡμῶν), with its own original composition (πρώτη ὑπόστασις ἰδίᾳ),

<sup>132</sup> See Schreckenberg 1992: 73-78, noting Jerome's inclusion of Josephus among famous Christian figures.

<sup>133</sup> If *Apion* formed a codex of its own (Schreckenberg 1992: 62), it would not have been transmitted with Josephus' other works.

<sup>134</sup> For Josephus' construction of Judean identity in the first half of *Antiquities*, see Spilsbury 1998.

<sup>135</sup> On the origin and development of "Hellenicity," see Hall 1997; 2002; Malkin 2001; on "Romanness," see Woolf 1998.

<sup>136</sup> See note to "direction" at 2.29.

<sup>137</sup> For this reason I am disinclined to structure what follows by the template of ethnicity proposed by Smith 1986 (cf. Hutchinson and Smith 1996) and employed by Esler (forthcoming) in analyzing *Apion*. This has six ingredients: a common proper name; a myth of common ancestry; a shared history of a common past; a distinctive common culture; a link with a homeland; and a sense of communal solidarity.



its long history, its land that “we now possess” (νῦν ἔχομεν), and its sacred books. There might also be a hint, in the parading of the fact that *Antiquities* was written in Greek, that Josephus considered his native language something else. In other words, bundled together in this opening sentence are elements of descent (γένος), territory, history, cultural resources (sacred books), and, perhaps, language, all of which serve to define the identity of the Ἰουδαῖοι. Our task is to see what these mean, how they are deployed, how they are supplemented by other elements, and how they function together in this crafted presentation of Judean identity. Six features are particularly prominent.

A. *Descent and Shared History.* Josephus speaks frequently of fellow Judeans as “our” γένος, the term conveying common ancestry and kinship-relations, constituting what anthropologists would call a “descent-group.”<sup>138</sup> At the micro-level, regarding individuals, γένος is to do with birth and family origin. Josephus criticizes Lysimachus for not declaring who Moses was by descent, and of what parentage (τὸ γένος ὅστις ἦν καὶ τίνων, 1.316), and he frequently introduces people, Judeans and others, by reference to their descent or ancestry, Ἰουδαῖος τὸ γένος, Αἰγύπτιος τὸ γένος, etc.<sup>139</sup> Regarding Judeans as a whole, Josephus insists that his people has its own unique genealogical identity (1.1), descended from the “Chal-

deans” (1.71), and he is particularly concerned to demonstrate that Judeans are not “Egyptian by ancestry/descent” (e.g., 1.252, 298, 316-17; cf. 1.278; 2.289).<sup>140</sup> Josephus insists, in summing up his work, that “our ancestors” (ἡμῶν οἱ πρόγονοι) were *not* Egyptian, but came into Egypt from elsewhere (2.289; cf. 1.104), a distinction crucial to the rhetoric of this treatise and throwing into relief the importance of *ancestry* in defining Judean identity.<sup>141</sup> If the Judeans enjoy “kinship” (συγγένεια) with “Chaldeans” (1.71), they are clearly distinct from “people of another origin” (ἄλλόφυλοι, 2.121-22, 209; cf. *alienigeni*, 2.103), and would be defiled by sexual intercourse with them (1.35).

An indication of the significance of descent is the emphasis Josephus places on the bearing and raising of children, including their induction into the ancestral heritage. The importance of παιδοτροφία (the raising of children) is signaled prominently in his introduction to Judean values at 1.60 (cf. 2.202), where Judean piety is also described as παραδεδομένη (“traditioned,” almost “inherited”). On four occasions elsewhere Josephus speaks of Judean children learning the ancestral heritage right from the very beginning: it is “innate” (σύμφυτον) in every Judean from birth to regard the scriptures as decrees of God (1.42), Judean children are socialized in the laws from the very beginning (2.173, 178), and these regulate their upbringing (2.204). They are to be taught both the contents of the laws and “the exploits of their forebears” (2.204), recorded in the scriptures, with their historical record of some 5,000 years (1.1, 37-42). If Josephus only alludes to that history here (1.91-92, 127; 2.132, 136), it is because he has already devoted twenty volumes to its retelling; but it is clear that to be a Judean is to be heir to the story of “our people” through myriad generations of a shared past.

<sup>138</sup> The term γένος is associated with Judeans throughout the work: e.g., 1.1, 2, 32, 59, 71, 106, 160; 2.288, 296. I have avoided using the translation “race,” because of its problematic association with 19<sup>th</sup>-century racial “science,” especially in relation to Jews; see note to “people” at 1.1. Josephus also uses the term ἔθνος in relation to the Judean people (e.g., 1.5, 68, 161, 166, 172, 185, 194), more rarely λαός (1.132, 253, 305, 313 [both Lysimachus]; 2.159 [plural!]). Although ἔθνος might have a more political sense (“nation”), its association with the notion of a descent-group remains strong (cf. the ἔθνη in Egypt, 1.137).

<sup>139</sup> “Judean by descent”: 1.179; “Egyptian by descent”: 1.73, 252, 275, 298, 317; 2.8, 28, 138; other examples: 1.129, 164, 250, 265, 314. For Ἰουδαῖος τὸ γένος, and its use by Josephus, see Cohen 1994. γένος is also used of priestly ancestry, both of Josephus himself (1.54) and in general (1.30-35, kept pure by the ban on intermarriage outside the ἔθνος).

<sup>140</sup> For his refusal to allow any such “mixing” (1.229, 252-53, 278), his relief that Manetho clearly distinguished his “ancestors” from Egyptians (1.104), and his anxiety that Chaeremon and Lysimachus did not (1.298-302, 314-18), see commentary ad loc.

<sup>141</sup> On the distinction between Judeans and Egyptians, and its social and cultural importance in Rome, see Barclay 2004.

B. *Territory*. As we have seen, the opening statement of the treatise refers to “the land that we now possess” (1.1, in an emphatic present tense), and when he speaks of the lack of contact between Greeks and Judeans (1.60-68) Josephus also mentions that “we live on good terrain, and work it thoroughly” (1.60). In fact, the treatise is sprinkled with a remarkable number of references to “our land,” “our own land,” “the ancestral land,” even once “this land,” and these not as some remote or past phenomenon, but as the territory that “we inhabit” (present tense), even “now.”<sup>142</sup> Just as other peoples have their “homeland” (πατρίς), so Judeans have theirs (1.210, 212; 2.277); at one point, in denying any innate hostility between Judeans and Greeks, Josephus goes so far as to say that “we are separated from the Greeks more by geography (τόποι) than by customs” (2.123). Josephus has not forgotten about the Diaspora, or his own location in Rome. The treatise contains plenty of references to Judeans in the Diaspora, taken into exile (1.135-41), serving in Alexander’s army (1.192-95), or settling in Alexandria, Antioch, or Ephesus (2.23-39). Indeed, he insists that the purity of the priestly line is maintained “not only in Judea itself, but wherever there is a corps of our people,” including “those in Egypt and Babylon and wherever else in the world any members of the priestly stock have been dispersed” (1.32-33).<sup>143</sup> But the dual territorial connection—Judea and Diaspora—is not contradictory. Those settled in Alexandria “came from elsewhere” (2.67) and, in emphasizing fidelity to the laws, Josephus claims that “there is no Judean, however far he may go from his homeland (πατρίς), or however much he fears a cruel master, who will not fear the law more than him” (2.277). Thus, whatever may be the case in other Diaspora texts, in this treatise Josephus figures the Diaspora as absence from

“homeland” and appears to include himself among those “we” who presently possess a land elsewhere.<sup>144</sup>

C. *Language*. Although this text is written in Greek, Josephus makes specific mention of the linguistic medium of his work (1.1), as he does in relation to Manetho (1.73), as if it were a notable feature, a matter of choice rather than necessity. He indicates that, in writing *War*, he used “collaborators for the Greek language,” and although it is not clear what role they played, the confession indicates that Josephus was not entirely at home in Greek (cf. *Ant.* 20.263-64). If this were purely a personal matter, it would not merit mention here, but elsewhere he represents language as a sign of ethnic, and not just individual, distinctiveness. In 1.167 he gives the meaning of Corban as “gift for God,” “as one might translate from the Hebrews’ language” (ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραίων ... διαλέκτου). Later he refutes Apion’s spurious connection between the sabbath and “sabbo” by referring to “the language (διάλεκτος) of the Judeans” (2.27), and he insists, in dismissing Lysimachus’ false etymology, that “we Judeans do not speak of temple-plundering in the same language (φωνή) as do Greeks” (1.319). Although he never specifies here what language Judeans *do* use,<sup>145</sup> it is striking that he constructs Judean difference as containing a linguistic component—however false that might be to Diaspora reality in his day.

D. *Sacred Texts*. Just as other nations have their own “texts” and “sacred writings” (1.105, 116, 228), the significance of the Judean scriptures is obvious throughout this treatise. Several times Josephus refers to “our writings” (1.128, 160, 218; cf. 1.42) or “our books” (1.154), but their status is greatly enhanced by the adjective “sacred” (ἱερός) as these “sacred books” or “sacred writings” (1.54, 127, 217; 2.45) have a symbolic significance of a different order than

<sup>142</sup> For a full list of references see note to “possess” at 1.1.

<sup>143</sup> Other references to Judea fall partly in excerpts cited (1.90, 179, 195; 2.21) and partly in Josephus’ own comment (1.228, 310; 2.25). Intriguingly, Judea itself is never mentioned in the discussion of the constitution (2.145-286), but the “homeland” is (2.277).

<sup>144</sup> For configurations of the Diaspora more generally, see van Unnik 1993; Scott 1997; Gafni 1997; Gruen 2002: 232-52.

<sup>145</sup> On the distinction between Hebrew (Ἑβραϊστί) and Aramaic (συριστί), see *Ant.* 10.8; on Hebrew as φωνή ἑθνική, see *Ant.* 12.36. For Josephus’ use of the label “Hebrew,” see Harvey 1996: 124-29.

mere historical records. Their importance is particularly clear in the opening segment on historiography (1.6-56), where Josephus contrasts the carelessly composed Greek texts, to which Greeks are largely indifferent, with the univocal and uniquely authoritative canon of twenty-two books honored by Judeans (1.37-41). Their authors, Moses and the prophets, were taught the truth by inspiration from God and every Judean is taught to regard these as “decrees of God” (δόγματα θεοῦ) and, if necessary, to die for them (1.42). These precise texts thus form a core component of Judean identity.

E. *Temple*. Another focal point of Judean identity in *Apion* is provided by the Jerusalem temple (“our temple,” 1.109, 154; 2.102). This might seem surprising, given that Josephus is writing a generation after its destruction,<sup>146</sup> but the priests or the splendors of the temple are described in almost every segment of this treatise, often in the present tense. The opening discussion of historiography parades the priestly genealogies, and the 2,000-year line of high-priests, as examples of Judean historical accuracy (1.30-36). The citations proving Judean antiquity frequently make mention of the temple, as sponsored by the Phoenician king or destroyed by the Babylonians (1.108-11, 132, 145). “Hecataeus” is a spokesman for Greek admiration of the temple, including its altar and ritual (1.197-99), while Lysimachus is criticized for ridiculing a sanctuary that is “universally famous” (1.315; cf. 2.79). *Apion*’s tale of the annual slaughter of a Greek is countered by a full account of the temple’s design and good order, which starts in the past tense (since Josephus is refuting a historical tale) but slides into the present, as if its priests continued in Josephus’ day to offer sacrificial victims (2.102-9). And in the description of the Judean constitution (2.145-286), not only are priests prominent as guardians of the law (2.185-88, 193-94), but the temple is emphasized, as the one temple for the one God in which the priests are engaged

in worship (2.193-98). However “unreal” we may judge this depiction of Josephus’ contemporary circumstances, we cannot ignore the importance of the temple in this textual construction of Judean identity.

F. *Constitution*. The concept of the Judean “constitution” is largely absent from *Apion* until it becomes the dominant category in the “apology” against Apollonius Molon (2.145-286): there Josephus’ defense of his tradition is framed in terms of “the whole structure of our constitution” (ἡ ὅλη κατάστασις τοῦ πολιτεύματος, 2.145).<sup>147</sup> Here Moses is presented as the original “legislator” (νομοθέτης), whose constitution embraces all features of the Judean life, from their religious rites to their social behavior, from their domestic customs to their stance towards foreigners. The political category makes Judeans comparable to other peoples, especially within the Greek tradition. The legislator Moses can be favorably compared with Lycurgus or Solon (2.154-56, 161-63); Judeans can be contrasted with Athenians and Spartans in their knowledge of, and faithfulness towards their constitutions (2.171-78, 225-35); and the most famous philosophical constitution in the Greek tradition, that of Plato, can be explicitly invoked, and even trumped (2.220-24, 257).<sup>148</sup> In describing the structure of the constitution, Josephus declines to fit his tradition into any of the standard types (monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy) but invents a new term, “theocracy” (2.165). This is often taken to mean the governance of priests (a temple-centred form of aristocracy), but in context the primary sense of the term is not the rule of priests (not mentioned before 2.185) but very exactly *the rule of God*, God’s sovereign oversight of history and human well-being (2.165-68).<sup>149</sup> If this seems to stretch

<sup>146</sup> In fact, this destruction is never explicitly mentioned in *Apion*: Titus “occupied” the temple (2.82), but is never said to have destroyed it; cf. note to “others” at 2.131.

<sup>147</sup> On the use and meaning of the term πολιτεύμα, and its near equivalent πολιτεία, see note to “constitution” at 2.145.

<sup>148</sup> As well as explicit allusions to Plato’s *Republic*, there are many parallels to his *Laws*, noted in the commentary; for the relationship of *Apion* to Plato, see Gerber 1997: 226-43.

<sup>149</sup> For the meaning of “theocracy” in this context, and its relationship to the philosophical tradition, see

the political sense of “constitution” rather far, that is precisely Josephus’ goal, to highlight within this political category the specifically “religious” dimensions of Judean identity. In this connection Josephus emphasizes the place of “piety” (εὐσέβεια) at the head of the Judean virtues (2.170; cf. 1.60, 146, etc.), since this governs both the motivation for keeping the laws and much of their specific contents. The first of the laws to be summarized concerns God (2.190-92), and the Judean constitution is compared to others at greatest length in their conception of the divine and their attitude to foreign religious beliefs (2.236-70).

For this “religious” dimension of his political category Josephus is indebted to Plato, and it is from this vantage point that he is able to draw on the support of “philosophers” (2.168, 239, 242). “Philosophy” is not a prime category for describing the Judean tradition in this treatise. Although Josephus refers to “our ancestral philosophy” (2.47; cf. 1.54), just as he can speak of other nations who “philosophize” (e.g., 1.28, 129), the emphasis falls on Judean laws as the ingredients of the constitution, of which Moses is the legislator (not original philosopher). Since the core of this constitution concerns the rule of God, and certain beliefs about him, (Greek) philosophy may be said to be congruent with, or even dependent on, the Judean tradition (2.168, 239, 281); but Judeans themselves are not so much “philosophers” as law-learners and law-observers, who faithfully maintain their constitution even in adverse political circumstances (2.218-19, 225-35, 271-75).<sup>150</sup>

note to “theocracy” at 2.165. For the difference in constitutional analysis to that offered in *Antiquities*, see note to “these” at 2.165.

<sup>150</sup> Clearchus is cited as admiring a Judean for his philosophical qualities (1.177-81) and Josephus can insist, in referring to *Antiquities*, that the Judean tradition contains many who have excelled in wisdom (2.135-36); but philosophy is important in 2.145-286 only as it supports the truth of the Judean constitution, not as a category of its own. If the synagogues are sites of sabbath learning (2.175-78), what is learned there is the law not (as in Philo) “philosophy”; and the virtue of φρόνησις is conspicuous by its absence in 2.146, 170. Of course, much of the content of the constitution

The laws and customs regulated by the Judean constitution establish “the singularity of our lifestyle” (ἡ περὶ τὸν βίον ἡμῶν ιδιότης, 1.68). But the apparently close tie between ancestry and culture is loosened by the fact that at three points Josephus refers to individuals of other nations who have “agreed” or “chosen” to live under Judean laws. He refers to Greeks who have “agreed to come over to our laws” (2.123), and in the summary of the laws makes a special point of “the consideration which our legislator gave to the kindness to be shown to outsiders,” not begrudging “those who choose to share our ways” and welcoming any who “wish to come and live under the same laws as us, reckoning that affinity (ὀικειότης) is not a matter of birth alone (οὐ τῷ γένει μόνον) but also of choice in life-style” (ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ προαιρέσει τοῦ βίου, 2.209-10). Later, echoing this passage, he refutes Apollonius’ charge of “misanthropy” by arguing that Judeans do not emulate others’ customs but “gladly welcome those who wish to share ours” (2.260). There are limitations here: there must be no “mixing” with outsiders on a casual basis (2.210, 257), since the state (πολίτευμα) should be kept “pure,” consisting of those who remain faithful to the laws (2.257). However, purity is a matter not only of ancestry (cf. 1.30) but also of law-observance. While the constitution includes those of Judean ancestry, kinship and culture do not form an exclusive bond.

The combination of factors listed here—descent, territory, language, sacred texts, temple, and constitution—makes good sense within the

could be recognized, in a broad sense, as “philosophical”—both the piety it inculcates and the virtues it induces. Josephus’ constitution is certainly influenced, in shape and substance, by philosophical traditions, and at his level of abstraction and idealization, as in Plato’s *Laws*, the line between “philosophy” and “politics” is blurred (cf. 2.47 for the twinning of philosophy and laws). But the political category is the most suitable vehicle for emphasizing the centrality of Judean laws. To this extent, Haaland (1999: 288-99) is right to argue, against Mason 1996, that there is some difference in emphasis between *Apion* and *Antiquities*, though his political-historical explanation for this phenomenon (Haaland 2005) is speculative (see above, § 6).



Greek (and Roman) ethnographic tradition, and within the politico-philosophical discussion of “constitutions.”<sup>151</sup> There are no elements that would appear anomalous in that context, such as the notion of a “covenant” with God.<sup>152</sup> But ethnic identity could be variously formulated, and Josephus’ choice of elements and emphases is his own. There may be personal factors in this choice. As a first-generation immigrant to Rome, whose first language was Aramaic and who still owned property in Judea (*Life* 429), it was natural that he should make both land and language integral to Judean identity. Perhaps also, as a once-active priest (1.54), Josephus found it impossible to conceive of Judean culture without a focal point in the Jerusalem temple. There may be rhetorical factors at play as well. The distinct geographical identity of Judeans explains their unfamiliarity to Greeks (1.60-68), and the present possession of Judea provides opportunity to display the virtue of agricultural labor (1.60; 2.294). Presenting Judean culture as a “constitution” affords scope for favorable comparison with lesser constitutions, and its openness to outsiders gives good grounds for refuting the accusation that Judeans are antisocial. At the same time, the stress on the distinct identity of the Judean γένος is a crucial tactic in distinguishing Judeans from Egyptians, the one honorable at the expense of the despicable other. One cannot rule out the influence of sources on Josephus in composing this treatise (see Appendix 5), but there is no reason to doubt that the total construction is his own. What appear to us the most striking elements—the emphases on territory and temple—must be taken as seriously as the rest: the identity of Judeans here is closely linked with the land of Judea, and the focus of worship remains, in theory, the temple. It would

not be surprising if Josephus genuinely expected the temple to be rebuilt; but, in any case, he has not developed a view of Judean culture that could dispense with a “homeland” or with a cultic focus in the Jerusalem temple.<sup>153</sup>

In the light of this analysis, it is clear that the term Ἰουδαῖος has not become an indicator merely of “religion,” but retains its connection with kinship and even land. In recent years it has been argued that a number of historical trends or events led to a reduction in the “ethnic” or territorial connotations of the term, making it more nearly a signifier of culture or religion alone. The addition of non-Judeans into the body of the Judean people—both through forcible assimilation (Idumaeans) and through voluntary incorporation (proselytes)—has been regarded as one important factor in this trend (reducing the relevance of ancestry).<sup>154</sup> It has also been argued that Nerva’s abolition of Domitian’s tax-trials (for the *fiscus Iudaicus*) marked the Roman recognition of apostasy, and thus of the element of choice in “Jewish” identity,<sup>155</sup> while the Roman abolition of the Herodian dynasty after the Revolt contributed to the sense that “being Jewish was a matter of law rather than place.”<sup>156</sup> Without entering into all

<sup>151</sup> For the latter, see Rowe and Schofield 2000.

<sup>152</sup> *Apion* thus offers a “constitutional nomism” rather than a “covenantal nomism”; see Spilsbury 2001 on Josephus’ notion of the “patronage” of God. The covenant notion that the land and the destiny of Israel were the subject of a special promise by God, given to the patriarchs, is missing, along with the concept of a contract with God unique to the Judean people. Here “theocracy” involves God’s oversight of *all* humanity, as well as that operative in Judean history (2.165-67).

<sup>153</sup> For Josephus’ possible hopes, see note to “God” at 2.193. But it is precarious to press beyond the text to the psychology of the author. Ever since Herodotus (8.144.2), an essential component of “Greek” ethnicity had been the common bond of sanctuaries and sacrifices.

<sup>154</sup> See Cohen 1999: 69-197, a highly nuanced argument of wide scope, arguing for a transition in the sense of the term from “ethnos” to “ethno-religion.” He concludes that “for most *Ioudaioi* in antiquity, the ethnic definition was supplemented, not replaced, by the religious definition” (1999: 137); but he elsewhere notes that, for Josephus, the expression Ἰουδαῖος τὸ γένος “still had its Hellenistic meaning ‘Judean by birth’ rather than ‘Jewish by birth’” (1994: 38).

<sup>155</sup> See Goodman 1989.

<sup>156</sup> D. Schwartz 2005: 74; for a wider argument on the shift from a national to a religious definition of “Jewishness,” parallel to that affecting “Greekness,” see D. Schwartz 1992: 5-15. Schwartz also notes that Flavian authors usually refer to the homeland as “Idumaea” or “Palaestina,” rather than “Judea” (2005:

the complexities of this issue, we can note that, even in this text that foregrounds the phenomenon of foreigners choosing to adopt the Judean constitution, Josephus does not weaken the significance of descent or territory in Judean identity.<sup>157</sup> While Josephus' use of the "constitutional" model allows for an expansion in the definition of ethnicity, and its theological definition ("theocracy") masks the lack of any contemporary *political* expression (in a state run by aristocrats, priests, or kings), the traditional components of Judean ethnicity are not lost or even marginalized. And since our text makes multiple references to the land which "we" inhabit or possess, there are good reasons to translate the term Ἰουδαῖος by its more natural equivalent "Judean," rather than "Jew." At two points, *Apion* explicitly links the name of the people to the land Judea. In the citation from Clearchus, Ἰουδαῖοι are introduced as philosophers from Syria "who take their name from the place; for the place they inhabit is called Judea" (1.179); while later we find the same connection implied by a general rule, spoken in Josephus' own voice: "those who think highly of their own homelands (πάτριδες) are proud to be named after them" (2.30). This connection is largely if not entirely lost if Ἰουδαῖος is translated "Jew," and so for the purposes of this commentary, whether speaking in Josephus' voice or in my own, I have adopted the less misleading alternative "Judean."<sup>158</sup>

69). But the practice did not stick: Tacitus' normal label is *Judea*.

<sup>157</sup> The case of Izates in *Antiquities* 20 is striking: he undertook circumcision to be "genuinely a Judean" (βεβαίως Ἰουδαῖος, 20.38), but his conversion was far more than a "religious" phenomenon since his subjects were angry at its political ramifications (being ruled by a foreigner, 20.39); the military and political support of the house of Adiabene for the people and land of Judea was evident from that point onwards. Even much later Dio Cassius (ca. 160–230 CE) links the name of Judeans with the land Judea, but then immediately adds that the title applies also to people of other ethnic groups (ἄλλοεθνεῖς) who emulate their customs (37.16.5–17.1). It does not seem absurd to Dio that one could adopt the label of a people whose practices one adopts, even though that label has specific geographical associations.

<sup>158</sup> I am aware that for some the label "Judean" may

## 10. *The Text*

The text of *Apion* is the most problematic in the Josephan corpus, not because of a surfeit of contradictory witnesses, but because there are so few, and because these are manifestly deficient. The most spectacular deficiency is the lack of any Greek text for a large part of Book 2 (2.52–113), a lacuna which would be devastating were it not for the early Latin translation of Cassiodorus (see below). Although the other volumes in this series have been based on Niese's *editio maior* (1889a, for *Apion*), their authors have also taken account of textual advances since Niese's time, and in this case I have been fortunate to be able to use the very significant advance achieved by the Münster team. Their work

seem *more* misleading. The geographical connotations of the term "Judean" may seem either excessively dominant, or overly specific (i.e., relating to Judea, as opposed to Galilee or other parts of the Judean homeland). The use of the term may also seem alienating to some contemporary Jews, whose identification with their ancestors may appear weakened by the use of this different label (as if one were attempting to *avoid* the label "Jew"). The term "Judean" certainly signals the territorial component in Josephus' understanding of his ethnicity. For some contemporary Jews, even the word "Jew" connotes some loyalty to the land of Israel, while for others "Jew ... denotes culture, way of life, or 'religion,' not ethnic or geographic origin" (Cohen 1999: 105). If such contemporary Jews define their ethnicity in terms different from those of Josephus (e.g., without reference to the temple and with, at least, a different sense of belonging to "the land"), that is no barrier to ethnic continuity: an ethnic group can be continuous even when defining itself and its cultural identity-markers differently over time (Barth 1969). I am certainly not motivated by a political concern to distance the Ἰουδαῖοι of ancient texts from the Jews of today (as appears to drive BAGD s.v., in relation to early Christian texts). Ultimately, the problem is that of the English language, and one has to judge whether "Judean" or "Jew" more nearly corresponds to the nuances evoked in each particular text. For a parallel statement of the case for the translation "Judean," though differently nuanced and with claims more comprehensive than those argued here, see Esler 2003: 62–74; Esler (forthcoming); and Mason (forthcoming b). For a survey of ancient "Jewish" and Christian use of the terms "Judean," "Hebrew," and "Israel," see Harvey 1996.



on *Apion*, concurrent with my own, has been kindly conveyed to me by Prof. Folker Siegert, and their newly established text now supersedes that of Niese, for reasons described below. In outline, and in chronological sequence, the textual witness to this treatise is as follows.

The earliest witness to the text is contained in citations found in early Christian authors (see § 8, above). Only two of these actually *cite* the text (as opposed to speaking of it), and of these the text of one, Theophilus, is itself too corrupt to aid the reconstruction of Josephus' original.<sup>159</sup> However, the other, Eusebius, is of first-rate importance. In the course of his works, Eusebius cites almost one sixth of *Apion*, and it has been recognized at least since Niese that this constitutes our very best evidence for Josephus' text.<sup>160</sup> Unfortunately, Niese misjudged the reliability of the varying texts of Eusebius, but the new edition by Mras (1954) has placed this matter on a firm footing and has shown that several passages, suspected by Niese as subsequent Christian interpolations (especially in 2.163-65, 190-218), were authentic to Eusebius and probably authentic to Josephus.<sup>161</sup> The textual witness of Eusebius is not impeccable: where it

exists only in Armenian translation (for the *Chronicon*), it is of limited use in reconstructing the Greek, and it does not fill the lacuna of 2.52-113 left by later Greek manuscripts. But its early date (fourth century CE) makes it the most precious testimony, nonetheless.

We are extremely fortunate that Cassiodorus (d. 584 CE) commissioned a Latin translation of *Apion* (along with *Antiquities*), for use in the West, a text that has survived intact. There are major flaws in the translation, which often misconstrues the Greek; but sometimes it can provide corroboration for Greek readings found elsewhere, and in the case of the Greek lacuna it provides our only available text.<sup>162</sup> To some degree one may extrapolate from this to an underlying Greek text, but the procedure is hazardous and Shutt's attempt at retroversion into Greek (1987) is implausible or erroneous on numerous occasions.<sup>163</sup>

Beyond the sixth century, we have a few cited extracts of *Apion* in Christian sources, of which the most important are Syncellus, *Ecloga* (ninth century) and the so-called *Excerpta Constantiniana* (tenth century).<sup>164</sup> Thereafter we reach our first (nearly) complete Greek MS, designated L (eleventh century).<sup>165</sup> This is clearly corrupt in numerous places and has to be emended by one means or another; the Greek is often wrong, meaningless, or altered by interpo-

<sup>159</sup> For Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum*, see R. Grant 1970.

<sup>160</sup> For a full listing of the citations of *Apion* in Eusebius, see Schreckenberg 1972: 82-84; Labow 2005: xlvi-l. In brief the facts are these:

1.6-26 cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.7.1-21  
 1.38-42 cited in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.10  
 1.73-75, 82-90, 103-4 cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.13.1-12  
 1.73-105 cited in Eusebius, *Chron.* 70.3-74.6  
 1.106-27 cited in Eusebius, *Chron.* 54.1-56.19  
 1.128-60 cited in Eusebius, *Chron.* 21.3-25.25  
 1.136-37, 146-54 cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.40.1-11  
 1.172-74 cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.9.1-2  
 1.176-82 cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.5.1-7  
 1.197-204 cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.4.2-9  
 1.215-18 cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.42.2-3  
 2.163-218 cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8.8.1-55.

<sup>161</sup> For Niese's understanding of the Eusebian texts, see 1889a: xvi-xxi. The critical edition of Mras (1954) evaluates highly the very MS (I or J) that Niese had most disparaged; for this matter and its implications see Mras 1954: 220-21; Schreckenberg 1977: 157-62.

<sup>162</sup> On this translation and its problems see Niese 1889a: ix-x; Schreckenberg 1972: 58-61; 1996a: 64-65; Siegert, Schreckenberg & Vogel: 2006: 59-60. We are fortunate to have an excellent critical edition of the Latin in Boysen 1898.

<sup>163</sup> For dissatisfaction with Shutt's retroversion see Schreckenberg 1996a: 78; Siegert, Schreckenberg & Vogel 2006: 61.

<sup>164</sup> Syncellus (d. 810 CE) draws from *Apion* 1.107-26, 135-42, 146-54; see Schreckenberg 1972: 110-12; 1996a: 70-71; Siegert, Schreckenberg & Vogel 2006: 58. The *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis* by Constantinos Porphyrogenetos (d. 959 CE) cites 2.156-74; see Schreckenberg 1972: 124-27; Labow 2005: liii. The standard edition is Büttner-Wobst 1906.

<sup>165</sup> Laurentianus 69, 22; see Schreckenberg 1972: 19-20; 1977: 157-69; Siegert, Schreckenberg & Vogel 2006: 53-54.

lation.<sup>166</sup> All subsequent Greek MSS share with **L** the great lacuna, and many of its errors, and it was argued by Niese, and commonly accepted since, that they were all dependent, directly or indirectly, on **L** (and thus of no independent value regarding the text).<sup>167</sup> However, the Münster team have recently argued that **E** (Eliensis; a fifteenth century MS, now in Cambridge) may have some independent value.<sup>168</sup> More significantly, they have shown in recent work that the MS known as Schleusingensis graecus 1 (fifteenth—sixteenth centuries) and used by Arlenius in his *editio princeps* (1544) is *not* simply derivative from **L**, but draws on a partially different textual tradition, that may go back before **L**, while sharing **L**'s large lacuna and many of its other faults.<sup>169</sup> The establishment of this MS, known as **S**, as an independent textual witness (used in the *editio princeps* but not quite identical to it) has altered the textual apparatus of *Apion*. While the text is not thereby radically improved, and the necessity for conjectural emendation often remains, this in effect gives greater weight to readings that were otherwise known only in the *editio princeps* and suspected of being merely conjectures advanced by Arlenius.

With the *editio princeps* (1544), the text of *Apion* takes on a new fixity.<sup>170</sup> Further editions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Hud-

son 1720; Bekker 1855-56; Dindorf 1864) added refinements through conjectural emendations, but it was Niese's achievement in his critical edition of *Apion* (together with the rest of Josephus) to reexamine the whole textual tradition and thereby establish a new text. His *editio maior* (1889a) is famously conservative, and follows **L** more often than is plausible; the *editio minor* (1889b), with minimal apparatus, often provides a better, or at least more plausible, text. His authority ensured that subsequent editions of the text (e.g., Naber 1896; Thackeray 1926; Reinach 1930) generally followed his readings, departing from it only for textual conjectures of their own. A number of individual emendations were suggested in subsequent years (Giangrande 1962; Hansen 2001), but Niese's critical edition of the text remained unchallenged, despite its well-known deficiencies.<sup>171</sup>

The Münster project, based at the Institutum Judaicum Delitzchianum, has now provided what has long been lacking: a new, full, critical edition of the text, based on the latest assessment of the manuscript tradition (Siegert, Schreckenber & Vogel 2006).<sup>172</sup> In its use of Mras' edition of Eusebius, its inclusion of the *Excerpta*, and its establishment of **S** as an independent textual source, this offers a major new advance, and will become the standard text of *Apion* for the foreseeable future. Although the present volume does not print the Münster text (hereafter named Münster), readers should ideally refer to that volume (due to appear in late 2006) as the base text for this translation. Very many of the textual variants are too minor to influence the English translation, and pass here without comment. But where textual issues seriously affect the meaning of the text and its translation I have referred to the chief options (following the sigla named above). In the vast majority of cases, I follow Münster; where I am bold enough to dis-

<sup>166</sup> See Niese's exposition of its faults in 1889a: iv-v, xi-xix.

<sup>167</sup> Niese 1889a: iv-vii; Schreckenber 1996a: 62.

<sup>168</sup> **E** contains 1.1–2.133 (minus the great lacuna). For discussion, see Schreckenber 1972: 16; 1996a: 62-63; Labow 2005: liv-lv; Siegert, Schreckenber & Vogel 2006: 54-55 (arguing that it could draw from an earlier stage of the tradition, before **L**, but when the text was already lacking 2.52-113).

<sup>169</sup> On this MS, see Niese 1889a: vi-vii, x-xi; Schreckenber 1972: 42. Earlier Schreckenber had wondered if there might be a good, or at least independent, textual witness lying behind the *editio princeps* (1996a: 64), but further research into this MS has shown that it is independent of **L**, and, despite its late date, should be treated as a witness to the text on a par with **L** (neither better nor worse). See Siegert, Schreckenber & Vogel 2006: 55-56 with Anhang I.

<sup>170</sup> See Schreckenber 1972: 52-53; 1996a: 63-64; Labow 2005: lvi-lviii.

<sup>171</sup> For the deficiencies of Niese see Schreckenber 1977: 158-59, 169-74; 1996a: 69; Labow 2005: lxv-lxix.

<sup>172</sup> This follows on the parallel achievement in relation to *Life* (Siegert, Schreckenber & Vogel 2001). Labow's text for book 1 (2005) is now also superseded.

agree, the notes indicate and explain the divergence.<sup>173</sup>

### 11. *The Translation*

In line with the principles of this series (see Series Preface), I have attempted to keep the translation as close to the Greek (or Latin) as possible, without unduly straining the English. Where possible I have followed the form and order of the clauses in the original, though I have constantly struggled with the difficulty of finding English equivalents to phrases or individual words. Josephus' Greek in this treatise is

<sup>173</sup> The following are the significant points where I diverge from Münster: 1.3: I do not add καί; 1.18: I do not add διά; 1.36: I read ἀρχιερεῖς (with L E S), not ἱερεῖς; 1.46: I read ἐπιγράψαντες (with L S; cf. E) not συγγράψαντες; 1.78: I read Σαίτη (with L E), not Σεθροίτη; I place 1.83 in square brackets as textually dubious; 1.102: I read λέγει (with L E S; Latin: *dicit*), not λέγεται; 1.112: I read Δῖον (with L E S), not δεξιόν; 1.137: I do not add καί; 1.139: in this highly uncertain case, I follow Giangrande 1962 (see notes ad loc.); 1.150: I read Ἀσίαν (with L E S), not βασιλείαν; 1.176: I read περιτίθησι (cf. Latin: *ascribit*), not παρατίθει; 1.179: I do not add ἔφη; 1.194: I read ἡμῶν ... αὐτῶν (with L), and do not omit αὐτῶν; 1.200: I read συνεστρασεύσαντο (with L; cf. Eusebius), not συνεστρατεύσαμεν; 1.235: I see no need to bracket ἱερέων; 1.238: I read λέγομενον (with L E S), not λόγιον; 1.246: I read μέλλειν (with L), not μὴ δεῖν; 1.313: I read περιπεσόντων (with L), not περιπεσοῦσιν; 2.2: I follow Boysen's modest emendation κὰν τοῖς ... τετολημένοις, rather than more drastic alternatives; 2.10: I read εἶχεν (with L), not εἶδεν; 2.18: I read πλείοσι (with L S Latin) not πέντε; 2.21: I read σαββάτωσις (with L), not σαββῶ; 2.60: I consider *Iudaeos* just possible (with L S Latin), and do not emend to *se*; 2.75: I follow Boysen in emending to *inanimatum*, in preference to other possible emendations; 2.126: I read ἀπόσχοιτο and τοιαύτης (with L S) without emendation; 2.135: I omit ὀρθῶς ποιῶν (absent from L S) as a gloss introduced in Latin; 2.200: I read ἐπιτήδειον (with L S and superior Eusebian codd.), not ἐπιτηδείου; 2.235: I read οἱ ... οὐκ ἀντέβλεψαν (with S, against L); 2.263: I emend to ἴδια παίζων (following Boysen, on the basis of Latin), rather than other less plausible emendations; 2.281: I read ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι (with L S Latin), not ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι.

relatively sophisticated, with a large vocabulary range, including many *hapax legomena* (van der Horst 1996). His rhetorics, especially his polemics, are vigorous, a quality I have tried to retain in the English. I have rendered the Latin portion (2.52-113) directly, not via a conjectured retroversion into Greek, though the temptation is strong to translate what "must have" been the underlying Greek.<sup>174</sup> All translators of Josephus are immensely grateful for the labors of Rengstorf and his team in amassing *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus* (1973-83), which gives one instant access to Josephus' vocabulary usage. For the translation of the Latin portion, there is value in the concordance compiled by Schreckenberg (1996b), though this covers only the extent of the lacuna in Greek (2.52-113), and not the whole of the Latin version of *Apion*. Where possible, I have followed the Series preference for rendering the same Greek term by the same English equivalent.<sup>175</sup> Of course this is not always possible (the semantic range of terms in different languages may not fully overlap), and in the case of trivial words (e.g., verbs of speech) it might suggest greater rhetorical distinctions than seem warranted. Where a particularly difficult, or unusual, choice is made, this is noted in the commentary; as explained above, I have avoided the term "race" in translating γένος, and have adopted the translation "Judean" for Ἰουδαῖος or *Iudaeus* throughout. For names of people and places, where these very nearly correspond to English usage, I have used the normal English form, but in cases of significant difference have retained a form closer to the language of the text.

The concern to keep as close as possible to the original, and the use of the new Münster text (see above), ensure that this translation is rather different from its well-known English predecessors, by Whiston and Thackeray, although

<sup>174</sup> I have succumbed to this temptation at one point where the Latin makes no sense: see note to "hawks" at 2.86.

<sup>175</sup> E.g., λοιδορία and cognates are rendered by "insult"; βλασφημία and cognates by "slander"; διαβολή and cognates by "libel."

I have often consulted them both. Whiston's translation is not only based on an outdated text, from before Niese, but paraphrases freely and uses now antiquated language. Thackeray's Loeb translation (1926) is extremely elegant, and often employs a turn of phrase that can hardly be bettered. But it frequently strays far from the form and structure of the Greek, and in its preference for elevated idiom becomes more paraphrastic than I could allow. I have consulted also Blum's French translation (Reinach 1930) and recent translations into German and Italian,<sup>176</sup> but at the end of the day, one can only struggle with the Greek (or Latin) itself, and bear the frequent disappointment that one cannot find *exactly* the proper equivalent in translation.

## 12. *Scholarship on Apion*

*Commentaries and Editions.* The first major commentary on *Apion*, by J.G. Müller (1877), contains a mixture of philological and historical notes, already in its day considered limited in value, and now largely superseded.<sup>177</sup> A far more valuable analysis was begun by Alfred von Gutschmid, whose extensive "Vorlesungen" are immensely rich in textual, philological, historical, and analytical detail (1893); sadly he was able to comment on only one third of the text (up to 1.183) before his death. The early twentieth century saw the publication of the Loeb edition of *Apion*, by H. St. J. Thackeray (1926), and the Budé edition, by Th. Reinach (1930, with French translation by L. Blum). Both provided notes, though these were few and limited in range. A fuller treatment was offered in the historical commentary by L. Troiani (1977), though

this confines itself to the elucidation of historical references and the citation of parallels or secondary literature; an analysis of Josephus' argumentation was still lacking.<sup>178</sup> The first full-dress commentary was written in Hebrew, by A. Kasher (1997), but its uncritical stance and rhetorical style greatly limit its value.<sup>179</sup> In the last few years, this obvious lacuna in scholarship has begun to be filled, at least in German: D. Labow has produced a large-scale commentary on Book 1 (2005), and the Münster project is about to publish its new text and translation, with notes by M. Vogel. The present volume constitutes, to my knowledge, the first commentary on *Apion* in English, and the first of its scale to cover the whole work and to attempt to elucidate both its historical and its rhetorical features.

*Scholarly Interest in Apion.* The bulk of the attention devoted to this treatise has concerned the *sources* that Josephus cites or paraphrases.<sup>180</sup> In some cases, these are from authors otherwise unknown, and thus of great interest to ancient historians. For Egyptologists, the fragments of Manetho (1.75-102, 232-51) are of especial interest for the light they shed on early Egyptian history (the shadowy Hyksos) and on early Ptolemaic historiography, though many regard Josephus' source as already edited and interpo-

<sup>176</sup> A new German translation is supplied in Siegert, Schreckenberg & Vogel 2006; Labow 2005 provides his own for Book 1 and Gerber gives her own translation of 2.145-286 (1997: 395-419). Italian translations are available in both Troiani 1977 and Calabi 1993. A new English translation (from Thackeray's Greek text) by Patrick Rogers is now available online at [www.josephus.ie](http://www.josephus.ie), but came to my attention too late.

<sup>177</sup> Gutschmid 1893: 382: "völlig werthlos und trivial." Müller uses a text, and text-divisions, now no longer current, rendering his commentary particularly difficult to use.

<sup>178</sup> In the Italian sphere one may add the "Il Convivio" edition of *Apion* by F. Calabi (1993), providing text, translation, and endnotes.

<sup>179</sup> Sections of the introduction are available in English in Kasher 1996b. I am grateful for the assistance of Ms. Naomi Jacobs in enabling my access to this commentary.

<sup>180</sup> See Reinach 1930: p. xx-xxi: "Pour nous, lecteurs du XXe siècle, l'intérêt principal du *Contre Apion* réside peut-être dans la masse de citations qu'il nous a conservées d'écrivains plus anciens, en très grande partie perdus." It is symptomatic that Reinach devotes nearly half of his introduction to this topic. In this connection, there has been some debate about the *source* of Josephus' sources, whether he drew on a previous collection of "witnesses" to Judean antiquity (e.g., from Alexander Polyhistor) and/or a previous collection and refutation of Egyptian tales regarding the exodus (see Reinach 1930: xxiii-xxix). One may certainly doubt that Josephus has looked up all these sources for himself, but we are reduced to conjectures on this matter.



lated (see Waddell 1940; cf. Appendix 1). From another angle, this assembly of references to Judeans has stimulated the gathering of larger and more comprehensive collections, that of Reinach (1895) now superseded by the magnificent compilation and commentary by Stern (1974-84). Josephus' text has provided, ironically, some of our best evidence for ancient hostility to Judeans, a subject of intense interest especially in the last few decades. The stories and slanders reported by Josephus figure prominently both in comprehensive treatments of this topic (e.g., Feldman 1993; Schäfer 1997a) and in individual essays (e.g., by Bar-Kochva; see bibliography). The study of sources has also encouraged continuing debate regarding the identity of the "Hecataeus" cited by Josephus (1.183-204; Bar-Kochva 1996a), and concerning the relationship between Josephus' summary of the laws and the summaries found in parallel Judean texts (Ps.-Phocylides and *Hypothetica*; see Appendix 5). For investigations of Alexandrian history, and of the figure of Apion, Josephus' retort in 2.1-144 has also provided an invaluable, if highly slanted, source (recently, K. Jones 2005).

Study of Josephus himself, of his rhetorical tactics and cultural self-positioning, has only recently gathered momentum. Momigliano's special interest in this treatise (see bibliography) long alerted readers to its importance, and seminal essays by Schäublin (1982) and Cohen (1988) drew attention to its particular rhetorics. The gathering of a collection of essays devoted to this text (Feldman and Levison 1996) marked the "arrival" of *Apion* as a focal point of study, and coincided with a new surge of interest in Josephus as an author, evidenced in numerous Josephus colloquia and seminars staged over the last decade. The first significant monograph devoted to (a section of) *Apion* appeared in 1997, C. Gerber's study of 2.145-296. This broke fresh ground both in elucidating Josephus' argumentation and in close analysis of his precise claims regarding the constitution; the few previous studies on this portion of the text (e.g., on "theocracy" or on the summary of the laws) were here superseded by its first comprehensive treatment. Since then a number of essays have studied the apologetics of our text (Goodman 1999; Gruen 2005) or its particular

Roman stance (see Appendix 6). The time is clearly ripe for a comprehensive treatment of the rhetorics of our text with a view not only to its modes of argumentation but also to its cultural strategy in placing the Judean people within and beyond the categories of the Greek and Roman traditions.

*Note on bibliography:* the range of topics mentioned by Josephus—Egyptian, Phoenician, Babylonian, Greek, and Roman, as well as Judean—renders commentary on this text particularly taxing, and potential bibliography enormous. On all the central themes I have given what I know of the most recent bibliography, but for numerous more tangential points readers are best referred to the standard reference works, from which I have benefited greatly. For classical antiquity, besides Pauly-Wissowa, the latest (revised third) edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) is a mine of up-to-date information and offers further bibliography; Egyptian material can be accessed in D.R. Redford's *Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) and the *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (ed. W. Helck et al., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975-). The bibliography does not claim to be fully comprehensive; much of the older literature is now superseded, and some more recent treatments were judged insufficiently significant to merit mention.<sup>181</sup> More comprehensive bibliographical listings are available, on some topics, in Feldman and Levison 1996: 22-48 and in Labow's 2005 commentary; for Josephus as a whole see the older bibliographical surveys in Schreckenberg 1968; Schreckenberg 1979; Feldman 1984. A number of special themes are treated in more detail in the Appendices to the present volume, where more literature is cited.

### 13. Reading Options and Reading Stances

According to the modern critical tradition, the commentator occupies a stance of lofty objectiv-

<sup>181</sup> No doubt I have missed some truly significant items, for which I apologize.

ity and strives to offer a univocal reading that corresponds to the original, intended meaning of the text. With the commentator as inconspicuous as possible, it is presumed that the text has a single and universal meaning; the only task is to reveal what this is, and to correct those who have thus far failed to discern it. Under the influence of “reception theory,” this understanding of both interpreter and text has come under increasing challenge.<sup>182</sup> In this new light, interpreters are understood as *constructors* of meaning in their engagement with the text, and their reading stance is presumed to be not “objective” or “disinterested,” but located in a specific context, with its own interests and goals. If there are multiple reading stances, there may also be multiple meanings; the only question is whether they are legitimate, or at least appropriate in relation to the text. Here judgments may vary as to whether the text is inherently “open” or “closed,” and whether even a comparatively “closed” text may contain meaning potential beyond the intentions of the author (as putatively reconstructed). If the text bears the potential for multiple meanings, and if interpreters are both situated and partial in their readings, the history of reception of the text could be more than the story of stumbling progress towards the recovery of its singular, “correct” meaning.

Even where the insights of reception theory are recognized, it is difficult to embrace them within the genre of the commentary. The turn to reception history has resulted in new forms of commentary that gather readings in the “effective history” of the text, but here the commentator usually engages with the text at one remove, through the readings of others (selected and themselves interpreted).<sup>183</sup> The challenge is to create a literary forum in which the commentator deals directly with the text from an explicitly partial standpoint, while giving space to other responsible readings, both actual and potential.

The procedure adopted in this commentary is to introduce each main segment of the text with

an introduction entitled “Reading Options,” in which a range of reading stances is explored and explained (at 1.6, 1.73, 1.106, 1.128, 1.161, 1.219, 2.1, and 2.145). The phrase-by-phrase commentary, which constitutes the bulk of this book, is properly concerned with issues of text, language, rhetoric, and history. But the selection of topics within this field and the analysis of the rhetorical and political “work” of the treatise are influenced by interpretative preferences that need to be made explicit. Within each “Readings Options” survey I describe *five* reading stances relevant to the following segment of text. These all relate, in varying ways, to the historical origins of *Apion*, but they approach the text with different interpretative interests, expectations, and goals. These five may be best explained here.

As an apologetic text written by a Judean in Rome, *Apion* stands at a cultural border between Judean and Roman traditions. It was suggested above that Josephus intended his work to be heard/read by two kinds of audience—those familiar with the Judean tradition (scriptural and other) and those who were sympathetic to Judean culture but more attuned to Roman traditions (here labelled “Romanized”). Of course these two categories could overlap (in the case of Judeans who were also “Romanized”), but the double cultural horizon of the work opens it to two kinds of reception. Thus, we are invited to ask both how (1) a *Romanized audience* might have received this work (with what sympathies or expectations, and influenced by what other traditions), and how (2) a *Judean audience* might have heard/read it. If our proposal on Josephus’ intentions is right, Josephus himself invites more than one reading of this text; if it is wrong, it is still appropriate to imagine, within his context, two distinguishable forms of reception. Since Josephus includes in this text many citations of other authors, whose disparate perspectives stand alongside his own, *Apion* is in any case a somewhat polyphonic text: although he cites them for his own purposes, the inclusion of these voices creates the possibility of readings other than those intended, and Josephus sometimes struggles to make them supportive of his case (e.g., Agatharchides in 1.205-12). Elsewhere, his rhetoric leaves gaps or creates ambiguities that render the text less than fully

<sup>182</sup> Reception theory embraces a broad spectrum of theoretical positions; my own is closer to that of Iser (1978) than the later extremes of Fish (1989).

<sup>183</sup> See, e.g., Kovacs and Rowland 2004 in the new Blackwell Bible Commentaries series.



“closed.” Thus we are justified historically and textually in considering the text open to more than one reading. The possible receptions of this text by Romanized or Judean audiences must be a matter of conjecture, but we know enough about Judeans and Romans at the end of the first-century CE to make such hypotheses plausible.

Like many texts, Josephus’ *Apion* escaped its original context and the horizon of its author’s original intentions; like many others from classical antiquity, it was preserved within the Christian tradition, and by this means made available to modern scholarship. Thus we may add to the two reading stances outlined above (Romanized and Judean), that of (3) *early Christian interpreters* up to and including Eusebius (practically the only known readers of this text in antiquity; see above, § 8); and that of (4) *historical scholarship* of the post-Enlightenment era, with its distinct set of interests in *Apion* and (particularly) its sources. In these cases we can trace the stances of real readers and can thus discern and evaluate their relationship to the dynamics of the text.

As a final reading option I make explicit (5) *my own approach to the text*, with specific interest in its rhetorical and political dimensions. This is not, I hope, idiosyncratic: I have learned most of what I know from standard historical scholarship, and much of the commentary will follow the normal lines of historical interpretation. But in reading *Apion* I have paid particular attention to its rhetorical dynamics, its strategies and forms of persuasion, and I have tried to link these to its political goals, interpreted, where appropriate, with the aid of postcolonial theory. On this reading the rhetorical and the political are closely entwined: I am interested less in the rhetorical *techniques* of the text than in its rhetorical *strategies*, its positioning of the Judean people and the Judean tradition within the pre-suppositions and prejudices of the late first-century world.

Each of these reading options could teach us something about the text. By imagining first-century Romanized and Judean receptions we can place it more securely within its first cultural context. The early Christian reception of the text will clarify some of its apologetic value, though the Christians’ special interests shaped a highly

selective reading that “colonized” the text for their own ends. Modern historical scholarship has illuminated many elements of the text and its background, though its particular fascination with sources and citations generally reads *Apion* against the grain, with minimal interest in Josephus’ own goals. My own reading strategy (which is no more particular than others) is an attempt to read the text with the grain, as a cultural and political statement that defends and commends the Judean people within a framework derived from its dominant cultural environment—derived, but bent, supplemented, and re-fashioned in the interests of a comparatively powerless people.

My use of “postcolonial theory” requires some explication. The term covers a diverse set of analytical tools applied to the cultural relationship between dominant geopolitical powers (“imperial” or “colonizing” in the broadest sense) and subordinated peoples, nations, and cultures.<sup>184</sup> Despite the prefix “post,” and although the theoretical framework for such analysis was developed in the wake of European empires, the field of study is by no means confined to the aftermath of colonial relations. Moreover, while its origins lie in the study of literature, the scope of this theoretical field has widened to “culture” in its broadest sense (including material culture), as it is impacted by asymmetrical relations of power.<sup>185</sup> For our purposes, two focal issues within this broad agenda are of particular importance. The first is *the problematic of representation* in the contact between two cultures of unequal power. The analysis of this topic by Edward Said, under the label of “Orientalism,” provided the launch pad for postcolonial theory. In his study of Western dis-

<sup>184</sup> Moore-Gilbert defines postcolonial criticism as a “distinct set of reading practices ... preoccupied principally with analysis of cultural forms which mediate, challenge, and reflect upon the relations of domination and subordination—economic, cultural and political—between (and often within) nations, races or cultures” (1997: 12).

<sup>185</sup> Reliable introductory books include: Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin 1989; 1998; Childs & Williams 1997; Loomba 1998; for more advanced analyses, see Moore-Gilbert 1997; Young 2001.

course on the East, Said indicated how Western speech and knowledge constructed an image of the East, homogenized and stereotyped, an “other” that subtly served the ends of colonizing powers. Often “Orientalist” discourse represented the East as morally or intellectually inferior (thus justifying Western rule), though sometimes, where the Orient was positively viewed, its “overvaluation” served to mirror back Western values or project Western dreams.<sup>186</sup> Crucial here is the connection between knowledge and power (drawn from Foucault): where Western patterns of discourse delimit and define the field of knowledge, where the Western vantage point provides the sole legitimate perspective, and where Western canons of truth, rationality, and morality fix the norms and analytical concepts, this pattern of representation constitutes a form of power, and is generally maintained by some relationship (direct or indirect) to political, economic, or intellectual power. Under these conditions of cultural hegemony, it is in practice impossible for subordinate peoples and cultures to represent themselves on their own terms—a dilemma much analyzed in postcolonial studies.<sup>187</sup>

In this connection we encounter our second nodal point of postcolonial theory, the analysis of *the products and strategies of the subordinate parties in relations of unequal cultural power*. At an early stage in postcolonial studies, scholarly attention was focused on signs of resistance, where the literature of the subordinate managed to evade, twist, or even subvert the cultural authority under which it was written. More recently, under the influence of Homi Bhabha, it has become common to eschew the binary antithesis of assimilation/resistance, and to identify within the products of postcolonial encounter

subtle and ambivalent forms of “in-betweenness.”<sup>188</sup> A key concept in this connection is “hybridity,” by which is meant not the “fusion” of cultures, but the emergence of new cultural forms that neither continue the “authentic” native culture nor reproduce the hegemonic culture, but produce a third entity, often unstable and destabilizing. At one level, the “hybrid” product appears to affirm the authority of the dominant culture, by mimicking its modes of discourse; but at another by creating something inevitably different (e.g., “anglicized” rather than “English”), it unsettles, and even mocks, the supposed superiority of the colonial/imperial power. This paradoxical stance, in which the dominant culture is both reformulated and deformed, both reproduced and changed, both hallowed and hollowed (Moore 2005: 87), reflects the ironies inherent in the postcolonial condition. An analysis attuned to such ambivalence is arguably best able to assess the complex products of postcolonial encounter.

The specific contribution of postcolonial theory to the analysis of cultural contact and cultural negotiation is its ability to unveil the power relations involved, and to trace their complex effects. The study of “Orientalism” enables us to go beyond the simplistic labelling of a discursive stance as “positive” or “negative,” seeking out the ideological or social interests at work in the representation of others’ cultures and enquiring into the sources of power for the generation of such knowledge. The notion of “hybridity” not only adds many layers of nuance to older categories of “assimilation” or “acculturation,” but focuses attention on the dynamics of power in situations of cultural contact.<sup>189</sup> More particularly, it investigates not only the power of the dominant to impose their own cultural matrix, but also the more subtle and indirect forms

<sup>186</sup> Said 1978. Said’s pioneering work influenced all subsequent postcolonial theorists, however much they may nuance his conclusions (Young 2001: 383-94). For recent work in this field see, e.g., MacKenzie 1995; Sardar 1999; Macfie 2000. Said 1993 developed his analysis with greater range and subtlety.

<sup>187</sup> For the fields of historiography and ethnography/travel writing, see, e.g., Young 1990; Pratt 1992; 1994; Spivak 1994 (a seminal essay on the problematics of “subaltern” self-representation).

<sup>188</sup> Bhabha 1994 (a collection of essays, of which “Sly Civility” and “Signs Taken for Wonders” are especially significant in this connection); for an analysis, see Moore-Gilbert 1997: 114-51. The influence of Derrida on Bhabha’s construal of this “in-between” phenomenon is widely recognized.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. in this respect my third category “accommodation” in Barclay 1996a: 92-98, but then innocent of the nuances available from postcolonial theory.

of power at work in the discourse of the subordinate, transforming, redefining, or supplementing the cultural systems they only seemingly “adopt.” Because of the vastly different social and historical contexts in which struggles for cultural power have been, and continue to be, played out, there are no templates here for the measurement or prediction of their effects. Even with regard to contemporary postcolonial (or neocolonial) conditions, postcolonial criticism operates with an apparatus of quite generalized concepts, adaptable to the subject in view. Thus, although the (post)colonial circumstances normally studied in this connection are modern, the same apparatus can be employed in analysis of the unequal power relations of antiquity; while the *forms* of power (economic and political) may be very different from the modern world, their *effects* in the realm of cultural interaction bear many similarities. In relation to antiquity, analyses more or less directly related to postcolonial theory have been applied to Greek representations of the barbarian “East,” and to the subtle negotiations of power within the Roman empire between conquering Romans and the cultures of their subjects.<sup>190</sup> Biblical studies has also adapted equipment from this theoretical workshop to examine its texts afresh, both in their original historical contexts and in their contemporary appropriation in the postcolonial present.<sup>191</sup> The study of Judeans in antiquity is ripe for this form of analysis, both with regard to the image of Judeans generated under the impact of Egyptian, Hellenistic or Roman power, and in relation to the cultural products of this highly articulate but subject people, in whose literature “the empire writes back.”<sup>192</sup> Josephus, as a (for-

merly rebellious) subject of the Roman empire, brought to Rome under imperial patronage but committed to large-scale projects of Judean self-representation in the imperial metropolis, seems a fitting object of analysis from a postcolonial perspective.<sup>193</sup>

The heuristic potential of postcolonial theory seems particularly promising in relation to two aspects of our text. In relation to Judean antiquity, Josephus complains that Greek historiography is partial, as well as inaccurate; he threatens to turn the table on Greeks by asking how they would fare if history were told from a Judean perspective (1.69). This alerts us to the fact that the prejudice in favor of Greek historiography, against which Josephus contends (1.2), is part of a contest between differing regimes of historical truth; doubts about Judean antiquity are rooted in the inequalities of cultural and political power. Josephus’ riposte, championing “barbarian” historiography (1.6-56), is an important statement in that contest, but it is significant that he felt compelled, nonetheless, to include a lengthy segment of Greek “witnesses” to Judean antiquity (1.161-214). The analysis of “Orientalism” by postcolonial critics could shed significant light on the representation of Judeans advanced by these Greek authors (at least those that are genuinely Greek); their understandings of the diffusion of culture, and their representation of Judeans as “philosophers” might turn out to be classic “Orientalist” constructions.<sup>194</sup> At the same time, we can be alerted to observe what happens when Josephus enters the historiographical de-

---

situation of Jews in the “holy land” under Christian rule.

<sup>193</sup> For explorations in this direction, related to the commentary, see Barclay 2005a; 2005b; forthcoming (c).

<sup>194</sup> As I have pointed out elsewhere (Barclay forthcoming [c]), Bickerman’s seminal essay on ancient constructions of the origins of nations, strikingly adumbrates postcolonial themes: tracing the nexus between Greek knowledge and Greek power, he notes that “a Greek inquirer in a foreign land did not feel himself bound by the question of what his informant actually meant. The construction he put upon the barbarian account was rather faithful to the historical reality of his own system” (1952: 71).

---

<sup>190</sup> For Greek representations of the East, see Harrison 2000 on images of Persia (cf. earlier Hall 1989) and Vanusia 2001 on the Greek construction of Egypt. For the use of postcolonial theory in the archaeology of the Roman empire see Webster & Cooper 1996 and Mattingly 1997. For the power dynamics entailed in “being Greek under Rome” see Goldhill 2001 and Whitmarsh 2001.

<sup>191</sup> The field has suddenly grown to enormous proportions; for samples see Sugirtharajah 1998; Moore and Segovia 2005 (with further literature).

<sup>192</sup> Jacobs 2004 applies postcolonial analysis to the

bate in 1.6-56, and positions Judean historiography within, but also beyond, the conventions established in the Greek (and Roman) tradition. The degree to which he *alters* the rules of historiography, while claiming to act within them, could be newly comprehended by sensitivity to the complexities of the postcolonial encounter.<sup>195</sup>

Secondly, the self-representation of Judean culture found throughout this work invites analysis regarding its relationship to the Greek traditions on which it draws, and the Roman values to which it pays some respect (see Appendix 6). Josephus at times subjects himself to the Romans' view of their own "magnanimity" and "benevolence" (2.42, 73), and is at pains to align Judeans with Romans as faithful friends (2.33-78, 125-34). But there are also moments when readers might detect subtle criticisms of Rome in moments of strategic silence (2.74, 131, 252), a phenomenon suggesting a hidden and different transcript. Even on the surface of the text, Josephus' adoption of non-Judean modes of representation (e.g., his presentation of the Judean constitution) by no means surrenders Judean difference. In comparing Judean with Greek constitutions, Josephus consistently claims that the Judean version is of a subtly different type (2.165-68) and a superior status (2.289-95). In this connection, the postcolonial concept of "hybridity" is potentially fruitful, if it can alert us to the subtleties of this strategy and its ambivalent relationship to the cultural traditions it both mimics and purports to surpass. In other words, postcolonial theory has the potential to unravel the ways in which Josephus both accepts and unsettles the authority of the Greek (and Roman) tradition, restructuring the values he has adopted, and advancing bold claims for Judean originality and superiority.<sup>196</sup>

<sup>195</sup> Such questions are pursued in the Reading Options for 1.6-56 and 1.161-218.

<sup>196</sup> See the discussion of this matter in Barclay 2005a and the Reading Options for 2.145-286. Although I will often speak of Josephus' agency in this matter, my prime interest is in the strategies of the text, whether or not they were intended by Josephus. The conscious intentions of an author, and especially an

Viewed from this angle, as an attempt at self-representation, written by a member of a subject nation fully engaged with the dominant cultural tradition, Josephus' work is a classic "postcolonial" text, and the complexities of his stance nowhere more evident than in *Apion*.

In applying postcolonial tools, where they seem to fit the text, I hope to make clear that the reading of *Apion* is, in a broad sense, a political act. Postcolonial theory places a premium on the self-representation of the subordinate, the challenge to hegemonic discourse, and the destabilizing of apparently "universal" structures of discourse. To trace Josephus' strategies, as spokesman for a minor and politically humiliated nation, is both to reveal and to evaluate the political dimensions of his work. I consider this interpretative stance both historically sensitive (not an intellectual anachronism) and politically appropriate. Few things seem more necessary in our world than granting the right to speak to those who are culturally and economically marginalized, and few things more dangerous than the exaggeration of cultural polarities in unequal relations of power. Josephus' *Apion* remains a striking testimony to the interest and importance of a minority voice, and the complexity in his positioning of Judean culture is an important pointer to the potential ambivalence and creativity enabled by a constructive cultural encounter.

ancient author, are a hypothetical reconstruction, and postcolonial analysis is particularly prone to leave questions of agency moot. The reader should thus be aware that the intentions of "Josephus" are an interpreter's construct, though one that seems necessary in the analysis of a text with such urgent rhetorical goals.





JOSEPHUS, *AGAINST APION*



## BOOK ONE

(1.1) <sup>1</sup> Through my treatise on *Ancient History*,<sup>2</sup> most eminent Epaphroditus,<sup>3</sup> *The occasion of the treatise*

<sup>1</sup> The preface (1.1-5), considerably briefer than that of *War* and *Antiquities*, contains the bare essentials: the occasion of the work (1.1-2), its purposes (1.3), and its methods (1.4-5). In form and generic content it matches the prefaces of technical or “scientific” works (Alexander 1993); despite some rhetorical coloring, it does not present *Apion* as a work of rhetoric, nor of history in any of its classic modes. The explicit reference back to *Antiquities* might suggest that *Apion* continues the agenda of the previous work, though it is in fact self-standing (see Introduction, § 2). As in *Antiquities*, Josephus offers no self-introduction (for the implications regarding his audience, see Introduction, § 7). The rhetorical tone is that of a teacher slightly irritated by unnecessary questions. The polemical front is not clearly defined, but the four-fold mention of “Greek” (1.1, 2, 4, 5), the only non-Judean ethnonym mentioned in the preface, suggests a dialogue with the “Greek” tradition that will be of rhetorical significance throughout *Apion*.

<sup>2</sup> “Ancient History” (ἀρχαιολογία) is Josephus’ shorthand title for his 20-volume work, which we term his *Antiquities* (cf. 1.54, 127; 2.136, 287; *Ant.* 20.259, 267; *Life* 430). Its public title (if it had one) would have had to indicate whose “ancient history” this recounted (cf. *Ant.* 1.5; *Apion* 2.136, “our ancient histories”). The connotations of the term are ambiguous at a critical point (see Rajak 2002: 241-55). For some in antiquity, ἀρχαιολογία suggested “ancient lore,” the sagas and “myths” which historians could at best sift for true history, but might wholly discard (Plutarch, *Mor.* 855d; *Thes.* 1); for others (presumably Josephus; cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.4.1) it simply meant the history of ancient times. In his *Antiquities* Josephus had not fully defended his almost complete dependence on a particular, Judean source for the most ancient history (the Judean scriptures), and thus encountered (or imagined) skepticism (1.2).

<sup>3</sup> The same Epaphroditus is the dedicatee of *Antiquities* (1.8-9) and *Life* (430), thus binding the three works together. He is given here no further description or address (cf. 2.1, 296), and the repetition of identical wording from *Life* 430 (the end of Josephus’ most recent work) could indicate that the dedication is a formality. The epithet (literally, “most eminent of men,” κράτιστε ἀνδρῶν) is probably formulaic (cf. κράτιστε in Luke 1:3 with comment by Alexander 1993: 132-33;

Cadbury 1922: 505-7); it is “a form of address too vague to allow us to determine the man’s social status” (Cotton and Eck 2005: 49). All attempts to identify this figure among the known elite of Flavian Rome run up against the severe limitations in our knowledge. Epaphroditus was a very common name in Rome (nearly 300 cases are known from the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries CE), especially for slaves and freedmen. There are two figures contemporary with Josephus of whom something is known, and both have been proposed as his patron.

1. Epaphroditus, the freedman of Nero (see Steindorff 1905: 2710-11). This man was secretary (*a libellis*) to Nero, helped expose the Pisonian plot against him (65 CE), then fled Rome with Nero and helped him commit suicide. He appears to have returned to Rome and was known to Domitian who first exiled him, then had him killed in 95 CE (Suetonius, *Dom.* 14.4; Dio Cassius 67.14.4-5). We do not know how much “earlier” he was exiled (Dio Cassius 67.14.4; Cotton and Eck [2005: 50] suggest c.90 CE, but without clear warrant), but even if he left Rome in 94 CE it is hard to find time for the composition of *Apion* after *Antiquities* (93/94; see Introduction, § 3). Moreover, there is no reason to think that this Epaphroditus wielded significant influence in the Flavian court (see Weaver 1994), where he may have been tainted by his association with Nero. Thus, the older tradition that identifies this man as Josephus’ patron (Luther 1910: 61-63; cf. Mason 1998: 98-100; Nodet 1992: 4, n.1) is now largely discredited (Cotton and Eck 2005: 50-51). Josephus’ description of him as a man used to large changes in fortune (*Ant.* 1.8-9) could apply to anyone who had lived through the last few decades of Roman history.

2. M. Mettius Epaphroditus, a freedman scholar (*grammaticus*; see Cohn 1905: 2711-14). This man is known only from the *Suidas*, where he is described as a former slave of the *praefectus* of Egypt, a scholar on Homer, Hesiod, and Callimachus, who lived in Rome from the time of Nero to Nerva (died 98 CE), and had a library of 30,000 books; for an inscription attached to a statue, see *CIL* 6.9454. If Josephus’ patron is identifiable at all, this is the most likely candidate: he had both financial and intellectual resources of value to Josephus, and probably had at least some contacts in aristocratic families, even if he was not himself among the elite (see Sterling 1992: 239-40, n.66; Rajak 1983: 223-24; Cotton and Eck 2005: 51-52, perhaps over-

I consider that, to those who will read it,<sup>4</sup> I have made it sufficiently clear<sup>5</sup> concerning our people,<sup>6</sup> the Judeans,<sup>7</sup> that it is extremely ancient<sup>8</sup> and had its own original composition,<sup>9</sup> and how it inhabited the land that we now possess;<sup>10</sup> for<sup>11</sup> I composed

stressing his social marginality).

If one has to choose between these two Epaphroditoi, the second is far more probable (cf. Gerber 1997: 65-66; Labow 2005: lxxiv-lxxv; Feldman 2000: 5, n.9; Mason 2001: 173, n.1780). But it is equally possible that Josephus' Epaphroditus is otherwise unknown to us (Weaver 1994: 474-75; Jones 2002: 114-15, suggesting, as another candidate, a freedman who served *ab epistulis* under a Flavian emperor, *CIL* 6.1887). For the relation of this question to the date of the work, see Introduction, § 3.

<sup>4</sup> The clause may be innocent (and redundant), but may also indicate that the present work has in mind those who have *not* read Josephus' *Antiquities* and are not likely to do so. Otherwise, if the following points have already been made there "sufficiently clearly," Josephus need do no more than refer his readers back to the earlier work. On Josephus' implied audience, see Introduction, § 7.1.

<sup>5</sup> In the Greek, "sufficiently" (ἰκανῶς) stands in an emphatic position as the very first word of the sentence. Josephus does not admit to plugging gaps or mending faults; he is simply dealing with peevish objections (1.2). The rhetorical pose of "sufficiency" (cf. 1.58, 160, 182; 2.288, etc.) enlists the reader's assent. A μέν ... δέ construction ties 1.1 and 1.2 closely together; the point has already been made clear but is now to be bolstered by proof. The sentence is as cumbersome in Greek as in this translation. The syntax of preface sentences is frequently over-loaded (Alexander 1993: 64-65; cf. Luke 1:1-4 and, conspicuously, *War* 1.1-6).

<sup>6</sup> Greek: γένος. The term evokes birth and ancestry, and, as the following clause hints, it is extremely important for Josephus that the Judean people have a distinct line of genealogy, and are not descended from Egyptians (cf. 1.252, 278; 2.289). While the nearest English equivalent might appear to be "race," that term is too tainted by association with the "racial science" of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and is best avoided. The term means "people" in the anthropological sense of a "descent-group" (see Esler forthcoming). ἔθνος ("nation") has a potentially broader, and more political, sense, though the two can be practically synonymous (in the preface at 1.5). The "our" provides an immediate identification of author and people, reinforced through the preface by 5 further uses of the pronoun ἡμεῖς (and one each of the adjective "our" and first-person plural verb).

<sup>7</sup> Here and throughout this commentary Ἰουδαῖοι is translated "Judean" in recognition of the continuing

association Josephus makes between the people and "the land that we now possess" (1.1; cf. 1.179: the name derives from the place). See further, Introduction, § 9, with defense of this lexical choice. Even as a long-term resident in Rome, Josephus presents himself and his people as "Judean."

<sup>8</sup> This is the first of the three items here chosen (out of all the topics in *Ant.*), since it is the first under dispute (1.2). The claim is never given greater precision in this work (cf. 1.36, 39, 104, 108; 2.226); the origins of the people (with Abraham?) are here implicitly elided with the total historical span of the work (from Adam), about to be numbered as 5,000 years. Cf. *Ant.* 1.13, 16, 82-88, 148-49. For the importance of antiquity as a proof of value, see Pilhofer 1990.

<sup>9</sup> Greek: καὶ τὴν πρώτην ὑπόστασιν ἔσχεν ἰδίαν. ὑπόστασις is rare in Josephus (otherwise only at *Ant.* 18.24, which is textually uncertain); it has philosophical connotations of "essence" or "true substance." The stress falls on "its own" (ἰδίαν), suggesting something distinct. The point is emphasized here in anticipation of the "slanders" that Judeans were in fact (renegade and polluted) Egyptians; cf. 1.104, 228-29, 252-53, 278, 298; 2.289 (in summary). Later, Josephus will declare that "the ancestors of our people were Chaldean" (1.71), but he cannot allow any original "mixing" with Egyptians; on the cultural politics see Barclay 2004. *Ant.* 1.148 had begun the history of the "Hebrews" with Abraham, of Chaldean descent (cf. 1.158-69). The Egyptian issue is alluded to in *Ant.* 2.177, but ethnic purity was not there given the prominence this comment suggests.

<sup>10</sup> Although eternal possession of the land is taken for granted in *Antiquities* (e.g., 4.115), its means of possession by Abraham or after the Exodus is not given any special profile in that narrative. But that the Judeans' homeland was *not* Egypt is a vital point in this treatise, in refutation of Egyptian stories (cf. *Apion* 1.252, 314; 2.289). The emphatic present-tense statement ("we now possess") is striking from a long-term resident in Rome. Although he is fully conscious of the Diaspora in this treatise (e.g., 1.33; 2.33, 39, 67, 277), Josephus makes remarkably frequent reference to Judea as the land *presently* possessed or inhabited by Judeans, and as the land that they call *their own*. Thus he describes Judea as: a) the land (χώρα) or place (τόπος) "we (now) inhabit" (present tense of [κατ]οικέω): 1.60, 174, 179, 195, 209 (Agatharchides), 280 (vῦν), 315 (vῦν). b) "our land" (ἡμετέρα χώρα/γῆ): 1.132, 174; c)

in the Greek language<sup>12</sup> a history covering 5,000 years,<sup>13</sup> on the basis of our sacred books.<sup>14</sup> **2** However, since I see that a considerable number of people<sup>15</sup> pay attention to the slanders spread by some out of malice,<sup>16</sup> and disbelieve what I have written on ancient history,<sup>17</sup> but adduce as proof that our people is of more recent

*The aims of the treatise*

“our own land” (οἰκεία γῆ/χώρα): 1.224; 2.289; d) “this land” (ἡ χώρα αὐτή): 1.103; e) “the ancestral land” (ἡ πατριος γῆ): 2.157; and f) “the homeland” (πατρίς): 1.210 (Agatharchides), 212; 2.277. Cf. the reference to “our cities” (in Judea, 1.60), and Jerusalem as the city “we inhabit from the remote past” (1.196). For the significance of this geographical component of Judean ethnicity, see Introduction, § 9.

<sup>11</sup> Reading γάρ (following Latin *enim*, with Reinach and Münster); L has no connecting conjunction, leaving the text unsyntactical. Niese marks a lacuna.

<sup>12</sup> *Ant.* 20.262-66 parades Josephus’ achievement to have written in Greek, as an acquired language (cf. *Apion* 1.50 on *War*).

<sup>13</sup> The round figure (as in *Ant.* 1.13) is made up of 3,000 years from creation to Moses (*Apion* 1.39) and 2,000 years of the Judean constitution (2.226; cf. 1.36; *Ant.* 1.16). For more precise, but inconsistent, calculations, see *Ant.* 1.82; 8.61-62; 10.147-48; cf. Nodet 1992: 5. In the Greek tradition, where the Trojan War was dated to 1184 BCE (Diodorus 1.5), few historians would attempt a chronological calculation further back (but cf. Diodorus 1.24.2: 10,000 years from the Giants or Olympians). But oriental nations were known to make large claims, which were sometimes taken seriously (Diodorus 1.23.1: some Egyptians say Osiris was 10,000 years before Alexander; others more than 23,000), sometimes not (Diodorus 2.31.9: Babylonians claim to have charted 473,000 years; cf. Cicero, *Div.* 1.36-37). Josephus’ figure would not look wholly implausible in his western context.

<sup>14</sup> The documentary sources for Judean history are a pivotal point in the discussion of historiography in 1.6-59 (especially 1.37-41), and Josephus frequently identifies the basis of his history as “the sacred writings” (1.54, 127; cf. *Ant.* 1.17; 2.347; 3.81, etc.). In fact, the reliance on these sources is both Josephus’ boast (*Apion* 1.37-41) and, to a non-Judean, his greatest vulnerability. While he will cite many other sources in this work, their truth is, ultimately, judged by their agreement with the Judean scriptures (1.91-92, 154, 279-86, etc.); it is his unwillingness to sift, sort, and critically evaluate *all* his sources that makes Josephus’ historiography discordant with the Greek tradition (see at 1.37).

<sup>15</sup> The description is vague (merely συχνοί), and suggests that Josephus is responding to a general mood of disbelief in Judean self-claims, rather than specific critics of his work (see below). A preface has to indi-

cate the necessity of the work, and this is often expressed in polemical statements regarding the inadequacy or wrong-headedness of others; cf. *War* 1.1-3, 13-16. The “people” mentioned here are defined by two participles in the Greek: they “pay attention to slanders ...” and “disbelieve what I have written ...” They are not themselves the “slanderers” (whose slander is left undefined: see below), but by associating their doubt with such “slander” and “malice” Josephus brings even the initial topic of this treatise (a proof of Judean antiquity) into the overarching strategy of apologetic (see Introduction, § 5).

<sup>16</sup> The “slanders” are attributed to a third party (“some”), to whom “a considerable number of people” attend; placing this source at one remove frees Josephus to use as strong invective as he wishes. Of the two terms here used, the first in particular attaches itself to the “Egyptian” material (narratives about Moses; charges by Apion). βλασφημία (“slanders”) and its cognates recur in 1.4, 59, but then not again (apart from a neutral use in 1.164) until 1.221, 223, 279 and the segment on Apion (2.5, 32, 143; cf. Latin in 2.79, 88); it is one of Josephus’ favorite labels for the stories he attacks. For δυσμένεια (“malice”), repeated in 1.3, cf. 1.70, 212, 220; 2.145. As far as we can tell, such “slanders” rarely if ever induced doubt on the antiquity of the Judean people (see note to “us” at 2.156), but it suits Josephus’ rhetoric to associate the first topic of this treatise (the proof of Judean antiquity) with the other topics, wrapping them all in the same mantle, as responses to hostility. The doubt itself is hardly a “slander” and Josephus’ following remarks might suggest that its origin lay in ignorance rather than malice (1.3, 5). But he later redescribes it as a “charge” (2.288) and as a “case against us” (ἡ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀντιλογία) advanced by “detractors” (οἱ βλασκαίνοντες, 1.72), thus again associating it with the “charges” and “slanders” that occupy the rest of the work.

<sup>17</sup> Here the terrain is not the trading of insults (an argument focused on *ethos*), but the display of evidence and proof (a matter of *logos*). Hence the material on the antiquity of Judeans is characterized as a correction of ignorance (1.3, 5), where “disbelief” (ἄπιστία, 1.6, 161) is countered by reliable evidence worthy of belief (πίστις; noun, verb, or adjectival forms in 1.4, 38, 72, 112, 143). One can imagine many aspects of Josephus’ *Antiquities* open to doubt, but in what follows he chooses to focus on only one. The problem of



origin that it was not thought worthy of any mention by the most renowned Greek historians,<sup>18</sup> 3 I thought it necessary to write briefly on all these matters,<sup>19</sup> to convict

disbelief (and malice) had been recognized in the earlier work (*Ant.* 14.187; 16.44).

<sup>18</sup> At first sight, this looks like a simple argument: Greek historians knew about antiquity; they did not mention Judeans; therefore Judaeans did not exist in antiquity, but are a new nation. This straightforward argument is what Josephus wishes to dispute (cf. 1.58; 2.288) and the ground on which he wages battle in 1.6ff. But we might suspect that such a charge is invented or at least misrepresented by Josephus. No names are associated with this argument (cf. the named critics elsewhere), and its form is later changed to a claim that the Judean people is “recent” (νέα, 1.58) or even “very recent” (νεώτατον, 2.288; here the form is νεώτερον). In any such forms the charge is unlikely to emanate from “Greek” sources or on the basis of Greek evidence (as the context implies, cf. 1.6). It is hard to imagine a strong objection being raised to Josephus’ assertion of the mere existence of Judeans in antiquity, on the superficial level he suggests. It was generally recognized that Greek historians were not well informed on oriental ancient history (as Josephus knows and uses for his ends in 1.6-29). All of Tacitus’ variant versions of Judean origins (*Hist.* 5.2-3) presuppose great antiquity; and it was widely believed that Moses was a figure of the distant past (cf. 2.156). Moreover, it would be highly convenient for Josephus to concoct a charge on these lines, both to provide some polemical occasion for his work (cf. *War* 1.1-3, 13-16) and to set up a Greek “straw man,” easily knocked down (1.6-26); so Droge 1996: 117-19, 140; Goodman 1999: 52-53; Gruen 2005: 40-41.

Yet there are reasons to think that there *may* have been some doubts expressed about Judean self-claims, at least concerning Judean *importance*. Josephus’ language here indicates that the matter is not directly about the ancient existence of the Judean people but is differently slanted. The issue is whether the Judeans were “worthy” of mention (μνήμης ἡξιῶσθαι), and whether they were mentioned by “the most renowned (ἐπιφανέϊς) Greek historians.” This suggests that the topic is Judean prestige, not mere existence: if the Judeans did not rate mention in such authoritative sources, they were clearly undistinguished, since renowned Greek historians could be relied upon to notice anyone who had a significant impact on history (cf. Diodorus 1.9.3: barbarians insist that their history is also “worthy of record”). Anyone familiar with the Greek historians would notice the complete lack of overlap between Josephus’ Judean history and the history recounted in the Greek tradition. It might be

claimed by some (and disputed by others) that Homer had alluded to them (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2.3), but that none of the famed historians so much as gave them a mention would naturally lead to the conclusion that they were a wholly insignificant people (cf. the concern at *Aristeas* 312). The circulation of a work on the Judeans attributed to the truly famous Hecataeus thus occasioned dispute and doubt: Herennius Philo (second century CE; Origen, *Cels.* 1.15) considered the work probably spurious, since it seemed so adulatory. At the start of his treatise on Moses, Philo complains that Greek men of letters (λόγιοι) have not regarded Moses as “worthy of mention” (μνήμης ἡξιῶσαι, *Mos.* 1.2). The similarity to Josephus’ statement might indicate a rhetorical trope, but it also suggests a common perception among Judeans that they were unfairly disregarded, because their ancient heroes were not mentioned by Greeks. Celsus, in fact, gives us good evidence of exactly this non-Judean viewpoint: the Judeans never did anything worthy of mention (ἀξιόλογον) and have never been of any significance, as witnessed by the fact that no event in their history is recorded by the Greeks (*apud* Origen, *Cels.* 4.31). It is quite possible that such an opinion circulated among *literati* in Josephus’ Rome, though not necessarily, as he suggests, in specific reaction to his own *Antiquities*. While some might agree with Josephus that Greek historiography was myopic (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.4.2; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.88), others could use Greek silence about Judeans as a weapon of denigration.

Another dimension to this issue has been suggested by Boys-Stones (2001: 44-95). He has shown that in post-Hellenistic Stoicism the question of the antiquity of nations was of major philosophical and cultural significance. The Stoic belief that the wisdom of the ancients was deposited in pure (even if cryptic) form led to the search for traces of this primitive truth; and those nations that could show loyalty to such traditions of ancient wisdom would have perfect justification for their customs, however awkward or unusual they may seem. In this context it was extremely important to show which traditions *were* ancient, and which were merely derivative (younger and corrupt versions of the original truth). The challenge to Judean antiquity could thus belong to a philosophical attack on the value and integrity of Judean culture (see further below, Reading Options to 1.219-320)

Josephus’ presentation of the matter may thus contain a grain of truth, but is misleading: although he seems aware that the issue is historical *importance* or *integrity* (1.1), he shifts the battle to the easier ground

those who insult us as guilty of malice and deliberate falsehood,<sup>20</sup> to correct the ignorance of others,<sup>21</sup> and to instruct all who wish to know the truth on the subject of our antiquity.<sup>22</sup> 4 I will employ as witnesses for my statements<sup>23</sup> those judged by the Greeks to be the most trustworthy on ancient history as a whole,<sup>24</sup> and I will

of mere historical *existence*. The issue is thus easily manipulated to his own ends: he can safely lambast Greek pretensions to knowledge of ancient history and can readily collect “witnesses,” who need only mention the Judeans in their narratives. At its deeper level, the issue concerns the solipsistic Greek criteria for “significance”: the only history worth recounting is what Greek historians know and relate. But Josephus will not challenge this cultural presumption head on. A swifter and easier case can be made if the issue is taken to be the mere existence of Judeans in antiquity.

<sup>19</sup> The fact that this clause is followed, irregularly, by three further infinitives expressing purpose has led to several textual conjectures: Niese minor omits “to write” (γράφαι), making the following infinitives depend on “it [was] necessary”; Bekker, Naber, and Münster (following the Latin) add καί (“and”) before “to convict,” to achieve the same result; Reinach inserts ὥστε (“with the result that”). But the syntax of prefaces is often convoluted, and it is probably better to leave the text as it stands. A condensed statement of decision and purpose is standard in prefaces, as is the claim to be brief (cf. 1.29, 58; 2.145; Alexander 1993: 94). “All these matters” is vague enough to embrace the topics highlighted in 1.1, together with the issues of 1.2.

<sup>20</sup> The first purpose relates to the first issue of 1.2, reflected in the repetition of “malice.” “Insult” (λοιδορέω) is another term strongly associated with the material in 1.219-2.144: it recurs in 1.219-20, 319 and frequently in the Apion segment (see note to “irksome” at 2.4). “Falsehood” (ψευδολογία) is also a recurrent charge against “Egyptians” (1.252, 267, 293, 318, etc.). The term alone could be free of moral blame (one can tell erroneous tales unwittingly), but the epithet “deliberate” removes that ambiguity (on “lies” in Greek historiography, see note to “matters” at 1.16). The moral tone suggests the translation of ἐλέγξει as “convict as guilty”; in other contexts Josephus uses this verb to speak of logical “proof” (e.g., 1.253), but since he usually attributes error to malicious motivation, the verb often hovers on the border between “prove,” “convict,” and “expose.”

<sup>21</sup> The second aim meets the second issue of 1.2, those who doubt Josephus on Judean antiquity. Josephus prefers to present this as a matter of factual correction, though 1.5 hints at a more sinister dimension to the problem of “ignorance.”

<sup>22</sup> The third clause relates more to the second purpose than to the first, and the category may be artificially created, out of the second, to create a rhetorical tricolon (cf. *War* 3.108-9). Although “truth” is at issue in both cases, “antiquity” (ἀρχαιότης) is the theme of the proofs running up to 1.218 (the term is repeated in 1.59, 69, 93, 160, 215, 217; cf. 2.1). This clause may be partly responsible for the common title accorded to this work in antiquity (see Introduction, § 4), but it hardly covers the whole treatise: after so much else in 1.219ff., it is listed as only one of the topics in the summation at 2.287-90. This generalized depiction of audience (cf. 2.296) is of little help in assessing Josephus’ intended readers (see Introduction, § 7), though the reference to “wishing” to know the truth (repeated in 2.296) perhaps hints at his awareness that he will only convince those who are willing to be persuaded (cf. *Ant.* 1.12). “The truth” will often be decided through a procedural asymmetry: while those who agree with Josephus’ argument, or his scriptures, are hailed as truth-telling, without scrutiny of their motives or bias, those whom Josephus refutes are subjected to lengthy analyses of their (improper) motives.

<sup>23</sup> 1.4-5 now indicates the means by which Josephus will achieve the aims of 1.3, though not in the sequence that he will follow; the substance is repeated in 1.58-59, in proper order. The two means mentioned in this section reflect the two challenges of 1.2, in reverse order. The appeal to witnesses (μάρτυρες, see note to “witnesses” at 1.70; the terminology permeates 1.69-218) is necessary to provide proof against the doubters, who have cited “evidence” (τεκμήριον, 1.2). The language hints at the development of a legal metaphor as if the Judean nation were here on trial; it thus provides a rhetorical link to the more developed forensic metaphors in later material (2.4, 147).

<sup>24</sup> Josephus will not dismiss the authority of the Greek tradition altogether, but will work within its parameters to relativize its significance; the tactic is deployed throughout 1.6-59, where the Greek historiographical tradition is utilized, both in self-criticism and in validation of others considered more “trustworthy” (the three nations of 1.8-9, here still unnamed). The statement thus looks forward to the segments on Egyptian, Phoenician, and Chaldean witness in 1.73-160. ἀξιόπιστότατοι (“most trustworthy”) echoes both ἀπιστέω (“disbelieve”) and ἀξιόω (“think worthy”) in 1.2.

show that those who have written about us slanderously and falsely are convicted by themselves.<sup>25</sup> **5** I will try also to explain the reasons why not many Greeks made mention of our nation in their histories;<sup>26</sup> at the same time, however, I will draw attention to those who have not passed over the history which relates to us<sup>27</sup> for those who are, or feign to be, ignorant.<sup>28</sup>

*Comparative Historiography (1.6-59): Reading Options*

The introductory segment on historiography (1.6-59) had not been announced as part of Josephus' strategy in 1.4-5, and since he has to restate his agenda in 1.58-59 it might be taken to interrupt and delay his program. However, it takes its point of departure from the reference to the trust accorded to "renowned Greek historians" in 1.2, and offers an immediate counter-thrust to the cultural presumption that Josephus detects among his doubters. The material here will not be appealed to in later segments; indeed, in its strong repudiation of Greek historians, it is partly incompatible with the use of Greek witnesses in 1.161-214. Nonetheless, it provides a rhetorical foundation for the rest of the treatise in three respects. In the first place, in subverting cultural confidence in "Greek" historiography (1.6-27), it encourages receptivity to alternative versions of history. Secondly, it validates Judean historiography, and specifically the Judean scriptures (1.28-44), which will undergird the truth-claims in the rest of the treatise. Thirdly, it demonstrates Josephus' expertise as an historian in relation to both his earlier works (1.45-56) and thus establishes his *ethos* as a reliable authority in the treatise to follow. The fact that the segment starts and finishes on a polemical note enhances its rhetorical appeal; indeed, its combination of learning and polemics makes it one of the most arresting portions of the whole work.

The segment is structured to flow from the negative to the positive. The extended salvo against Greeks, in their ignorance of antiquity (1.6-27), is followed by an assertion of the superior records of other nations, and especially those preserved by Judeans (1.28-29). Examples of the latter are identified first in priestly records (1.30-36) and then in the 22 books of scripture (1.37-41). A comparison between Judean and Greek attitudes to their respective records (1.42-45) leads into

<sup>25</sup> The terminology indicates the authors whom people "attend to" in 1.2, and whom Josephus will convict of "falsehood," not least by showing how they contradict themselves. This anticipates 1.219-2.144, where the self-refutation takes the form of contradicting one another (e.g., 1.303, echoing this statement) and individually contradicting themselves (1.226, e.g., of Manetho in 1.230-32, 253-87; of Apion in 2.17, 137-39). The language here (as in 1.219) is ambiguous enough to cover both collective and individual self-incrimination. As Quintilian noted (*Inst.* 5.7.29), turning one's opponents' arguments against themselves is one of the most effective rhetorical strategies.

<sup>26</sup> This looks forward chiefly to 1.60-68 (lack of contact between Judeans and Greeks), but the silence is given additional explanation in 1.6-27 (Greeks do not know about antiquity anyway) and in 1.213-14 (a case of hostility towards Judeans). Josephus thus partially concedes the charge of 1.2 (though not its implication of the Judeans' historical insignificance). But, as the next clause shows, he will not concede it altogether. Although this double strategy is not without internal tension, it gives the impression of providing a more

than adequate answer to the challenge.

<sup>27</sup> "Draw attention" (ποιήσω φανερούς) echoes the Greek of the opening statement of 1.1 ("made clear"), providing a linguistic bracket for the preface. Josephus will not allow that there is no Greek historical reference at all (the criterion of "most renowned" historians in 1.2 is quietly dropped), and thus announces the section of Greek witnesses in 1.161-218. "Not passed over" allows a minimal degree of attention to the Judeans, as is often the case with the sources collected in that segment. Now all the main segments in 1.60-2.144 have been mentioned, though not in the order in which they will appear. 1.6-59 thus stands outside the pre-announced scheme, with a preliminary role relevant to the proof of Judean antiquity (1.69-214). On the status of 2.145-286, see note to "Molon" at 2.145 and Introduction, § 1.

<sup>28</sup> Correcting ignorance was one of the aims of 1.3, but a twist is here added in the suspicion that at least some of the "ignorance" may be feigned. This injects a dose of polemic sufficient to justify the sharpness which hovers around the edge of an otherwise unemotional argument (cf. 1.72, 213-14).

discussion of the historiography of the Judean War (1.46-56) in which Josephus' extended self-praise (1.47-52) turns out to be apologetically slanted against anonymous critics (1.53-56). Returning from this "digression" (1.57), Josephus briefly summarizes his thesis before restating his agenda for the rest of the treatise (1.58-59). Despite its diversity, the segment is held together by its focus on historiography and by the recurrent antithesis with "Greeks" (after 1.6-27 at 1.44, 58). Although the digression threatens to derail the argument, not least in its shift to *contemporary* historiography, rhetorical elisions enable Josephus to maintain the impression of a coherent discourse.

Josephus' assault on Greek historians expands themes already outlined in the preface of his *War* (1.13-16). His historiographical principles (accuracy, eye-witness evidence, impartiality, reliable sources, facts v. rhetoric) are standard themes in his work, as in ancient historiography in general (see Marincola 1997). His self-defense has many points of overlap with the apologetic digression directed at Justus of Tiberias in *Life* 336-67, but no mention is made of that earlier (?) treatment. Newly developed here are an emphasis on *documentary* sources, and a claim that the critical tradition in Greek historiography discredits it all. Josephus has sufficient knowledge of the Greek intellectual tradition to expand and refocus his earlier polemical asides, in ways that fit the new rhetorical context.

*Roman or Romanized readers* (for the category, see Introduction, § 13) would find much congenial material in this segment. Greek historiography was initially received in Rome with the same ambivalence as other features of Hellenism (see Gruen 1990; 1992), though the subsequent presence in Rome of flattering Greek historians (e.g., Diodorus; Dionysius of Halicarnassus) could reduce suspicion. Since they had no comparable tradition of their own, Roman authors and politicians could exploit or excoriate Greek historiography according to their needs (Wardman 1976: 74-110; Wallace-Hadrill 1988). Thus Josephus' opening assault on Greek historians could gain a sympathetic hearing in Rome, especially in its resonance with general Roman stereotypes about the Greeks (Haarhoff 1948: 203-65; Petrochilos 1974; Balsdon 1979: 30-54; Rawson 1992). His most prominent charge, that Greeks were arrogant and self-obsessed (1.6, 15) mirrors a common Roman complaint (e.g., Pliny, *Nat.* 3.42; 37.31; in relation to history, Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.88). In addition, his presentation of Greeks as impossibly vain and inveterate liars (1.15-23) parallels a strong strain of Roman distrust: authors as diverse as Valerius Maximus (4.7.4: *gens ad fingendum parata*), Pliny (*Nat.* 28.112: *mendacia Graecae vanitatis*) and Juvenal (10.174-75: *quidquid Graecia mendax audet in historia*) trade in this common stereotype. In a brief but telling vignette, Josephus paints a picture of Greek wordsmiths, whose clever rhetoric and sly self-adaptation enables them to invent whatever will please their hearers (1.24-27); the passage bulges with Roman prejudice (see notes ad loc.) and places Josephus in a long line of Roman anxiety about the place of rhetoric in historiography (cf. Cicero, *De or.* 2.51-64; T. Wiseman 1979; Woodman 1988). Although he knows about Roman historians (e.g., Livy, *Ant.* 14.68), Josephus offers no criticism of Roman historians in this context.

Josephus contrasts the failings of Greek historiography with the ancient records preserved by certain other nations, specifically Egyptians, Chaldeans, Phoenicians, and Judeans. As he admits (1.8-10) he builds here on a tradition established by Greeks themselves, though he uses it now for very different purposes. The tradition had been introduced to Rome by Greeks in universal histories such as that by Diodorus, where the "ancient lore" (ἀρχαιολογία) of Egypt, Babylon, the Medes, the Chaldeans, Arabia, and India had been accorded an antiquity far greater than that of Greece or Europe. It is Josephus' strategy to smuggle Judeans into this company (1.8, 28-29) and, judging from Tacitus' survey of opinions (*Hist.* 5.2-3), there was no strong prejudice in Rome against Judean antiquity as such. Indeed, in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE Alexander "Polyhistor" had collected and published in Rome compilations of material about Judeans (as well as Egyptians and Chaldeans). Whether Judeans should be believed in their own accounts of their ancient history was, of course, another matter. There is some evidence for a receptivity in Rome to newly "discovered" sources on eastern history: alternative accounts of the Trojan War were circulating in Josephus' lifetime (attributed to Dictys of Crete and Dares of Phrygia) and a near-contemporary, Philo of Byblos (64-141 CE), gained credence for his claim to publish an ancient Phoenician source that refuted Greek historians (Attridge & Oden: 1981; Bowersock 1994: 43-48). On the other hand, a strong strain of Roman skepticism greeted native versions of their own histories:



Cicero, like Diodorus, thought Chaldean claims absurd (*Div.* 1.36-37; Diodorus 2.31.9), and from Cato (frag. 45) to Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.11.3) foreign histories were apt to be regarded as corrupted by myth and self-delusion (cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* 11.5.3-5). How Josephus' claims for Judean antiquity fared would depend on wider attitudes to Judeans and their culture: a nation regarded as insignificant or despicable would (and will) never have its version of history taken seriously.

Josephus' appeal to the Judean priestly records (1.30-36) might sound parallel to the Roman annalistic tradition, where that was taken to represent the archives of the *pontifices maximi* or the *tabula apud pontificem* (Rawson 1971; Frier 1979). But these, as everyone knew, went no further back than 500 BCE, and the Judean claim to record history accurately from the beginning of time (some 5,000 years) was bound to raise eyebrows. Following a Greek scheme, Varro (*apud* Censorinus, *DN* 21.1.1) divided time into three periods: the mythical (up to the first cataclysm), the "obscure" (up to the first Olympiad), and the historical. Anyone familiar with the Thucydidean tradition would know of the standard doubts surrounding the really ancient, "mythical" traditions. While Dionysius of Halicarnassus is glad of those who simply handed down traditions of the past "without adding to or subtracting from them," he knows that these accounts, believed from remote antiquity and passed down through the generations, contain legends which "people nowadays think quite silly" (*Thuc.* 5-7). Josephus' claim that Judeans were committed from childhood to believe their national records (1.42) could thus win as much criticism from an unsympathetic reader as admiration from those who shared this conservative instinct. In particular, his extraordinary claims for the authority of Judean "prophets" as historians, and for Moses' knowledge of the 3,000 years of preceding history "by inspiration from God" (1.37-41) would surely startle all but the most sympathetic reader. Whatever may be the case for other genres, there is no precedent in Roman (or Greek) culture for the notion that historiography could be attributed this directly to the divine.

As Livy's preface illustrates, when dealing with ancient claims for which normal rules of evidence do not apply, what counts is the authority of those who relate the stories: Rome has sufficient power to be allowed to say that she was founded by Mars, and other nations can submit to this claim with as much good grace as they submit to her *imperium* (preface, 6). Rival historiographies were thus a reflection of competitive claims to power. Where Judean culture was despised, Josephus' claims for Judean history and scripture had no chance of winning acceptance. Perhaps only those Roman readers who were generally sympathetic to Judean culture would be able to entertain Josephus' remarkable "truths." For others, such credence in Moses' *arcanum volumen* (Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.102) was bound to look absurd.

Among *Judean readers*, whatever the diversity of views about the contents of the "scriptures," Josephus' validation of Judean records was bound to be welcome. If the attack by Justus of Tiberias had damaged Josephus' reputation, his self-defense, and his self-presentation as an expert in the "philosophy" of the Judean texts (1.54), may have helped restore Judean confidence. The opening argument that the Greeks were comparatively young (1.6-14) chimes with a long tradition of Judean efforts to place their nation among the very earliest representatives of humanity, and as the inventors of key elements in the culture of the ancient world. Such competitive bids for the status of "first discoverers" were a notable part of cultural interaction in the Hellenistic world, and many Judean authors (e.g., Aristobulus, Artapanus, Eupolemus, Ps.-Eupolemus) had boldly staked their claims for the Judean patriarchs as benefactors in this sense (see Thraede 1962a; Wacholder 1974; Droge 1989). Josephus elsewhere makes a modest gesture in this direction (*Ant.* 1.165-68, on Abraham), but here declines to make specific claims about Greek dependence on *Judean* culture (cf. 1.168; 2.168).

*Early Christian readers* showed far less interest in this preliminary segment than in the proofs of Judean antiquity to follow. In our time period (see Introduction, § 8) Eusebius is the only Christian known to cite from this segment. (Tatian's argument that Moses was older than Homer (*Ad Gr.* 31) seems to be independent of Josephus (Droge 1989: 96, n.56; cf. Schreckenberg 1996: 66). The first passage to catch Eusebius' eye is Josephus' opening argument about the comparative youth of the Greeks (1.6-14). In showing that it made sense for Christianity to follow Hebrew rather than Greek theology, the greater antiquity of Moses and the prophets was of some importance, and the old (originally *Greek*) testimony that the earliest Greek culture was derived from more ancient nations was a useful rhetorical weapon. Eusebius was by no means the first Chris-



tian to exploit this line of argument (Pilhofer 1990). In his discussion of this matter in *Praeparatio Evangelica* Book 10, he first cites Clement of Alexandria at length, but then utilizes *Apion* 1.6-26 (in *Praep. ev.* 10.7.1-21), before turning to a longer set of citations from Diodorus. The most apposite material for Eusebius is clearly 1.6-14; the following discussion of Greek historiographical dissonance (1.15-26) is hardly relevant. But the location of this Josephan citation, sandwiched between larger and more impressive blocks of evidence, suggests that, while Josephus was of a special interest to Eusebius, in this context his testimony was of supplementary, not foundational, importance.

Josephus' description of the Judean scriptures (1.37-42) is the other passage of sufficient interest to Eusebius to be cited in full (*Hist. eccl.* 3.10). But this is not integrated into a larger discussion of the biblical canon, only cited in passing as other interesting material found in Josephus (after long quotations of his account of the siege of Jerusalem). Among earlier Christian scholars who commented on the canon of Judean scriptures (e.g., Melito, Hippolytus, and Origen), our passage was either unknown or not directly discussed (see Beckwith 1985).

*Western scholarship* has paid little sustained attention to this segment, despite Momigliano's estimation of this text as "one of the most important discussions on historiography left to us by Antiquity" (1969: 36). Two scholars have recently underlined its importance for understanding Josephus' ideology. Rajak, who considers Josephus here to be "at his most original and interesting" (2002: 11), explores the presuppositions of Josephus' sense of history and notes the way he writes largely within the terms of the Greek tradition, but positions himself outside the framework of Greek thought in a "fusion" or "blend" of two cultures (1986; cf. Schäublin 1982). She also notes the emphasis on revelation as the basis for biblical truth, and compares Josephus' attitude to national "records" with the histories emanating from other eastern nations, such as Egypt (Manetho) and Babylonia (Berossos) (2002: 241-55). Cohen's important article on our passage (1988) also highlights the peculiarities of Josephus' historiographical criteria and the difference between his model of history as "testimony" and the Greek tradition of criticism. As he notes, Josephus "learned historical criticism from the Greeks, but in the *Against Apion* the student turns upon his masters" (1988: 11). The cultural dynamics inherent in this rhetorical move are what we will explore in our postcolonial reading (below).

On the whole, scholarly interest has been focused on isolated features of the text. Josephus' critique of Greek historiography has been disregarded as a recycling of old motifs; only his statement about the oral tradition behind the poems of Homer (1.12) has stood out, constituting an important clue for modern scholarship on the Homeric corpus (Wolf 1795). His comments on his writing of the *War* have attracted little interest except for one, almost throwaway, remark about his use of "collaborators" (συνεργοί, 1.50). Thackeray's fascination with these "assistants" (1929) has spawned two generations of debate about Josephus' methods of composition (see notes ad loc.). Apart from these, only Josephus' statement about the 22 books of the Jewish scriptures (1.37-41) has attracted much interest, with the recent reignition of debate about the formation of the biblical "canon" (see Lebram 1968; Meyer 1974; Chapman 2000; McDonald and Sanders 2002). But it is rare to find this paragraph interpreted in context (Höffken 2001 and Mason 2002 are notable exceptions) since the wider discourse has been subject to so little analysis.

My *postcolonial reading* of this segment is founded in recent discussions of the problems and possibilities of postcolonial historiography (see Barclay 2005b and further literature cited there). The question that Josephus raises in 1.6 concerns cultural authority: why should "renowned" Greek judgments on antiquity be taken to be true? In his assault on Hellenocentric presumptions (exaggerated by his rhetoric), Josephus' discourse raises issues parallel to the postcolonial challenge to Western historiography: his objections are reminiscent of Césaire's complaint that "the only history is white" (1972: 54). Why should Greeks be allowed to determine what is "significant" enough to mention? Who decides which are the "reliable" sources for history? More fundamentally, what are the appropriate frameworks, paradigms, and methods of historiography, and is the Greek regime of truth (acquired through critical scrutiny, comparison, and sifting of sources) superior or inferior to the Judean reliance on authoritative narratives? Postcolonialism asks about the terms in which politically subordinated cultures can tell their own historical narratives, and how such "autohistories" (my term) negotiate the terms and conditions imposed by the ruling cultural discourse. As a spokesman for an ancient but patronized culture—comparable to

Manetho or Berossos in antiquity, or “subaltern” historians from India today—Josephus provides a particularly interesting example of the cultural “hybridity” created by engagement with the dominant cultural tradition, and nowhere more so than in this opening segment on historical methodology.

The power dynamics of this engagement are made complex by the fact that the “Greek” tradition to which he responds was already, in Josephus’ day, expropriated and relativized by the Roman empire, and was in some senses itself another colonized culture (see Goldhill 2001). The ground from which Josephus assaults “the Greeks” is thus not as dangerous as at first appears: he has allies in the Roman tradition who could afford, when it suited, to be just as dismissive of the Greeks (see above). Positioning himself outside the Greek tradition and among “barbarians” (1.8, 58), Josephus overturns Greek presumptions of superiority without placing Judeans in isolation. The delicate ways in which he refers to the recent Judean Revolt against Rome (1.34, 46), and his tactful references to theater-martyrdoms (avoiding mention of the Romans who used these deaths for public entertainment, 1.43), suggest an effort to enable an implicit alliance between Roman and Judean perspectives on the topics under discussion.

But Josephus’ stance towards the Greek tradition is not simply that of an external critic. Subtly insinuating himself into centuries-old debates (see Schäublin 1982), Josephus exploits the fissures of Greek internal disagreement, turning limited differences into fundamental critiques, and placing the Greek habit of self-reflexive criticism into a new and more damaging framework by deploying it, as a non-Greek, against the whole Greek tradition. Josephus’ most polemical passages have their foundation in motifs with a long Greek pedigree: he silently uses Herodotus, Thucydides, and Plato (1.8-14), even while ridiculing the tradition to which they belong. Appealing to the *Greek* recognition of the temporal priority of other nations, and the essentially *Greek* criteria of “accuracy” and documentary evidence, Josephus siphons off such cultural capital to the credit of his own Judean tradition.

The full dimensions of this skillful transculturation are not apparent until Josephus turns from his critical to his constructive argument at 1.28. At first the “greater” Judean care for “records” (1.28-29) might look like a simple claim to outperform the Greeks on their own ground, but it slowly emerges that Josephus is operating by a distinctive “philosophy” (1.54) which is not the same as Greek “wisdom” (1.51). The most crucial statement of this alternative ideology is the description of Judean scriptures in 1.37-41, which stresses not only the harmony and accuracy of such sources, but also their *necessarily* unchallengeable authority, based on the inspiration of God accorded to Moses and the prophets. The emphasis here on “learning” (μανθάνω) as the proper mode of knowledge (rather than scrutiny and challenge) betokens a distinctively Judean regime of truth, which substitutes submission to divine authority for the ideology of control prevalent in Greek discussions of historiography.

By inserting these special claims into an otherwise standard discussion of the rules of history, Josephus creates a special form of “hybridity” which does not simply add to, but subtly destabilizes, the historiographical tradition to which he contributes (see Bhabha 1994). Josephus does not present Judean culture as a wholly alien tradition: he does not invert Greek claims completely, nor criticise the Greeks for their failure to produce authoritative “prophets.” But neither is his stance unambiguously mimetic, forcing the Judean tradition to compete on purely “Greek” terms. His strategy is more subtle and, potentially, more threatening to the metropolitan tradition: by introducing a different historiographical logic, he disturbs the rules by which “truth” is normally discerned and decided. He thus provides a fine example of that “mirror-dance” in which a native “autohistory” deploys select elements of the hegemonic discourse in order to establish its own self-affirmation, for reception in the metropolis (imperial Rome). But this is no mere embedding of Judean culture within a majority discourse, or even a simple “fusion” of two compatible traditions. By inserting distinctively Judean claims into the long-running debates of the Greco-Roman world, Josephus introduces a different canon of authority and a subtly different understanding of the task of the historian. It was a strategy which early Christianity subsequently learned to deploy in order to crack open the authority of the whole Greco-Roman intellectual tradition, with enormous consequences for western history.

(1.2) 6 The first thing that occurs to me is utter astonishment<sup>29</sup> at those who think one should pay attention only to Greeks on matters of great antiquity, expecting to learn the truth from them, while disbelieving us and the rest of humanity.<sup>30</sup> For my part, I find the very opposite of this to be the case,<sup>31</sup> if indeed one should not follow worthless opinions but derive a right conclusion from the facts themselves.<sup>32</sup> 7 For everything to do with the Greeks I have found<sup>33</sup> to be recent, so to speak from yesterday or the day before<sup>34</sup>—I mean the founding of cities, and matters concerning the invention of arts and the recording of laws;<sup>35</sup> and just about the most recent of

*The absurdity  
of claims for  
the Greeks*

<sup>29</sup> The prominence of personal and emotional language gives this preliminary segment an immediate rhetorical draw. “Astonishment” is a familiar rhetorical mask for rebuke or scorn (cf. Paul in Gal 1:6); Josephus uses cognate terms in sarcastic comment on Apion (2.12, 20, 25, 125, etc.).

<sup>30</sup> The language echoes 1.2, but if Josephus there only half represents the issues at stake, he now exaggerates the viewpoint of his doubters to assist his rhetoric (cf. 1.161). It is hard to imagine that anyone argued that *only* Greek historians should be trusted; in fact, as 1.8-9 suggests, even Greeks looked to others for information about ancient history. But by restating the matter in this way, representing the doubt as directed against “us” (not just Josephus’ *Antiquities*, but Judeans as a whole), and by adding “and the rest of humanity,” Josephus can suggest a generalized cultural antagonism between Greeks and everyone else. When the (artificial) charge is then reversed, Josephus can embed the authority of Judean historiography among well-respected examples of “the rest of humanity” (cf. 1.8, 28-29, 58) who put Greek historiography to shame. The issue is “truth,” the theme that will dominate this segment (1.15, 24, 26-27, 47, 50, 52, 56).

<sup>31</sup> The rhetorical tactic of reversing one’s opponents’ arguments leads Josephus into denial of any historical worth in Greek historiography; only at the very end is a more nuanced statement allowed (1.58).

<sup>32</sup> The tone and vocabulary (not following ματαίαι δόξαι, but deriving τὸ δίκαιον from the πράγματα) evokes the “philosophical” pursuit of truth, which attacks mere fancy (cf. 1.211); the opposite view is ἄλογον (“absurd,” 1.15). Philosophical criteria will be evoked more explicitly in 2.145-286, not least in refutation of erroneous δόξαι (2.169, 239, 258). “The facts” appealed to are common opinion (e.g., 1.7-15, 28-29), and, for Josephus, the most crucial is the authority of the biblical books, which are “rightly trusted” (δικαίως πεπιστευμένα, 1.38).

<sup>33</sup> Translating ἤνρον (“I have found”) suggested by the Latin (*cognovi*) and supported by Reinach and Münster, in preference to the optative εὔροι (in L and Eusebius, supported by Niese and Thackeray), which

lacks a subject. Other emendations are possible.

<sup>34</sup> The idiom (χθές καὶ πρόην) is repeated as ἐχθές καὶ πρόην in 2.14 and 2.154 also in relation to the Greeks; cf. *Ant.* 2.348; 18.243. It has its roots in a famous passage in Herodotus 2.53, where Herodotus uses this idiomatic expression to contrast the antiquity of Egyptian theology with the recent Greek knowledge of the Gods (Homer and Hesiod being only 400 years in the past). It is used by Plato in a passage closely parallel to our text: Greek inventions in arts, and the founding of cities, are only 1,000 or 2,000 years old, that is, compared to Egypt, only yesterday or the day before (ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν χθές καὶ πρόην γεγονότα, *Leg.* 677d; cf. Droge 1989: 43). That Josephus should (silently) use Herodotus and/or Plato here on this critical point, where Greeks acknowledged their historical inferiority, is a symptom of his tactic throughout 1.6-26, to deploy Greek self-criticism and self-deprecation in a blanket critique of Greek historiography. The trope of Greek youth (compared to Egyptian antiquity) echoes through later Greek literature, e.g., Plato, *Tim.* 22b-c (cf. 1.10 below); Aristotle, *Pol.* 1329b. For Josephus the crucial term here is “recent” (νέα), in counter-echo of the claim that the Judean nation is “more recent” (νεώτερον, 1.2; cf. Plato, *Tim.* 22b on the Greeks as νέοι). Josephus will not allow that a “recent” nation, such as the Greeks, might have better critical tools for judging the ancient history of other nations; for him accurate historiography requires the faithful transmission of one’s own ancient records and in this the Greeks are evidently inferior for the reasons to be discussed.

<sup>35</sup> These three items together encapsulate a Greek understanding of “civilization” and play on familiar Greek themes (cf. Diodorus 1.2). The founding myths of many Greek cities (e.g., Thebes and Argos) involve settlers coming from more ancient civilizations such as Egypt (cf. 1.103). The “invention of arts” (τεχνάϊ) alludes to the theme of “first inventor,” in which other nations regularly claimed priority over the Greeks (see note to “intellectuals” at 2.135). The third item (cf. 1.21; 2.151-56) is carefully phrased to include the key term “recording” (lit. “records,” ἀναγραφάς), since what matters for Josephus is not having laws but having

*Superior  
eastern  
traditions*

*Greek  
civilization is  
comparatively  
new*

all for them is care in relation to the writing of histories.<sup>36</sup> **8** However, they certainly themselves acknowledge<sup>37</sup> that matters to do with the Egyptians and Chaldeans and Phoenicians<sup>38</sup>—for the moment I refrain from adding ourselves to this list<sup>39</sup>—enjoy an extremely ancient and extremely stable tradition of memorialization.<sup>40</sup> **9** For these all inhabit places which are least subject to the catastrophic effects of climate,<sup>41</sup> and they have applied great forethought to leaving nothing of what happens among them unrecorded,<sup>42</sup> but to have them consecrated continuously in public records composed by the wisest individuals.<sup>43</sup> **10** The region of Greece, on the other hand,<sup>44</sup> has been

them *in writing*. The prominence of this theme is indicated by the profusion of terms from the γραφ- root in 1.6-59: γράφω (1.20, 21, 24, 25, 26[*bis*], 37, 41, 45, 55); ἀναγράφω (1.49); ὑπογράφω (1.37); ἐπιγράφω (1.46); συγγράφω (1.7, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 33, 37, 40, 45, 57); συγγραφεύς (1.15, 23, 27, 58); ἀναγραφή (1.7, 9, 11, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 36, 38, 43, 47, 58); γράμματα (1.10, 11[*bis*], 12, 21, 22, 28, 35, 54[*bis*], 59); συγγράμματα (1.44). For Josephus everything hinges on the reliability of *written* tradition.

<sup>36</sup> This (unsupported) claim is placed last for emphasis, since this is the central issue. Lack of “care” (ἐπιμέλεια) in historiography (cf. 1.9, 21, 28-29) suggests a cultural deficiency more damaging to Greek honor than the accidents of history (1.10). The phrase seems to denote care *in* the composition of history, rather than care *about* it, but both may be implied.

<sup>37</sup> If others appeal to the authority of Greeks (1.2), Josephus will do so too (cf. 1.4)—but here in order to undercut (supposed) Greek pretensions. It is hard to see how this acknowledgement by Greeks can be squared with the self-importance attributed to them in 1.15.

<sup>38</sup> The three peoples are chosen to match the three categories of “witness” whom Josephus will employ in 1.69-160; cf. 1.10, 14, 28. The antiquity of Egypt was discussed in educated circles from the time of Hecataeus and Herodotus and was taken for granted by Josephus’ contemporaries (sufficient to be satirized by Lucian, *Sacr.* 14). The Chaldeans were an ethnic group or priestly caste associated with Babylonia, with a reputation for astrology dependent on the possession of extremely ancient records of the stars (see below, *Chaldean Evidence (1.128-60): Reading Options*). The Phoenicians, taken by Greeks as their teachers in the alphabet (see at 1.10), were also reputed to have ancient records. At the time of Josephus, Philo of Byblos (70-160 CE) claimed to translate material from the Phoenician Sanchuniathon, whose accounts of life before and during the Trojan War were gaining credence in some quarters as more reliable than Homer; see Baumgarten 1981; Attridge & Oden 1981; Bowersock 1994: 43-48.

<sup>39</sup> The seemingly modest gesture (discarded in 1.28-29) is enough to affect the reading of all that follows,

suggesting that Judeans could be taken as included in this excellent company. Of course precisely this insinuation is what would be resisted by Josephus’ critics. Greek lists of ancient oriental nations (Egyptians, Chaldeans, Assyrians, Persians, Indians) never include Judeans, except as offshoots from one or another. Celsus pointedly refused to include Judeans in such distinguished company (*apud* Origen, *Cels.* 1.14; 6.78-80).

<sup>40</sup> I translate μνήμη as “memorialization” to include both memory and record. Both antiquity and stability are important to Josephus. He does not commit himself to precision on the antiquity. Cf. Herodotus’ claim to more than 11,000 years of recorded Egyptian history (2.100, 143) and Diodorus’ statement on Chaldean tradition, passed on from father to son for 473,000 years (2.29; 2.31.9). The implied contrast is with Greek novelty and *instability*, the latter to be stressed in 1.10. Herodotus is close to the surface here: “the Egyptians, by their practice of keeping records (μνήμη), have made themselves the best historians (λογιώτατοι) of any nation I have encountered” (2.77.1).

<sup>41</sup> The general claim, advanced to contrast with 1.10, derives from a particular tradition concerning Egypt: that she had a sufficiently good climate to escape radical change (Herodotus 2.77) and had not been affected by the flood of Deucalion (Diodorus 1.10.4). The Chaldeans and Phoenicians are allowed to ride on this Egyptian tradition. For comparison of the climate of Asia and Europe, see Hippocrates, *Aer.* 12-24.

<sup>42</sup> ἄμνηστον echoes μνήμη (“memorialization,” 1.8). The claim suggests a comprehensiveness which is wildly exaggerated, but Josephus does not know enough, or wish, to describe the narrow compass of these records; in a similar vein, he will use the Judean priest-lists to generalize about Judean historiography (1.30-36).

<sup>43</sup> Each of the terms is carefully chosen. “Consecrated” (καθιερώω, an unusual term in this context) suggests security and stability, and echoes the Chaldean reputation as priests, and the role of priests in Egyptian historiography (cf. 1.28, 73 and Herodotus book 2, *passim*); Diodorus, drawing on Hecataeus, refers to Egyptian “holy records” (1.44.4; 46.7). “Continu-



affected by numerous catastrophes that have wiped out the memory of past events;<sup>45</sup> and since they were repeatedly establishing new ways of life, the people of each period thought that their time was the beginning of everything,<sup>46</sup> and it was late—and with difficulty—that they learned the nature of the alphabet.<sup>47</sup> In any case, those who wish its use to be the most ancient pride themselves on learning it from the Phoenicians and Cadmus.<sup>48</sup> **11** In fact, no-one would be able to produce any record even from that date,<sup>49</sup> preserved either in temples or on public monuments,<sup>50</sup> seeing that, even with regard to those who fought against Troy so many years later,<sup>51</sup> it has become a question of considerable uncertainty and research as to whether they used writing; and the true, prevailing view is rather that they did not know the present mode of writing.<sup>52</sup> **12** Across the board among the Greeks no authentic writing is to

*Greek literature  
is recent*

ously” underlines the claim that there is no break in tradition (cf. 1.8). “Public records” (δημοσίου ἀναγραφάι) implies both public authorization and public accessibility (cf. 1.11, 21). “Wisest” reflects the Chaldeans’ reputation (cf. 1.28, 129) and the notion of Egyptian priests as “philosophers” (1.28; 2.140; cf. Herodotus 2.160 on Egyptians as the wisest people). The Phoenicians had no comparable reputation, but can be included here by association.

<sup>44</sup> To the charge of carelessness in record-keeping (1.7) Josephus now adds two reasons why Greece was in any case *unable* to keep records: the repeated destruction of civilizations and the late discovery of writing. He can advance both as well-known tropes in discourse on Greece, but only the second is elaborated in detail (1.10-12).

<sup>45</sup> Josephus aims for maximum contrast with the statements of 1.8-9: the regions *the least* subject to catastrophe (1.9) are here contrasted with a land subject to *numerous* catastrophes (1.10). The motif is at least as old as Plato, *Tim.* 21e-23c, where the exposure of Greece to repeated conflagrations and floods is contrasted to the safety of Egypt, as an explanation of the “youth” of Greek culture; cf. Plato, *Leg.* 677a-678a. The theme is recycled right through antiquity (cf. Celsus *apud* Origen, *Cels.* 1.20). Josephus was aware of Greek flood stories which he connects to Noah (*Ant.* 1.93-95), but he does not specify here the well-known floods associated with Ogygus and Deucalion.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Plato, *Tim.* 23b: disasters leave only the unlettered (ἀγράμματοι) so that the Greeks become “young” again and again, with no knowledge of what happened in ancient times; cf. *Leg.* 680a; *Crit.* 109d. Once again Josephus is using against Greeks a motif which originates in the Greek tradition.

<sup>47</sup> The late origin of the Greek alphabet is a motif broadly discussed in Greek literature (see below); its acquisition “with difficulty” (cf. 1.66) is a slur on the intelligence of Greeks, which places them in contrast with the “wisest individuals” active in other nations (1.9).

<sup>48</sup> Josephus’ wording suggests both skepticism (those who *wish* its use to be most ancient) and scorn: if they are *proud* to have *learned* the alphabet from another nation, the Greeks trumpet their own cultural inferiority (cf. 1.14)! Throughout this section, “learning” (μανθάνω) signals subordination to a superior authority (1.14, 23, 37; cf. 1.22). The introduction of the alphabet to Greece by Cadmus, the legendary Phoenician founder of Thebes, is a tradition already familiar to Herodotus (5.58-61) and passed on through antiquity (cf. Ephorus *FGH* 70, frag. 105a; Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 738f; Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.14). For Josephus the Phoenician origin is crucial, to support his inclusion of that nation in the ancient company of Egyptians and Chaldeans (1.8). For Judean attempts to go one better, making Judeans the source of Phoenician knowledge of the alphabet, cf. Eupolemus *apud* Clement, *Strom.* 1.23.153.4 (Holladay 1983, frag. 1).

<sup>49</sup> Josephus is vague, as Cadmus is undatable; he is simply presumed to be “many years” before the Trojan War (below; cf. Labow 2005: 16, n.32). Homer refers to the inhabitants of Thebes as “Cadmeii” (*Il.* 4.388) or “Cadmeiones” (*Il.* 4.385). “Record” (ἀναγραφή) is the third use of this term since 1.7 (see note to “laws” ad loc.).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. the twinning of “consecrated” and “public” in 1.10. Josephus takes this absence of evidence to raise questions about the Greek ability to write, thus not committing himself to the Cadmus-legend while silently alluding to the claim of Herodotus (5.58-61) to have seen three inscriptions in “Cadmean letters” in the temple of Ismeneian Apollo at Thebes, which he dates to 2/3 generations after Cadmus (Gutschmid 389).

<sup>51</sup> Again no dates are provided and Josephus’ chronology throughout lacks precision (see at 1.104). Eratosthenes (3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE) had provided a widely accepted date for the fall of Troy as 1184 BCE.

<sup>52</sup> Josephus begins to display his cultural expertise—knowing both that there is debate and what is the majority opinion—and notably changes the issue from use of any sort of writing to knowledge of writing in



be found older than Homer's poem, and he clearly lived after the Trojan events;<sup>53</sup> and even he, they say, did not leave his own poem in written form, but it was transmitted by memory and later put together from its recital in songs, and for this reason has many internal discrepancies.<sup>54</sup> **13** On the other hand, those of their number who attempted to write histories<sup>55</sup>—I mean such as Cadmus the Milesian<sup>56</sup> and the Argive Acusilaus<sup>57</sup> and any others that may be cited after him<sup>58</sup>—lived only a little

“the present mode.” He thus protects himself against alternative readings of the famous passage on which this debate hinged, the reference to the writing of “baneful signs” (σήματα λυγρά) at Homer, *Il.* 6.168-69. Opinions in antiquity were divided as to whether this represented alphabetic script, e.g., in scholia on Homer (Dindorf 1875: 1.235) and on Dionysius of Thrace (Hilgard 1901: 185); the modern debate on this passage began with Wolf 1795 (see now Kirk 1990: 181-82, with further literature). But since most now regard the written forms of Homer's poems to be no earlier than 750 BCE, a reference to alphabetic writing there does not prove anything about the emergence of Phoenician-Greek in earlier centuries (probably, in fact, in the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE). See Powell 1991.

<sup>53</sup> Josephus follows Herodotus who, in the same passage as that echoed in 1.7 (see note to “before” ad loc.), suggested that any poets said to have preceded Homer and Hesiod were in fact of a later date (2.53; see Lloyd 1976: 247-49). There is also a verbal echo of Thucydides here (noted by Schäublin 1982: 319 n24): Thucydides wrote that Homer “lived much later than the Trojan events” (πολλῶ ὕστερον ἔτι καὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν γένομενος, 1.3.3); Josephus' Greek runs: καὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν ὕστερος φαίνεται γενόμενος. Homer is left as uncertainly dated as the Trojan War, but Josephus seems to depend on the consensus that that is the first secure date in Greek history and, by the standards of eastern chronology, not all that ancient. This line of argument—that Homer was the earliest Greek author, but much later than Moses—was crucial to early Christian apologetics, in explaining the greater authority of the Judeo-Christian tradition (e.g., Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 31, 36; cf. Pilhofer 1990: 253-60). On the question of how long Homer lived after the Trojan War, Tatian lists no less than 16 ancient authorities who discussed this question, with answers varying from 80 to 500 years (*Ad Gr.* 31). Josephus does not commit himself to precision on the matter, and does not need to.

<sup>54</sup> Using this common opinion (“they say”), Josephus places a further historical gap, bringing the first writing, and thus historiography, down to a yet more recent period. Apart from scholia to Dionysius of Thrace (see Gutschmid 391), this statement by Josephus is the main passage indicating the oral transmission, in

song, of the Homeric epics. This was the foundation of the revolutionary approach to Homer by Wolf 1795 and, through the modern comparative studies of Parry and Lord (see Lord 1960), continues as the presupposition of contemporary analysis of Homeric style in comparison with the performance of bards (Segal 1992). Josephus' comment on the resulting discrepancies anticipates a major theme in his exposure of contradictions between Greek historians (1.15-26).

<sup>55</sup> From writing in general Josephus moves to the writing of history; Homer was presumably in a different category (epic; though Hesiod is to be found in the company of historians in 1.16). Josephus demands now not just the keeping of records (cf. Draco in 1.21), but the composition of “histories.” For the other nations (Egyptians, Chaldeans, Judeans) possessing written records is sufficient (1.8-9, 28-29)—or at least Josephus never clarifies what would qualify in their case as “history.” In this treatise, the verb “attempt” (ἐπιχειρέω) always conveys a sneer, presuming lack of success (cf. 1.53, 56, 58, 88, 220, 223, etc.).

<sup>56</sup> A shadowy figure of the mid 6<sup>th</sup>-century BCE, known as among the first prose writers (with Pherecydes and Hecataeus; Strabo 1.2.6; Pliny, *Nat.* 5.112; 7.205), and associated with the *logographoi* who recycled “mythical” tales (Diodorus 1.37.3). The fragments attributed to him are collected in *FGH* 489, but their authenticity was doubted in antiquity (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 23) and remains uncertain.

<sup>57</sup> Listed with Hellanicus and Hecataeus in *Ant.* 1.108, and known among scholars in Rome (Cicero, *De or.* 2.53; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 5). His probable dates (end of 6<sup>th</sup>–beginning of 5<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE) would make him a contemporary of Hecataeus, Herodotus' most important predecessor; see *FGH* 2, and further below, at 1.16.

<sup>58</sup> The others (the “logographers” listed, e.g., in Dionysius, *Thuc.* 5) are all described as “after him,” so that no additional names could place the beginnings of Greek historiography any earlier. The most famous in this category, Hecataeus of Miletus, goes unmentioned here and in 1.16, perhaps to avoid confusion with Hecataeus of Abdera, whose (inauthentic) work *On the Judeans* constitutes a key Greek witness (1.183-204).

before the Persian invasion of Greece.<sup>59</sup> **14** Certainly, the first among the Greeks to philosophize on the heavens and matters divine,<sup>60</sup> such as Pherecydes of Syros,<sup>61</sup> Pythagoras,<sup>62</sup> and Thales,<sup>63</sup> are acknowledged, by universal consent, to have been pupils of the Egyptians and Chaldeans for what little they wrote.<sup>64</sup> This is what the Greeks consider the most ancient material of all—and they have difficulty believing that these works were all written by those men.<sup>65</sup>

**(1.3) 15** Is it not absurd, then, for the Greeks to puff themselves up as if they alone know about antiquity and accurately transmit a true account of it?<sup>66</sup> Can one not easily discover from the authors themselves that they wrote without reliable knowledge of anything, but on the basis of their individual conjectures about

*Greeks  
historians  
disagree with  
one another*

<sup>59</sup> Herodotus, the first proper “historian” on some definitions, was reputed to have been born just before the Persian Wars (Dionysius, *Thuc.* 5). Xerxes’ invasion of Greece (480-479 BCE) is alluded to as a known fact, but undated; and lack of precision allows Josephus to bring all the “historians” close to this date. Thucydides’ damning comments on such “logographers” (1.21) and his refusal to set any store on history before the Persian Wars stands behind the dismissive tone of this sentence.

<sup>60</sup> This is not strictly relevant to a discussion of Greek historiography, but it is the only other genre of early Greek prose, and it allows further mention of Egyptians and Chaldeans (cf. 1.8-9), again suggesting Greek inferiority. Ionian science was well known to combine cosmology with theology as the beginning of “philosophy”; in Pherecydes, for instance, the “upper heaven” is Zeus and the “lower” Chronos.

<sup>61</sup> Syros is one of the Cyclades, west of Delos, and Pherecydes a well-known philosopher of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE (cf. Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.38: the teacher of Pythagoras); see Schibli 1990.

<sup>62</sup> Of the mid 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE; his place of origin was disputed (cf. 1.162; 2.14) and is here left unstated. Josephus will use his authority in 1.162-65, and portray him as a youngster compared to Moses (2.14). His inclusion here is important as his borrowings from older nations were much discussed (see below).

<sup>63</sup> The Ionian philosopher (from Miletus, early 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE) was famous as one of the “Seven Sages” who brought Egyptian mathematics and Chaldean astrology into the Greek tradition (Diogenes Laertius 1.24-28). Herodotus thought him Phoenician by origin (1.170.3), a suggestion Josephus would have enjoyed.

<sup>64</sup> The paragraph thus circles back to its beginning (the youth of the Greeks compared to eastern nations), with the added point of cultural inferiority, as mere *pupils* (cf. 1.10). Pythagoras was indeed generally thought to have borrowed his chief ideas from Egypt (Isocrates, *Bus.* 28-29; Diodorus 1.98.2; Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 729a) and from Chaldea (Diogenes

Laertius 8.3, 6). Thales’ science was generally traced to Egypt as well (Iamblichus, *VP* 12; Diogenes Laertius 1.27). These two are prominent figures in a larger schema, in which Greek science/philosophy traced its roots to the East (Diodorus 1.96-98; Strabo 17.1.29; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 354 d-e); see West 1971. The *topos* was available for other nations (including Judeans) to exploit in their own interests, especially in response to Greek cultural or political hegemony. Josephus is less direct than some of his Judean predecessors in claiming Judean originality (see 1.162-65; 2.168, 281), but he turns the theme more subtly to his advantage.

<sup>65</sup> The statement seems to refer particularly to the philosophers; doubts were aroused in particular by alleged writings of Pythagoras (see note to “his” at 1.163) and Thales (Diogenes Laertius 1.23). By raising doubt at this point, Josephus leaves the antiquity of Greek writing dangling in rhetorical uncertainty, with Greeks themselves beset by self-doubt—a striking contrast to their (false) self-assurance (1.15).

<sup>66</sup> The rhetorical question heightens the aggressive tone (cf. 1.44), and the charge of “absurdity” (ἄλογον) meets the Greek tradition of reason on its own terrain (cf. 1.6). The language echoes earlier statements about the Greeks (1.2, 6: here μόνους, “alone,” matches μόνους, “only” in 1.6), but the issue has also subtly changed: whereas earlier Josephus pits himself against *those who made appeal* to the authority of the Greeks (1.2), here he counters directly *the Greeks themselves*. There is no indication that Greek historians, past or contemporary, made a claim as extreme as this; indeed, Josephus has just described Greek *humility* on this score (1.8-9; cf. 1.14). His statements of the issue thus evidence a progressive distortion: from the likely misstatement at the outset in 1.2, through the exaggeration of 1.6 to this evident gross misrepresentation. The image of Greeks now forged matches a common Roman stereotype of the self-important and impudent Greek; see, e.g., Cicero, *Flac.* 9-11, and Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.88 (of the German Arminius: *Graecorum annalibus ignotus, qui sua tantum mirantur*).

events?<sup>67</sup> Indeed for the most part they refute each other in their books, and do not hesitate to say the most contradictory things on the same topics.<sup>68</sup> **16** It would be superfluous for me to instruct those who know more than I<sup>69</sup> how much Hellanicus disagreed with Acusilaus on the genealogies,<sup>70</sup> how often Acusilaus corrects Hesiod,<sup>71</sup> or how Ephorus proves Hellanicus to have lied on most matters,<sup>72</sup> and how Timaeus did the same to Ephorus,<sup>73</sup> and Timaeus' successors to him,<sup>74</sup> and everyone

<sup>67</sup> "Authors" (συγγραφεῖς) is a slightly less specific term than "historian," allowing Hesiod into the following discussion (1.16); this ambiguity will later enable the inclusion of a wide assortment of Greek "writers" in 1.161-214. Josephus now turns to internal evidence, and will argue that disagreement between authors is caused by each simply guessing at the facts, a phenomenon which is itself explained by their lack of sources (1.16-23). This highly partial chain of reasoning is here presented as "easily" deduced; the rhetorical force of the argument precludes consideration of alternative explanations for historians' disagreements (beyond that offered in 1.24-26). Cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.3.9: "ancient historians do not agree with one another as they were brought up on lies, due to mythology." It was common to accuse the historians whom one disparaged of operating by "guesswork"; cf. 1.45; 2.20; Polybius 12.3.7; 4.4 (on Timaeus).

<sup>68</sup> The generalizing statement prepares for the list of examples of 1.16-18, using exaggeration ("for the most part"; "most contradictory") to suggest that the following disagreements are of such extent as to wholly discredit them all. In this polemical context, the fact that they do not hesitate suggests not courage (cf. 1.205) but brazenness (cf. 1.226).

<sup>69</sup> The *praeteritio* excuses Josephus from giving a long description of the matter, but allows him to cause the damage to Greek historiography that he desires, while flattering his implied readers as more educated than himself. The following list indicates his knowledge of most of the famous figures in early Greek historiography (the obvious absentees are Xenophon and Theopompus; cf. 1.220) and of the penchant for Greek historians to establish their credentials by criticising their predecessors (Marincola 1997: 217-36). This feature of Greek agonistic culture could be favorably represented as an emblem of the critical spirit in the quest for truth (cf. Diodorus 1.56.6), but Josephus skilfully turns it round into a mark of Greek confusion and ignorance. He knows enough about the Greek tradition to turn its self-reflexive virtues into a defect, with the help of Roman prejudices against "quarrelsome" and "mendacious" Greeks (e.g., Cicero, *Flac.* 16-19; Juvenal, *Sat.* 10.174; cf. Josephus, *War* 1.16). For a parallel strategy—an eastern historian criticising the contradictions among Greek histori-

ans—see Philo of Byblos, *FGH* 790, frag. 1.

<sup>70</sup> Josephus will present a chain of six figures, each of whom undermines his predecessors; but he enters the chain part way in, perhaps to prevent tedium and to debunk at once one of the figures in the previous discussion (cf. 1.13). Hellanicus of Lesbos (ca.480—395 BCE) was a major figure in Greek historiography, of whom about 200 fragments survive (*FGH* 4). The "genealogies" are accounts of Greek origins whose mythological character and local variations made them vulnerable to criticism. Hellanicus' attempt to create a common chronology of Greece no doubt gave him occasion to critique the Argos-based accounts in Acusilaus (see note to "Acusilaus" at 1.13).

<sup>71</sup> Acusilaus' work on cosmogony and theogony (his "Genealogies", *FGH* 2, frags. 5-22) inevitably brought him into the terrain of Hesiod. Plato, *Symp.* 178b reports agreement, but points of divergence were easily detectable (cf. Clement, *Strom.* 6.2.26.7). Hesiod wrote epic poetry ca. 700 BCE; his *Theogony* is probably in view here.

<sup>72</sup> The exaggeration echoes the introduction in 1.15; for one example see Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.5.5 and for other criticisms of Hellanicus' inaccuracy see Thucydides 1.97.2. Ephorus of Cyme (ca.405-330 BCE) wrote a 30-book universal history which enjoyed a high reputation in antiquity and was much used by Diodorus, Strabo and others, but is preserved only in fragments (*FGH* 70); see Barber 1935. "Lied" translates ψευδομενον, a verb which in some contexts can connote merely "giving a false account" (where the falsehood is not taken to be deliberate). But in this context "falsehoods" are presumed to be intentional (cf. 1.3, 68), and the contrast with mere "error" (πλάνη, 1.20) suggests that the historians in question were deliberately deviating from the facts; the verb recurs in 1.18, 20, 23.

<sup>73</sup> Timaeus of Tauromenium in Sicily (ca.350-260 BCE; see Pearson 1987: 37-51; *FGH* 566) was famous for his extreme criticisms of his predecessors (cf. 1.17). He was dubbed "Epitimaeus" ("The Censurer") by Ister, and was often regarded (e.g., by Polybius 12.4-11, 24-25) as playing his polemical role to excess. For his criticisms of Ephorus, see, e.g., Polybius 12.23.1-8; 28.12. He was especially concerned for accuracy in dating (Polybius 12.10-11).

<sup>74</sup> The chain ends with anonymous critics. Josephus

to Herodotus.<sup>75</sup> **17** Even on Sicilian affairs Timaeus did not deign to agree<sup>76</sup> with the narratives of Antiochus<sup>77</sup> and Philistus<sup>78</sup> or Callias,<sup>79</sup> nor again did the authors of the “Atthides” follow one another on Attic affairs,<sup>80</sup> nor the historians of Argos on Argive affairs.<sup>81</sup> **18** And why is it necessary to speak about the histories of city-states and minor matters,<sup>82</sup> when the most reputable historians have disagreed even on the subject of the Persian invasion and what took place during it?<sup>83</sup> On many points even

perhaps did not know how to carry on the list, or had now sufficiently displayed his erudition, or declined to bring it down to historians such as Polybius, who were highly regarded in Rome (cf. 2.84). Ister (3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE) wrote a contradiction of Timaeus, and Polemon of Ilium (2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE) no less than 12 books against him; Polybius (2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE) devoted practically the whole of book 12 to an assault on his reputation.

<sup>75</sup> Manetho is cited later (1.73) as part of this chorus of criticism, which was a common trope in historiography. The implied criticism in Thucydides 1.21 is made explicit by Ctesias (see Diodorus 2.15), Diodorus (e.g., 1.69.7), Cicero (*Div.* 2.116; *Leg.* 1.5), Strabo (e.g., *Geogr.* 17.1.52), and many others, before becoming the subject of a treatise by (Pseudo-?) Plutarch (“On the Malice of Herodotus”); see Momigliano 1984 and, for Roman views, Wardman 1976: 105-6. Despite this comment (cf. *Ant.* 8.253; 10.19), Josephus will use Herodotus as a reliable Greek witness to Judean antiquity in 1.168-71.

<sup>76</sup> The discussion of local history begins with Sicily, providing a link to the previous section via Timaeus, a Sicilian, and offering 3 more names to add to the catalogue of 1.16. The logic appears to be based on the assumption that one would expect locals to agree on their own history; and if they cannot agree on this, how much less on matters on a larger scale (cf. 1.18). In fact, local history might be the most contested of all, as the most politically significant, but Josephus does not reveal the nature or the extent of the disagreements. “Did not deign” (using ἀξιόω, cf. 1.2) suggests that the disagreement is a matter of pride and competition, not better knowledge of the facts.

<sup>77</sup> Antiochus of Syracuse wrote a 9-book history of Sicily in the 5th century BCE (Diodorus 12.71.2); see *FGH* 555 and Pearson 1987: 11-18.

<sup>78</sup> Philistus of Syracuse (ca. 430—356 BCE) wrote an extensive history of Sicily which was notorious for the support it gave to the tyrants Dionysius I and II. Extensive references to him by later writers, including Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Quintilian (who admired his style), indicate he was well-known in antiquity; see *FGH* 556 (esp. the testimonia) and Pearson 1987: 19-30. Timaeus’ critique, fuelled by political disagreement, is also known from Plutarch, *Dion* 36; *Nic.* 1.

<sup>79</sup> Callias of Syracuse (late 4<sup>th</sup>—early 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BCE; *FGH* 564) wrote a favorable account of the tyranny of Agathocles (316–289 BCE) in 22 books, which won him later suspicion (cf. Diodorus 21.17.4) and the more immediate enmity of Timaeus, whose exile from Sicily (in 315 BCE) probably owed much to Agathocles’ rise to power. The political nature of such disputes among historians is not made evident here, though 1.25 hints at the general phenomenon.

<sup>80</sup> “Atthides” designates a genre of local history of Attica, which was particularly popular during the 4<sup>th</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BCE; authors include Cleidemus, Androton, Phanodemus, Demon, and Philochorus, with a later compilation by Ister; see *FGH* IIIb (including Supplement vols.) and Jacoby 1949. Their style (based on lists of kings and archons) was later considered tedious (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.8.3) and their disagreements were well-known (cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* 9.1.6); see, e.g., Philochorus’ dispute with Demon, *FGH* 328 frag. 72.

<sup>81</sup> Accounts of Argive history (see *FGH* 304-14) were similarly varied and contested (cf. Pausanias 1.14.2). In these last two cases Josephus provides no names, but the multiplication of examples is enough to convey both his erudition and the sense that the Greek tradition of historiography was riddled with self-contradiction.

<sup>82</sup> Münster adds διὰ before τῶν βραχυτέρων, referring to *War* 4.338 (a speech made διὰ βραχέων “in a few words”). But nothing in the context suggests that the issue is the *length* of their histories; rather, the contrast with the Persian invasion indicates that it concerns the *significance* of the events. Cf. the use of the superlative βραχύτατος in the sense “slightest” or “least significant” (*Apion* 1.284; 2.173).

<sup>83</sup> This rhetorical climax (marked by a rhetorical question) moves from minor matters and minor historians to major events and “the most reputable” historians. The Greek (οἱ δοκιμώτατοι) hints at Josephus’ ironical detachment (cf. Mason 2001: 106-13; Paul and οἱ δοκοῦντες in Gal 2:2, 6, 9). Criticisms of Herodotus’ account of the Persian Wars, perhaps especially by Ephorus, may be here in mind. But that Herodotus should be implicitly included among “the most reputable” historians hardly matches the notice on his universal disparagement in 1.16.



Thucydides is accused by some of lying, although he is reputed to have written the history of his time with the highest standards of accuracy.<sup>84</sup>

*Reasons for  
disagreement:  
(1) no reliable  
records*

(1.4) 19 Among the reasons for such disagreement,<sup>85</sup> many other factors may perhaps present themselves to those who wish to enquire into the matter, but I would give the greatest weight to the two I am about to describe,<sup>86</sup> and I will discuss first the one which seems to me the more significant.<sup>87</sup> 20 From the outset the Greeks did not bother to create public records of contemporary events,<sup>88</sup> and this above all supplied to those who subsequently wanted to write about ancient history both error and the license to lie.<sup>89</sup> 21 It was not just other Greeks who neglected to make records,<sup>90</sup> but even among the Athenians, who—they say—are indigenous and care about education,<sup>91</sup> nothing of this sort can be traced, but the oldest public documents

<sup>84</sup> Reading ἀκριβέστατα τήν, an emendation of ἀκριβεστάτην (found in L and Eusebius) suggested by Holwerda and followed by Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster. The reputation of Thucydides (ca. 455-400 BCE) and his 8-book account of the Peloponnesian War was immense: Dionysius' essay contains criticism only of his structure and style, and presupposes that he is typically judged the greatest of historians, providing the gold-standard of historiography (*Thuc.* 2-3); cf. Diodorus 1.37.4; Lucian, *Hist. passim*, and, for Roman views, Wardman 1976: 106-8. Thus this (vague and unsubstantiated) reference to the vulnerability of Thucydides forms the climax of this paragraph. Josephus does not justify these criticisms, but the tenor of this passage implies that all the critics are to be credited in their "corrections" of their predecessors (1.16). For the influence of Thucydides on Josephus' own historiography see, e.g., Mader 2000.

<sup>85</sup> Reading τοιαύτης διαφωνίας (with Eusebius, Niese, Thackeray, and Münster), rather than τοσαύτης διαφωνίας ("so great disagreement," with L, Naber, and Reinach). In 1.15 Josephus had suggested that Greek historians contradicted one another since they were going on nothing but guesswork. That hint is now taken up as the first of two causes of disagreement: the lack of records to which to refer (1.20-23). A second cause—the historians' concern for style and reputation—will be added (1.24-25) connecting this discussion to more familiar tropes. By remaining vague about the nature of the disagreements surveyed in 1.16-18, Josephus is able to attribute them all, chiefly, to lack of documentary evidence; the possibility that some had better sources than others is not considered.

<sup>86</sup> Josephus presents himself as a contributor to cultural "enquiry," an informed and discriminating analyst of the failings of the Greek tradition. He could hardly here admit that the critical spirit—the process of scrutiny and challenge which might bring historians closer to the truth—could be viewed as a positive phenomenon.

<sup>87</sup> Although Josephus has only one concrete fact

about the Greek lack of documentary evidence (1.21), he prioritizes this, in both order and length of treatment (1.20-23), since it reinforces the critique of 1.7-14 and will provide the deepest contrast to Judean culture (1.28-43).

<sup>88</sup> The language closely echoes (by contrast) 1.9; the term "records" (ἀναγραφαί, see note to "laws" at 1.7) occurs three times in 1.20-23. As in 1.7, the charge is deeper than just the lack of records: it is the lack of concern on this matter ("did not bother") that makes this cultural lacuna a sign of moral deficiency (cf. 1.21, 24, 45). The lists of kings and (later) archons drawn on in local histories often had public events connected to them in their chronologies (see notes at 1.17), but Josephus either ignores or distrusts that tradition. On the problems in early Greek historiography see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 5 and Finley 1990: 11-33. In fact, Greek records of their own history are hardly the issue for Josephus or his critics: the question is whether Greek historians can be depended upon to relate what was important about other nations in antiquity (cf. 1.27).

<sup>89</sup> The distinction between πλάνη ("error") and ψεύδεσθαι justifies the translation of the latter as "to lie" (not simply, as sometimes in Greek, "to be in error"). The association with "license" (ἐξουσία) connotes a cultural and moral slackness (cf. 2.173), and stands in sharp contrast with Judean control in this matter (1.37).

<sup>90</sup> Josephus has only one piece of information to draw on, concerning Athens; but he manages to suggest that what applies there will apply, *a fortiori*, to other Greeks. "Neglect" (ἀμελέω) echoes the charge of lack of "care" (ἐπιμέλεια) in 1.7; cf. *War* 1.16 (Greek neglect of historical truth).

<sup>91</sup> The logic implied is that an indigenous people should have a long continuous history and thus no excuse for not remembering ancient history; and care for "education" (παιδεία; cf. 2.171-72) might be expected to include attention to written records. The claim to be "indigenous" ("autochthonous"—sprung from the local soil) was crucial to Athenian identity as the original



are said to be the laws on murder<sup>92</sup> drawn up for them by Draco,<sup>93</sup> a man who lived a little before the tyranny of Pisistratus.<sup>94</sup> **22** And what need is there to speak of the Arcadians, who boast of their antiquity?<sup>95</sup> For even at a later point in time it was with difficulty that they were educated in the alphabet.<sup>96</sup>

**(1.5) 23** It is, then, the absence of any previously deposited record—which would have both instructed those who wished to learn and refuted those who lied—that accounts for the extent of the disagreement among the writers.<sup>97</sup> **24** But a second reason must be added to this:<sup>98</sup> those who hastily set about writing did not bother about the truth<sup>99</sup>—although they were always quick to make this their promise<sup>100</sup>—but displayed their literary prowess,<sup>101</sup> **25** and in whatever way they thought they

*Reasons for disagreement:  
(2) lack of concern for truth*

and only inhabitants of Attica; see Thucydides 2.36.1 and Loraux 1993; 2000. On the Athenian claim to παιδεία, supreme in Greece, see Isocrates, *Paneg.* 50; *Antid.* 293-4; Thucydides 2.41.1; Schaublin 1982: 326.

<sup>92</sup> Reading φονικῶν with S and all modern editors. On Athenian records, see Sickinger 1999.

<sup>93</sup> Athenian tradition placed Draco in 624 or 621/0 BCE as an innovative lawgiver and the first to put laws into writing. Only the law on homicide survived the reforms of Solon, and so became famous as Draco's law; it is referred to in Athenian oratory (e.g. Demosthenes, *Aristocr.* 51) and in an inscription of 409/8 BCE, *IG I* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition) 104 (cf. Gagarin 1981).

<sup>94</sup> The famous Athenian tyrant who came to power in ca. 560 and again in 546—527 BCE; Josephus assumes he will be known and not regarded as particularly ancient. “A little before” (cf. 1.13) covers a gap of more than 60 years, but that is relatively small in the context of the chronologies of eastern nations.

<sup>95</sup> The rhetorical question (cf. 1.18) allows Josephus to add another example through vague allusion to common opinion, rather than concrete evidence. The inhabitants of Arcadia (central Peloponnese) were reputed to be another ancient autochthonous people (Herodotus 8.73; Cicero, *Resp.* 3.15, 25; Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.8.1). Aristotle's reference to them as προσέληνοι (frag. 591) was widely interpreted to mean “more ancient than the moon” (Plutarch, *Mor.* 282a). Josephus' phrase conveys skepticism towards this “boast” (cf. 1.15).

<sup>96</sup> As a pastoral people, Arcadians were celebrated as unspoilt, or disdained as wild and primitive (Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.8; Polybius 4.20-21); cf. Schaublin 1982: 318, n.18. Josephus portrays them as late learners (later than Draco?): if they were “taught,” and learned “with difficulty” (μόλις, cf. 1.10), their antiquity conveys no cultural superiority at all. Without a script, they can have had no reliable records.

<sup>97</sup> συγγραφεῖς, in the immediate context, might mean “historians” (cf. below at 1.27), but I preserve the non-specific sense (cf. the specific ἱστοριογράφοι, 1.2), since the term can thus include any kind of author, including perhaps poets such as Hesiod (1.16). The ambi-

guity is important in 1.161-214. This summary of the point reinforces the opening statement in 1.20 and connects it back to the central theme of disagreement. Josephus' logic suggests that historical truth is attained by following records, and that all one needs to do is “learn” from them. This passive attitude to the texts as “instructors” forms the core value in his historiography (cf. 1.37-41), in distinction from the Greek understanding of criticism (evaluation, comparison, and testing of evidence).

<sup>98</sup> This second reason (the poor standards in Greek historiography, 1.24-25) constitutes a condensed statement of standard complaints about Greeks—their showy rhetoric, their competitive drive for fame, their slipperiness—which restate some of Josephus' earlier remarks on this topic (esp. *War* 1.13-16; *Life* 40, 336-39) and chime well with Roman prejudices (see below). Since these factors apply to contemporary as well as ancient history, Josephus can build on this short polemic in his comments on recent accounts of the War (1.42-56).

<sup>99</sup> Since the truth was taken to be the main purpose of history (*Life* 339; see next note), this is a charge as broad as one can imagine; it is one matter not to bother with records (1.20; cf. 1.7, 21), another not to bother even about truth. “Haste” in writing suggests a failure to expend that proper preparatory effort which is the hallmark of a serious historian (see 1.45-50; *War* 1.15-16; Thucydides 1.22.3; Lucian, *Hist.* 47; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.1.2); a historian has to be seen to be φιλόπονος, *Life* 338.

<sup>100</sup> Historians universally claimed to be offering the truth (Josephus himself in *War* 1.6; cf. Thucydides 1.22; Polybius 12.12; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.6.5; Livy, *praef.* 5 etc.), though what they meant by that, and how they understood it to relate to the rhetorical features and moral purposes of historiography varied according to different cultural and personal preferences. Josephus' cynical remark parallels some Roman portrayals of Greeks as untrustworthy (e.g., Cicero, *Quint. frat.* 1.1.16; 1.2.4; Virgil, *Aen.* 2, 152, 195).

<sup>101</sup> The suspicion of “literary prowess” (lit. “the

could outshine others they adapted themselves in accordance with this,<sup>102</sup> some turning to recount mythology,<sup>103</sup> others seeking favor by praising cities or kings,<sup>104</sup> others set out to criticise historical actions or the historians, thinking that their reputation would shine in this way.<sup>105</sup> **26** In short, what they continue to practice is the complete opposite of history.<sup>106</sup> For it is evidence of true history if everyone both says and writes the same things about the same (events).<sup>107</sup> They, on the other hand, think

power of words,” δύναμις λόγων) is a regular pose in Josephus; cf. 1.27; 2.292 and a similar invective in *War* 1.13; *Ant.* 1.2; *Life* 40 (with notes in Mason 2001 ad loc.). He presses on a well-known tension in historiography between factual content—which as a bare chronology might be painfully thin or impossibly tedious—and a readable style, which was open to the charge of rhetorical falsification (see, e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 51; Lucian, *Hist.* 16, 48; Plutarch, *Mor.* 874b; and Josephus’ own comments on this tension in *Ant.* 14.2-3). To target Greeks in this way was to reinforce a Roman suspicion of the “Greek” capacity to twist the truth in words (e.g., Juvenal, *Sat.* 10.174; Pliny, *Nat.* 5.4; 28.112; cf. Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.1 using the same phrase).

<sup>102</sup> Two interlocking stereotypes are here invoked: the Greeks’ lust for fame and their slippery skill in adapting themselves for their own convenience. The competitive concern for reputation (repeated at the end of this section) is a charge Josephus had used against other historians in *Ant.* 1.2. Given the agonistic culture of antiquity it was a motive easily attributed to others (e.g. Lucian, *Herod.* 1), and difficult to deny of oneself; but the Thucydidean claim to be writing for posterity, not to please one’s contemporaries (1.22.3-4), was often repeated (see Marincola 1997: 57-62, 251). On the Greek ability to adapt themselves, see Lucian, *Tox.* 42 and the long invective in Juvenal, *Sat.* 3.58ff.

<sup>103</sup> On the Greek propensity to indulge in “mythology,” cf. 2.239-54 and Roman criticism in Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.4. Since “myths” were associated with the unreliable, the female, the childish and the illogical, their repetition was considered a work of entertainment, not serious history. Roman historians regularly expressed their concern not to delve into that terrain. But their anxieties continue a Greek tradition stretching back to Hecataeus of Miletus: “the tales Greeks tell are many and laughable” (frag. 1).

<sup>104</sup> A charge of bias, in order to win the favor of a state or a powerful figure, was a stock weapon in the historians’ battles (real or mock; cf. *Ant.* 16.184); for a general statement of cynicism see Diodorus 21.17.4 (cf. Lucian, *Hist.* 38-41; Cicero, *De or.* 2.62, etc.). Josephus deploys it elsewhere with reference to alternative accounts of the War (*War* 1.2, 6; *Life* 336) and to historians in general (*Ant.* 1.2). The claim to speak the historical truth was nearly always connected to a denial

of bias (speaking from personal favoritism or hatred), but every historical judgment, especially if strongly expressed, was vulnerable to this charge (cf. Luce 1989). In the conditions of the empire, political influence on historiography was regularly noted (cf. Dio Cassius 53.19), on which Tacitus’ famous claim to be writing *sine ira et studio* (*Ann.* 1.1) is perhaps an ironic comment. On Josephus’ own relation to the Flavian emperors, see 1.50-52.

<sup>105</sup> Hostility to historical figures was recognized to be just as distorting as praise, but the rhetorical and moral features of historiography led as easily in both directions. Josephus here ignores the regular claim of historians that their work was morally useful precisely in pronouncing judgments on past events. Criticism of other historians is now cast in a negative light as a disreputable quest for fame (contrast 1.16-19), perhaps with Josephus’ own experience in mind (see at 1.53-56).

<sup>106</sup> The reference to historians’ battles has led Josephus back to his central theme, the endemic tradition of disagreement among Greek historians. He thus reaches his conclusion (1.27) by way of a general principle, expressed in extreme terms for rhetorical effect. Its phrasing in the present tense helps make it applicable to his subsequent discussions of contemporary historiography (1.42-56).

<sup>107</sup> This notorious sentence (τῆς μὲν γὰρ ἀληθοῦς ἐστὶ τεκμήριον ἱστορίας, εἰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἅπαντες ταῦτὰ καὶ λέγοιεν καὶ γράφοιεν) at first sight looks absurd (see Cohen 1988; Schäublin 1982: 321). If τεκμήριον is given the strong sense, “proof,” and ἱστορία the sense of “historical method,” the sentence could be taken to mean that a historical procedure can be proved to be correct by the fact that everyone is in agreement on the facts it ascertains. This is logically ridiculous: historians can be collectively misled to agree about falsehoods, and the statement might conceivably be correct only under very stringent conditions, such as all parties having equal access to the truth and equal desire to tell it. What is more, Josephus himself often upholds as true matters which are highly contested—such as his own account of the War, or the Judean (rather than the Egyptian) accounts of the exodus—and this disagreement is not taken to diminish their truthful status in any way. But although τεκμήριον can mean “proof” (cf. 1.2, 36, 69, 213; 2.17; Mason 2001: 4, n.7), and is so translated by Thackeray and Blum (“preuve”),

that they will seem the most truthful of all if they describe the same things differently.<sup>108</sup> 27 Thus in eloquence and cleverness in that field we must give pride of place to the Greek writers,<sup>109</sup> but certainly not in the true history of ancient times<sup>110</sup>—particularly that of the various native groups.<sup>111</sup>

(1.6) 28 That among both the Egyptians and Babylonians, from extremely early times,<sup>112</sup> the priests, in the one case, were entrusted with taking care over the records and conducted philosophical enquiry on that basis,<sup>113</sup> and the Chaldeans in the case

*Egyptian,  
Babylonian,  
and Chaldean  
records*

it can also have the weaker sense of “evidence” (cf. 1.192; 2.35, 125, 183, etc.; “Kennzeichen” [Münster]). ἱστορία may be best taken here in the sense “historical fact” rather than, as in the previous sentence, “historical method.” If so, the claim is less far-reaching and less obviously absurd: it is (a contributory piece of?) evidence that a historical event is true if all parties agree on the matter. Even so, as a general statement we would want to hedge this about with so many qualifications as to make it practically valueless, and the fact that Josephus commits himself to it (in either strong or weak versions—the ambiguity might be rhetorically useful) is an indication that his understanding of history has its source elsewhere than in the Greek critical tradition. 1.37-43 will reveal that source: the claimed unanimity of the biblical witness to historical truth, and the Judean attitude of unquestioning acceptance (“learning”), which finds neither the desire nor the need to alter those sources by addition or subtraction. This core of inner and unalterable coherence can then be extended to embrace all sources which stand in agreement with it, whose agreement is taken as evidence of truth (cf. 1.127-28, 154, 160, 217). But it is not assailable by contrary sources, whose disagreement does not disprove its truth, but merely prove their own error (cf. 1.279-86; 2.20-27). This logical asymmetry in Josephus’ methods of argument reveals where the foundation of his definition of “truth” really lies.

<sup>108</sup> This is a rather clumsy sentence (reading εἰ ταῦτα γράφειαν ἑτέρως, with Hudson, Thackeray, Münster; Niese follows L, reading ταῦτα “these things” rather than ταῦτά, “the same things”). It is given better expression in Eusebius’ version (“if they do not write the same things as others,” εἰ μὴ τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειαν ἑτέροις), but the general sense is the same. Josephus presents the Greek desire to improve others’ histories as motivated only by thirst for fame (“they will seem ...”; cf. 1.25) and utterly wrongheaded—an effect not just of carelessness or inadequate sources but of a fundamentally mistaken view of history. On the Greek desire for “novelty” see 1.222; 2.182; and Acts 17:21 (Athens); Schäublin 1982: 321.

<sup>109</sup> This back-handed compliment echoes 1.24, adding “cleverness” (δεινότης), an ambiguous term which can characterize something as “awesome” or, as here (rather too) “smart” (cf. *Ant.* 1.2 and Lucian, *Hist.* 58 in

an identical context; the adjective is used of the historian Justus, *Life* 340). This feigned concession, which in reality concedes nothing, throws the emphasis back on historical truth (cf. *Ant.* 14.1-3).

<sup>110</sup> The phraseology echoes 1.26, but specifies *ancient* history, which is the proper subject matter of the discourse (1.6).

<sup>111</sup> This final phrase rescues the long discussion about Greek lack of (indigenous) records to ensure its connection to the real question, whether Greeks can be trusted to convey information about Judeans (1.2). This qualification may look like a natural addition, but the issue of Greek reliability on their own history is really quite distinct from the critical point in Josephus’ debate, whether they know about the history of *others*. Josephus’ validation of Menander of Ephesus in 1.116 gives the mirror opposite of this claim; but Menander is there treated as a “Phoenician,” not a “Greek.”

<sup>112</sup> 1.28-29 forms a transition to the next topic of Judean record-keeping, 1.28 looking back (to 1.8-9) and 1.29 forward (to 1.30-41). The same three peoples are mentioned in 1.8-9 and for the same reasons (see at 1.8, “Phoenicians”), but now Judeans are added to this illustrious company, as hinted already in 1.8. Thus a formidable rank of “barbarians” are placed in opposition to “Greeks” (cf. 1.58). Josephus adds very little here to what he had said in 1.8-10, and excuses himself for his brevity. The three segments of witness to come (Egyptian, 1.73-105; Phoenician, 1.106-27; Chaldean, 1.128-60) thus rest on a poorly substantiated basis; as Josephus indicates in this section, he depends on a cultural presumption that all three possessed ancient, reliable records.

<sup>113</sup> Egyptian “care” (ἐπιμέλεια) contrasts directly with the Greeks (1.7, 20-21): the priests afford this matter a special security (cf. 1.9 “consecrated”). Since Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 1.69) and Herodotus (Book 2 *passim*), it was a common trope that Egyptian priests had a special role in the preservation of records, which were often inscribed in temples; for the priests as philosophers (cf. 2.140-41), see Strabo, *Geogr.* 17.1.3 and Plutarch, *Mor.* 354b-c. Josephus here elides the chronological records (hardly the basis for philosophy!) with religious texts, which were of major philosophical significance.

of the Babylonians,<sup>114</sup> and that of those who were in touch with the Greeks it was the Phoenicians in particular who used writing both for managing daily life and for transmitting the memory of public events<sup>115</sup>—since everyone agrees about these things, I think I may pass them by.<sup>116</sup> **29** But that our ancestors took the same, not to say still greater, care over the records as did those just mentioned,<sup>117</sup> assigning this task to the chief-priests and prophets,<sup>118</sup> and how this has been maintained with great precision down to our own time<sup>119</sup>—and, if one should speak with greater boldness,<sup>120</sup> will continue to be maintained<sup>121</sup>—I shall try to indicate briefly.<sup>122</sup>

**(1.7) 30** Not only did they, from the outset, place in charge of this matter<sup>123</sup> the

*Judean records: priestly genealogies*

<sup>114</sup> For perceptions of the Chaldeans, see below, *Chaldean Evidence (1.128-60): Reading Options*. Diodorus 2.29-31 reflects a common view that they were priests with access to extremely ancient wisdom.

<sup>115</sup> For the Phoenicians' contact with the Greeks, see 1.61-63. Josephus is trying to justify why he should single out Phoenicians to join the Egyptians and Chaldeans, who were more famous for their antiquity. He can appeal only to their knowledge of writing, adding little to 1.10 but providing a general basis for the specific claims about Tyrian archives in 1.107, 112, 116. For Roman perceptions of Phoenician antiquity (not directly here claimed) see below, *Phoenician Evidence (1.106-27): Reading Options*.

<sup>116</sup> The long subordinate clause is suddenly dropped, to dramatize the *praeteritio*. Trading on this consensus, Josephus can address the more delicate point, the records of the Judeans. Since the other witnesses will, in effect, be validated by their agreement with the Judean Scriptures, the historical validity of those "Judean records" is the foundation on which the whole argument rests.

<sup>117</sup> The claim is made possible by the looseness of the category "records": two very different kinds of record will be discussed, priestly genealogies (1.30-36) and Scriptures (1.37-43). The detail with which Josephus describes the care over these records and its stringency (1.36, 42-43) justifies this hint at cultural superiority ("greater care"), which enables the Judean tradition both to gain by association with others and to be distinguished from them in quality.

<sup>118</sup> If priests were involved in Egyptian and Chaldean record-keeping, Judeans use *chief*-priests (cf. the different depiction of their role, as enforcing compliance, in 2.185-87, 194). The two categories of people broadly cover the two kinds of record—though the assignment of roles in the first case is unclear; see note to "matter" at 1.30. On prophets in relation to the writing of history, see 1.37-41 (cf. 2 Chron 9:29; 12:15; 13:22, etc.).

<sup>119</sup> "Precision" translates ἀκρίβεια, a term with a semantic range covering both "accuracy" (getting the facts right) and "detail" (getting all the facts in). It (or a

cognate term) has been used twice already (1.15, 18) and it will recur three times in the discussion of Judean records (1.32, 36, 41). It constitutes a major element in the excellence of the Judean constitution in 2.145-286 (see note to "scrupulosity" at 2.149); cf. Mason 2001: 14. The claim that the care is maintained down to the present could apply to the preservation of the records (1.34-35, 43), but not to their construction (see 1.41), unless Josephus means to include his own historiography under this heading (1.46-56; cf. Labow 2005: 27, n.70).

<sup>120</sup> The text is uncertain but I here follow Gutschmid (398) and the Latin (*oportet*) in reading εἰ δὲ δεῖ θρασύτερον εἰπεῖν; so also Niese and Münster.

<sup>121</sup> This intriguing interjection suggests a defiant hope for the future of the Judean tradition, despite the recent catastrophe of the War. On Josephus' expectations for the future of the priesthood and even the temple, see at 2.193-98.

<sup>122</sup> "Try" (πειράω) is a token of modesty but confidence (see note to "do" at 1.70). Josephus takes up his role of instructor (using διδάσκειν here as in 1.3), claiming brevity (cf. 1.3) to suggest he could say so much more on this topic to strengthen or broaden his claims.

<sup>123</sup> Reading ἐπὶ τούτῳ (singular) with Niese minor, Reinach, and Münster. The phrase is vague enough to include either the composition or the preservation of the "records" (cf. 1.29 and 1.54). "From the outset" (ἐξ ἀρχῆς) mirrors the phraseology used in relation to Greek sloppiness (1.20), but is as ill-defined as the "extremely early times" in 1.28. Josephus will soon refer to the 2,000 years of high-priestly succession (1.36), but the chief-priests are there the subjects of a genealogical list, not the authors or preservers of historical records. Ordinary priests are here depicted (1.30-36) as the authors or scrutineers of marriage records, which have genealogical components, but the argument can only cohere via this ambiguity in the category "record" and in the role of the personnel involved. If Josephus is also alluding to the role of the priests in preserving the scriptures (Gray 1993: 10-11), the point is less than clear; cf. *Ant.* 4.304.



best people and those who are devoted to the worship of God,<sup>124</sup> but they also took care that the priestly stock should remain unalloyed and pure.<sup>125</sup> **31** For anyone who takes a share in the priesthood must father children by a woman of the same nation;<sup>126</sup> he must pay no attention to wealth or other distinctions,<sup>127</sup> but should examine her pedigree, procuring her genealogy from the archives<sup>128</sup> and supplying multiple witnesses. **32** And this is our practice not only in Judea itself,<sup>129</sup> but wher-

<sup>124</sup> The claim implies a presumption that the priests' consecration makes them reliable in matters of truth (cf. 1.9, 28), but is general enough to include both chief-priests (1.29, 36) and ordinary priests. Here, as in 2.186-87, the evaluation of (chief-) priests suggests both moral and social standing (οἱ ἄριστοι)—with an assumption that their moral worth will be transmitted down through the generations of priestly descent.

<sup>125</sup> From the careful preservation of records Josephus shifts the topic to the preservation of the record-keepers' lineage, because the latter is in fact the only evidence he has for the continuous production of "records" within the Judean tradition. The priestly ideology of purity, which is of huge symbolic significance to Josephus (cf. 1.199; 2.102-9, 193-98), required the sowing of priestly "seed" in an uncontaminated "field," thus requiring the child-bearing wife to be an Israelite not previously or irregularly "sown" (Lev 21:7-8, with higher standards of purity for chief-priests at 21:13-15; cf. *Ant.* 3.276-77 and other interpretations of the Levitical rules in Ezek 44:22; Philo, *Spec.* 1.101-11. Rabbinic discussions are surveyed in Feldman 2000: 315). "Unalloyed" (literally "unmixed," ἄμικτον) echoes Josephus' anxieties concerning tales of Judean "mixing" with Egyptians (1.229, 278, etc.).

<sup>126</sup> Marriage is important precisely for the fathering of children (especially male children to carry on the priestly line). Josephus leaves out here the criterion of the wife's sexual history (Lev 21:7, 13-15), to which he will allude at 1.35; but in both sections ethnic mixing is the chief taboo. Lev 21 is not specific about the ethnicity of priests' wives, but insists that chief-priests marry only "a virgin of his own kin" (לְבַת אִשְׁתּוֹ; LXX: ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ). It was possible to interpret this to mean "of priestly stock" (Philo, *Spec.* 1.110; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.277, φυλέτην, following a conjectural emendation of the text). But Josephus seems to be speaking here of priests in general, not chief-priests, and the term he uses—ὁμοεθνής—means "fellow-national," not fellow-priest (cf. *War* 1.433; *Ant.* 12.336; *Life* 286); cf. Ezek 44:22 of priests marrying "from the seed of Israel" (Philo, *Spec.* 1.111). In fact, priests might prefer to marry daughters of priests, since their genealogy would be more easily guaranteed, but Josephus' own marriages (*Life* 414, 415, 427) suggest a concern only for the Judean identity of the wife (though this is explicit only

in the third case; on the first, see note to "foreigners" at 1.35; cf. *Ant.* 11.306). See further Feldman 2000: 315; Jeremias 1969: 213-21; Schürer (revised) 2.240-42.

<sup>127</sup> The rhetoric is repeated in regard to the selection of the priestly caste in 2.186, suggesting a concern for moral virtue, not (tawdry) wealth or office; cf. *Life* 1 on the "nobility" of priesthood as an honor theoretically independent of other status-indicators in the Judean tradition. But Josephus' description of his third marriage (*Life* 427) suggests a different reality.

<sup>128</sup> Reading ἀρχείων (in place of ἀρχαίων, L; Niese) with Gutschmid, Thackeray, and all modern editors. These "archives" are the "records" Josephus wishes to spotlight here, but the reference is not clear. At *Life* 6 and here at *Apion* 1.35 he refers to a priest's genealogical record (his father and earlier male ancestors, perhaps with reference to their wives, for a number of preceding generations), which he says are kept (in Jerusalem) on "public tablets" (δημοσίου δέλτοι, *Life* 6; cf. his own—with missing generations—in *Life* 3-5). But in this context he is speaking of priests inquiring into the Judean pedigree of a potential bride, and unless she happened to be part of a priestly family herself she would not appear in the genealogical records just described. Thus the "archives" here are more likely to be local registers of marriage contracts such as we find alluded to on papyri from Egypt (e.g., *CPJ* 144; cf. *CPJ* 128). *CPJ* 143 refers to a Judean ἀρχεῖον in Alexandria. In certain contexts public tax-registers would also include records of births and deaths, with listing of lineage (e.g., *CPJ* 427). From looking up the marriage contract of the bride's parents it was possible to confirm whether she was a Judean (determined by the ethnicity of her father), and perhaps his immediate ancestry also (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.101). On the matrilineal principle as a later (post-Second Temple) innovation, see Cohen 1999: 263-307. See Jeremias 1969: 275-83 on the family records of lay families.

<sup>129</sup> The practice of care over priests' marriages is presumed to be significant in Judea, as the home of the temple. The present tense suggests continuity in this matter, despite the destruction of the temple; the allusion to that event in 1.34-35 gives no hint that the recent trauma has caused any more major interruption than that caused by previous "invasions" (see at 2.184-87 on the continuing priestly constitution). Contempo-



ever there is a corps of our people,<sup>130</sup> there also precision is maintained with regard to the marriages of priests.<sup>131</sup> **33** I am referring to those in Egypt and Babylon<sup>132</sup> and wherever else in the world any members of the priestly stock have been dispersed;<sup>133</sup> for they write a statement, which they send to Jerusalem, indicating the name of the bride,<sup>134</sup> with her patronymic, and of her ancestors of previous generations, and who were the witnesses.<sup>135</sup> **34** If a war breaks out<sup>136</sup>—as has already happened on many

rary priests' enquiries into local marriage registers hardly prove the presence or significance of an ancient tradition of historical recording (1.28-29), but Josephus does his best to suggest the antiquity of such records in the following sections.

<sup>130</sup> The term γένος has multiple, though related, senses in this context. It refers to the priestly "stock" (1.30, 33; the "caste" of priests, who hand down their role from father to son); to the "pedigree" of an individual (1.31; her "descent" from her genealogical ancestors); and here, probably, to the Judean "people" as a whole ("our people"; see note to "people" at 1.1, on its sense as a "descent-group"), unless Josephus, as a priest, is still referring to the priestly "caste." This is the only time Josephus refers to a Diaspora community with the term σύστημα ("corps"; elsewhere in Josephus only at *Ant.* 20.213, for a "band" or "mob"); cf. 2 Macc 15:12; 3 Macc 3:9; 7:3. Josephus usually refers to the Diaspora simply as "Judeans in X" (e.g., *Ant.* 16.27, 63; *Apion* 2.33, 39) and has no standard label for such a community.

<sup>131</sup> With such a vague statement Josephus does not quite claim that a complete and precise record is kept in the Diaspora; as the next section shows, the precision comes in the local enquiry, while the marriage record is sent to Jerusalem. On "precision" (here τὸ ἀκριβές) see note to "time" at 1.29; the usage here includes the sense of "accuracy."

<sup>132</sup> The huge Judean community in Egypt included the priests (and Zadokite chief-priests) who built a temple in Leontopolis (*War* 7.422-32; *Ant.* 13.62-73), but they can hardly be in mind here, as they would not deposit records in Jerusalem. Besides *Hypoth.* 7.12-13 (see Appendix 5) there is very little evidence for Judean priests in Egypt, but the family of the Alexandrian Jew Boethus produced a number of chief-priests in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 15.320-22; 17.339; 19.297). Josephus' second marriage was contracted in Alexandria (*Life* 415). Judeans resident in Babylonia are often mentioned by Josephus (see at 1.138) and the chief-priest Ananel originated from there (*Ant.* 15.22, 39). That chief-priests could be drawn from such Diaspora locations suggests a careful preservation of priestly lineage, at least in their cases.

<sup>133</sup> Greek: διεσπαρμένοι ("scattered"), one of the rare occasions when Josephus appears to echo the pejorative

LXX term διασπορά (and cognates) with reference to Judeans outside the homeland (*Ant.* 8.271; 11.212; 12.139; cf. *Ant.* 4.190: σκεδασθέντες; 8.127, 297; 10.59; *War* 7.53); see van Unnik 1993; Scott 1997. The term suggests passive victimhood, which is not how Josephus usually depicts (what we call) the Diaspora (cf. *Ant.* 4.116 and *Apion* 2.38-43; Gafni 1997; Gruen 2002: 232-52). A number of inscriptions after 70 CE suggest that priests (and women of priestly families) continued to have their status noted (see Williams 1998: 52-53).

<sup>134</sup> Reading γαμετῆς (with Latin: *nuptae*, Niese, Thackeray et al.) against L (γεγραμμένης). Unless she is recognized to be of Judean descent, the male offspring will be disqualified from inheriting the priesthood (1.31).

<sup>135</sup> The witnesses (as in 1.31) are to the marriage: the repetition suggests Josephus is padding out as far as he can a single piece of evidence for his case. It is unclear how far back the lineage of the bride could in practice be traced (cf. a similar vagueness in Philo, *Spec.* 1.101; the ruling in *m. Qidd.* 4.4-5 seems idealistic). Depositing the statement in Jerusalem was presumably intended to ensure that such Diaspora priests could resume the duties and privileges of priests in the temple were they to return. As a result the temple archives would have contained numerous certificates of priestly marriages, constituting perhaps the (basis for) the "public documents" (collected priestly genealogies?) from which Josephus derived his family tree (*Life* 6). The records which Julius Africanus says were burnt by Herod (*apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.14) may be such priestly documentation, or other aristocratic genealogies.

<sup>136</sup> The extreme case of war indicates the depth of Judean commitment to record-keeping, but also the existence of an archive of material (1.35) and special care in preserving the purity of the priestly line (1.35). Three of the four examples to follow involve Romans capturing or occupying Jerusalem (cf. 2.82), glossing over the other less honorable occasions of the capture of the city (cf. 1.209-11). The same incidents are highlighted in *War* 1.19-20, and Josephus seems to presume knowledge of the people and events. Despite the potential embarrassment of admitting this history (see 2.125-35), Josephus turns such cases of the city's vul-

occasions, when Antiochus Epiphanes invaded the country,<sup>137</sup> and Pompey the Great<sup>138</sup> and Quintilius Varus,<sup>139</sup> and above all in our own times<sup>140</sup>—**35** the surviving priests make up new lists from the archives<sup>141</sup> and scrutinize the women who are left,<sup>142</sup> since they no longer admit any who have been prisoners, suspecting that they have had frequent intercourse with foreigners.<sup>143</sup> **36** The greatest proof of precision is this:<sup>144</sup> our chief-priests<sup>145</sup> for the last 2,000 years are listed in the records by name, in line of descent from father to son.<sup>146</sup> And to those who break any of the

*High-priestly  
succession*

nerability into an illustration of a Judean virtue.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. 2.80-84 and Josephus' accounts at *War* 1.31-40; *Ant.* 12.237ff. On the historical events (169-68 BCE) see Schürer (revised) 1.137-63 and notes to *Apion* 2.83, below.

<sup>138</sup> The Greek Μάγνος ("the Great") transliterates the Latin *Magnus*, rather than using the Greek equivalent Μέγας; the Latin title had probably become fixed in Josephus' mind, as in that of his Romanized readers (Mason 2005a: 92). On Pompey in Jerusalem, cf. 2.82, 134 and the accounts in *War* 1.131-58; *Ant.* 14.34-76. The date was 63 BCE; see Schürer (revised) 1.233-42.

<sup>139</sup> At the death of Herod (4 BCE), Publius Quintilius Varus, as governor of Syria, intervened to control Judea during the resulting power-vacuum (*War* 2.39-79; *Ant.* 17.250-99). The Pompey and Varus incidents involved major damage to the temple buildings and their contents, though neither was as devastating as the case about to be mentioned.

<sup>140</sup> "Our own times" (cf. 1.29) refers, somewhat coyly, to the total destruction of the temple by Titus (cf. the oblique references in 2.82 and perhaps 2.131). The "above all" suggests that this constituted the most extreme threat to Judean records, but leaves unclear what "archives" (1.35) survived the devastation and how they did so.

<sup>141</sup> Reading ἐκ τῶν ἀρχείων γράμματα (with Gutschmid, Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster); L has ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων γραμμάτων. The "archives" are perhaps the Jerusalem marriage registers of priests (from both Judea and the Diaspora), and the "lists" the genealogical trees constructed from them. The new lists cannot just be an updating of the old (to take account of the priests who had recently died), since no reference to the archives would be necessary in this case. But it is not clear how the "archives" survived while the old genealogical lists did not.

<sup>142</sup> This is a quite separate procedure, investigating the present not the past, and determining who is still eligible for a priest to marry in the light of the purity rules alluded to in 1.30.

<sup>143</sup> Prisoners of war were routinely raped, a practice forbidden to Judeans (2.212; *Ant.* 4.257-59). Although Lev 21:7 permits a priest to marry a widow (unlike the chief-priest, who must marry a virgin, 21.14), it forbids

marrying someone "defiled," and intercourse with an uncircumcised man was generally regarded as irretrievably defiling for a Judean woman (cf. *Ant.* 1.192). Thus *Ant.* 3.276 interprets the Leviticus text as ruling out marriage to a slave or a prisoner of war (both presumed to be sexually "soiled"), and the questions raised against the high-priesthood of Hyrcanus, because his mother was reputed to have been captured by Gentiles, indicate the potential importance of the issue (*Ant.* 13.292); cf. *m. Ketub.* 2.9. Josephus' first marriage was in fact to a prisoner-of-war (*Life* 414), but he insists that she was a virgin, and the marriage, commanded by Vespasian, did not last long or result in any issue; the qualifications suggest his embarrassment in the light of this *halakah*; see Siegert, Schreckenberg & Vogel 2001: 182.

<sup>144</sup> Although τεκμήριον can have the weaker sense, "evidence" (see note at "events" at 1.26), in this climactic statement it seems to indicate "proof." "Precision" seems the best translation of ἀκρίβεια (see note to "time" at 1.29): the details in the list display that the record is precise, but by themselves could hardly prove its accuracy. However, the ambiguity in the term might suggest both senses.

<sup>145</sup> The Greek text (ἀρχιερεῖς) is supported by the Latin (*pontifices*) and followed by Niese, Thackeray, and Reinach. Noting the sudden change of subject (priests in general are the topic of discussion both before and after this sentence), Holwerda suggested emending this to ἱερεῖς ("priests"), and is followed by Naber, Gutschmid (400—noting the priestly genealogies in Chronicles), and Münster. But the conjectural emendation seems unnecessary and unlikely. Josephus frequently inserts only partially relevant material into a larger argument, and shifts ground in mid-flow. And he could hardly claim the existence of genealogies for all ordinary priests covering 2,000 years, while we know he *did* claim this for chief-priests (see next note). Of course a list of chief-priests, even if truly ancient, is hardly the sort of ancient record on which historical narratives could be built and corrected (cf. 1.19-23). Josephus' reliance for ancient history is really on the scriptural narratives themselves (1.37), not on isolated strands of tradition like this.

<sup>146</sup> 2,000 years takes Josephus back to Moses (and

above rules,<sup>147</sup> it is forbidden to approach the altars or share in any other rite.<sup>148</sup>

37 Naturally, then, or rather necessarily<sup>149</sup>—seeing that it is not open to anyone to write of their own accord,<sup>150</sup> nor is there any disagreement present in what is written,<sup>151</sup> but the prophets alone learned, by inspiration from God,<sup>152</sup> what had happened

Aaron); cf. 2.226; *Ant.* 20.261. He elsewhere counts 13 chief-priests from Aaron until the first temple, in succession from father to son (*Ant.* 20.224-230; all are named in the earlier books); then 18 from Zadok till the exile (*Ant.* 20.231-32; cf. the list of 17 names, with patronymics, in *Ant.* 10.151-53); then, after the exile, Jesus, son of Josedek and 15 generations of descendants until Antiochus (*Ant.* 20.233-34); then a more irregular period, climaxing in the 28 chief-priests from the time of Herod till the destruction of the temple (*Ant.* 20.235-51). He is drawing in part on biblical sources (e.g., 1 Chron 6:3-15, 50-53), but the length and prominence of the tracing of this line in *Ant.* 20.224-51 suggests the significance of this tradition for his view of history. As a priest trained in the scriptures (*Apion* 1.54), it was natural for him to think of Judean “records” primarily in terms of priestly lineage and biblical literature.

<sup>147</sup> Reading τοῖς ... παραβάσιν (and omitting the extraneous γένοιτο εἰς) with Niese minor and Münster. The subject seems to have reverted to priests in general, and the rules about marriage. παραβάσιν is one of Josephus’ favorite terms in relation to the Judean constitution, where he insists that “a law-breaker is rare” (2.178).

<sup>148</sup> The present tense suggests a continuing practice, despite the lack of temple. For an historical attempt to challenge a chief-priest according to such rules, see *Ant.* 13.292. Josephus will later highlight a similar strictness regarding the bodily perfection of priests (1.284). The rigor of law-observance, and the ruthless punishment of offenders, is a central theme of the constitution (2.190-218), in harmony with Roman principles of discipline.

<sup>149</sup> The two adverbs (in combination suggesting the force not merely of fact but of logic) introduce the new point by giving the appearance of providing a conclusion from the previous one (1.30-36); but in reality the two statements on Judean sources seem to have no inner connection, except in common exposition of 1.29 (cf. Reinach 113; Bilde 1996: 102). The new paragraph (1.37-41) is logically the most crucial for the whole discussion of historiography, since it indicates the distinctive Judean confidence in the authorship and authority of the scriptures, on which Josephus’ historiography is utterly dependent. Its brevity is striking: Josephus is either reticent to expose these points to greater exposition (and thus greater scrutiny), or is confident that his readers will not regard them as conten-

tious. The normal criteria of historiography are here given a distinctively Judean twist, a “subaltern” intervention in a debate otherwise conducted in traditional Greek categories; see Barclay 2005b.

<sup>150</sup> From the preceding discussion, one might think that this concerned the composition of priestly genealogies (1.35), but the following statement about “the prophets” indicates otherwise; the shift indicates that the new paragraph discusses “records” of a very different kind. “Of their own accord” (αὐτεξούσιον) echoes by contrast the “license” (ἐξουσία) of the Greeks (1.20). The rare term occurs in highly significant contexts in 2.173 and *Ant.* 4.146, and the statement encapsulates the Josephan virtue of cultural control.

<sup>151</sup> Again this is in contrast to the Greeks, with their cacophony of sources in mutual contradiction (1.15-27); and it suggests a presumption of historical accuracy on the principle of 1.26. Josephus’ narrative in *Antiquities* always smoothes over inconsistencies in his biblical sources, usually silently, but occasionally with explicit comment (*Ant.* 10.106-7, 141). Disagreement would invite critical assessment about which was more likely to be true, and in the case of the scriptures Josephus is unwilling to undertake such a task.

<sup>152</sup> The singular role of prophets in the composition of history (cf. 1.29) matches what Josephus will shortly say of the scriptural books (with the exception of the last four, 1.40). This association of Judean historiography with prophets (cf. *War* 1.18; 6.109) is without parallel in Greek or Roman culture, where prophets (or Sibyls) might predict the future, under divine inspiration, but had no role in the genre of historiography. Similarly striking is the sense that those responsible for writing history *learned* it from God. “Learning” (see note to “Cadmus” at 1.10) suggests a passive subordination quite contrary to the Greek (esp. the Thucydidean) spirit of enquiry, which involved the critical testing of sources. As “prophets,” these Judean historians would be recipients of divine inspiration (ἐπίπνοια, hapax in Josephus), since the prophet was mastered and possessed by the divine Spirit (*Ant.* 4.118-19). Josephus elsewhere speaks of Moses “learning” the Judean code of laws “from God” (*Ant.* 4.286; cf. 4.329), and it is this conviction that undergirds Judean commitment to the “decrees of God” (1.42). The Judean attitude to their scriptures thus matches this ethos of deference implied in the “learning” of their contents.

in the distant and most ancient past<sup>153</sup> and recorded plainly events in their own time just as they occurred<sup>154</sup>—(1.8) 38 among us there are not thousands of books in disagreement and conflict with each other,<sup>155</sup> but only twenty-two books,<sup>156</sup> containing the record of all time,<sup>157</sup> which are rightly trusted.<sup>158</sup> 39 Five of these are the books of Moses,<sup>159</sup> which contain both the laws<sup>160</sup> and the tradition from the birth of humanity up to his death;<sup>161</sup> this is a period of a little less than 3,000 years.<sup>162</sup>

<sup>153</sup> The notion of learning ancient history direct from God is theologically reasonable (since God can be presumed to know history comprehensively), but utterly strange to the Greek tradition of historiography. It circumvents the usual objection that ancient “history” is inevitably contaminated by “myth,” since it can be claimed to be based on an utterly reliable source, God. As 1.39 will show, Josephus has Moses specifically in mind here. Even the record of chief-priests (1.36) cannot provide historical sources earlier than Moses, so for all previous history Moses had to rely on God alone. The truly “ancient” past (παλαιότατα) is what is most significant for proving that the Judean nation is “extremely ancient” (παλαιότατον, 1.1).

<sup>154</sup> The recording of contemporary events (with eyewitness certainty, cf. 1.47) is to be claimed of the prophets who succeeded Moses (1.40); that they wrote “plainly” (σαφῶς) implies they are not subject to normal human uncertainty in interpretation (cf. Gutschmid 401).

<sup>155</sup> The vague and huge “thousands” will stand in contrast to the tiny 22, and the association of vast numbers with internal disagreement (described by two phrases, to magnify the impression, cf. 1.15-18) sets up an expectation that a very much smaller number of books will be characterized, in contrast, by harmony. Of course there is no logical reason why the number of books should correlate to the extent of mutual disagreement.

<sup>156</sup> “Only” (μόνα), emphasizing the fewness in number, echoes the restriction of authorship to prophets “alone” (μόνων, 1.37); what might have looked like a cultural weakness (only 22 books of Judean records) is thus turned into a strength. The 22 is made up of the 5 of Moses, the 13 of prophets and the 4 other (1.39-40; for the probable contents of each see notes ad loc.). They are not characterized here as “sacred” (cf. 1.1, 54, 127), but they are clearly distinguished from other and subsequent literature (1.41), and to this extent Josephus’ canon is clearly “closed” (even if the contents of these books and their textual form may have been subject to dispute); so rightly Beckwith 1985: 78-80; Mason 2002: 110-27. Josephus’ rhetoric encourages here the citation of the lowest possible number; it is the same figure given by several early Christian sources (e.g., Origen in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25; Jerome, pref-

ace to Vulgate translation of Samuel and Kings; cf. Beckwith 1985: 119-22). As Jerome noted, an alternative Judean enumeration (counting some combined books as two, rather than one) could result in a total of 24, as is found in 4 Ezra 14:44-46 and implied in *b B. Bat.* 14b.

<sup>157</sup> “The record” (ἀναγραφή, as for Greek sources, but here in the singular; cf. *Ant.* 1.12) is fully comprehensive, from the beginning of all time (see 1.39—though not up to the present, 1.41), and, perhaps, concerning all humanity.

<sup>158</sup> “Trust” is the issue highlighted in 1.2, 6, and its appearance at this critical juncture (here πεπιστευμένα) shows that Josephus recognizes its importance. “Rightly” (δικαίως) echoes the appeal for proper deduction from the facts in 1.6, but the context provides rather little support for that judgment for any readers not already convinced of the case. The addition of θεῖα in Eusebius’ version (“correctly believed to be divine”) may be a Christian modification, anticipating the claim made in 1.42 (cf. Gutschmid 401-2). On the differences between the following explication of the canon and the earlier practice of Josephus in *Antiquities*, see Höffken 2001.

<sup>159</sup> Following 1.37, Moses is apparently regarded here as a prophet; so also explicitly in *Ant.* 2.327; 4.165, 329, etc.. Moses was always known as the source of the laws (cf. 2.151ff.), but his authorship of the other narratives in the Pentateuch is also taken for granted by Josephus (cf. *Ant.* 3.74; 10.58).

<sup>160</sup> Reading νόμους with Eusebius and all modern editors.

<sup>161</sup> Although Josephus acknowledges that the Pentateuch contains two genres, the second is in this context the more important: elsewhere Moses is the pre-eminent legislator, but here the prophet-historian whose comprehensive history can only have been “learned from God” (1.37). “Tradition” (παράδοσις) was used before for a human tradition handed down over the generations (1.8, 28). Here it is applied to what is “handed over” by God to Moses. On Moses’ account of his own death see *Ant.* 4.326 and Feldman 2000 ad loc.

<sup>162</sup> See note to “years” at 1.1. The “little less” hints that Josephus has a very exact calculation to hand, but does not need to be precise (see Gutschmid 402-3).



40 From the death of Moses until Artaxerxes,<sup>163</sup> king of the Persians after Xerxes,<sup>164</sup> the prophets after Moses wrote the history of what took place in their own times in thirteen books;<sup>165</sup> the remaining four books contain hymns to God and instructions for people on life.<sup>166</sup> 41 From Artaxerxes up to our own time every event has been recorded,<sup>167</sup> but this is not judged worthy of the same trust,<sup>168</sup> since the exact line of succession of the prophets did not continue.<sup>169</sup>

<sup>163</sup> Reading μέχρις Ἀρταξέρξου (the emendation of Gutschmid 403, following Latin and followed by Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster). L and Eusebius read τῆς between these two words, suggesting the sense “until the (death of) Artaxerxes.” Josephus thought Artaxerxes (465-424 BCE) was the figure named Ahasuerus in the book of Esther (*Ant.* 11.184ff.), taking the biblical “Artaxerxes” of Ezra-Nehemiah as Xerxes (*Ant.* 11.120ff.). Thus his reference here is to the biblical history up till the end of the book of Esther (*Ant.* 11.296), which finishes in the reign of “Artaxerxes,” but does not include his death.

<sup>164</sup> Named here as the more famous figure (reigned 486—465 BCE) who invaded Greece. This means that the biblical record is so old that it *finishes* at the time the Greek records are hardly *beginning* (1.13).

<sup>165</sup> The phraseology suggests that Moses himself was the first prophet, and identifies his successor-prophets as historians of contemporary events (echoing 1.37). Josephus continues to operate with the dualism between historiography of the past and of the present, as in *War* 1.13-16. The 13 books are not named or listed (Isaiah and the “other” 12 prophets mentioned in *Ant.* 10.35 may be not these 13, but Isaiah and the book of the 12 minor prophets; see Beckwith 1985: 99-100, n.80). However, judging from Josephus’ naming of prophets elsewhere and from other lists it is most likely that Josephus means: Joshua, Judges + Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah + Lamentations, Ezekiel, the 12, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah (=Esdras), Daniel, Job, and Esther (the order is unknown, if indeed it was fixed); see Gutschmid 404-5; Ryle 1914: 173-76; Thackeray, Reinach ad loc.; Beckwith 1985: 78-80, 119; Leiman 1989. It is possible that Ruth and Lamentations could be counted as independent, and not among the prophets, but it was in Josephus’ interests to keep the total low, and to place as many books as possible in the prophetic category, since he has declared all of the scriptures to be the product of prophets (1.37).

<sup>166</sup> Since these books are neither historical nor prophetic, they do not support or illustrate the case for the Judean “records,” or for their prophetic origins. That Josephus mentions them at all, and in a context where he wants the total to be low as possible (1.38), is testimony to their ineradicable place in the canon (so also Höffken 2001: 162-64). The 4 no doubt include the Psalms and Proverbs, and probably also Song of Songs

and Qoheleth (if Lamentations was in the earlier group of 13); see the scholarly discussion cited in the previous note. Josephus does not place a label on these 4, but neither are the previous 13 given an official label. It is possible that the grouping of the books into labelled categories was neither fixed nor universal at this time, even if the limits of the canon were. Even if he knew category-labels, Josephus was not obliged to cite them, and may have ignored them in order to shift as many books as possible into the prophetic group. In this sense, Josephus does not witness (for or against) the notion of a “tri-partite” canon, though neither does he support a “bi-partite” thesis (Barton 1986: 49); so rightly, on both points, Mason 2002. His numbering of the books in three groups has long invited comparison with other hints at a division between the law, the prophets, and “others” (or “Psalms”); see, e.g., Prologue to Sirach; 4QMMT C 9-12; Philo, *Contempl.* 25; Luke 24:44. For a selection of recent discussion of the “tri-partite” issue, which has been bedeviled by differing understandings of “canon” and of the different ways in which a canon can be fixed or fluid, see McDonald and Sanders 2002. The “instructions” (ὑποθήκαι; cf. *Life* 291) are clearly distinguishable from the “laws” of Moses (1.39) and must include at least Proverbs.

<sup>167</sup> Judean records thus did continue, up to and including the records created by Josephus himself (1.47); the Judean tradition did not leave gaps for others to fill. (In reality, of course, it did: note the leap of 100 years between *Ant.* 11.296 and 11.304.) But Josephus says nothing about how, where and when these records were made—though they presumably include the ongoing record of the chief-priests (1.36). His lack of interest in defining them shows that his real foundation lies in the 22-book canon, at least for any statement about antiquity.

<sup>168</sup> On the issue of trust, see 1.38 at “trusted.” Admitting the problematic status of the later books throws all the weight of emphasis, and confidence, on the earlier 22. The distinction between later Judean historiography and Greek historiography will have to be made on other grounds, as in Josephus’ self-accreditation to follow (cf. Höffken 2001: 163).

<sup>169</sup> “Exact” (ἀκρίβης, cf. 1.29, 32, 36) and “succession” (διαδοχή, cf. 1.31) echo important motifs from the previous discussion, but this criterion was not mentioned in 1.40 and, after the succession between Moses



42 It is clear in practice how we approach our own writings.<sup>170</sup> Although such a long time has now passed, no-one has dared to add, to take away, or to alter anything;<sup>171</sup> and it is innate in every Judean, right from birth,<sup>172</sup> to regard them as de-

*Judean respect  
for records:  
dying for the  
law*

and Joshua (*Ant.* 4.165), is not a feature of the narrative in *Antiquities* (Höffken 2001: 169-70). Neither is it clear why only “exact succession” guarantees trustworthiness (cannot unrelated prophets record history?), unless it is implied in 1.40 that each generation needed a contemporary prophet to relate its history. The motif looks like an artificial creation to emphasize, by comparison, the unimpeachable authority of the 22 books (cf. Gray 1993: 12).

That the *exact line of succession in scripture-writing prophets* did not continue need not imply that there were no prophets after the time of Artaxerxes. In fact, Josephus acknowledges John Hyrcanus to have been a “prophet” (*War* 1.68-69; *Ant.* 13.299; cf. 3.218), but he otherwise uses the language of “prophecy” very sparingly: although he speaks of the Essenes (*Ant.* 15.373-79) and himself (*War* 3.399-402) predicting the future, he does not use the precise language of “prophecy” in this connection (see Aune 1982; Feldman 1990a; Gerber 1994; and the carefully nuanced treatment by Gray 1993: 16-34). In context, this clause need not suggest that Josephus thought that prophecy in general, or “the Spirit,” had ceased in his day (though other texts might indicate this, e.g. 1 Macc 4:46; 9:27). He is simply denying that the same degree of prophetic historiographical reliability was in operation after Artaxerxes as before, thus emphasizing the uniquely authoritative status of the closed canon. On the place of his own work in this context, see *War* 1.18; *Ant.* 1.17; *Apion* 1.47-56; while displaying some of the same characteristics of accurate historiography as that of the prophet-writers, he does not here claim prophetic status (rightly, Gray 1993: 15) and does not present his work as “on a par” with the scriptures (*pace* Bilde 1996).

<sup>170</sup> Reading *πρόσιμεν* (“we approach”) with Eusebius and all modern editors (against *πεπιστεύκαμεν*, “we have trusted/believed,” in L; cf. Latin). “In practice” (*ἔργῳ*) hints at the combination of word and deed/practice which reflects the consistency of the Judean constitution (2.171-74; cf. 1.219). This allows Josephus to shift to the topic of Judean commitment to the Scriptures (1.42-43), and thus circle back, in contrast, to the sloppiness of the Greeks (1.44-45).

<sup>171</sup> The formula, “neither to add nor to take away,” is widely attested in antiquity as a statement of fidelity to a written statement or tradition (van Unnik 1949). It is present in Deuteronomy as a warning against disloyalty to the commandments (Deut 4:2; 13:1), and Josephus knew it also from *Aristeas* 311 as a formula

for expressing the unalterable accuracy of the Greek translation of the Bible (*Ant.* 12.109; cf. Philo, *Mos.* 2.34, where the same three verbs are used as here, in relation to keeping the form and shape of the God-given laws). Josephus famously promised in his introduction to his *Antiquities* that he would present the biblical material without addition or subtraction (*Ant.* 1.17; cf. 4.196-97; 10.218; 14.1-3), spawning considerable modern debate as to what he means by this claim and the extent to which he lives up to it (see van Unnik 1978: 26-40; Feldman 2000: 7-8; Inowlocki 2005). There, as here, he may be drawing not so much on the Deuteronomy texts as on the commitment of some historians to pass on ancient traditions, unaltered, with nothing added or taken away (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 5). This is a different matter from (though often confused with) the common claim by historians to relate *the facts* without addition or subtraction (e.g., Dionysius, *Thuc.* 8; Lucian, *Hist.* 47). What Josephus is claiming (whatever his actual practice), and what Dionysius records with obvious disapproval (as an uncritical procedure, *Thuc.* 5), is the relating of ancient *traditions* or narratives unaltered. Although Josephus parades it here as a mark of Judean fidelity to trustworthy sources (his use of “dared” suggests it would be a shocking act of insubordination to do otherwise), it could look to others like simple-minded conservatism, an unwillingness or inability to sift the ancient material, which is contaminated with “myth.” Josephus here keeps company with other eastern historians relaying their histories straight from the records (see Rajak 2002: 249-50; Cohen 1979: 27-29, citing Ps.-Nepos on translating Dares Phrygius); but this and the following phrase could be taken by a skeptical reader as a sign of Judean credulity (cf. Agatharchides in 1.205-11).

<sup>172</sup> Very early socialization, “right from the first,” is a favorite theme of Josephus; cf. 2.173, 178, 204. “Innate” (*σύμφυτον*) is a rare term in Josephus (cf. *Ant.* 6.36), but the phrase reflects his emphasis on the universality and thoroughness of Judean commitment (cf. 2.178). Philo, *Legat.* 209-10 expresses a very similar constellation of themes: dying for the law, training in the law “from the earliest age,” and holding the laws to be “oracles given by God” (*θεόχρηστα λόγια*); cf. *Hypoth.* 6.9. From another angle, childhood commitments could look distinctly childish, and to retain these unaltered into adulthood might be taken as a sign of the failure of adult reason; cf. Josephus’ reply to Agatharchides in 1.212 with notes ad loc.

crees of God,<sup>173</sup> to remain faithful to them<sup>174</sup> and, if necessary, gladly to die on their behalf.<sup>175</sup> **43** Thus, to date many have been seen, on many occasions,<sup>176</sup> as prisoners of war suffering torture and all kinds of deaths in theaters<sup>177</sup> for not letting slip a single word in contravention of the laws<sup>178</sup> and the records associated with them.<sup>179</sup>

<sup>173</sup> Greek: θεοῦ δόγματα, a phrase not used elsewhere by Josephus with reference to the scriptures, though related to the notion of “inspiration” (1.37). δόγμα suggests a ruling or ordinance, and thus fits the laws in the Pentateuch more obviously than any other genre. Indeed the laws are the real topic of the rest of this section, and the next, with “the records” tacked on rather loosely at the end of 1.43. Judean commitment to the laws will thus be favorably contrasted with Greek commitment to Greek literature (1.44-45), a slanted comparison masked by Josephus’ wording in 1.42-43. For the sentiment here, cf. *m. Sanh.* 10.1: “these are those who have no share in the world to come: he that says that ... the Law is not from Heaven ...” In a later context (2.151-63), Josephus will make rather less explicit claims for the divine status of the law.

<sup>174</sup> This and the next phrase anticipate a major theme in 2.145-286, the unwavering commitment of Judeans to their constitution. “Remain faithful” (ἑμμένω) is used 6 times in that segment (2.150, 153, 182, 221, 257, 278).

<sup>175</sup> The extreme mark of faithfulness is death on behalf of the law, a point repeated, with similar vocabulary, in 2.218 and developed in 2.219-34. “If necessary” protects such self-sacrificing Judeans from the charge of futile self-destruction, and prepares the ground for the following example (1.43). The fact that Josephus introduces this theme here and returns to it often (cf., besides 2.219-34, 1.190-91, 212; 2.146, 272, 294) suggests how significant it is for his rhetoric in this treatise. The theme of Judean “martyrdom” for the law had become especially important in narratives of the Maccabean uprising (see van Henten 1997; Rajak 2002: 99-133) and could be connected to the Greek motif of the noble death (Droge and Tabor 1992; van Henten and Avemarie 2002). Josephus included several examples of such Judean self-sacrifice in his earlier narratives (e.g., *War* 1.648-55; 2.152-53, 169-77; 7.341-88, 416-19; *Ant.* 18.23-24, 55-62, 261-88; see the full list in van Henten 1999: 137-39). It remains prominent in this treatise and evokes the Roman virtue of contempt for death (2.146; see Appendix 6).

<sup>176</sup> The vague generalization (whose vocabulary is echoed in 2.219) bundles together all the “martyr” stories and connects the recent events after the Judean War with a previous history of suffering, shared by more than a few unfortunates or fanatics.

<sup>177</sup> The reference to prisoners and to (amphi-)theaters strongly suggests the recent treatment of Judean

prisoners after the Judean War, whom the victorious Romans used for violent entertainment all over the empire; see, e.g., *War* 6.418 (prisoners of war presented by Titus to be destroyed in the theaters by the sword or wild beasts); 7.23-24 (Titus’ display of prisoners to be killed by wild beasts or in mutual combat); 7.37-38 (2,500 killed in similar fashion or burned to death); 7.373-74 (dying on the rack, by fire or whip or wild beasts). Here, as in *Apion* 2.232-33, which alludes to the same events, Josephus passes over the fact that these prisoners were being slaughtered on the orders of Roman emperors, suffering the usual fate of rebels against Roman authority. By remaining silent on the context of these deaths and the identity of those who ordered them, he avoids pitting Judeans against Romans. For his sensitivity on this matter, and on the related charge that Judeans were repeatedly insubordinate to Roman rule, see his response to Apion in 2.33-78. In speaking indirectly Josephus glorifies the Judean heroes without impugning Roman imperial power or indicting her savagery.

<sup>178</sup> Not even a word—let alone an act—suggests the height of commitment; cf. the closely parallel comments in 2.219, 233. The victims in the theaters were no doubt regarded by the Romans as suffering for their role in the Revolt, not for their commitment to the Judean law; and as prisoners of war, they were hardly able to say or do anything by which they could escape their fate. Thus Josephus has constructed an artificial scenario, more fitting to the literary representations of martyr-heroes who were offered release if they spoke or acted against the law (2 Macc 6-7; 4 Macc). Josephus hints at *War* 6.419 that some prisoners starved to death in keeping to the Judean food-laws, but the theaters spelled death regardless of one’s attitude to the law. For the significance of speech (declaring Caesar to be δεσπότης), see *War* 7.417-19.

<sup>179</sup> The “records” (ἀναγραφαί, see note to “laws” at 1.7) are rather awkwardly tacked on here (and absent from the parallel statements in 2.219, 233) since the context requires a claim of faithfulness to all the Judean scriptures, not just the law. But the awkwardness indicates that the Judean martyr-tradition on which Josephus draws was familiar with dying for the laws (or for God), but not with dying for the scriptures—and, indeed, with death for the laws as textual phenomena only inasmuch as they contained the rules and customs obeyed by Judeans, not as written (historical) records in themselves. Josephus, however, needs this addendum

44 What Greek would suffer this on behalf of his own writings?<sup>180</sup> He will not face the slightest injury even to save the whole body of Greek literature from obliteration!<sup>181</sup> 45 For they regard these as stories invented at the whim of their authors,<sup>182</sup> and they are right<sup>183</sup> to think this even with regard to the older authors, since they see some of their contemporaries<sup>184</sup> daring to write accounts of events at which they were not present and about which they have not troubled to gain information from those who know the facts.<sup>185</sup> 46 In fact, even in relation to the war that happened recently to us,<sup>186</sup> some have published works under the title of histories<sup>187</sup> without

*Greek lack of respect: "history" is fiction*

to create the following artificial contrast with the attitude of Greeks to their historiography (1.44-45).

<sup>180</sup> Reading ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ (with Naber and Münster). Josephus does not specify "writings" (just "his own things"), but the context before ("records") and after ("literature") suggests something like this. The reintroduction of "Greeks" keeps the Greek/non-Greek contrast alive, the main theme of 1.6ff. to be summed up in 1.58. Josephus can now develop his earlier aspersions on Greek historiography and, through the rhetorical question (expecting the answer "none"), he can exploit the Roman perception of Greeks as soft and cowardly (e.g., Cicero, *Fin.* 2.62; *Tusc.* 2.65; 5.113; Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.47.2), or clever at avoiding trouble (Juvenal, *Sat.* 3). Of course there are plenty of instances in Greek history and legend of self-sacrifice (to the point of death) on behalf of one's family, one's city or one's cause; see van Henten and Avemarie 2002 for a selection of primary sources. Dying for one's fatherland could be represented in terms, like those of Josephus, as dying for "the sacred laws of our country" (the famous epigraph for Leonidas and the Spartan heroes of Thermopylae, admired by Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.101). But because the Greek civic laws were not textualized in the same way as in the Judean tradition, even if they were believed to derive from the Gods (cf. 2.160-62), no Greek texts became as sacrosanct as the Judean scriptures. Josephus exploits this cultural difference to suggest, unfairly, that Greeks were completely cavalier in their attitude towards their own literature.

<sup>181</sup> The sentence gives the greatest possible contrast with Judean willingness to die, and fear of uttering even a word in contravention of the laws and writings (1.43). What follows depends on an implied logic: Judeans are willing to die for their writings because they know they are utterly reliable; if Greeks won't lift a finger to defend their literature (1.44) it must be because they know they are utterly false (1.45). The argument obscures the quite different cultural logics at work in the Judean and Greek traditions.

<sup>182</sup> What was obviously true of poetry is here asserted, on the basis of 1.15-27, as applicable to Greek "history" as well, and thus to all Greek literature (1.44). The invention (cf. 1.15-18, "conjectures" and "lies")

reflects merely the whim (lit. "desire") of the author (cf. 1.20: "license"), in contrast to the divine authority and historical truth which undergird the Judean scriptures.

<sup>183</sup> δικάϊως, as in 1.6 (adjective) and 1.38 (adverb).

<sup>184</sup> The logic (implicitly attributed to the Greeks) seems to be that if contemporary historians do not bother to find out what happened, the same can be presumed of the historians of the past. Josephus will not allow a narrative of cultural decline: the Greek tradition is uniformly deficient, and carelessness a persistent ethnic trait. This shift from the historians of antiquity (the real subject matter of this segment) to historians of the present is necessary to permit Josephus' self-presentation (and self-defense) as an historian of the Judean War (1.47-56). The sequence of the argument requires that the "some" he here criticises are themselves "Greeks"; but by failing to identify them, he leaves his readers with a sufficiently imprecise image to cover whomever he wants to target.

<sup>185</sup> The two fundamental requirements for contemporary historians are i) that, as far as possible, they are eyewitnesses to events and places they describe; and ii) that for other information they use the very best sources. These two criteria, implicit throughout 1.47-52, are repeated in 1.53; they echo the similar sentiments of *War* 1.1-3 (cf. *Life* 357 for a negative example). For such criteria as *topoi* in the historiographical tradition, see Marincola 1997: 63-86. Josephus is setting up the categories for the following discussion of historiography of the Judean War, and his "daring to" (cf. "reckless," 1.56) raises the emotional tone, which will reach an initial climax at the end of 1.46. That the contemporary historians did not "trouble" themselves in their gathering of information echoes the "careless" attitude of Greeks, highlighted in 1.20, 21, 24.

<sup>186</sup> Greek: περὶ τοῦ γενομένου νῦν ἡμῖν πολέμου; Josephus leaves unspoken whom it was against and obscures who started it. As in 1.43 he avoids explicit reference to enmity between Judeans and Romans.

<sup>187</sup> Münster emends L's ἐπιγράφαντες ("entitling") to συγγράφοντες ("composing"), on the basis of Latin, *conscribentes*. But the end of this section suggests that Josephus wishes to maintain an ironic distinction be-

either visiting the sites or going anywhere near the action;<sup>188</sup> rather, concocting a few things on the basis of misinformation,<sup>189</sup> they have given it the name of “history” with the complete shamelessness of a drunk.<sup>190</sup>

*Josephus’  
account of the  
Judean War*

(1.9) 47 I, on the other hand,<sup>191</sup> have written a truthful account of the whole war and its individual details,<sup>192</sup> having been present myself at all the events.<sup>193</sup> 48 For I

tween these books and the titles they are accorded by their authors (cf. Polybius 12.11.8). Cf. the same point (with ἐπιγράφω) at *War* 1.7.

<sup>188</sup> Josephus emphasizes the significance of eyewitness acquaintance, which will be his unique qualification in the profile that follows (1.47-49, 55). His criticism of others on this score (they were so absent as to be not anywhere near!) echoes a long tradition of Greek historiographical polemics, as in Polybius’ criticisms of Timaeus (Polybius 12.4, 25e-g). Josephus’ generalized assault leaves it hard to deduce his targets. The repetition of this theme in 1.53-55 leads many to find a connection with Justus of Tiberias (see note to “history” at 1.53). However, we know from *War* 1.1-7 that Josephus criticised other accounts of the War, both for bias and for their lack of first-hand knowledge and dependence on “hear-say” (ἀκοή; cf. παρακούσματα, “misinformation,” in this section). Thus the polemic here is broad and vague enough to include any of the rival histories of the War. The immediate context (1.44) would suggest that Josephus has “Greek” historians particularly in view, but Josephus often uses his categories loosely.

<sup>189</sup> They do not have much to say, and what they have is based on misunderstanding or misinformation (παρακούσματα; cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 9.22.1); “concocting” (συντίθημι) is Josephus’ regular term of disdain for authors he regards as creators of fiction (e.g., 1.287, 293, 294).

<sup>190</sup> The metaphor (beloved of Josephus, cf. *Ant.* 6.265; 13.426; 17.130; 20.154—a close parallel) brings to a rhetorical climax Josephus’ critique of Greek historiography. “Shamelessness” is a charge he likes to throw at his opponents (e.g., 1.320; 2.97; *Life* 357); cf. the “daring” of 1.45.

<sup>191</sup> This justification of Josephus’ history of the War, in 1.47-52, at first looks out of place in a text whose advertized concern is Judean antiquity and the account of this Josephus had offered in his other work, the *Antiquities* (1.1). Why does he now depart into what he recognizes as a “digression” (1.57), repeating several themes he had outlined in his introduction to the *War* (1.1-3)? Three levels of explanation can be offered, mutually reinforcing rather than exclusive. i) As 1.53-56 shows, Josephus’ account of the War has come under criticism—certainly from Justus and perhaps from others (see 1.53). Thus, just as *Life* contained an apologetic “digression” directed at Justus (*Life* 336-67), so

here Josephus responds to what he regards as a serious attack on his integrity. One may wonder why *another* defense is needed, after that offered in *Life*, and why no reference is made back to that earlier digression (if indeed *Life* was written before *Apion*; see Introduction, § 3). If this is not simply a sign of Josephus’ vanity (so Gutschmid 410), it may reflect his perception that his reputation as a historian depended on the fame and significance of his account of the War: if that was discredited, he could not expect his other historical work (*Antiquities*) to be taken seriously. ii) Within the context of the present work, Josephus may regard himself as a representative of Judean historiography. As a paradigm case, whose historical methods parallel those of the Judean prophet-historians of contemporary events (1.37, 40), Josephus may hope that his self-profiling will serve to boost the reputation of all Judean historians. This is not to say that he regards his work as belonging to same category as the scriptures (*pace* Bilde 1996), but in the contrast between Greek and Judean historiography, his own work is the obvious contemporary example on the Judean side. iii) More broadly, as he draws this preliminary segment to an end, Josephus takes this opportunity to establish his *ethos* as the author of this work. No self-introduction had been given in the preface, parallel to that offered in the preface to *War* and the conclusion to *Antiquities* (at length in *Life*). But Josephus can here present himself as the uniquely competent author of two major works (1.54-55), as a contemporary historian of impeccable credentials (1.47-49), and as a public figure with intimate contacts with the highest political authorities in both the Roman and the Judean worlds (1.48-52). At the same time, three asides in 1.50, 1.51 and 1.54, place him on his contemporary cultural map, and reinforce his image as a Judean expert whose commitments to his own tradition take priority over Greek “wisdom” while honoring its presence in others. The sharpness of the counter-polemic in 1.53-56 indicates that he is responding to real charges, but his training in rhetoric enables him to turn this into an opportunity for self-promotion.

<sup>192</sup> “Truthful” is highlighted as truth is the issue at stake (1.56; cf. 1.50, 52, 53). The claim to a complete and thorough account provides the greatest possible contrast to the “few things” of 1.46.

<sup>193</sup> Autopsy is the key theme in Josephus’ self-defense, as established in 1.48-49 and repeated in 1.55;



was in command of those we call “Galileans” for as long as it was possible to resist,<sup>194</sup> and after being captured lived among the Romans as a prisoner.<sup>195</sup> When they had me under guard, Vespasian and Titus compelled me to be continually in attendance on them, initially bound;<sup>196</sup> then, when I was released, I was sent from Alexandria with Titus to the siege of Hierosolyma [Jerusalem].<sup>197</sup> **49** During that time none of the action escaped my knowledge:<sup>198</sup> for I watched and carefully recorded what happened in the Roman camp,<sup>199</sup> and I alone understood what was reported by deserters.<sup>200</sup> **50** Then, when I had leisure in Rome, and when all the work was pre-

cf. *War* 1.1, 3. The comprehensive claim requires exaggeration and strategic silence in 1.48-49. For the importance of personal witness and experience in historians’ claims see Marincola 1997: 63-86, 133-48.

<sup>194</sup> It is important for Josephus that he has first-hand knowledge of the War from both sides (cf. 1.56; Thucydides 5.26). Although he will say much more about his acquaintance with the Roman perspective, perhaps to counter claims of his comparative ignorance (1.56), his initial role as a Judean general indicates his unique historiographical advantage (cf. *War* 1.3). For the present purposes, his ambiguous and highly controversial role in Galilee can be passed over. His phrasing suggests that his readers might not recognize the label “Galilean,” and may not have read either *War* or *Life*. Here his resistance “as long as it was possible” suggests the nobility of a general who neither surrenders with cowardly haste nor prolongs the fight with desperate defiance. The sentiment hardly matches his conduct at Jotapata, where he refused to surrender the city before it was overrun, while he himself entered a suicide pact (*War* 2.141-391).

<sup>195</sup> The circumstances of the capture in July 67 CE (*War* 2.316-92) are glossed over. Elsewhere, Josephus emphasizes the precautions, the kindness, and the honor with which he was treated as a prisoner (*War* 3.397-98; 4.410-11; *Life* 414). Here all that matters is his proximity to Romans.

<sup>196</sup> Josephus was a Roman prisoner from July 67 to (at the earliest) July 69 CE, when Vespasian was acclaimed emperor in Alexandria and, on a visit to Beirut, ordered his release (*War* 4.622-29). During these two years he was probably kept under guard (according to *War* 3.398, with especially tight security) in Caesarea; see *Life* 414 with Mason 2001 ad loc. and Bilde 1988: 55-57. The notion that he was *constantly* in attendance on Vespasian and Titus is necessary for his argument that he was well informed about the Roman side in the War, but is clearly exaggerated and extremely implausible. In *War* 3.399-402 Josephus records only one encounter with Vespasian during this whole period (the famous prediction of Vespasian’s rise to power) and nowhere suggests why they should need him in their entourage. *War* 4.622-29 gives the impression that

Vespasian had not thought about Josephus between the initial meeting and his acquisition of imperial powers.

<sup>197</sup> According to *War* 4.622-29, the release involved a symbolic cancellation of the indignity of imprisonment. It probably took place in the autumn of 69 CE when Vespasian was in Beirut (Levick 1999: 40-42). Vespasian then went to Alexandria in the late autumn/winter of 69 (*War* 4.630-56; *Life* 415) taking Josephus with him. Josephus’ dispatch from there with Titus (cf. *War* 4.658-63; *Life* 416 using near identical vocabulary) must have been in early 70 CE. His precise role on being “sent with” Titus (συνεπέμφθη) is unclear, as is the degree of proximity. The absence of time-indications in his narrative masks the fact that Josephus was out of touch with the Judean war effort for two-and-a-half years, from his capture till the start of the Jerusalem siege.

<sup>198</sup> Omitting γενομένην with all modern editors except Niese; it perhaps belongs with the preceding “siege” (Gutschmid 409). The general claim of omnipresence (and omniscience) in 1.47 is now concentrated in the period of the siege. From his comments elsewhere it is clear that his ambiguous position, as a Judean general in the Roman camp, earned him hatred from the defenders of the city (*War* 3.438-42; 5.541-47; 6.98, etc.) and suspicion from its besiegers (*Life* 416-17). Here he turns his ambivalence to his advantage, with the claim that he was in a position to know about both sides in the conflict. Contrast Justus of Tiberias, who was wholly absent (*Life* 358).

<sup>199</sup> “Watching” underlines his eyewitness role, though surprisingly little is said about this in *War* besides occasional references to his presence at Titus’ side (*War* 5.325). The “careful” (ἐπιμελῶς) recording echoes the emphasis on ἐπιμέλεια in 1.7, 21, 28, 29.

<sup>200</sup> Josephus’ role as a spokesman to the defenders of the city is often mentioned in *War* (e.g., 5.114, 261, 361-420), including reference to his linguistic qualification for this task (*War* 5.361; 6.96). While that narrative makes frequent reference to “deserters” (e.g., 4.377; 5.454; 6.118-21), only here does Josephus indicate that he debriefed them. But inasmuch as he knew anything about what was going on in Jerusalem it is reasonable to suppose that they were his chief source of knowl-



pared,<sup>201</sup> having made use of some collaborators for the Greek language,<sup>202</sup> I thus constructed my account of the events.<sup>203</sup> So confident was I of its truthfulness that I decided to use as my witnesses,<sup>204</sup> before everyone else, the commanders-in-chief

edge; thus he can claim to have “gained information from those who knew the facts” (cf. 1.45).

<sup>201</sup> Cf. *Life* 422-23 on the honors accorded to Josephus in Rome. To mention those here might invite accusations of bias in the composition; in this context Josephus will record the emperors’ testimony to his accuracy, but not their personal patronage. In fact, this sentence, on how Josephus composed his *War*, at first looks out of place. The surrounding context establishes the truthfulness of his historiography, on the basis of his own knowledge (1.47-49) and the testimony of authoritative and knowledgeable figures (1.50b-52). So why does Josephus indicate here his method of composition, and why does he mention only here (and not in *War* or the Justus-digression in *Life*) the use of “collaborators for the Greek language”? If this is not merely superfluous detail (which it might well be), there are two possible explanations. i) In this apologetic context (1.53-56), Josephus may be responding to charges that he needed collaborators in composing his history, such as Agrippa (“I used collaborators for the Greek, not for the subject matter; in essence the work was already prepared”); or that, in view of his poor Greek style, the work could not be his own (“I did use collaborators for the Greek”); or that the Greek style of the *War* was deficient (“I did try, and employed collaborators for this purpose”). However, none of these look particularly convincing explanations, especially not the third, despite the support it might receive from a particular “mirror-reading” of *Life* 40 (cf. *War* 1.13). ii) Josephus may be supporting the value of his history by claiming that his initial concern was simply the statement of the “facts.” Only when the work was prepared did he bother about the Greek, and then employed others for that purpose, since he was not personally responsible for such things as style. This would fit the larger context of this passage, where Josephus criticises the Greek obsession with “literary prowess” at the expense of the facts (1.24, 27; cf. 2.292). Thus here, as variously elsewhere (*War* 1.13-16; *Ant.* 1.7; 20.262-65), Josephus distances himself from Greek rhetorical skill. He accords the (undeniable) stylistic merits of the *War* to anonymous others, in an ancillary role, and in implicit contrast takes credit for the factual accuracy of the account. For parallels and Roman precedents see Rajak 1983: 47-48. If the “collaborators” carry this rhetorical role, this would diminish still further our ability to say anything about their actual deployment (see next note); indeed it might cast doubt on their

existence altogether. For πραγματεία as “the work” (the literary product), cf. 1.54.

<sup>202</sup> Greek: πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνῆν συνεργοί. As parallels elsewhere show, the φωνή here is literary (the Greek style) not oral (pronunciation); cf. 1.1, 73, 319; *War* 1.17; *Ant.* 1.10. The συνεργοί are best translated as “collaborators” or “accomplices,” rather than (as usual) “assistants,” although the expression that Josephus “made use” of them suggests they had an inferior status (cf. *Ant.* 4.616; 16.82). What role these collaborators had in the composition of *War* has been the subject of a long and inconclusive debate. Thackeray famously found evidence for their work in the varying style of different books of *Antiquities* (1929: 100-24), identifying “Thucydidean” and “Sophoclean” assistants. This theory has now been discarded (for criticism see, e.g., Shutt 1961: 59-78; Rajak 1983: 62-63, 233-36; older literature in Feldman 1984: 827-30), although the reasons for unevenness of style in Josephus’ works are obscure. Josephus’ *War* is in fact “Thucydidean” in some respects throughout (see Mader 2000), but it is not clear that this has to be attributed to Josephus’ collaborators. If they are not mere rhetorical invention (see previous note), they could have contributed in a variety of ways, ranging from wholesale composition to minor revisions of the Greek, with many intermediate possibilities. There is no method by which we can determine this matter as we cannot identify unassisted Josephan style. On Josephus’ study of Greek literature in Rome (*Ant.* 20.263) and likely competence in Greek, see Rajak 1983: 46-64.

<sup>203</sup> “Account” (παράδοσις) repeats a key term suggesting reliable transmission of material (1.8, 28). There may be an implied negative here: Josephus did not need further information from the emperors’ field-notes (1.56), or from anyone else (cf. *Life* 366, which half supports but half undermines such a denial).

<sup>204</sup> The thought and vocabulary are closely parallel to *Life* 361, though Josephus mentions the following figures only as witnesses, not (as in *Life* 361-66) as sources offering additional information or as sponsors encouraging the publication of the work. On *War* as encouraged by the Flavians but not simply Flavian propaganda see Rajak 1983: 200-1; Mason 2001: 149. For the problems in admitting imperial patronage (negotiated by Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.1.3-4) see Marincola 1997: 143-44, 166. The issue here is simply the truthfulness (ἀλήθεια) of the account (cf. 1.56); Josephus’ rhetorical confidence will make the doubts alluded to in 1.53-56 seem startling and even absurd.

during the war, Vespasian and Titus.<sup>205</sup> **51** For I presented the books to them first of all;<sup>206</sup> after them I sold copies to many Romans who had fought with them in the war,<sup>207</sup> and to many of our own people, men also steeped in Greek wisdom,<sup>208</sup> among whom were Julius Archelaus,<sup>209</sup> the most distinguished Herod,<sup>210</sup> and the most renowned king Agrippa himself.<sup>211</sup> **52** These all bore witness that I had carefully safe-

*Witnesses to  
Josephus'  
accuracy*

<sup>205</sup> “Commanders-in-chief” translates ἀυτοκράτορες a military title (Latin: *imperatores*), which was used by Roman emperors (see Mason 2001: 140-41, n.1403), and thus fits both Vespasian (emperor 69-79 CE) and Titus (79-81 CE) who had military command at different times during the Judean War. If Josephus has been criticised by those who cited their field-notes (1.56), he trumps the criticism with an appeal direct to the authors. If he was considered one-sidedly pro-Judean, the emperors’ approval of his work is decisive counter-evidence. If this statement and its parallel in *Life* 361 are taken at face value, *War* must have been completed before Vespasian’s death in 79 CE (see Mason 2001: 148-49).

<sup>206</sup> Josephus repeats their priority (πρώτοις) as in 1.50 (cf. “after them” in the next clause). They are also distinct in being given, not sold, copies. In both their military and their political significance, they must rank as the supreme authorities accrediting Josephus’ account.

<sup>207</sup> For the processes of publication in first-century Rome, see Fantham 1996. For Roman generals who might be alluded to here, see Cotton and Eck 2005: 41-44. The following list of people to whom the book was sold includes Agrippa; in *Life* 362 he and his relatives are said to have been given copies. The difference arises from Agrippa’s inclusion here at the end of the list of sales. Laqueur appears to make too much of the discrepancy and also imagines a financial crisis for Josephus arising from the challenge of Justus (1920: 21-23). In comparison with *Life* 362, Josephus places more stress here on Roman witnesses: if Romans personally involved in the events support his account, he can hardly be accused of anti-Roman bias. But the claim is vague and no individuals are identified.

<sup>208</sup> “Our own people” might suggest that Josephus was accredited by combatants on both sides (cf. 1.56), but in fact the three following figures were either certainly or probably opponents of the uprising and thus hardly likely to guarantee a fair representation of the insurgents themselves. It is somewhat puzzling that Josephus here emphasizes the Greek education of these witnesses, their immersion in Greek “wisdom” (σοφία). A very similar accolade is present in the parallel passage (*Life* 359: experts in Greek παιδεία), where it may reflect, and match, the “learning” Josephus recognizes in his opponent, Justus (*Life* 40; see Mason 2001 ad loc., following Laqueur 1920: 11-13). It is possible that

Josephus here repeats the portrait painted in *Life*, with a similar (though more remote) polemic in view (so Troiani 81). More plausibly, the depiction is meant to contrast with the “low characters” who employ cheap rhetoric to attack Josephus (1.53; cf. 1.175): Josephus has the really educated people on his side (who can also appreciate his effort to write in fine Greek, 1.50). In either case, it is revealing that Josephus, in the midst of a broad critique of “Greek” historiography (1.6-56), uses immersion in “Greek wisdom” as a mark of honor (cf. Manetho in 1.73 and the deployment of Greek philosophy in 2.168, 239, etc.). He seems to depend on a high evaluation of such “wisdom,” at least where it is found in those who support him or honor Judean culture (1.175). While he himself draws on a specifically Judean well of “philosophy” (1.54), “Greek” wisdom is not disparaged, and can even be paraded in appropriate contexts. In general, Josephus’ complex and ambivalent stance towards the “Greek” tradition seems to be determined by its value for, or threat to, his own Judean interests. The hybridity he values is that which finds “Greek” reasons to honor Judaism.

<sup>209</sup> *Life* 362 mentions vaguely some of Agrippa’s relatives; here two individuals are named. Julius Archelaus was the brother-in-law of Agrippa II (husband of Mariamme, his sister), *Ant.* 19.355; 20.140, 147 (Kokkinos 1998: 197). His name suggests Roman citizenship and thus good credentials. He presumably shared Agrippa’s opposition to the revolt.

<sup>210</sup> If this is not Agrippa himself (see next note), it is impossible to say which of the Herodian clan Josephus refers to; for his rhetoric all that matters is the (famous) name, not the precise identity. The two most likely candidates are: i) The son of Phasael (nephew of Herod the Great) and Salampsio (*Ant.* 18.131, 138), if he lived till after the war (so Reinach 114; Troiani 81). ii) The eldest son of Aristobulus (king of lesser Armenia, son of Herod of Chalkis) and Salome (the famous daughter of Herodias; cf. Mark 6:17-29), *Ant.* 18.136-37 (so Gutschmid 410; Kokkinos 1998: 313). The epithet “most distinguished” (σεμνότατος) appears to make up for the obscurity in identification.

<sup>211</sup> This phrase has no conjunctive “and” in the Greek, and it might appear that this (Agrippa II) is the same as the “Herod” just mentioned. But in a list no conjunctions are needed, and one would not expect two epithets (“the most distinguished,” “the most re-

guarded the truth,<sup>212</sup> and they would not have held back or kept silent if, out of ignorance or bias, I had altered or omitted any of the facts.<sup>213</sup>

*Slanders  
against  
Josephus as  
historian*

**(1.10) 53** But certain despicable characters have attempted to libel my history,<sup>214</sup>

nowned”) to be used of the same person (Gutschmid 410). Thus Agrippa is the third figure in this trio, placed last and with emphasis (“himself”) in rhetorical climax. He was dead by now (see Introduction, § 3), but had a profile second to none as representative of the Judean aristocracy. He resolutely opposed the Revolt, and no doubt shared Josephus’ hatred of the radicals who took over its leadership. Justus had apparently made use of his close connection to Agrippa to discredit Josephus’ account of the War, not least his conduct in Galilee opposed to Agrippa’s interests (*Life* 336-67). It was important to Josephus, in his more direct response to Justus, to give more detail on Agrippa’s support for his version, including citations from 2 of his (allegedly) 62 letters on the subject (*Life* 362-66).

<sup>212</sup> Josephus concludes the case with repetition of the terms with which he introduced it: cf. “carefully” in 1.49; “witness” and “truth” in 1.50 (cf. *Life* 361, 365, 367). The agreement of all parties, Romans and “our people,” appears to confirm the truth (cf. the principle of 1.26). The disagreement of others has yet to be mentioned (1.53-56) and will not be allowed to undermine the validity of this historiography; disagreement in the Greek tradition has a quite different significance (1.15-18).

<sup>213</sup> The status of the parties here named is critical to this argument: they were knowledgeable and powerful enough to override Josephus’ authority had they wished to, but (implicitly) diverse enough to have spotted “bias” wherever it occurred. In fact, as we have noted, they were all more or less on the same side in the conflict, so bias against the rebels would hardly have been challenged; after the War, Josephus would not have wanted to gain accreditation from any of the latter, even if he had been able to. The statement here parallels *Life* 365-67, though that implies that Agrippa did make additions to Josephus’ account before publication. “Bias” (or “favor”; Greek: *χαριζόμενος*) was the common complaint in the Greek and Roman historiographical tradition (Marincola 1997: 158-74; Luce 1989). Josephus had earlier accused Greek historians of being ignorant (1.23) and seeking favor (*χάρις*, 1.25; cf. *Life* 336). On neither “omitting” nor “altering” cf. 1.42, though here “the facts” are at issue, there the biblical sources.

<sup>214</sup> Only now, having established the strength of his own case, does Josephus permit the reader to discover the existence of personal criticism, which is thereby weakened in advance. Even in the short paragraph on this point (1.53-56), after a vague depiction of “libel,”

Josephus portrays himself as a exemplar of historiography (1.54-55) before hinting, in a rhetorical question, at the charges being laid against him (1.56). In this initial depiction (1.53), Josephus’ response is mere counter-invective. The charges arise from unidentified “despicable characters” (*φῶλοι*, cf. 2.3 and the superlative in 1.175, 2.236, 290, etc.; the term connotes both social and moral inferiority, in contrast to those listed in 1.51), who merely “attempt” (*ἐπιχειρέω*, cf. note to “histories” at 1.13) to “libel” (*διαβάλλω*; cf. 1.70, 219; 2.145). Whereas criticism of Greek historians was fair and damaging (1.15-18), this is mere “libel,” an unjustified and futile personal attack.

Since his response is dominated by this *ethos*-assault, we have almost no materials for reconstructing Josephus’ target. One line of interpretation, following Laqueur 1920: 16-20, would take this passage (and 1.46) as primarily, if not exclusively, targeting Justus of Tiberias. We know from *Life* that Justus had recently published an account of the War that was highly critical of Josephus (on Justus, see Rajak 1973). Although *Life* is not as absorbed in apologetics towards Justus as was once thought (see Mason 2001), it does contain a large “digression” directed to Justus (*Life* 336-67), indicating Josephus’ hurt and anger on this score. Thus it seems natural to read the present “digression” (1.57) as similarly motivated, not least since (as we have seen) several of the themes highlighted in this context echo and reinforce claims in the Justus-digression in *Life*, and many items of vocabulary are shared between the two passages (see Laqueur 1920: 16-17; table of parallels in Labow 2005: 9). It is no strong objection to this thesis that the present context concerns “Greek” historiography, while Justus was a Judean. By keeping this passage anonymous, Josephus can smuggle in one piece of invective under the cover of another, and Justus’ educational training (*Life* 40) might make him a “Greek” for such rhetorical purposes anyway. Moreover, it would spoil Josephus’ rhetoric to indicate that *Judean* historiography could also be flawed (Laqueur 1920: 18). More solid objections to Laqueur’s thesis have been mounted on the basis of minor inconsistencies between the target-description in the two passages (see Gutschmid 407-8; Troiani 78-79; Cohen 1979: 116-17, 129, 138). In *Life* Josephus asserts that Justus had not read the emperors’ “field-notes” (*ὑπομνήματα*, 358; cf. 342), whereas here he seems to allow that his opponents had (1.56). Also here, Josephus claims his critics were “not present in the affairs on our side, in

thinking they have been set an exercise, as are boys at school, of an extraordinary form of accusation and libel.<sup>215</sup> They ought to know that it is incumbent on the person who promises to give others an account of true occurrences<sup>216</sup> that he first himself acquire an accurate knowledge of these, either by having followed events or by gaining information from those who know about them.<sup>217</sup> **54** This I consider I have accomplished very well in both my works:<sup>218</sup> the *Ancient History*, as I said, I trans-

The Antiquities

the opposite camp” (1.56), whereas Justus, at least in the Galilean campaign, clearly was. Neither of these objections is insurmountable. It is not impossible that Josephus’ rhetoric directed against the same person first denies that he has access to good sources, and then half-allows it (in the condition, “even if they claim ...”); and it is certainly striking that these two digressions are the only places in the Josephan corpus where these “field-notes” are mentioned. Similarly, Justus’ absence “in the opposite camp” could be claimed after 67 CE, and Josephus emphasizes in *Life* 357-58 that he knew nothing about events after he fled to Agrippa in Beirut. In other words, with rhetorical leeway, covered by anonymity, Josephus could have Justus still in mind in our passage.

However, it is perfectly possible that he has other critics in mind as well. Even in the digression in *Life* there is reference to “others” who write untruthful history (*Life* 336), and here also, throughout 1.53-56, Josephus defends himself against plural critics. It is possible to take this as a rhetorical mask, pluralizing a single figure as part of a general, negative category (see Mason 2001: 137 on “others” in *Life* 336); if Josephus here wishes to avoid naming Justus (to maintain the pretence he is talking about “Greeks”), he may have considered it better to lash out at an anonymous plurality than an anonymous individual. However, there may be other reasons why Josephus allows the potentially damaging impression that the criticism he faces comes from many sources. We know that he was the object of repeated criticism from fellow-Judeans (*Life* 425, 429; see Rajak 1987: 94), and his account of the War was bound to elicit suspicion from those who denigrated the Judean combatants (*War* 1.2, 7-8) or considered the subject-matter unworthy (*War* 1.13). Josephus may enfold his specific anger with Justus within a global attack on all the critics of his *War*. It seems impossible to deny that Justus is partly, and perhaps primarily, in view, but equally difficult to rule out the possibility that other critics of Josephus’ work may be in mind.

<sup>215</sup> For the genitive (“an exercise ... of an extraordinary form”) see Gutschmid 410-11; it is probably not a genitive of exclamation (*pace* Thackeray and Labow). The school exercise (γύμνασμα) was a central component of rhetorical training, in which pupils were required to adopt a standpoint (in praise or blame,

accusation or defense) in relation to some historical or quasi-historical situation. It thus connotes here something artificial, immature, insincere, and exaggerated (cf. Origen, *Cels.* 5.58). There may also be echoes of Thucydides’ famous contrast between his history, as a permanent monument, and an insubstantial γύμνασμα (Thucydides 1.22.4; cf. Polybius 3.31.12-13). Josephus never reveals what the “extraordinary” accusations consist of, except a challenge to his veracity (1.56). Justus charged Josephus with inciting revolt in Tiberias and thereby offering a distorted account of the War (*Life* 340, 350); he may have criticised Josephus’ prose as well, considering himself a far more stylish historian (*Life* 40, 340). Other aspects of his (and others’) criticisms of Josephus are no doubt obscured by Josephus’ selective response; 1.56 may suggest a criticism for failing to represent the Roman point of view.

<sup>216</sup> Reinach suggests a slight emendation to read “a truthful account of events”; in either case, the issue is truth (cf. 1.52, 56). Since he has characterized his opponents as school-boys, Josephus lectures them on an elementary feature of historiography (cf. *Life* 339).

<sup>217</sup> The two criteria of good history (autopsy and reliable sources) are repeated from 1.45, with matching vocabulary. The principles have been illustrated by Josephus’ practice in 1.47-52, with special emphasis on the first, to be underlined in 1.55. On “follow” (παρακολουθέω) as “being in close touch” with contemporary events, see Moessner 1996; although, as he argues, the verb need not always mean autopsy (simply “staying abreast” of events), the parallel between this statement and 1.45 (cf. *Life* 357 and *Apion* 1.47) suggests that Josephus is here claiming personal testimony.

<sup>218</sup> The immediate context concerns only the *War*: that is the text whose composition he describes in 1.47-52 and which he defends (“my history”) in 1.53. The inclusion of both works is thus initially surprising. In relation to the *Antiquities* Josephus can claim no personal “following of events” but must rely on the authority of the biblical texts (see 1.37-41). That he includes it here suggests that he wishes now to wrap up the whole discussion of historiography from 1.6ff. as he approaches its conclusion (1.58), and that this passage also, and perhaps primarily, concerns his *ethos* as a uniquely authoritative writer, worthy of respect for what he writes in the present work as well.



The Judean  
War

lated from the sacred writings,<sup>219</sup> being a priest by ancestry<sup>220</sup> and steeped in the philosophy contained in those writings,<sup>221</sup> 55 and I wrote the history of the war having been personally involved in many events,<sup>222</sup> an eyewitness of most of them,<sup>223</sup> and not in the slightest deficient in my knowledge of anything that was said or done.<sup>224</sup> 56 So how could one consider other than reckless those who have attempted to challenge my truthfulness<sup>225</sup>—who, even if they claim to have read the field-notes of the commanders-in-chief,<sup>226</sup> were certainly not present in the affairs on our side as well, in the opposite camp?<sup>227</sup>

<sup>219</sup> Cf. 1.1, here using the verb μεθερμηνεύω, whose connotations sometimes include “interpretation” together with “translation” (see *Ant.* 1.5; 12.20, etc., with comments by Feldman 2000: 3-5). If the authority of his *Antiquities* rests on that of the “sacred writings” (cf. 1.37-41), Josephus leaves out of account the whole second half of the work, which goes beyond the biblical sources.

<sup>220</sup> His priestly pedigree is central to Josephus’ self-presentation in *War* 1.3 and, especially, *Life* 1-6. Here it makes his role parallel to that of priests in the Egyptian tradition (1.28), but also appears to justify the following statement.

<sup>221</sup> This revealing remark about biblical “philosophy” (φιλοσοφία) appears in close proximity to his praise of other Judeans who were steeped in Greek “wisdom” (σοφία, 1.51). Josephus never claims for himself an expertise in Greek philosophy (not even in *Ant.* 20.262-65), since his ideological grounding lies in the distinctively Judean, and scriptural, tradition. He will sometimes demonstrate how Judean “philosophy” is supported by Greek philosophy, and will often use terms and concepts derived from the Greek tradition, but it is crucial for him to maintain the unique sources and standards of the Judean tradition, and its comparatively higher achievements. The Judean “philosophy” (cf. 2.47) will be placed within the framework of a “constitution” in 2.145-286. See note to “philosophy” at 2.47 and Introduction, § 9. Josephus’ successful transculturation adopts both these terms from the Greek tradition to buttress a superior Judean equivalent.

<sup>222</sup> To be “personally involved” (αὐτουργός) is even better than being an eyewitness (αὐτόπτης, in the next clause). In relation to the *War*, Josephus can fully satisfy the conditions he has set in 1.45, 53, and in drawing on his self-description in 1.47-52 can put the major emphasis here on the first condition, that of being present at the events he narrates. If others drew on authoritative sources (Agrippa II; the Roman generals’ “field-notes”), Josephus can outdo them only by means of his personal knowledge.

<sup>223</sup> The second limb in a tricolon: only an eyewitness, but now of “most,” not only of “many,” events. This depends on the exaggerated claims of 1.48-49.

<sup>224</sup> The third limb is, as usual, the most extensive in scope: the double negative comes remarkably close to a claim of omniscience. This makes the charge against him, about to be mentioned, bizarre.

<sup>225</sup> The “libel” (1.53) is at last specified, but only in a rhetorical question eliciting shock, with a further *ethos*-attack on the “reckless” (θρασεῖς, cf. τολμάω in 1.45) people who make a clearly doomed “attempt” (ἐπιχειρέω, cf. 1.53) to challenge Josephus. The anonymity of the challengers makes their disparagement easier; their ground of attack (“truthfulness,” ἀλήθεια) looks hopeless after the usage of this term and cognates in 1.47, 50, 52, 53.

<sup>226</sup> This is the only glimpse we get of the character of the challenge to Josephus. Even so, Josephus makes the matter hypothetical (“even if ...”) and the possible ground for attack suspect (“they claim to have read”); he does not reveal in what way this source was being used against him. The “field-notes” in view here (ὑπομνήματα; Latin *commentarii*) were the memoirs composed by the commander, sometimes merely the rough material that could form the basis of a more polished historical narrative, sometimes, as in the case of Julius Caesar, already quite stylistic (see Marincola 1997: 180-82). Josephus refers to such sources only in *Life* 342, 358, in connection with Justus. The line of argument here (admitting a possible claim but discounting it) is different to that in *Life* (denying an implicit claim), but the two are not sufficiently incompatible to rule out the possibility that Justus is in mind here again (see note to “history” at 1.53). However, this notice might imply that his critics are also Roman, and view the War from a Roman perspective. Although *Life* 342 implies that Josephus has also read these sources, he prefers here not to match the claim but to trump it: if others have read (ἐντυγχάνω) such sources, he has been present (παρατυγχάνω) to witness the events on both sides.

<sup>227</sup> The importance of the narrative in 1.47-49 is now fully evident. The fact that Josephus had been in command against the Romans, even if only for a short time and at the start of the War, gives him a unique advantage over those who knew only the Roman perspective. The criticism could apply to Justus, but only



(1.11) 57 The digression I have made on these matters was necessary,<sup>228</sup> as I wished to indicate the irresponsibility of those who promise to write history.<sup>229</sup> 58 Now that I have made it sufficiently clear, I think,<sup>230</sup> that the recording of ancient history is a tradition more among “barbarians” than among Greeks,<sup>231</sup> I wish, first, to respond briefly to those who attempt to show that we have recently been established,<sup>232</sup> on the ground that, as they claim, nothing is said about us by the Greek

*Restatement of  
aims and  
structure of the  
treatise*

at a stretch (see note to “history” at 1.53); it would apply more readily to every other account of the War.

<sup>228</sup> The “digression” is both admitted and justified, indicating Josephus’ control of his discourse; cf. *Life* 367, his only other use of παρέκβασις in relation to his own work. Unlike in *Life* 336, it is not so clear here where the “digression” had begun: is it the whole discussion of Greek historiography (from 1.6), or of contemporary historiography (from 1.46), or the apologetic passage about his account of the War (from 1.47), or only the explicit polemics of 1.53-56? It is unlikely that this whole opening segment (1.6-56) could be so labelled (*pace* Mason 1996: 209), as one can hardly open a treatise with a digression; one of the more limited options is to be preferred. Josephus had skilfully maintained the flow of his argument so the reader does not feel any abrupt change of subject; but it was perhaps impossible to make a bridge back from the polemics of 1.53-56 to the subject matter of the whole segment without admitting that some “digression” had taken place.

<sup>229</sup> “Irresponsibility” (or “frivolity”, εὐχέρεια) is a charge later directed against Chaeremon (1.301, the only other use of the noun by Josephus). By keeping the charge broad (concerning “history” in general, and without specification of authors), Josephus can wrap together his criticism of those who have written inadequate contemporary history (since they were neither eyewitnesses nor had good sources) and his assault on the integrity of the “Greeks,” whose “promise” to write good history (1.24) was vitiated by their lack of ancient sources. The vagueness enables transition back to the central issue, which is competence to write ancient history.

<sup>230</sup> The phrase echoes the opening statement (1.1), with the same emphatic positioning of ἰκανῶς (“sufficiently”); as he draws his conclusion, Josephus exudes rhetorical confidence.

<sup>231</sup> The closing statement mirrors the opening (1.6), except that the absolute contrast drawn in 1.6-10, 15, 27, 44-45 is here softened to a comparative: “more” among others than among Greeks. This subtle dilution of the argument is necessary if Josephus is going to use Greek “witnesses” at all, as he does in 1.161-214. While his argument justifies giving priority to non-Greek sources, phrased in this form it does not preclude the

supplementary evidence of Greek literature. The modification stands at sufficient distance to allow the previous polemics to stand, but acts as a rhetorical buffer permitting his later appeal to the sources he has discredited.

In 1.6 Josephus had placed “Greeks” in antithesis to “us and the rest of humanity”; in 1.8, 28-29 he had specified that “rest” as Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Phoenicians, the peoples whose evidence he will use in 1.73-160. Here he employs the traditional Greek-devised antithesis between “Greeks” and “barbarians” (βάρβαροι). This antithesis has its roots in 5<sup>th</sup>-century BCE cultural politics (see Hall 1989) but had continued in use into the Roman era, as a residue and sometimes still potent sign of the power of the Greek tradition to define “civilization.” Josephus’ use of βάρβαρος (at least 44 times in his works; 6 times in *Apion*: 1.58, 116, 161, 201; 2.148, 282) illustrates its ambivalence: sometimes it seems a purely “neutral” label for non-Greeks (e.g., *Apion* 1.116, 201 [used by “Hecataeus”; perhaps ironic]; 2.282), at other times, especially if attributed to a hostile “Greek,” it conveys scorn towards uncivilized “barbarians” (2.148). This loaded sense lies latent in the word, but is not always activated; however, if the juxtaposition with “Greeks” carries the nuance of a presumed Greek cultural superiority, the label carries a more or less explicit negative charge. Such seems to be the case both here and in 1.161, where the context suggests the cultural presumption that “Greeks” are better and βάρβαροι worse—a presumption that Josephus ironically overturns even while using the labels. It is impossible to convey this fluidity of nuance in a single English term: “non-Greek” (cf. Thackeray ad loc.: “non-Hellenic”; Münster: “Nichtgriechen”) sounds purely neutral, while “barbarian” seems unambiguously pejorative (cf. Whiston: “nations which are called Barbarians”; Blum: “Barbares”). Here Josephus seems to deploy the negative nuance with irony (signalled with scare quotes): “barbarian” civilization is actually superior. For Roman handling of this label, see, e.g., Cicero, *Resp.* 1.58.

<sup>232</sup> Literally: “that our κατάστασις is recent.” The term is used later (2.145, 184) for the “structure” of the Judean constitution, but it here seems to mean the original “establishment” of the nation, and is thus a near synonym to ὑπόστασις (“composition”) in 1.1. On

writers.<sup>233</sup> **59** Next I shall provide evidence of our antiquity from the literature of others<sup>234</sup> and I shall demonstrate that those who slander our people issue slanders that are completely devoid of reason.<sup>235</sup>

*Reasons for  
Greek  
ignorance of  
Judeans*

**(1.12) 60**<sup>236</sup> Now, we do not inhabit a country with a coast,<sup>237</sup> nor are we keen on trade or on the mixing with others that results from it,<sup>238</sup> Rather, our cities have been

the negative connotations of “attempt,” see note to “histories” at 1.13. The charge that Judeans were “more recent” (νεώτερον) is now exaggerated to the simple form “recent” (νέα); cf. “very recent” (νεώτατον) in 2.288, and note to “historians” at 1.2.

<sup>233</sup> The phraseology echoes 1.2, but with subtle differences. Instead of “renowned Greek historians” (1.2) the criterion is now only “Greek writers.” This will allow Josephus to include the obscure along with the famous in 1.161-218 and other writers along with historians; on the convenient ambiguity of συγγραφεῖς (“writers”), see note to “compositions” at 1.161. The “honor” terms in 1.2 which hinted at the real issue (that Judeans were too insignificant to merit attention from Greek historians of importance) are here dropped, so the matter is further distorted: now Josephus implies that mere mention of Judeans is the issue at stake. Josephus now reiterates his plan, first outlined in 1.4-5: since all of 1.6-56 has intervened, and has not advanced the advertized programme, it is necessary to repeat the agenda. The “first” and “next” in 1.58-59 suggest the topics are here listed in the sequence to follow; thus the “brief response” here announced advertizes the short segment 1.60-68.

<sup>234</sup> For the “witness” language (cf. 1.4), see note to “witnesses” at 1.70. The “others” are probably, in context, non-Greeks, thus signalling the segment 1.69-160. If so, this careful announcement of contents (1.58-59) altogether omits reference to the Greek segment, 1.161-218. This may be deliberate: despite the modification introduced in 1.58 (“more ...than”), it would perhaps be too shocking to follow the blanket polemics against Greek historiography in 1.6-56 with a reference to a segment which will cite and use Greek witnesses. Thus, despite the announcement of 1.5, Josephus may prefer to omit here announcement of that plank in his argument. Alternatively, if “others” can mean “non-Judeans” (so Gutschmid 412), the statement could include all of 1.69-218 (cf. Thackeray ad loc.).

<sup>235</sup> Translating ἐκτὸς λόγου, the conjecture of Gutschmid 413 (followed by Münster) in place of the senseless reading of L: ἐν τοῖς λόγοις. The reference to “those who slander” (τοὺς βλασφημοῦντας) recalls the language of the preface, 1.2, 4. Here as there it points forward to the Part beginning at 1.219. The “slanders” will be refuted with heavy doses of *logos*-argumentation, adumbrated here with the reference to “reason.” They hardly dovetail with the criticism of the Judean

nation as “recent” (in fact, they presuppose great antiquity), but Josephus’ vague description here masks that incongruity.

<sup>236</sup> This short segment (1.60-68) offers the brief response promised in 1.58 and pre-announced in 1.5. Josephus’ strategy is to show that the general silence about Judeans in Greek literature results not from disdain but from ignorance, and not because Judeans did not exist, but because, for good reasons, Greeks had not encountered them. (For an alternative explanation, cf. *Aristeas* 31, 312-16.) The reasons, intertwined in this segment, are two: the Judeans’ geographical remoteness (not on a seaboard, 1.60, 61, 65, 58), and their cultural preference to maintain their own traditions (1.60, 61, 68). The two are complementary. Geographical remoteness could have been overcome by a desire to trade, but this did not happen, not because Judeans were economically backward, but because they did not desire to “mix” with others. Such a statement of cultural isolation could stir charges of “misanthropy” (2.148) and inhospitality (2.258). Josephus strays close to this danger, but gives Judean distinctiveness a positive explanation, in terms which lie parallel to Roman ideals of self-sufficiency and home-spun piety (1.60). The naming of Rome as a parallel case of Greek ignorance (1.66) also gives Judeans and Romans a common grievance against the self-important Greeks. As in 1.6-58, Josephus is in danger of arguing too much: if there was no mixing between Judeans and Greeks, how did Greeks know enough to provide the evidence of 1.161-214? But he pulls back at the end (1.68) from positing a total barrier of ignorance.

<sup>237</sup> On the present tense, although spoken in Rome, see note to “possess” at 1.1; cf. “our cities” later in this section. The lack of coastline will be closely associated with absence of trade (though that could be enabled by rivers); the principle is repeated in 1.65 and 1.68. The statement suggests that, even in Josephus’ present, the coastal strip is not considered authentically Judean; for his varying representations of this matter see Rosenfeld 2000. Historically, the conquest of Joppa by the Maccabees (1 Macc 10:76; 13:11) established for the first time a seaport for the Judean nation. Later, Herod the Great developed Caesarea Maritima as a major trading centre. But Josephus had elsewhere celebrated Solomon’s control of the coast and success in trade (*Ant.* 8.35, 37, 180-81).

<sup>238</sup> Since trade will be given a negative connotation

built inland, far from the sea,<sup>239</sup> and since we live on good terrain, we work it thoroughly;<sup>240</sup> above all we take pride in raising children,<sup>241</sup> and make keeping the laws and preserving the traditional piety that accords with them the most essential task of our whole life.<sup>242</sup> **61** When you add to the factors just stated the singularity of our life-style,<sup>243</sup> there was nothing in ancient times to cause us to mix with the Greeks,<sup>244</sup> as there was for the Egyptians, thanks to their exports and imports,<sup>245</sup> and as there was for those who inhabit the coast of Phoenicia, thanks to their enthusiasm for trade and commerce, in their love of money.<sup>246</sup> **62** (Nor, to be sure,<sup>247</sup> did our ancestors

in 1.61, not being keen on it (χαίρω) will appear a worthy resistance to its mercenary seduction. As Haaland notes (1999: 286), Josephus is drawing on a trope derived from Plato, *Leg.* 704d-705a: the ideal state should be sited away from the sea to avoid the corruption of luxury and the threat to native customs posed by contact with foreigners (cf. Cicero, *Resp.* 2.5-10 for its application to the founding of Rome). The contact created by trade is labelled “mixings” (ἐπιμιξίαι; cf. the singular in 1.61 and the negative adjective ἀνεπίμικτον in 1.68). On Josephus’ ideology of purity and the threat of ethnic mixing see 1.1, 30, 229, 257, 278; 2.257-59. With its suggestion of dilution, “mixing” implies degradation; literary sources often describe an urban mob as “mixed” or “motley” (μίγαδες, e.g., Philo, *Flacc.* 4-5). However, on Judeans in trade in Alexandria, see Philo, *Flacc.* 57; *Legat.* 129.

<sup>239</sup> Josephus’ vocabulary (ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἀνωρισμένοι) echoes Thucydides 1.7, part of a discussion of ancient piracy that is alluded to below (1.62). But for Josephus, Judean construction of cities inland was not a precaution against piracy but a simple fact. For the plural “cities” (*contra* 1.197), cf. *Life* 180, 235, though Josephus’ inconsistent usage makes it impossible to give this term precise definition. Jerusalem is about 40 miles from the sea, and 800m above sea-level, at a distance from the trade-route that ran down the coastal plain. This slanted depiction of contemporary reality omits reference to the large Judean populations in the coastal cities.

<sup>240</sup> For the quality of Judean land, see note to “says” at 1.195. For “work” as a special Judean quality, cf. 2.146, 234, 291, with special reference to agriculture at 2.294. To present Judeans as an agricultural nation would appeal to a Roman ideal fostered by Cato and the poets (e.g. Horace; Virgil), and still active in Tacitus’ comments on the Germans (*Germ.* 14.3-4); see further, Appendix 6. Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.2 had also presented the coast as occupied by merchant Phoenicians, with Judeans (among others) as farmers, inland.

<sup>241</sup> This Judean “taking pride” (φιλοκαλέω) will contrast with the Phoenicians’ love of money (φιλοχρηματέω, 1.61). “Raising children” (παιδοτροφία) may refer to the Judean disinclination to expose new-born chil-

dren (or practice abortion; cf. 2.202), or to the Judean investment in the upbringing and education of children (2.204), or both. The Judean stance on the former was noted by Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.8) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.5.3; cf. *Germ.* 19); the latter fits with the following emphasis on the maintenance of Judean tradition (cf. 1.42).

<sup>242</sup> As in 1.42-43, Josephus prepares for a major theme in his presentation of the Judean “constitution,” the premium on conservation; φυλάττω, “keep,” is one of the recurrent verbs in that segment (2.156, 184, 189, 194, 218, etc.). “Piety” (εὐσέβεια, cf. 1.212) is central to the Judean constitution (2.146, 170, 181, etc.) and its close association with the law here arises from the conviction that the laws are “decrees of God” (1.42). The preservation of tradition parallels Roman conservatism in relation to *mos maiorum*, but Josephus’ superlatives (the “most essential” task of our “whole” life) suggest a Judean superiority in this regard.

<sup>243</sup> “Singularity” (ἰδιότης) suggests something unique to Judeans (cf. the ἰδία ὑπόστασις, “own composition,” in 1.1), beyond the preservation of tradition just mentioned. The implication is that this increases the disinclination to “mix,” but Josephus does not spell out what this entails (cf. 1.68). He is sensitive, perhaps, to Apollonius Molon’s criticism of Judeans for being anti-social (2.148, 258); in 2.259 he insists that the limits of Judean sociability are not at all “unique” (ἰδιον). Here he makes the claim but leaves it undefined.

<sup>244</sup> Greeks are specified (cf. “others” in 1.60) as the issue is specifically Greek ignorance of Judeans, and particularly “in ancient times.” Josephus never explains when or how the curtain of separation between Judeans and Greeks was eventually removed.

<sup>245</sup> Egyptians were actually famed for their resistance to foreign customs (Herodotus 2.79, 91), but Josephus uses trade contacts—thanks to the Nile, rather than the coast—as the medium for knowledge of Egypt to filter back to Greece. On Naucratis as the first Greek trading station (from the 7<sup>th</sup> century BCE), see Herodotus 2.178.

<sup>246</sup> For early contact between Phoenicia and Greece, cf. 1.10. The Phoenician cities of Tyre and Sidon were especially famous for promoting trade in the Mediter-

*Other nations' means of becoming known*

turn to piracy, like some others,<sup>248</sup> or think fit to seek aggrandizement by going to war,<sup>249</sup> although their land contained many tens of thousands of men who lacked nothing in courage.)<sup>250</sup> **63** By this means the Phoenicians, sailing over to the Greeks for the sake of trade, became known to them directly,<sup>251</sup> and by their agency so did the Egyptians and everyone else whose cargo they transported to the Greeks, crossing huge oceans.<sup>252</sup> **64** Later, the Medes and Persians became well-known through ruling Asia,<sup>253</sup> especially the Persians by their campaign as far as the other continent.<sup>254</sup> The Thracians were known about because of their proximity,<sup>255</sup> and the Scythian nation via those who sailed into the Pontos.<sup>256</sup> **65** In general,<sup>257</sup> all those settled by the sea, both to the east and to the west,<sup>258</sup> were more familiar to those

ranean and beyond (Ezek 27:12-25; Strabo, *Geogr.* 17.1.3; Lucian, *Tox.* 4). Their enthusiasm is here given a negative twist by the final clause (διὰ τὸ φιλοχρηματεῖν, a *hapax* in Josephus); on Phoenicians introducing greed and luxury to Greece, cf. Cicero, *Resp.* 3, frag. 3. Josephus makes a gesture to the disdain professed by Roman aristocrats for the grubby money-making associated with trade (Cicero, *Off.* 1.150-51).

<sup>247</sup> Since 1.63 seems to pick up the topic of 1.61, this sentence looks like an aside. It recognizes that trade is not the only possible means of contact between peoples; but by adding piracy and war-mongering it strengthens the negative image of trade.

<sup>248</sup> For Judeans as robbers/pirates (λησταί) cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.28, 37 (Hasmoneans). But Josephus appears to have in mind here the discussion of Mediterranean piracy before the Trojan War in Thucydides 1.5-8 (cf. Schäublin 1982: 325). There piracy (associated especially, but not exclusively, with Caria and Phoenicia) is considered to have been once an honorable, not a shameful, profession. As in 1.60 (see note to “sea”), Josephus’ wording (πρὸς ληστείας . . . ἐτρέπησαν) contains a verbal echo of Thucydides (ἐτρέποντο πρὸς ληστείαν, 1.5).

<sup>249</sup> The Greek, shaped around Thucydides (see previous note), is awkward, but the sense is clear. This negative depiction of war is repeated, in similar terms, in 2.272, 292. It could easily be applied to Rome’s wars of expansion (cf. 1.66), though Romans themselves could interpret their motives differently (see note to “laws” at 2.272). By interpreting Manetho’s Hyksos as the ancestors of the Judeans, Josephus is about to offer a direct contradiction of this claim (1.75-82)!

<sup>250</sup> On the populousness of the nation, see Hecataeus of Abdera *apud* Diodorus 40.3.8 and “Hecataeus” in 1.194. With no recognized record of conquests, the Judeans could be subject to ridicule as a feeble nation (cf. 2.125-34, 148); as in 2.146, 272, 292, Josephus confronts this potential aspersion.

<sup>251</sup> In context (and contrast with the Egyptians), “directly” seems a better translation of εὐθύς than “at an early date” (Thackeray; Blum); see Gutschmid 415.

Otherwise the clause adds little to what is already stated in 1.61.

<sup>252</sup> For the Phoenicians as traders of Egyptian and Assyrian goods over long distances see Herodotus 1.1. Ezek 27:17 suggests that they traded with Judah and Israel as well, but Josephus has ruled out trade as a possible mode of contact with Greeks, even by such indirect channels (1.60).

<sup>253</sup> The rise of the Median and Persian empires was familiar to Greeks through Herodotus, and their impact on Asia (cf. 1.90) was felt in the Greek Ionian cities. As usual, Josephus is vague on the chronology.

<sup>254</sup> The Persian invasion of Greece (480 BCE) has already been mentioned in 1.13, 18. L (followed by Niese) reads “our” (ἡμετέρας) continent, but the Latin *alteram* suggests that the original text was ἑτέρας (“the other”; so Hudson, Thackeray, Gutschmid, and all modern editors). “The other” suggests a division of the world into two continents (Asia and Europe; Gutschmid 415), and since Josephus identifies “our land” as Judea (1.1), it is unlikely that he would refer to Europe as “our continent,” even though he writes in Rome.

<sup>255</sup> This is a new criterion, important for 1.69-70. The borders of Thrace, north-east of Macedonia, varied in antiquity (at times roughly co-extensive with present-day Bulgaria); cf. 1.165 for Pythagoras’ supposed knowledge of both Thracians and Judeans.

<sup>256</sup> The sea-faring criterion prepares for the generalization of 1.65. The Scythians, renowned for their “savagery” (2.269), were settled to the north of the Pontos (the Black Sea); Greek traders were in contact with this region from about 600 BCE (see Herodotus Book 4).

<sup>257</sup> The summary statement, echoing 1.60-61, is not quite the conclusion, as Josephus will add examples of Greek ignorance (1.66-67) likely to win Roman assent and amusement.

<sup>258</sup> The text has minor confusions, but its sense is clear (Gutschmid 415); naming the two ends of the Mediterranean enables the shift to western examples in 1.66-67.



who wished to write something,<sup>259</sup> while those who had settlements more inland were for the most part unknown.<sup>260</sup> **66** This is clearly the case even in relation to Europe,<sup>261</sup> where, at least, the Romans' city, although it had long since acquired such power and achieved such success in its military exploits,<sup>262</sup> is not mentioned by Herodotus or Thucydides, nor by even one of their contemporaries;<sup>263</sup> it was only late, and with difficulty, that knowledge of the Romans filtered through to the Greeks.<sup>264</sup> **67** Those reputed to be the most accurate writers<sup>265</sup> were so ignorant about the Galatae<sup>266</sup> and Iberians that, for instance, Ephorus thought the Iberians constituted a single city, although they inhabit such a large section of the western world;<sup>267</sup> and they dared<sup>268</sup>

Greek  
ignorance of  
others

<sup>259</sup> συγγράφειν ("to write") is not quite as specific as ἱστοριογράφειν (cf. 1.2), and the phrase can thus include authors of geographies and ethnographies (generally based on sailing ventures), as well as historians in the proper sense. "Wishing" (βουλομένοις) may convey a hint of the wilfulness (βούλησις, "whim") castigated in 1.45. The comparative ("more familiar") is a crucial modification, suggesting that *some* knowledge may still have been available to others (cf. the next clause and 1.68, "not to *many* people").

<sup>260</sup> "For the most part" (ἐπὶ πλείστον) allows for exceptions, whose conditions remain obscure. Josephus will never explain how the Greek witnesses in 1.161-214 penetrated the barriers to knowledge discussed in this segment.

<sup>261</sup> One might expect the Greeks to know about their own continent; their ignorance there reinforces the case for their ignorance of the other one.

<sup>262</sup> Josephus cleverly names Rome as a parallel victim of Greek ignorance, so those associated with the city are more likely to identify with Judeans in this matter. In this case, he insists, Greek ignorance is no proof of the Romans' insignificance or even non-existence: he flatteringly makes reference to Rome's military greatness, backdated to a vague antiquity ("long since," ἐκ μακροῦ) and unspecified (cf. Barclay 2000: 235). Romans traditionally dated their foundation to 753 BCE, 250 years before Herodotus (5<sup>th</sup> century BCE). But, judging by Livy, they were modest about the city's military history in its first few centuries. Only in the late 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE did Romans conquer and colonize Latium as the first step to the conquest of Italy.

<sup>263</sup> Josephus names the two most famous Greek historians, active in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE (cf. 1.16, 18). There were sporadic references to Rome in early Greek historiography (e.g., Hellanicus, *FGH* 4, frag. 84; Antiochus of Syracuse, *FGH* 555, frag. 6; see *FGH* 840 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.72). But even western Greeks, settled on the south coast of Italy, took very little notice of the city; see Bickerman 1952: 65-68; Momigliano 1975a: 12-15.

<sup>264</sup> "Late and with difficulty" echoes 1.10, underlin-

ing the limitations of the Greeks, in intellect or breadth of knowledge. Greek unfamiliarity with the early history of Rome was noted by Polybius (1.3) and by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who suspected prejudice against Rome (*Ant. rom.* 1.4.2-3); Pliny, *Nat.* 3.57-58 thought that no Greek had noticed Rome before Theopompos (4<sup>th</sup> century BCE). Josephus can build on Roman annoyance to launch the following ridicule of Greek historiography.

<sup>265</sup> The irony echoes 1.18, and will now be applied to Ephorus (despite the criticism recorded in 1.16). After the argument that Greek ignorance led to silence (1.60-66), Josephus now claims that it led also to egregious errors and wholesale invention of "facts" (1.67-68). This development is hardly relevant to the argument about the Greeks and Judeans, but it reinforces 1.6-27 in discrediting Greek historiography in general.

<sup>266</sup> Josephus' term Γαλάται appears to mean not the "Galatians" (in western Turkey), but the Celtic tribes of western Europe, known to the Romans as *Galli* (cf. *War* 1.5; Polybius 1.6). Greek knowledge of these Gauls began with the foundation of Massalia (Marseilles) in ca. 600 BCE, but remained skin-deep for many centuries; see Momigliano 1975a: 50-73; Rankin 1987.

<sup>267</sup> It is not entirely clear whom Ephorus referred to by Iberians (cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* 6.2.4), and Josephus, unlike Strabo (4.4.6), does not allow for changes in nomenclature over the centuries. It is possible that in Ephorus' day (4<sup>th</sup> century BCE) the label was used for a relatively small city state, perhaps centred in the city Hibera mentioned by Livy (23.28.10), near the river Ebro on the east coast of Spain. Josephus may draw on sources here which misunderstood Ephorus, but it is equally possible that he wilfully misrepresents the historian (see Jacoby *FGH* 70, frag. 133, commentary, pp. 74-75; Troiani 85). By Josephus' day the label could cover the peoples of the whole of Spain; but cf. his own error (or at least exaggeration) regarding Iberia in 2.40.

<sup>268</sup> The plural (questioned by Jacoby) enables Josephus to revert to vague generalization; for the verb, cf. 1.42, 45.



to describe customs, as if practiced by them, which were neither in existence among them nor even spoken about.<sup>269</sup> **68** The reason they did not know the truth was the complete lack of mixing,<sup>270</sup> while the reason they wrote lies was their desire to give the appearance of making enquiry further than others.<sup>271</sup> Is it appropriate, then, still to be surprised if our nation was not known to many people nor offered an occasion for its mention in their writings,<sup>272</sup> when it was both settled like this, away from the sea, and chose like this its own pattern of life?<sup>273</sup>

*Evidence for  
Judean  
antiquity:  
introduction*

**(1.13) 69**<sup>274</sup> Suppose we were to argue, in relation to the Greeks, that their people is not ancient, and decided to use as proof the fact that nothing is said about them in our records.<sup>275</sup> Would they not think that utterly laughable—adducing, I imagine, the same reasons that I have just discussed?<sup>276</sup> And would they not produce their near neighbors as witnesses to their antiquity?<sup>277</sup> **70** Well, that is what I also shall try

<sup>269</sup> The “them” presumably covers both Gauls and Iberians; Strabo criticises Ephorus for misrepresenting the customs of the former (*Geogr.* 7.2.1). For the Greek capacity to invent “truths,” cf. 1.15, 23, 27. Josephus claims here pure invention, not just dependence on unreliable hearsay. The same charge would have been useful in reporting some Greek claims about Judean customs (e.g., 1.164, 168-70), except that in 1.161-214 Josephus cannot allow any doubts about the reliability of his witnesses.

<sup>270</sup> The Greek (ἀνέμικτον) echoes the use of ἐπιμιξία in 1.60-61; we might say “contact,” but “mixing” expresses Josephus’ fears. The criterion of living away from the coast is hardly applicable to the cases in 1.67 and is temporarily dropped.

<sup>271</sup> “Make inquiry” (ἱστορέω) is the root verb associated with the writing of “history” (ἱστορία); its juxtaposition with “lies” (ψεύδη) is shocking. The competitive concern for reputation was indicated in 1.24-26, and serves further to discredit Greek historiography.

<sup>272</sup> As in 1.56, Josephus closes with a rhetorical question (both πῶς οὐν), shutting off further debate. The language echoes 1.5, but introduces the motif of “surprise” which heightens the sense of aggression in the debate (cf. its use at 1.6). That Judeans were not known “to many people” (cf. 1.5) silently allows for the exceptions to follow in 1.161-214; cf. the modifications to the blanket claim of ignorance in 1.65.

<sup>273</sup> The twin themes of 1.60-61 are repeated to form an *inclusio* for this segment.

<sup>274</sup> 1.69-72 provides a transition from the previous segment (1.60-68) and an introduction to the collection of “witnesses” to Judean antiquity (1.73-218: non-Greek, 73-160; Greek, 161-218). Josephus skilfully uses his announcement of intentions to weave his material together.

<sup>275</sup> This rare hypothetical argument mirrors and inverts the objection of 1.2, and, for a moment, raises the prospect of a full-frontal assault on its Hellenocentric presumption. By turning the objection around, Jose-

phus exposes its cultural arrogance, and hints at the possibility of radical cultural difference: perhaps Greek claims for what counts as “significant” (in this case, significant historical evidence) are merely a symptom of cultural imperialism. The myopia in Greek historiography was certainly noted by others (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.4.2; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.88). Why should not (the lack of) Judean evidence for Greek antiquity be taken as seriously as (the lack of) Greek evidence for Judean antiquity? In fact, Josephus does not pursue this potentially subversive track. The next clause indicates that both lines of argument are, or would be, absurd. Josephus has just shown that Greek silence is a function of geographical accident, not deliberate disdain (1.60-68). By the same token, he now insists, the issue is not whether the Greek historians or Judean records make mention of each other, but whether they are mentioned by their near neighbors. A potentially major cultural clash is thus reduced to a dispute about reasonable demands for evidence. In the process, Josephus does not press the denial—which 1.6-15 suggests he could—that the Greeks were an ancient nation (cf. 1.7: ἅπαντα νέα), and he glosses over the fact that, on some interpretations of the Table of Nations (Genesis 10), the Greeks, or at least their ancestors, were mentioned in the Judean “records” (see Josephus himself at *Ant.* 1.124).

<sup>276</sup> Josephus does not challenge, but endorses, what the Greeks would consider laughable. He himself rarely laughs in this work (cf. 2.22), though it is an effective rhetorical weapon. The “same reasons” the Greeks would adduce are, presumably, not *parallel* reasons (i.e., that they, like the Judeans, had little contact with other nations), but the same reasons *in reverse*: since the Judeans were, on their own admission, little travelled, they could hardly be looked to for information on the Greeks.

<sup>277</sup> Josephus imputes to Greeks the reasoning he is about to employ in 1.70-71, but since the Greeks prided themselves on their international contacts, it is

to do.<sup>278</sup> I shall use particularly Egyptians and Phoenicians as witnesses,<sup>279</sup> and no one could libel their evidence as false;<sup>280</sup> for it is clear that they are particularly malicious in their attitude towards us<sup>281</sup>—all the Egyptians alike, and, of the Phoenicians, the Tyrians.<sup>282</sup> **71** I could not, however, say the same about the Chaldeans, since they constitute also the original ancestors of our people,<sup>283</sup> and, because of this kinship, refer to Judeans in their records.<sup>284</sup> **72** When I have provided the proofs from these sources,<sup>285</sup> I shall then reveal those, even of the Greek writers, who have made reference to Judeans,<sup>286</sup> so that our detractors may no longer

doubtful they would rely only on their “near neighbours.” Nor would they share Josephus’ anxiety to prove their great antiquity. Josephus claims merely to mimic their tactics, not to advance a specifically Judean, but equally valid, form of argument.

<sup>278</sup> The modest “try” (cf. 1.5, 29, 253, 320, all using *πειράω*) has a more positive nuance than the scornful “attempt” (1.13, 53, 56, *ἐπιχειρέω*). There are plenty of other “neighbouring” nations whose evidence Josephus does not cite (e.g., Arabs and Syrians), and his choice of Egyptians and Phoenicians is surely determined by the availability of their sources (and their famed antiquity), not by their contiguity (or hostility).

<sup>279</sup> Josephus announces the first two non-Greek segments (1.73-105, 106-127); the “particularly” represents not a special emphasis on these two (the Chaldean material is more extensive than the Phoenician) but the fact that they meet the criterion of propinquity. The “witness” vocabulary (already used in 1.4, 59, 69) will figure prominently in the segments that follow: Egyptian (1.74, 93, 104), Phoenician (1.106, 112, 115, 127), Chaldean (1.129, 160), and Greek (1.200, 204; 2.1). The legal metaphor (of witnesses in the courtroom) is occasionally brought to life (e.g., 1.74).

<sup>280</sup> For the strong connotations of the *ψευδ-* root, see note to “matters” at 1.16. Josephus constructs a hypothetical charge to give himself cause to refute it. One might have thought that he had done enough to authenticate the “records” of these nations in 1.6-10, 28, but he now supplies a further reason to believe them on the subject of Judeans. He thus commits himself to accepting all the evidence that follows in 1.73-127 as historically true. In another context he will provide plenty of reasons to claim that Egyptian sources wholly misrepresent both Moses and the Judeans (1.105, 223-26).

<sup>281</sup> On “malice” (*δυσμένεια*; here *δυσμένως*), see note to this term at 1.2. Here malice is cited as a reason not to question but to affirm their historical reliability, although as a general rule (followed by Josephus at 1.213-14, 223-24) the opposite implication might be drawn. A special logic seems to apply in this case: 1. Those who hate other nations do not pay them compliments. 2. It would be a compliment to say that another nation is ancient (and an act of hostility to deny this). 3. Some nations hate us, but nonetheless witness to our

antiquity. 4. This can only be explained if they are actually telling the truth. The cultural assumption embedded in statement 2 is crucial to Josephus’ whole apologetic (see 1.2), but the surrounding logic serves a purely local role in the logic of the treatise, and is not employed again. It does not allow for the possibility of malicious tales set in a fictitious past (cf. 1.219-320).

<sup>282</sup> The hostility between Egyptians and Judeans is a theme of some importance in this treatise; see 1.223-24 and Barclay 2004. It is not so “clear” that, or why, the Tyrians should hate the Judeans. In introducing his “Tyrian” sources, Josephus will actually stress the friendship between Hiram and Solomon (1.109). The assertion here may draw on the record of historical conflicts (e.g., *War* 2.478; 4.105; *Ant.* 12.331; 14.313, 319-22), although Tyrian hostility was shared by other Phoenician cities (cf. *War* 2.459; *Life* 44).

<sup>283</sup> It is assumed here that the two peoples remained on friendly terms because of the ancestral connection. Following the LXX, Josephus takes Abraham’s ancestry to derive from “Chaldea” (Gen 11:28; *Ant.* 1.151-68); the same assumption is followed in other Judean sources (e.g., Ps.-Eupolemus *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.17.2-3; Philo, *Mos.* 1.5; *Hypoth.* 6.1). In *Ant.* 1.158, Josephus claims that Berosus mentions Abraham, but he does not repeat that claim in this treatise. Neither does he suggest, as does Philo, that the language of the Judean scriptures is “Chaldean” (cf. Philo, *Mos.* 2.40, 224; *Legat.* 4, etc.). The reference to Chaldean ancestry helps strengthen the denial that the Judeans are descended from Egyptians (1.104; see note to “composition” at 1.1).

<sup>284</sup> As far as we can tell, no “Chaldean” source ever recognizes Judeans as a kindred people, and this is certainly not hinted at in the material from Berosus to be cited: in 1.137 (the only reference to Judeans), they are listed among other captives, with indifference.

<sup>285</sup> Translating *παρὰ τούτων* (with Thackeray, Reinach and Münster), rather than *περὶ τούτων* (L, Niese: “concerning these topics/authors”). The statement refers to 1.73-160, and speaks of *πίστεις* (“proofs”), echoing the issue of “trust” (the root *πιστ-*) highlighted in 1.2, 6, 38 (cf. hereafter 1.112, 143, 161).

<sup>286</sup> This announces 1.161-214 and echoes 1.5 (cf. 1.59). On the category “writers” (*συγγραφεῖς*), see note

have even this pretext for the case they mount against us.<sup>287</sup>

*Egyptian Evidence (1.73-105): Reading Options*

The Egyptian section of Josephus' chain of witnesses (1.73-105) is one of the most extraordinary, and most cited, segments of *Apion*. Josephus uses part of Manetho's Egyptian history, in citation (1.75-82), paraphrase (1.85-90), and excerpt (1.94-102), relating the invasion of a "shepherd" people, their subjugation of Egypt, and their reign for over 500 years, before they were besieged in Avaris and expelled. Josephus packages these selections with interpretative comments, in order to present Manetho's account as the story of the Judeans' ancestors, and thus as proof that they originated from outside Egypt and were in existence at an extremely ancient time (1.104).

The presentation of this material to a *Roman audience* might elicit a variety of reactions. Given Egypt's reputation for antiquity and the fame of her temple records (see at 1.6), it was impressive that Josephus could find reference to Judeans in such authoritative "sacred" sources (1.73), whose precise chronologies are here displayed (1.80-81, 94-97). To Romans who were conscious that their own recorded history was comparatively short, and their remoter ancestry traceable only in legend to Aeneas' escape from Troy, Josephus' "proof" that the Judeans' departure from Egypt was a historically verifiable fact practically 1,000 years *before* the Trojan War (1.104) might have looked awesome, at least to those willing to credit Josephus' chronology. At the same time, to present the Judeans' ancestors as conquerors of Egypt, who easily overran the country (1.75-76), could resonate with Roman disdain for that congenitally "unwarlike" nation (Juvenal, *Sat.* 15.126), which Augustus had "enslaved" (Dio Cassius 51.17.4). Educated Romans generally scorned Egyptian religion (at least its animal cults; see at 1.223; Berthelot 2000) and associated Judeans with antagonism towards it (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.2; Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.35). Thus, it was not necessarily shocking to read that these early Judeans demolished Egyptian temples in their invasion of the country (1.76). In general, the image of Judeans as successful conquerors could attract Roman admiration on the premise that virtue is proved by military success (see at 2.125). Even if the "shepherds" eventually left Egypt, they never suffered a military defeat (1.85-90).

On the other hand, it is easy to imagine a Roman reader becoming bored by the long king-lists and their tedious enumeration of years and months (1.80-81, 94-97), which even the highly sympathetic Eusebius considered excessive (*Praep. ev.* 10.13.13). Many details here are also somewhat obscure, such as the "ancient religious lore" of 1.78 and the etymologies in 1.82. Nor would it take much for a critical or suspicious reader to spot gaps and inconsistencies in Josephus' claims. The muddled treatment of the etymology of "Hyksos" (1.83, 91, if Josephus wrote both) is only the most obvious example. Indeed, unless one was inclined to believe Josephus, the identification between the Hyksos and the Judeans, on which the whole segment depends, does not look strong: apart from the reference to Jerusalem (1.90), it rests on an alternative etymology (1.83, 91) and a detail from Joseph's life (that he was a "captive") that readers have to take on trust, and that somehow provided the title for the whole dynasty (1.92). An equally damaging reaction to this segment might be a moral objection: if, as Josephus claims, the Judeans' ancestors were Manetho's Hyksos, they are here designated cruel (1.76), indeed genocidal (1.81), conquerors of Egypt. Such a story only confirms the reputation of Judeans as extremely hostile to other nations (2.145, 258). Thus, Josephus' use of Manetho's hostile account of the Hyksos entails a risk: if he can persuade his Roman readers to accept this account as a reference to early Judeans, he has left them with an impression of cruel

to "writers" at 1.58. The definition of the topic here suggests that *any* mention of Judeans is a sufficient criterion for inclusion; the theme of Judean *antiquity* (cf. 1.2-5) is not explicit, and in fact the material to be cited refers, in some cases, to comparatively recent history.

<sup>287</sup> Josephus suddenly sharpens his tone, raising the suspicion of antagonism, as in 1.1-5, 59. If doubters of Judean antiquity are not just ignorant, but unwilling to

believe, this collection of proofs has a polemical edge connecting it to the rest of the treatise, the response to "slanders." In the present Part, Josephus uses such *ethos*-attacks sparingly (cf. 1.160, 213-14), but their insertion helps the argument by dismissing doubts as a screen for ill-will. The reference to a "case against us" (ἀντιλογία) suggests a legal contest, to which Josephus will call a number of witnesses.

despots, who not only demolished Egyptian temples but wished to eradicate the entire Egyptian nation (1.81). Perhaps only strong sympathy with Judeans and disdain for Egyptians would overlook or excuse this brutality.

*Judean readers* of this section might also react in a variety of ways. If they shared Josephus' apologetic concerns they would be heartened by the evidence of this authoritative source. That the story presents the early Judeans as of international significance, and of impressive military power, might also swell Judean pride. There are examples elsewhere of the embellishment of Moses' reputation with an account of his campaign against the Ethiopians (Josephus, *Ant.* 2.238-53; Artapanus in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.27.1-37; cf. Rajak 2002: 257-72). These indicate how a Judean audience might appreciate tales of military prowess, even if they had no foundation in biblical accounts. But there is a significant difference between the legend of Moses' Ethiopian campaign and the Hyksos story. The first adds to, but does not significantly alter, the shape of the biblical narrative, while the second offers a radically different account of the Judeans' entry into, existence in, and departure from Egypt. If they understood it, as Josephus directs, as an account of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt and her subsequent exodus, his Judean readers would surely expect to find some reference to her slavery, to the plagues, to the crossing of the Red Sea, or at least to Moses. All these were integral to the biblical narrative, to the annual Passover ritual, and to the extensive reworking of these stories in subsequent Judean literature, including Josephus' own *Antiquities*. Where Judeans embellished stories of the patriarchs or of Moses, it was generally to present them as benefactors of Egypt. Like Eupolemus, Artapanus, Philo, and others, Josephus elsewhere presents Abraham as a cultural benefactor of Egypt (*Ant.* 1.161-68), Joseph as an economic reformer whose prudence earned him acclamation as the "savior" of the Egyptian populace (*Ant.* 2.94, 193, 202), and Moses as a loyal military agent of the Egyptian Pharaoh (*Ant.* 2.238-53). Indeed, Josephus recounts that the parting Judeans were showered with gifts by native Egyptians out of "neighborly fellow-feeling" (*Ant.* 2.314). To any reader of *Antiquities*, it must come as something of a shock to have the Judeans here portrayed as invaders who cruelly slaughtered and enslaved the Egyptian populace.

Thus Judean readers could hardly fail to notice not merely the absence of standard biblical and legendary motifs, and not only the presence of new features like the siege of the fortified Avaris, but also the fundamentally different tenor of Manetho's story. Josephus' need for an Egyptian "witness" has forced him to use a story that has almost nothing in common with Judean tradition, and that cannot be spliced into the biblical account (hence its non-appearance in *Antiquities*, despite Josephus' mention of Manetho in *Ant.* 1.107); indeed, it can only be associated with Judean tradition by the flimsiest of threads. Because his rhetoric requires an absolute contrast between the accuracy of this Manetho story and the falsity of the other (1.105, looking ahead to 1.227-87), Josephus cannot afford to dispute any element in Manetho's account of the Hyksos by reference to biblical "truth." Judean readers would have to suspend their natural disbelief of this account for the sake of its apologetic benefits, and only a strong commitment to those benefits would enable them to assent to Josephus' remarkable strategy.

Some *early Christian readers* were certainly willing to follow Josephus for the sake of their own apologetic requirements. Our earliest known reader, Theophilus, uses this segment of *Apion* in his *Ad Autolyicum* (written about 180 CE). He does not cite Josephus as his source (appeal to a Judean source would weaken his argument), but clearly employs Josephus' selection and interpretation of Manetho (3.20-21; Hardwick 1989: 7-14). In his argument that the Christian religion is neither "modern" nor "mythical," but ancient, historically well-founded and therefore true (3.16, 29), Theophilus claims the Hebrews as "our ancestors" and their books as "ours." Manetho's account of the shepherds is not fully endorsed (3.21, in contrast to Josephus), but is accepted as a reliable means of dating the exodus in relation to Harmais/Danaus, and thus can be placed well before the Trojan War (3.20). In this way, Josephus' extraordinarily bold deployment of Manetho proved invaluable for its placement of Judean history (the Hyksos) and Greek history (Danaus) on the same chronological scheme (Manetho's king-list), and this presages extensive early Christian use of Manetho, either directly through the epitome of his work (by Julius Africanus and Eusebius) or indirectly via this passage from Josephus. (A parallel effort used Ptolemy of Mendes, who dated Moses as a contemporary of the Greek Inachus; see Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 36-41.) This enabled Christians to effect two complementary strategies: first, to prove the enormous antiquity of their "ancestors," their scriptures and their religious philosophy (Moses), and secondly to map out the entire chronology of human history, aligning Egyptian, Greek and biblical chronologies in a single scheme. This second



strategy is already part of Theophilus' aim (3.24-28), and it was much elaborated thereafter, stimulated by chiliastic speculation.

After Theophilus, we can trace readings of this section of *Apion* in both Tertullian and Eusebius. In his *Apology* (19-21, written ca. 200 CE), Tertullian explicitly utilizes this passage from Josephus, but gives his own summary of the crucial facts, wishing to avoid the "tedious discussion" of chronological details (19). For Tertullian, the origin and antiquity of the Judean people is not the critical issue, but the antiquity of Moses, since it is his writings that form the foundation of Christian belief. A similar shift is clear in Eusebius, who does not attempt to prove the antiquity of the Judean people as Christian "ancestors," but to justify the Christian appeal to Hebrew oracles rather than Greek philosophy. For this argument it is vital to show that Moses wrote prior to even the earliest Greek philosopher, his priority indicating that they have borrowed from him (*Praeparatio Evangelica* Book 10). Within this argument, Eusebius relies primarily on previous Christian authors (10.10-12), but includes a shortened version of our passage from Josephus (10.13). By his time (4<sup>th</sup> century CE), Josephus' use of Manetho no longer constitutes the central plank in the argument, though he remains a supplementary support. Similarly, although Eusebius cites the whole of our section in his *Chronicon* (70.3-74.6), the citation appears superfluous after the direct use of the epitome of Manetho (63ff.). Christian historiography was content to re-use Josephus, but had now developed its own tools to meet its distinctive apologetic needs.

*Scholarship* on this section of *Apion* has been largely concerned with Josephus' source, Manetho. Since Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* is crucial for the reconstruction of Egyptian chronology, and since Josephus' citations are the only extant portions of Manetho that have not been compressed in an epitome, Egyptologists have swarmed around this passage (and its companion, 1.232-53). Although it might reveal much about Manetho, and about the mysterious "Hyksos," there is doubt about how much goes back to Manetho himself, and how much has been altered and edited on its way to Josephus. Source-critical theories have been abundant and complex, and are surveyed in Appendix 1. Underneath the layers of redaction, Egyptologists detect in Manetho's twin stories echoes of standard Egyptian motifs, particularly the cruel foreign invader and the polluted "Sethian" foe (see Appendix 3, III).

Entangled with the questions of source-criticism is the issue of Manetho's attitude to Judeans. Regarding the present section, scholars have debated what reference to Judeans, if any, is intended by the mention of "Jerusalem" (1.90), and whether Manetho can be said to represent an early form of "anti-Judaism" (see Appendix 1). Whether Manetho's stories bear some relationship to the biblical account of Joseph or the exodus has also attracted some interest (e.g., Troiani 1975; Catastini 1995), although most consider that the biblical and Hyksos legends are quite independent of one another.

*My own reading* focuses partly on Manetho's nationalist politics (his carefully constructed strategies to demean the invader Hyksos), but mostly on Josephus' struggle with Manetho as his essential but awkward "witness." Josephus needs and wants Manetho to be speaking about the Judeans' ancestors. This is the only Egyptian text he employs on the topic of their antiquity, and it enables him to date Judeans spectacularly early, with all the authority of an Egyptian "sacred" source. But he knows that its story line is incompatible with the biblical account (see above) and its stance towards the Hyksos is explicitly hostile. He could certainly have debunked this story with the same critical rationality which he applies to its sequel (1.227-87), but he is confined by his rhetorical choice to portray an absolute contrast between the truthful Hyksos-history and the "mythical" leper-legend (see at 1.105, 287). Awkwardly compelled to rely on an irrelevant and hostile witness, Josephus wrests it to his advantage, selecting and editing his extracts, compressing them by paraphrase, and interrupting them with leading interjections. It is a fascinating literary tussle.

In a wider historical and cultural perspective, there are many ironies in Josephus' use of Manetho. When Manetho proudly placed his Egyptian traditions in the Greek domain, he made them available for use by others, who might be differently partisan. Nearly 400 years later, Josephus, representing another "oriental" tradition, saw the opportunity to locate his nation advantageously in the global historiography made possible by Manetho. Suspending his usually overriding commitment to the biblical tradition, Josephus' vision is focused on the public honor of the Judean people, here secured by their distinction from Egyptians and their immense antiquity. That he can redeploy a source which *dishonors* the Hyksos for the *honor* of his Judean ancestors is made possible by the fact that he reissues Manetho's text for both Roman and Judean readers, for whom the invasion and humiliation of Egypt could be construed as an achievement, not a disgrace. Thus Josephus turns an



Egyptian cultural weapon against its native manufacturers, trading on Roman and Judean disdain of Egypt to enhance the standing of his own nation. The power dynamics are complex and the strategy remarkably bold.

**(1.14) 73** I shall begin, first, with the Egyptians' documents.<sup>288</sup> It is not possible to present the materials in the original,<sup>289</sup> but Manetho was an Egyptian by descent, a man steeped in Greek culture, as is clear:<sup>290</sup> for he wrote his national history in the Greek language, having translated,<sup>291</sup> as he himself says, from the sacred tablets,<sup>292</sup> *Manetho*

<sup>288</sup> Egypt always comes first in Josephus' list of "witnesses" (cf. 1.8, 70), since its reputation in this field was pre-eminent. Treating Egypt first also enables Josephus to place the maximum distance between his two citations from Manetho (1.73-105; 1.227-287), although they clearly belong in sequence (see back references in 1.237, 241-42, 248). Josephus wants to make use of one and refute the other, and thus requires a categorical distinction between them, aided by this textual dislocation. This "Egyptian" section (which runs till 1.105) is introduced as if the witnesses were plural ("the documents among the Egyptians," cf. 1.93, 105), but only one author is cited, Manetho. Josephus knows other "Egyptian" authors who spoke of the Judeans in relation to Egyptian antiquity (e.g., Chaeremon and Lysimachus) and he may have known, through Apion, the account of Ptolemy of Mendes, who co-ordinated their exodus with the mythically early reign of Inachus (Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 38). But these accounts either failed to match the antiquity of the Hyksos, or unhelpfully portrayed the Judeans as native Egyptians or "lepers." Josephus is driving towards the double conclusion, that the Judeans are an extremely ancient people *and* of non-Egyptian origin (1.104), and only the Hyksos-story is amenable to that interpretation. The (vague) reference here to "documents" (γράμματα) implies the security of written sources (cf. 1.8-9), and prepares for the absolute contrast with "myths" (1.105); words from the γράφ-root (noun and verb) recur strategically at, e.g., 1.92, 104, 226, 228, 287.

<sup>289</sup> This is the only time Josephus admits to mediated access to his sources (although we may suspect it often elsewhere). Josephus' audiences would know that ancient Egyptian documents were written in languages and scripts that no non-Egyptian could read. Elsewhere Josephus stakes a claim to some knowledge of "Egyptian" (1.83, 286; 2.21, 27), but here his methodological candor could enhance his image as a historian.

<sup>290</sup> Josephus says nothing about Manetho (e.g., his date, status, and context) beyond the facts necessary to establish his authority. For further details and bibliography see Appendix 1. As an "Egyptian by birth," Josephus suggests, he had linguistic and physical access to ancient Egyptian records. This would hardly be true of all native Egyptians, and it is odd that Josephus does not mention Manetho's status as a priest, since this was a crucial qualification (cf. 1.28); perhaps he

knew so little about Manetho as not even to know this. Manetho's "Greek culture" gives him international currency and respect. Josephus, who is hardly the best judge of such things (see *Ant.* 20.262-65), deduces Manetho's ability from his linguistic competence and knowledge of Herodotus. We may presume from analysis of Manetho's Greek, and from his probable location in the Ptolemaic court, that his acculturation was thorough (Gutschmid 419).

<sup>291</sup> Greek: μεταφράζω. The verb (used by Josephus of his own work, *Ant.* 10.218; cf. of Menander, *Ant.* 8.144; 9.283) could mean merely "paraphrase," but seems to be equivalent to μεθερμηνεύω (*Apion* 1.228), which Josephus uses also of himself to mean (in some sense) "translate" (*Apion* 1.43; *Ant.* 1.5). On the nuances of these and related terms, as used by Josephus, see Feldman 1998a: 37-46.

<sup>292</sup> Josephus makes a similar claim for himself in 1.1, that he had composed a history in Greek, "on the basis of our sacred books." Here L reads ἐκ τῶν ἱερέων ("from the priests") but Niese et al. follow Eusebius in reading ἱερῶν from "sacred sources," or "temples"). But we would expect here a noun such as "books" or "writings" (cf. 1.91, 105, 228), and on this basis (and the extraneous τῆ) Gutschmid 420 (followed by Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster) suggested emending to ἐκ δέλτων ἱερῶν, as translated here; his alternative suggestion ἐκ τόμων ἱερῶν ("from sacred volumes") is equally plausible.

Josephus is probably right to report that Manetho described his sources as both temple records and oral legends (cf. 1.105), but is probably wrong in his repeated and anxious assertion that the Hyksos story is derived from one kind of source only, and the leper story only from the other (1.105, 228-29, 287). The Hyksos story bears signs of legendary features, alongside the chronological material (e.g., 1.98-101 alongside 1.79-81, 94-97), and the temple records, even those based on king-lists, may have included narratives with the characteristics of legend. See Lloyd 1975: 89-113 on the mixture of material conveyed to Herodotus by Egyptian priests and found in Manetho. Redford concludes on Manetho: "In the main he worked from Demotic sources in temple libraries, not from the monuments themselves ... Since they were found in the temple libraries and were therefore *ipso facto* acceptable, folk-tales and related genres found their way into

and on many points he convicts Herodotus of having given a false account of Egyptian matters out of ignorance.<sup>293</sup> 74 Well, this Manetho writes about us in the second book of his *Aegyptiaca* as follows;<sup>294</sup> I shall present his own wording, as if I had brought the man himself into court as a witness:<sup>295</sup>

*Manetho on  
the Hyksos*

75 His son, whose name was Timaios.<sup>296</sup> During his reign, I don't know why, a God whipped up a hostile storm,<sup>297</sup> and unexpectedly some people of obscure descent from eastern parts had the audacity to invade the land and easily captured it by force, without a battle.<sup>298</sup>

Manetho's work" (1986: 336). The "sacredness" of the records implies their reliability (cf. 1.9, 28-29).

<sup>293</sup> This reminder of Greek unreliability (1.6-56) makes Egyptians, like Judeans, victims of ignorant Greek historiography. Manetho is thus in common cause with Josephus, who here echoes language initially deployed in 1.3-5 (ἐλέγχειν, ἀγνοία, ψεύδομαι). This further dent in Herodotus' reputation (cf. 1.16) hardly assists Josephus' later use of his "witness" in 1.168-71, but it was common knowledge that Herodotus had written much questionable material about Egypt, and Josephus likes to display native knowledge as superior to the Greeks'. This notice suggests that Josephus knew more about Manetho than he cites in this treatise (cf. also *Ant.* 1.107), and the material regarding the Great Pyramid in *FGH* 609, frag. 2, p.22 (Waddell 1940, frag. 14) confirms (if it is authentic) Josephus' claim that Manetho refuted Herodotus (cf. Troiani 87). It is possible, but unlikely, that Manetho wrote a whole work against Herodotus (*FGH* 609, frag. 13), but in any case an attack in Greek on the famous Greek disseminator of Egyptian lore expresses Manetho's cultural politics perfectly: he adopts elements of Greek culture while aggressively asserting Egyptian superiority at critical points.

<sup>294</sup> The reference to a specific book looks impressively exact (cf. 2.10), but shows up by contrast the vagueness of 1.91 ("in another book"). There were 3 books of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* ("Egyptian matters," not necessarily restricted to history); the second, covering the 12<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> dynasties, included the stories about the Hyksos. The "about us," casually introduced, represents Josephus' strategy to implant a crucial presumption in his readers' minds. That the Hyksos were "our ancestors" is backed by brief argumentation in 1.91-92, but is otherwise taken for granted throughout, and given careful reinforcement in 1.103, 228, 232, 280 (cf. 2.16). Since the identification is never allowed to seem problematic, the text persuades simply by reiterating this assumption.

<sup>295</sup> This strong claim to verbatim citation, introducing the very first quotation in the treatise, spreads an air of authenticity over the rest (for Josephus' citation practice in this treatise, see Inowlocki 2005). Of the three Manetho citations, the second (1.84-90) is clearly

paraphrase and the third (1.94-102) more vaguely introduced as direct speech. It is not clear precisely where this first citation ends (contrast 1.94-103; 2.10-12), and there is room for suspicion that Josephus has doctored its conclusion (see 1.82); he may also have omitted an embarrassing description of the Hyksos' religion at 1.78. The "witness" metaphor, introduced in 1.4 and reinforced in 1.69-72, reactivates the over-arching metaphor of a legal defense (see Introduction, § 5). The "witness" theme recurs in this segment at 1.93, 104. Labow's suggestion (2005: 74) that this phrase indicates that Josephus knew Manetho only in a previously formed extract, not through direct access, is without foundation.

<sup>296</sup> Reading τοῦ Τιμαῖος ὄνομα. The text is corrupt and the translation uncertain (cf. the τοῦ formula in 1.95-98). The name sounds vaguely Egyptian, but we cannot reconstruct what Josephus wrote, let alone what name or further statement Manetho (or his sources) may have given at this point (see Niese, x; Gutschmid 421-22); for the possible connection of this name with Dudu-mose see Redford 1970: 2; 1997: 2-3 (otherwise Beckerath 1964: 77). It is not easy to discern the context of this passage in Manetho's work since the epitomes differ in their understanding of how he related the Hyksos to the succession of dynasties (see note to "years" at 1.84). In what follows Manetho appears to rework stock themes in Egyptian tales of foreign invasions, but maintains Egyptian dignity with subtle attempts to demean the honor or competence of the Hyksos. For the historical dates of the Hyksos (probably ca. 1655–ca. 1550) see O'Connor 1997: 45-56.

<sup>297</sup> If Manetho really wrote θεός (singular; Gutschmid 421-22 proposes emendation), it should probably be read without the article (*pace* Thackeray, Naber), and translated "a God." For the plural, cf. 1.76. The "storm" (ἀντίπνευσεν) may be an Egyptian idiom (Redford 1986: 241). Manetho reduces Egyptian shame by admitting no fault and attributing the incursion to divine will.

<sup>298</sup> The notion of invaders from "the east" (or "the north") is a recurrent feature of Egyptian historiography; later, Manetho satisfied Hellenistic curiosity by speculating on their precise origin with the suggestion that they were Phoenician (see below, note to 1.82). It

76 When they had subdued the rulers in the land, they then savagely burned the cities and demolished the temples of the Gods and treated all the inhabitants in an extremely hostile manner, slaughtering some and taking into slavery the children and womenfolk of others.<sup>299</sup> 77 Finally, they also made one of their number, whose name was Salitis, king.<sup>300</sup> He resided in Memphis and exacted tribute from both the upper and lower country, leaving fortresses in the most strategic places.<sup>301</sup> He fortified, above all, the eastern region, since he foresaw an attack by the Assyrians, were they at some time to grow in strength, in the desire to gain his kingdom.<sup>302</sup> 78 He discovered in the Saite nome<sup>303</sup> a city in a very advantageous position, situated to the east of the Bubastis branch of the river and called, by some ancient religious

*The city of  
Auaris*

seems that Josephus carefully omitted that identification but was happy to leave this vague notice of origin, since it supports his conclusion “that we came to Egypt from elsewhere” (1.104) and does not challenge Judean/Chaldean identity. Manetho’s description of the Hyksos’ arrival manages to maintain Egyptian honor: the Egyptians never fought and thus never lost a battle with the invaders, whose subsequent cruelty was all the more barbaric for being directed against a passive, not a resistant, population. The invaders’ “obscurity” (ἄσημοι τὸ γένος) expresses Egyptian contempt (Redford 1986: 242), a bitter pill that Josephus has to swallow. The debate about the historical Hyksos’ rise to power has oscillated between theories of gradual political ascendancy by Asiatic elements in the eastern Delta and an actual invasion from the north (see respectively van Seters 1966: 87-126 and Redford 1970, both in dialogue with extensive earlier debates; cf. Beckerath 1964: 113-22). Unfortunately our sources for this period are extremely sparse and key documents, such as the Turin Canon, are lacunose. For recent discussions of the evidence see Oren 1997.

<sup>299</sup> Manetho’s characterization of the Hyksos’ seizure of power serves, with 1.81, to frame his account of their rule. The stereotypical motifs (cruel foreigners, cities and temples destroyed; see Redford 1986: 260-90, esp. nos. 1, 2, 9) reflect very ancient anti-Hyksos propaganda (see Redford 1997, nos. 68-69, 73), but are matched (and even shaped) by accounts of the Persian period of rule (see note to “Gods” at 2.129); cf. the atrocities in temples when the “shepherds” return (1.239, 248-49). Manetho’s outrage is well expressed by emotive vocabulary, which Josephus allows to stand (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.13 omits 1.76-81).

<sup>300</sup> “Salitis” seems to have been Josephus’ version of the name (for variants, see Münster ad loc.); the epitomes of Manetho have “Saïtes,” perhaps by assimilation to the “Saïte” nome of Egypt, with which they associate him. Manetho seems to have had little to relate about these “first six rulers” (1.81), and associates all he knows about Hyksos politics with the first one, whom we cannot connect to any king known from

Egyptian records (Labow 2005: 76-77, n.71). Although a link with Joseph’s title (*shallit*, Gen 42:6) has been mooted, the connection is extremely tenuous (Troiani 88).

<sup>301</sup> Our scant traditions associate the Hyksos with the Delta, and locate their power-base in Avaris (see 1.78-79); in linking them with two cities Manetho may combine variant traditions. Memphis is just south of the tip of the Delta. The exaction of tribute represents political as well as economic power, and there is some evidence to suggest that at its height Hyksos power extended through most of Egypt (both “upper” and “lower”); see van Seters 1966: 162-70; Redford 1970: 17-22. Strategically cited fortresses (especially on the Nile) are essential for the military control of the country (cf. 2.44).

<sup>302</sup> Eastern fortifications were a perennial concern for rulers of Egypt (cf. Diodorus 1.57.4), and Manetho uses this motif to portray the mighty Hyksos as insecure; the theme is repeated in 1.90. Since they were eventually overthrown by an internal revolt (1.85-89), he also suggests their political and military naivety. The notion of an “Assyrian” threat is anachronistic for the time of the historical Hyksos, and in a different context, and with a more secure grasp of history, Josephus could have torn this to shreds. Manetho may be borrowing the Greek association of Ninus and Semiramis with “Assyria,” placed in very remote antiquity (e.g., by Ctesias). The vagueness of his allusion to their potential growth may indicate that he knows that his history, or his ethnic labels, are being stretched. The Assyrians did invade Egypt (first in 671 BCE), but more than 900 years after the last Hyksos.

<sup>303</sup> The epitomes of Manetho read “in the Sethroite nome,” which is geographically correct in relation to the Bubastis branch of the river, at the east of the Delta. But both L and Latin indicate that Josephus wrote “in the Saïte nome,” in the western Delta. Most editors correct Josephus here (see Gutschmid 425; Münster ad loc.), but I have left intact what probably constitutes an error on his part.

*Subsequent  
Hyksos kings*

lore, Auaris.<sup>304</sup> He established this city and rendered it extremely secure with walls, settling there a large body of armed troops<sup>305</sup>—as many as 240,000 men—as a frontier guard.<sup>306</sup> **79** He used to go there in the summer, partly to hand out rations and distribute pay, and partly to train them carefully in military exercises, to frighten foreigners.<sup>307</sup> After reigning for 19 years, he died. **80** After him there reigned another king, called Beon, for 44 years, then another, Apachnas, for 36 years and 7 months; next Apophis for 61 years, and Iannas for 50 years and 1 month; **81** and after all those Assis for 49 years and 2 months.<sup>308</sup> These six were

<sup>304</sup> The historical sources concur in associating the Hyksos with Avaris (Egyptian name: Het Waret). Van Seters 1966: 127-51 surveys the long history of debate among archaeologists on its probable location, arguing against Tanis in favor of Khatane-Qantir (Tell el-Dab'a), an identification now generally accepted; see Bietak 1996 and 1997. The town had very strong religious associations with the God Seth/Typhon; cf. the association between Seth and the Hyksos king Apophis in Sallier Papyrus I = Redford 1997 no. 74. Manetho clearly knew this and stated as much in 1.237, so here the unexplained association between religion and the name of the city is curious. There is reason to suspect that Josephus has deliberately corrupted Manetho's text. In this "citation" from Manetho, which he cannot afford to criticise, Josephus would not want the Hyksos (= "our ancestors") associated with an Egyptian God; the association is only safe in 1.237, where the whole story is put in doubt. Thus he probably suppresses a reference to Seth/Typhon, and links the "religious lore" (θεολογία) with the name of Avaris. Manetho, however, would delight in this cultic association, since by his day Seth (Greek: Typhon) had become associated with foreigners, disease, disorder, and enmity to the Gods and this provided another means of denigrating the Hyksos (see van Henten and Abusch 1996; note to "Typhonian" at 1.237; Appendix 3, III).

<sup>305</sup> Greek: ὀπλίται (cf. ἐξοπλισία, "military exercises," in 1.79). Manetho's term may have had a distinct sense for his Greek readers ("hoplites"), but for Josephus the term can refer to any sort of armed troops (cf. *War* 6.224; *Life* 92, etc.).

<sup>306</sup> It is a little unclear how Salitis can have both "discovered" (1.78a) and "established" (1.78b, literally "founded") the city, but the sense of either verb may be broad enough to make them compatible. Manetho de-

fines Avaris in his narrative in 5 different ways: as a frontier fort established by the Hyksos (here), as the site of their siege (1.86-88), as the lepers' assigned location (1.237-38), as the shepherds' "ancestral home" (1.242), and as the launch-pad for their combined assault on Egypt (1.242). One has the impression of an untidy weaving of threads, in which Avaris serves to join disparate tales.

<sup>307</sup> The fact that Josephus includes such inconsequential material suggests that, though he filters out material which causes embarrassment, he tolerates details that add nothing to his main point. It is possible that he heard here an echo of Joseph's role in food-distribution (Gen 41:53-57; *Ant.* 2.93-94), but if so he judged the link too tenuous to mention.

<sup>308</sup> None of these names or dates contributes anything to Josephus' argument (contrast 1.94-97 where the sum of the listed reigns is important), and their inclusion might either bore or impress his readers. The details are tedious, but the precision gives the impression of a history extremely carefully recorded and preserved, even to the counting of months. Transcriptional variations in names and numbers make it impossible to be confident on Josephus' text at some points. For instance, for the second king, L gives Βηών reigning for 44 years, while the citation of this passage in the Armenian of Eusebius' *Chronicon* suggests the name "Banon," who reigned for 43. For the variants at each point see Niese and Münster ad loc., and Gutschmid 427-29, who concludes that the versions of the names in Eusebius' *Chronicon* are to be preferred. Josephus here reports 6 kings from Manetho, but other summaries of Manetho (via the epitomes, in the church fathers, and in a scholion on Plato, *Tim.* 21e) give varying numbers of kings, in different sequences, with varying versions of their names and length of reign:

Josephus	Africanus	Eusebius, <i>Chron.</i>	Eusebius in Syncellus	Scholion on Plato, <i>Timaeus</i> 21e
Σάλιτις 19	Σαίτης 19	Saites 19	Σαίτης 19	Σαίτης 19
Βηών / Βανών 44/43	Βνών 44	Bnon 40	Βνών 40	Βνών 40
Ἀπαχνάς / Ἀπαχνάν 36,7m	Παχνάν 61			
Ἀπωφίς / Ἀφωφίς 61	Σταάν 50		Ἀφωφίς 14	
Ἰαννάς 50,1m	Ἀρχλης 49	Archles 30		Ἀρχάης 30
Ἀσσίς / Ἀσεθ 49,2m	Ἀφοβίς 61	Aphophis 14	Ἀρχλης 30	Ἀφωφίς 14



their first rulers,<sup>309</sup> whose continual and ever increasing desire<sup>310</sup> was to annihilate the native stock of Egypt.<sup>311</sup> 82<sup>312</sup> Their whole nation was called “Hykoussos,”<sup>313</sup> that is, “king-

*The name  
“Hykoussos”*

Manetho probably had 6 names (2 dropping out in transmission), but we cannot tell from this mass of contradictions in what order he listed them or with what lengths of reign. It appears that the Turin Canon also listed 6 Hyksos kings, reigning for a total of 108 (?) years, but the text is sadly fragmentary at this point. Most of these names receive no external confirmation, but Apophis is named in dramatic narratives as the last Hyksos king, defeated by a Theban uprising (van Seters 1966: 152-61; see further on 1.85). On Khyan (=Pachnan?), see Hayes 1973: 60-61; van Seters 1966: 159-60; Redford 1997: 6-7; Beckerath 1964: 130-31; and on Ianassi (=Iannas?), son of Khyan, see Bietak 1997: 113-14. On the Egyptian names see Beckerath 1999: 114-15.

<sup>309</sup> It appears that Manetho thought there were more than 6 rulers in total, but Josephus’ paraphrase of his work in 1.84 makes it unclear how he understood matters. The total there recorded of 511 years is far more than the sum of these six (259 years and 10 months), but how Manetho constructed the relationship between other (unnamed?) kings and these 6 is obscure.

<sup>310</sup> Translating ποθοῦντες ἀεὶ καὶ μᾶλλον, the text accepted by Niese, Naber, Thackeray (with doubts) and Münster. But L reads πορθοῦντες (“laying waste”) and the Armenian version in Eusebius, *Chronicon* has further clauses about warfare or spoilage; see Niese and Münster ad loc. and Gutschmid 429. The text seems corrupt beyond reconstruction.

<sup>311</sup> This summary statement by Manetho brings to a climax his patriotic hostility in recording these barbaric, foreign kings. It seems extraordinary that Josephus retains this statement. He appears insensitive to the Egyptian outrage expressed by Manetho and the danger this poses to the social reputation of Judeans. But this is consonant with his disdain of Egyptians throughout *Apion* (see, e.g., 1.224-226, 2.68-70, 128, 137-39). He can assume that they have a “poor reputation” (2.31), especially in the eyes of Romans (2.41). There is indeed a strong strain of contempt for Egyptians in Roman literature, particularly since Actium and the annexation of Egypt; see, e.g., Valerius Maximus 5.1.10; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.11; Dio 50.24-27; 51.17.1; Juvenal, *Sat.* 15; Reinhold 1980; for discussion, see Berthelot 2000:196-202; Sonnabend 1986.

<sup>312</sup> Besides textual problems, 1.82-83 present a complex tangle of questions concerning source and meaning, while the similarity but inconsistency between 1.83 and 1.91 has spawned a number of source hypotheses (see Appendix 1). Opinions differ on where

Josephus’ citation of Manetho stops (before or after the sentence about Arabs?) and it is generally concluded, from the reference to “another copy” in 1.83, that Josephus is influenced by edited and altered versions of Manetho, not the original text. There are, indeed, good grounds to think that Josephus is not citing Manetho precisely, either because he knows him only via intermediaries, or because he is deliberately altering his source. In favor of the latter option are the following considerations: i) Josephus never reveals where his verbatim quotation finishes (contrast, e.g., 2.10-12): this may suggest some loosening of citation procedures towards its close. ii) Manetho surely gave some explanation for the “shepherd” element in the Hyksos title, but that is missing here; Josephus has his own explanation to advance in 1.91. iii) The transition between the etymology and the comment “but some say they were Arabs” is harsh: the etymology concerns their title, not their origin, and the latter comment seems truncated or misplaced (Münster shifts it to the end of 1.81, but without textual warrant). iv) There is good, independent, evidence to suggest that Manetho asserted that the Hyksos were of Phoenician origin: this is witnessed in the epitomes (in Africanus, Eusebius, and the Plato scholion) and considered highly likely by Egyptologists (e.g., Redford 1986: 241). One can see why Josephus would leave this out (he needs the identification of the Hyksos to remain vague, so as to effect his association with the Judeans’ ancestors), but it would fit well at this point in Manetho’s text: the Hyksos etymology would then be followed by ethnic identification as Phoenicians (placing the “obscure descent” of 1.75 on the cultural map of Manetho’s day), with the alternative identification (as Arabs) constituting Manetho’s report of another opinion. On this scenario, Josephus has omitted (at least) Manetho’s explanation of the “shepherd” label and his Phoenician identification, quietly gutting his “citation” to suit his argument. A little clumsily, he leaves intact the opinion that the Hyksos were Arabs, since it is only an opinion, and less damaging to his case. For an alternative view, that this final comment comes from an editor of Manetho, see below, note to “Arabs.”

<sup>313</sup> L here reads Ἰκκουσῶς (Hyksos; see also next note) and is followed by Niese and most other editors; the label has stuck to this day. But, following Gutschmid 430-31, Niese’s apparatus suggests that Josephus’ text is better preserved by Eusebius: both in the Greek and in the Armenian Eusebius witnesses to an original Ἰκουσῶς, as read by Münster and transliterated here.



shepherds”; for “Hyk” in the sacred language means “king,” and “Sos” is “shepherd” and “shepherds” in the common dialect; and when combined they make “Hykoussos.”<sup>314</sup> But some say they were Arabs.<sup>315</sup>

[83 In another copy “kings” is not signified by the word “Hyk,” which indicates, on the contrary, that the shepherds were “captives”; for “Hyk” in Egyptian and “Hak” with a rough breathing mean literally “captive.” This seems to me more persuasive, and in line with ancient history.]<sup>316</sup>

“Hykou” would represent the Egyptian plural (“kings”), as Manetho surely knew. Egyptian sources use the phrase *hekaw Khaset* (rulers of foreign lands) to dub a number of “foreign rulers,” including our Hyksos; see O’Connor 1997: 48; van Seters 1966: 108, 187-88; Redford 1970: 10-13.

<sup>314</sup> Understandably, not appreciating the Egyptian plural (Hykou = kings), L put the two single syllable components together as “Hyksos” (Ἰκσῶς; Eusebius: Ἰκούσσως), while Eusebius (wrongly) thought that the second must be “Oussos,” not “Sos” (read by L). The text translated here is probably correct. At least it is most likely what Manetho wrote, with his knowledge of Egyptian, though it is possible that Josephus (witnessed by L) corrected Manetho to put the two single syllables together as “Hyksos.” Manetho may have invented this etymology or drawn it from tradition, but in either case he shows off his knowledge of Egyptian for Greek readers, including his ability to access both hieratic and demotic languages. It is striking, however, that the title is here applied to the “whole nation,” whereas it properly denotes rulers or kings of a people, not the people themselves. Manetho more likely referred to the rulers as “kings of shepherds” (a locution echoed in Josephus’ paraphrase at 1.84), and thus labelled the people as a whole not “king-shepherds” but simply “shepherds” (so in 1.86, 87, 94, 237, 241). It has been suggested that our text here is a corruption of Manetho, introduced by an editor before Josephus (van Seters 1966: 187). But given our suspicions that Josephus has doctored this citation, it is equally likely that Josephus himself has corrupted Manetho’s explanation of the label “Hykoussos” to make both parts of the composite name apply to the whole people. For his alternative etymology “captive-shepherds” (1.83, 91), Josephus needs both components to refer to *all* the Judean ancestors, so it is in his interests to make the original etymology function in this way. Manetho probably said that “these rulers [the subject of 1.79-81] were called ‘Hykoussos,’ that is ‘kings of shepherds’ ” (cf. 1.84), and then explained why the people as a whole were dubbed shepherds. Josephus changes this to “their whole nation was called ‘Hykoussos,’ that is, ‘king-shepherds’ ”; and he carefully omits Manetho’s explanation of the pastoral label, to avoid a clash with his own (1.91).

<sup>315</sup> Following Gutschmid 431, most source-critics and some commentators have judged that this final sentence of 1.82 (in some editions this is the first of 1.83) represents a redactional addition to the original Manetho, innocently reported by Josephus. Reasons include Manetho’s own vagueness on their ethnic origins in 1.75, the evidence that he actually said they were Phoenicians, and the apparent grammatical dependence of the infinitives in the following redactional statement (1.83) on this “some say.” See, for instance, Meyer 1904: 72; Laqueur 1928: 1067-70; Troiani 90; Reinach 17, n.2; Labow 2005: 68, 81. Stern 1.72 suggests, implausibly, that Josephus himself added this statement. On the status of 1.83 and its relationship to 1.82, see below. There are indeed excellent grounds for thinking that Manetho identified the Hyksos as Phoenicians (see above, n. 312), but there is no good reason to doubt that he added an alternative opinion such as this. As we can see from other fragments, Manetho adopted the stance of an open-minded historian and reported things that were “said” or “thought” by others (see, e.g., Waddell 1940, frags. 9, 21, 35, 52; cf. *Apion* 1.250). The statement only looks isolated and odd because Josephus has omitted the main statement, on the Hyksos as Phoenicians.

<sup>316</sup> This section must count as the most puzzling in the whole treatise. Nowhere else does Josephus mention having access to variant copies of his sources, and it is surprising that he speaks in such terms here, since such appeal to “another copy” reduces the authority of the “captive” etymology. Josephus uses another, and stronger, means to support a variant interpretation of the Hyksos-label in 1.91, but there he claims this is found “in another book” (ἐν ἄλλῃ τινὶ βίβλῳ), whereas here the text reads “in another copy” (ἐν ἄλλῳ ἀντιγράφῳ). What is more, the statement in 1.91 makes no reference back to this section. The final sentence of the present section is also couched in subjective and unusually vague terms, which hardly strengthen Josephus’ rhetoric. To compound the problem, the first two verbs in 1.83 are in the infinitive, not the indicative (σημαίνεισθαι; δηλοῦσθαι), as if they were detached from what went before, or, perhaps, dependent on the “some say” of 1.82. Broadly speaking, there are 3 possible solutions to this nest of problems, none without difficulty (see also Labow 2005: 81-82):

84 These above-named kings, and those of the so-called shepherds, and their successors controlled Egypt, he says, for 511 years.<sup>317</sup> 85 After that, he says, there was

*Revolt against the Hyksos*

1. Niese suggested (pp. xx-xxi) that this whole section is an interpolation: a Christian gloss on the text of Josephus has been incorporated into the text at an early stage (before Eusebius, who cites it as Josephan). On this hypothesis an early Christian reader anticipated the claim of 1.91 and attempted to support it by propounding an alternative explanation for the first component of the “Hyksos” title: his gloss was then noted by copyists as found “in another copy,” and incorporated into the text. A closely parallel phenomenon has occurred in sections 1.92 and 1.98 (see ad loc.), where later, post-Eusebian, additions begin in very similar terms (“in another copy is found as follows”). This hypothesis would easily explain the difference in vocabulary between 1.83 and 1.91 (“copy”/“book”), and why the latter does not refer back to the former. It could also account for the final sentence, which employs a phrase, παλαιὰ ἱστορία, otherwise unexampled in Josephus (though not uncommon elsewhere). (Niese’s solution is partially followed by Thackeray, though the latter takes the final sentence to be authentic, leaving Josephus claiming as “more persuasive” the notion that the Hyksos were Arabs!) That the glossator or editor should speak in such personal terms (“this seems to me more persuasive”) is perhaps unusual, and the infinitive form of the verbs is peculiar, but otherwise Niese’s hypothesis accounts for all the conundra posed by this section.

2. Gutschmid 431-32 and Meyer (1904: 72) suggested that in 1.83a Josephus reproduces what he had before him, an edited version of Manetho already interpolated with an alternative etymology. Meyer argued that the infinitive form of the verbs indicated their dependence on 1.82b (“some say that they were Arabs and that in another copy ...”). Thus Josephus here slavishly reproduces his (edited) source, but later, in 1.91, misconstrues or misreports it as a reference to “another book.” This theory has won wide acceptance, albeit with minor modifications: see, e.g., Weill 1918: 70, 72; Laqueur 1928: 1067-70; Momigliano 1975b: 780-82; Reinach 17; Troiani 90; Labow 2005: 81-82, n.90. It is sometimes suggested in this connection that this alternative etymology was advanced by a Judean (or “philo-Judean”) editor of Manetho, but this presupposes that there were Judeans as bold as Josephus in claiming the Hyksos to be Judean ancestors, unafraid of the negative image this could promote (cf. Gruen 1998: 57-67; on the difficulties here see Schäfer 1997b: 198-99). If, as suggested above, the final sentence of 1.82 is a truncated but authentic part of Manetho’s text, much in this hypothesis looks vulnerable, and it leaves unexplained

why Josephus bumbles his treatment of this topic so badly in 1.91.

3. A further alternative, not generally considered, is that Josephus himself has introduced the “captive” etymology, though with clumsy editing. It is hard to imagine him inventing this etymology himself, but it is possible that he found elsewhere a variant account of the Hyksos which attracted him in one particular, this alternative explanation of their name (perhaps a further Egyptian effort to denigrate these rulers). By inserting this alternative etymology here, Josephus can prepare the ground for the identification with Joseph (1.91-92) and close the Manetho citation with his own comment, in transition to the following *oratio obliqua* (1.84-90). He cannot afford to name another source, which would require full and perhaps problematic accreditation, but attributes this alternative to Manetho, first as found “in another copy,” then, clumsily, as “in another book.” In general this theory seems as strong, if not stronger, than the last-named.

The matter cannot be resolved with any degree of confidence, but the square brackets indicate my (hesitant) support for Niese’s hypothesis as the least problematic of the three, even if the gloss and its interpolation must have been effected within the first two centuries of the circulation of this treatise.

<sup>317</sup> Without signalling the transition, Josephus now moves into paraphrase, although the repeated “he says” (4 times in 1.84-87) gives this passage strong Manethonian authentication. For Josephus’ purposes, the single important point is that the “shepherds” left Egypt and settled in Judea/Jerusalem (1.89-90). Nothing in the rest of this narrative (the Egyptian revolt, the enclosure and siege of the shepherds, and the treaty enabling their departure) has anything in common with the biblical account of the exodus, and although Josephus has clearly foreshortened Manetho’s account, it is surprising that he has retained so much. However, the shepherds emerge with some honor (in large numbers, having withstood a siege without defeat, and on terms that allow them to depart “unharméd”), and it is possible that Josephus has carefully selected these items and omitted more damaging details. We may suspect, for instance, that Manetho had more to say about the defeat and repulsion of the shepherds from the rest of Egypt (1.86), about the source of their “plunder” (1.87), and about other aspects of the treaty-agreement (1.88). As source-critics have rightly noted, several items in this narrative seem to be doublets of the previous account of the Hyksos: the city Avaris is reintro-

a revolt against the shepherds by the kings of the Thebaid and of the rest of Egypt, and a great and extended war broke out.<sup>318</sup> **86** Under a king named Mispfragmuthosis<sup>319</sup> the shepherds, he says, were defeated, thrown out of all the rest of Egypt,<sup>320</sup> and confined in a place with a circumference of 10,000 arourae; the name of that place was Auaris.<sup>321</sup> **87** The shepherds surrounded this whole area, says

duced *de novo* (1.86, cf. 1.78), it is surrounded again with strong walls (1.87, cf. 1.78), there are again 240,000 people, although in a different role (1.89, cf. 1.78), and the fear of the Assyrians is again a potent factor (1.90, cf. 1.77). For Meyer (1904: 73-74) this was strong evidence that this whole section (1.84-90) is pseudo-Manethonian, an alternative version of the first, or an attempt by an editor to connect two genuine fragments of Manetho by recycling certain details; the fact that the two kings mentioned here (1.86, 88) reappear again in a different context (1.95-96) seemed to confirm this view (cf. Weill 1918: 74-76, 84; Momigliano 1975b: 778-79; Reinach ad loc.). This would date the link between the Hyksos and Judea/Jerusalem (90) to a time after Manetho, assigning it to an unknown (Judean?) editor of Manetho's text. However, it is equally likely that the doubling of details reflects the genuine Manetho's use of multiple versions of the Hyksos story, a stitching together of a patchwork narrative from various, overlapping accounts (Schäfer 1997b: 197-98). Since the story of the return of the shepherds (1.241-50) looks like a doublet of this whole account, it seems that Manetho tended to place variant versions of the same narrative in sequence, and it is very likely that he himself is responsible for most of the overlaps, repetitions, and inconsistencies in his stories.

This section suggests that the Hyksos era continued beyond the 259 years listed in 1.79-81, though it is not clear whether Manetho listed other kings or simply added on a new period of time. The text of L, followed by most editors, has three categories of kings: the "above-named," the kings of the so-called shepherds, and their successors. Gutschmid 433 suggested transferring the "and" between the first two to the beginning of the sentence to leave only two categories: the above-named kings of the shepherds, and their successors. This would accord better with the reference to "their first six rulers" (1.81). The vague reference to "their successors" might suggest that Manetho attached the Hyksos loosely to other kings in Egyptian history (in fact their vassals and contemporaries, Labow 2005: 82, n.92), and this could explain the fact that the epitome used by Africanus has the "shepherds" as the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, and 17<sup>th</sup> dynasties (the named 6 in the 15<sup>th</sup>), while that found in Eusebius has them (shortened to 4 names) in the 17<sup>th</sup> only. Egyptologists continue to debate how these variants and confusions arose (Redford 1970: 19-22; 1986: 240-41; O'Connor 1997: 48-52), but agree

that Apophis was the last Hyksos king and that the Hyksos period lasted only about 100 years (ca. 1655-1550 BCE).

<sup>318</sup> Manetho presents this revolt against the hated Hyksos as a national uprising, drawing on traditions emphasizing the centrality of Thebes, but interpreting the war as a conflict between foreigners and all native Egyptians (cf. 1.81). We are fortunate to have vivid ancient accounts of this war against the Hyksos, now collected in English translation in Redford 1997 (esp. nos. 68-74). They indicate the importance of Thebes, and the attempt to portray the Hyksos as "Asiatic" kings who had "defied Egypt."

<sup>319</sup> Here, and at 1.88, editors rightly follow the witness of Eusebius for the spelling of the name, rather than the version in L and the Latin (Halisfragmuthosis). The original cartouche name may have been Menkheperre' Thutmose (Tuthmosis III, 1479-1425 BCE). In 1.95-96 the same king and his son seem to recur, but in a different context (as members of the following dynasty). In another context Josephus could have attacked Manetho for this apparent inconsistency (cf. 1.230 on Amenophis, and 1.226 on contradictions), but it is not in his interests to allow doubts here.

<sup>320</sup> The defeat of the shepherds represents the total antithesis of the mastery they once wielded (1.84), reinforcing the power-language which permeates this narrative (cf. 1.75, 76, 81, 88).

<sup>321</sup> It is odd that, even in this paraphrase, Josephus does not refer back to 1.78 regarding Avaris, but this may reflect the way that Manetho loosely stitched together two accounts of the foundation and fortification of Avaris (see above, note to "guard" at 1.78). However, it is hard to imagine Manetho mistakenly taking the aroura (a measure of area; cf. Herodotus 2.168) to be a measure of length; the error seems to derive from Josephus who is probably responsible for adding the phrase "with a circumference" (τὴν περίμετρον). 10,000 arourae is reckoned by Reinach to represent 2756 hectares (roughly 27.5 square kilometers). Manetho represents the expulsion of the Hyksos as a two-stage event: their confinement in Avaris by Mispfragmuthosis, followed by a siege and treaty, conducted by his son, Thoummosis. In the ancient accounts there were at least two Theban kings who claimed the credit for the defeat and expulsion of the Hyksos, namely Kamose (who fought his way from middle Egypt into the Delta and besieged Avaris, ca. 1555 BCE) and his brother Ahmose

Manetho, with a huge, strong wall, in order to keep all their possessions, together with their plunder, secure.<sup>322</sup> **88** Thoummosis, the son of Mispthagmouthosis,<sup>323</sup> attempted to capture them, by force, by means of a siege, investing the walls with an army of 480,000 men. When he abandoned the siege, he made a treaty that they could leave Egypt and go, all of them unharmed, wherever they wished.<sup>324</sup> **89** On these terms, they left Egypt with their whole households and their possessions—numbering no less than 240,000 people—and crossed the desert into Syria.<sup>325</sup> **90** Fearing the dominance of the Assyrians—for at that time these ruled Asia<sup>326</sup>—they built in the region now called Judea a city sufficient for so many thousands of people, and called it Hierosolyma.<sup>327</sup>

*Siege of Auaris*

(who returned to besiege and capture Avaris; see esp. the Carnarvon Tablet, the Karnak Stela, and the El Kab testimony, Redford 1997 nos. 68-70). Oddly our text has the siege end without the destruction of Avaris or the military defeat of the Hyksos, while the king generally regarded in antiquity as having performed this feat, and founded the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, is Ahmose (Amosis) not, as here, Thoummosis (Thutmose); see, e.g., the epitomes in Africanus and Eusebius, and Ptolemy of Mendes *apud* Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 38). For Meyer (1904: 73-74) this was further evidence that this account is not from the authentic Manetho (except at its core, 1904: 78, n.3; cf. Gutschmid 435-37; Troiani 91; Labow 2005: 88, n.114). However, Weill (1918: 80-83, 88-95) argued that the story of the expulsion had been usurped by Thutmose IV, so that the use of his name here by Manetho (confirmed in 1.241) is not a corruption of Manetho, but a corruption of history prior to Manetho. Redford has further proposed that the present narrative of a siege and subsequent treaty is modelled on the siege of Megiddo by Thutmose III (1970: 33-34, 41-44; 1986: 243-46), and that various literary accounts of Egyptian attacks on foreign kings have been merged in the ancient retellings of Egyptian history.

<sup>322</sup> The doubling of details from 1.78 extends even to some verbal similarities (τείχεσιν ὄχυρωτάτην, 1.78; τείχει ... ἐν ὄχυρῳ, 1.87), which Josephus could have noted as an inconsistency: the city was already well fortified. Manetho's account denigrates both Avaris (a bolt-hole which the Hyksos were forced to defend) and the Hyksos (whose "plunder" presumably resulted from the despoilation of the land). A Judean reader might hear in this reference to "plunder" a faint echo of the biblical notion that the departing Hebrews despoiled the Egyptians (Exod 3:21-22; 11:1-2; 12:35-36), but this was a sensitive topic for Judean authors (cf. Artapanus *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.27.34; Philo, *Mos.* 1.141-42), and Josephus, if he recognized this parallel, would hardly draw it to his readers' attention (cf. *Ant.* 2.314).

<sup>323</sup> The son's name exists in various forms: Thoummosis (L), Thumnosis (Latin), Thmouthosis (Eusebius,

*Praep. ev.*), Thmosis (Eusebius, *Chron.*) etc. Given the obvious difficulty for scribes in this matter, we can only conjecture Josephus' original version (cf. Niese ad loc. and Gutschmid 435); there are similar difficulties at 1.94 and 1.96, with other variants of this name. In 1.231 and 1.241 the versions agree on "Tethmosis," but curiously none gives precisely that version of the name here. The historical figure (wrongly credited with the expulsion) is probably Thutmose IV (1397-1388 BCE), the uncle (not the son) of Thutmose III.

<sup>324</sup> On the siege and its conclusion, see note to "Auaris" at 1.86. Manetho clearly needs survivors to have them return in his sequel (1.241-50). This version of the story also suits Josephus: his "ancestors" successfully resisted a siege despite being outnumbered two to one, and then were free to go "unharmed."

<sup>325</sup> Josephus could have ridiculed the implausibility of this narrative, not least the difficulty of crossing the desert with all one's possessions (cf. 1.277). But once again it is crucial for him not to air difficulties with the story, and the obvious doublet with 1.78 (there the 240,000 were armed troops) passes without comment. This huge population-shift through the desert would certainly evoke the exodus narrative for readers familiar with the Judean scriptures, although the figure there is even larger (600,000 in Exod 12:37-38; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 2.317; Philo, *Mos.* 1.147). Gutschmid 438 suggests emending "possessions" (κτησέων) to "livestock" (κτηνέων).

<sup>326</sup> The motif is repeated from 1.77 (see note to "kingdom") and continues the theme of the Hyksos' psychological weakness. Here it apparently functions to explain why the Hyksos did not venture further. Like Manetho, Josephus placed the "Assyrians" at an extremely early date (in the *Antiquities* they appear in the patriarchal narratives). But this reference to their rule of Asia (τότε γὰρ ἐκείνους τῆς Ἀσίας κρατεῖν) is so similar to a phrase in *Ant.* 2.171 (κατ' ἐκείνον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν Ἀσσυρίων κρατούντων τῆς Ἀσίας) as to invite suspicion that Josephus has inserted this aside.

<sup>327</sup> Josephus has to tolerate an anachronism, which in another context he could have criticised (cf. 1.299):



*Hyksos as  
shepherds and  
captives*

91 In another book of the *Aegyptiaca*, Manetho says that this nation, those called “shepherds,” is recorded in their sacred books as “captives,” speaking correctly.<sup>328</sup> For it was customary for our earliest ancestors to tend flocks; and as they had a nomadic way of life they were accordingly termed “shepherds.”<sup>329</sup> 92 On the other

elsewhere he portrays Jerusalem as named by Melchizedek, but remaining a Canaanite city until its capture by David (*War* 6.438-39; *Ant.* 1.180; 7.67). But this conclusion to Manetho’s tale is precious for him, since it makes reference to places that all his readers would recognize as associated with Judeans. It is possible that Josephus has helped the reader a little here, by rendering Manetho’s “Solyma” as “Hierosolyma”: elsewhere Manetho refers to its inhabitants as “Solymites” (1.248, paraphrased by Josephus as “Hierosolymites,” 1.264, 296), and Josephus may have doctored all the references to “Solyma” similarly (1.90, 94, 241, 262). Josephus could also have inserted the phrase “in the region now called Judea,” in the interests of helping his identification between the Hyksos and “Judeans” (1.229, 251; 2.16); so Aziza 1987: 50; Gabba 1989: 633; Gruen 1998: 56 (cf. Appendix 1).

But it is more likely that these familiar names derive from Manetho himself, whose story serves to place an ancient Egyptian saga on the Mediterranean map current in his day. For this purpose it was helpful to name a city with an emerging reputation in a region becoming familiar to Hellenistic readers; Hecataeus refers to “Hierosolyma” in this connection (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.2-3). Its size is a necessary ingredient of its fame in these conditions (cf. Ps-Hecataeus in *Apion* 1.197). In many respects, Manetho’s account parallels Hecataeus’ tale of colonists departing from Egypt, some, led by Danaus and Cadmus, to Greece, others, led by Moses, to Jerusalem (Diodorus 40.3.2; cf. 1.102 below). It is clear that Manetho’s tale is hostile to these Hyksos founders of the city, who returned to terrorize the land (1.248-50), and it makes no sense to distinguish the *Tendenzen* of Manetho’s two Hyksos stories, since the second is clearly the sequel to the first. But it is not clear that this represents a current hostility to all Judeans on Manetho’s part, and there is no reason to think that Manetho was “anti-Jewish,” if that term is used to mean a specifically targeted venom against all things Judean (see further Appendices 1 and 3). Josephus’ awkward deployment of this tale requires him to identify the hated Hyksos as the ancestors of present-day Judeans, but how Manetho connected the founding of Jerusalem to the contemporaries he would term “Judeans” is not clear: the current inhabitants of a city, or its region, need not share the characteristics of its ancient founders. The identification of the banished “lepers” as “Judeans,” and their association with

Moses, is another matter (see on 1.250, 290, 292, 305).

<sup>328</sup> Josephus interrupts Manetho’s narrative to press home the point he feels established by the use of the terms “Judea” and “Hierosolyma” (90). The explicit affirmation of Manetho’s correctness on this point implies the veracity of the rest without explicitly affirming it (cf. 1.105, and the belated hedging of the issue in 1.287, “not far wrong”). Even here Josephus does not attempt to place the Hyksos and biblical narratives side by side, but contents himself with linking the Hyksos title with general features of the Joseph story, in an argument that seems more presumption than proof.

It might have seemed better to exegete the Hyksos title directly after 82: either Josephus himself or a glossator clearly felt that, and added 1.83. But the label “captive” looks more plausible after the narrative of 1.86-88 than at any earlier point, and the suggestive conclusion to the Hyksos story is the best place for Josephus to cement the join to the ancient Judeans. On the relationship between this section and 1.83, see note to “history” at 1.83. If 1.83 is an interpolation (solution 1), this represents the first time Josephus has offered an alternative explanation of the Hyksos’ name; if it is his own, he damages his argument by failing to refer back to that comment and by using different terms (“copy”/“book”). The vagueness of the reference to “another book” (cf. 1.74) is revealing. It is hard to imagine how Manetho would return to this topic elsewhere, and we may conclude that Josephus has i) misconstrued a variant he found in Manetho’s text; or ii) falsely attributed to Manetho an alternative account of the Hyksos’ name, which he found elsewhere (cf. solution 3 at 1.83); or iii) slavishly followed an ill-informed source (Labow 2005: 86, n.105). If 1.83 is an early gloss, Josephus himself had no idea how to justify this alternative, but a glossator came to his aid with a dubious etymology.

<sup>329</sup> The reference to “our earliest ancestors” (cf. 1.92, 103, 228, 232, 280) smuggles in the conclusion that Josephus’ weak argument attempts to demonstrate; a nomadic way of life could hardly become a distinctive *label* of a whole people unless it was a unique or highly unusual characteristic. We may guess from *Ant.* 2.186 that Josephus’ thinking is influenced by the biblical stories in which the patriarchs are introduced in the Egyptian court as shepherds (LXX Gen 46:31-34; 47:1-6), an occupation which is taken to be uncharacteristic of Egyptians (Gen 46:35, toned down by Josephus; cf. Demetrius *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.*



hand, it is not unreasonable that they should be recorded as “captives” by the Egyptians, since our ancestor Iosepos [Joseph] said to the king of the Egyptians that he was a captive, and later summoned his brothers to Egypt, with the permission of the king.<sup>330</sup> But I shall conduct a more thorough investigation of these matters elsewhere.<sup>331</sup>

**(1.15) 93** At the moment, I am presenting the Egyptians as witnesses to antiquity;<sup>332</sup> so, I shall resume citing sections from Manetho as they relate to the sequence of time.<sup>333</sup> **94** He says the following:

*More from  
Manetho*

9.21.13). But this echo would be noticed only by those familiar with the biblical account or very careful readers of the *Antiquities*.

<sup>330</sup> The strongest claim Josephus can make for the second part of the label is that it is “not unreasonable”: that, and much else in this section, indicates that he knows his argument hangs on the thinnest of threads. For a start it is not clear how the experience of one “ancestor” could become the label for the entire dynasty, lasting over centuries. Josephus recognizes that this title must be known to “the king” for it to come into common parlance, and refers to the king’s permission regarding his brothers (cf. Gen 45:4-20) to make their status official currency. But this cannot hide the fact that *they* were in no sense “captive,” and that if the epithet applies to anyone, it is to Joseph alone. The details here bear no relation to the Hyksos story. How could Joseph’s arrival as a “captive” fit the narrative of 1.75-82? And who is this unnamed king? Josephus’ readers thus have to take what he here recounts on trust and only those with biblical knowledge might recognize this as plausible. In the biblical text Joseph introduces himself to the king’s cupbearer as one stolen from his land (Gen 40:15), and is introduced to the king as a servant and prisoner (Gen 41:12). Josephus’ own paraphrase of the story (*Ant.* 2.32-33, 68-78) does not add the details required here, and never uses the term “captive” (ἀιχμαλώτος) of Joseph; the story is here manipulated to fit the argument. In our context, Josephus offers no explanation of how Joseph came to be a “captive,” and a later gloss on this section supplies the detail that “he was sold by his brothers and carried down into Egypt” (Niese, p.xx and ad loc.; Gutschmid 441 suggests that this could preserve Josephus’ own improvement of his text). One can see why Josephus would not wish to supply this explanation: it hardly enhances the reputation of the Judeans’ ancestors. As it is, Josephus has to risk damaging their collective honor by affirming the ignominious label “captive,” and that he should do this despite his awareness of the political capital his opponents could draw from it (cf. 2.125-34) is a sign of his confidence in his readers’ sympathy, or desperate need for Manetho’s “evidence.”

<sup>331</sup> This vague promise hints at a greater compe-

tence, but betrays Josephus’ awareness that his attempts to cement the identification with the Hyksos are inadequate. But it is hard to imagine that Josephus intended to write more on this topic, and, recognizing this, Gutschmid 442 suggests that he here refers to the further treatment of the Hyksos in 1.227-87 (cf. Troiani 94, Reinach ad loc., and, more cautiously, Thackeray ad loc.; Waddell 1940: 90, n.1). But the later passage does not provide a “more thorough investigation of *these* matters” (its points are merely summarized in 1.228), nor does 1.288-303 (*pace* Petersen 1958: 272-73). In any case, when Josephus refers to a further discussion in the same work he does not say “elsewhere” (ἐν ἄλλοις) but “later” (ὕστερον, e.g., 1.105). The claim here is thus more closely parallel to the repeated promise in *Antiquities* to write a further work “On Customs and Causes” (e.g., *Ant.* 1.192 [ἐν ἄλλοις]; 4.302; 20.268; see Introduction, § 2). But in the present case the promise is notably unspecific and may be nothing more than rhetorical camouflage.

<sup>332</sup> Josephus draws attention back from the flimsy proof of identity to stronger ground. As in 1.73-74 he talks of “witnesses” in the plural, though only one is produced. The antiquity theme has been pronounced as the main topic throughout (e.g., 1.59, 69-72), though Josephus’ conclusion indicates that another is of equal importance (1.104).

<sup>333</sup> The opening (1.94) and closing (1.103) of this “citation” make it look verbatim, but closer scrutiny of its end (1.102-103) makes it hard to tell where quotation ends and comment begins. There is good reason to think that Manetho’s text is here drastically abbreviated, since the history of the famous 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty (in a book covering the 12<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup>) could hardly have been given in a mere list of names and dates (1.94-97) and a short narrative about Sethos and Harmais (1.98-101; Gutschmid 442-43; Meyer 1904: 74). Josephus (or his source) appears to have extracted the former from Manetho and abbreviated the latter. Josephus has to prolong the history of Egypt beyond the era of the Hyksos because he needs some cross-reference to a person or event in Greek history that his audience can recognize. The nearest available point of cross-reference in Manetho’s text seems to have been Danaus, so Josephus

*Subsequent  
Egyptian kings*

After the shepherd people left Egypt for Hierosolyma,<sup>334</sup> Tethmosis, the king who expelled them from Egypt,<sup>335</sup> subsequently reigned for 25 years and 4 months, and died;<sup>336</sup> and his son, Chebron, inherited his rule, for 13 years.<sup>337</sup> **95** After him, Amenophis for 20 years and 7 months, and his sister Amesses<sup>338</sup> for 21 years and 9 months, and her son Mephres for 12 years and 9 months, and his son Mephramouthosis<sup>339</sup> for 25 years and 10 months. **96** And his son, Thmosis<sup>340</sup> for 9 years and 8 months, and his son Amenophis for 30 years and 10 months, and his son Oros<sup>341</sup> for 36 years and 5 months, and his daughter Akencheres<sup>342</sup> for

needs to skip over the intervening centuries to reach his era. The listing of kings and reign-dates (to the exact number of months) is impressively precise, but it was perhaps to relieve the ensuing boredom that Josephus includes details of the Sethos-Harmais narrative that are irrelevant to his chronological concerns. (Theophilus accordingly leaves the latter out, while Tertullian and Eusebius cut to Josephus' conclusions in 1.103-104.) If Josephus had known, or been willing to use, the Ptolemy of Mendes tradition, which dated the exodus to the reign of Amosis, a contemporary of Inachus, he could have spared himself the trouble of 1.94-103 (cf. Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 38; Tertullian, *Apol.* 19.3; Julius Africanus *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10).

<sup>334</sup> We may suspect that Josephus composed the wording of this connecting phrase, though there is no good reason to doubt that Manetho referred to Hierosolyma, as in 1.90 (*pace* Jacoby in *FGH* 609, p.88).

<sup>335</sup> Tethmosis is spelled thus in L here and at 1.231, 241. Other versions agree in the latter sections, but offer variations here ("Moses" in Theophilus, "Sethmosis" in Eusebius, *Chronicon*). The lack of congruence with the version of the name in 1.88 is striking. Meyer argued that Manetho must have used the name "Amosis," since this name occurs at the head of the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty in the epitomes (Africanus, Eusebius etc.), in the traditions conveyed by Ptolemy of Mendes and Apion, and in the early historical sources (as the victor over the Hyksos); for discussion, see note to "Auaris" at 1.86.

<sup>336</sup> Theophilus (3.21) accused Manetho of error at this point, since in his view the Pharaoh was drowned with his army in the Red Sea. But the biblical tradition does not specify the fate of the Pharaoh (cf. Josephus in *Ant.* 2.338-44), and, even if it had, Josephus could not have challenged Manetho at this point (cf. 1.105). Manetho's dates elsewhere cover the whole duration of a king's reign, not a segment of it. Thus, it is likely that Josephus has added the phrase "subsequently" (μετὰ τοῦτο): this "25 years and 4 months" was the only number in his source and he wished to begin his counting with the exodus (cf. Labow 2005: 88, n.114).

<sup>337</sup> So starts a king-list that extends, through 17 kings or queens, until Sethos/Ramesses. The list is totally bare of detail, like that in 1.79-81, and may represent the "chapter headings" of Manetho's narrative (see

Gutschmid 442-43). I have preserved the monotony and ellipses of the Greek in the translation. After Tethmosis the next 10 names (down to Rathotis, 1.96) tally well with the epitomes of Manetho in Julius Africanus and Eusebius. Minor variations in name-spelling and regnal years are due to the transcriptional process from Manetho, and are evident even in Theophilus' citation of Josephus' list; only major differences are noted here. For a tabular presentation of the king-lists, with suggested historical identifications, see Meyer 1904: 88; *FGH* 609, pp.72-75; Labow 2005: 67. Towards the end of the list, with so many similar names and some kings with double-names, it is easy to see why the lists diverge (see notes on 1.97). The historical sequence of the kings in this 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty (1569–1315 BCE) has been well established, but bears little resemblance to Manetho's list; see Meyer 1904: 88-95; Redford 2001 (entries on "New Kingdom," "Eighteenth Dynasty"); Labow 2005: 88-91. For a full treatment of the period, see Redford 1967; Beckerath 1994.

<sup>338</sup> Absent in Eusebius' version of this list, perhaps because of her gender; all the lists omit the important queen Hatshepsut, unless she is dimly represented here (Labow 2005: 89, n.118). In most other cases each monarch in this list is prefaced by τοῦ δέ (or τῆς δέ), which I translate here as a signal of filiation ("his/her son/daughter"). But Gutschmid 444 may be correct in thinking that these refer back to the noun "rule" (ἄρχή, 1.94), indicating "his/her rule was inherited by ...".

<sup>339</sup> In their variant spellings of this name, the versions do not reproduce exactly the name in 1.86/88. Although scholars sense here a doublet of the father and son pair in 1.88, it is likely that neither Josephus nor Manetho perceived this. It appears that names had been corrupted and stories separated before Manetho tried to put them into an ordered narrative for Greek readers (Gutschmid 445-46).

<sup>340</sup> The reading in Theophilus, and the parallels in the epitomes, suggest a better version might be "Tuthmosis" (with the first τοῦ dropping out by haplography; Gutschmid 446). There were four famous Tuthmosis (Thutmose) kings in this dynasty.

<sup>341</sup> Probably the same king later named "Or" in 1.232 (proving that Manetho had some narrative about Or/Oros at this point). The difference in spelling indicated to Meyer Josephus' use of different excerptors of

12 years and 1 month, and her brother Rathotis for 9 years. 97 And his son, Kencheres for 12 years and 5 months, and his son Akencheres for 12 years and 3 months, and his son Harmais for 4 years and 1 month, and his son Ramesses for 1 year and 4 months, and his son Harmesses Miamoun for 66 years and 2 months, and his son Amenophis for 19 years and 6 months.<sup>343</sup> 98 His son Sethos,<sup>344</sup> also called Ramesses,<sup>345</sup> who possessed cavalry and naval forces, appointed his brother Harmais<sup>346</sup> governor of Egypt, and conferred on him all the royal privileges, except that he ordered him not to wear the diadem, nor to violate the queen,

*Sethos and Harmais*

Manetho (1904: 77), but may be simply carelessness on the part of Josephus or of later scribes.

<sup>342</sup> Aside from variations in spelling, Theophilus and the epitomes differ in their listing of this and the next three monarchs: it is easy to see how omissions (or doublings) could occur. See the full discussion in Gutschmid 447-48. On this and the next 3 monarchs, from the Amarna period, see Labow 2005: 90, n.124.

<sup>343</sup> From Hermais onwards, a number of intriguing differences open up between Josephus' sequence of kings (here in 1.97-98, continued in 1.231-32, 245, 251) and the lists given in Africanus and Eusebius, based on an epitome of Manetho. It is also noticeable that similar names recur in almost regular cycles through these lists, as follows:

Josephus	Africanus	Eusebius ( <i>Chronicon</i> and in Syncellus)
'Αρμαῖς 4, 1m	'Αρμεσίς 5	'Αρμαῖς = Danaus 5
'Ραμέσσης 1, 4m	'Ραμεσσηῖς 1	
'Αρμέσσης Μιαμοῦν 66, 2m		'Ραμεσσηῖς = Aegyptus 68
'Αμένωφίς 19, 6m	'Αμενωφάθ 19	'Αμμένωφίς 40
Σέθωσ = 'Ραμέσσης 59 (=Aegyptus, brother 'Αρμαῖς =Danaus)	Σέθωσ 51	Σέθωσ 55
'Ράμψης 66	'Ραψάκης 61	'Ραμψής 66
'Αμένωφίς	'Αμμενέφθης 20	'Αμμενεφθίς 40
Σέθωσ = 'Ραμέσσης	'Ραμεσσηῖς 60	
	'Αμμεμενής 5	'Αμμενέμης 26
	Θούρις 7	Θούρις 7

The presence of so many similar names, in similar sequences, suggests there may be several Doppelgänger-cases here: different traditions about the same kings have caused them to appear more than once, in sequence. Conversely, when Josephus identifies Sethos with Ramesses (on two different occasions, 1.98, 245), we may suspect that this represents the conflation of similar stories which were associated with different names: the easiest option was to take the two names as equivalents for the same king. We cannot tell when such duplications and confusions took place, whether in the oral and literary tradition before Manetho, in

Manetho himself, in the transmission of Manetho's text before Josephus, or even in Josephus' mishandling of his source. There are grounds for suspecting Josephus of misrepresenting Manetho at some points (see at 1.102-3 and 1.231-2) but these concern more the reign-lengths than the names and sequence of kings. It is curious that the Harmais=Danaus and Ramesses/Sethos=Aegyptus identifications are placed at an earlier point in Eusebius' list, but that is probably a corruption. However, Josephus' treatment of the crucial identification of Harmais as Danaus is oddly mishandled (see 1.101-2), and it is just possible that he (or an earlier editor of Manetho) has made at that point a crucial supplement to Manetho. Meyer (1904: 88-95) offered an ingenious explanation of how the historical sequence of kings ended up in this confused tangle (cf. Helck 1956: 39-42). On the history of the 19<sup>th</sup> Dynasty (founded by Ramesses I, and lasting 1315-1201 BCE), see the entries on "New Kingdom" and "Nineteenth Dynasty," and on the relevant kings, in Redford 2001.

<sup>344</sup> L reads "Sethosis," probably on the basis of the dative Σεθώσει in 1.101; but this could be derived from the nominative Σέθωσ (Gutschmid 453), and editors correctly restore "Sethos," in line with Eusebius' reading and Josephus' usage in 1.102, 231.

<sup>345</sup> On this identification of two different kings (Sethos I and Ramesses II, respectively 1290–1279 BCE and 1279–1213 BCE), see above note to "months" at 1.97. Manetho himself may have been responsible for the conflation (cf. 1.245). Editors rightly restore the text (from Eusebius, *Chronicon*) as Σέθωσ ὁ καὶ 'Ραμέσσης. Theophilus reads the text as introducing two different figures, Sethos and Ramesses, and in L a marginal comment reads: "It is found in another copy as follows. After him, Sethosis and Ramesses, brothers. The former, possessing a naval force, blockaded those who were opposing him by sea and causing damage (?); not long after, also, he killed Ramesses and appointed Harmais, another brother, governor of Egypt." This is clearly a gloss by a reader trying to find a place for Ramesses in the story, on the understanding that he was a different figure from Sethos(is).

<sup>346</sup> Josephus later calls him "Hermaios" (1.231), another sign of his editorial carelessness.

*Harmais' revolt*

the mother of his children, and to abstain also from the other royal concubines.<sup>347</sup> **99** He himself launched expeditions against Cyprus and Phoenicia, then against the Assyrians and the Medes, and subdued them all, some by force of arms, others without a battle, through fear of his large army. Made confident by these successes, he advanced in an even bolder fashion and conquered the cities and countries of the east.<sup>348</sup> **100** After some time, Harmais, who had been left in Egypt, recklessly began to do everything contrary to his brother's instructions. He raped the queen, and made liberal and continual use of the other concubines; and, persuaded by his friends, he began to wear a diadem and rose in revolt against his brother.<sup>349</sup> **101** The person in charge of the temples<sup>350</sup> of Egypt wrote a letter and sent it to Sethos, telling him everything, and that his brother Harmais had risen in revolt against him.<sup>351</sup> So he immediately returned to Pelusium and gained control of his own kingdom.<sup>352</sup>

<sup>347</sup> The short narrative about Sethos and Harmais (1.98-101) serves Josephus' purpose only in the identification of Harmais as Danaus (1.102), thus enabling the cross-reference to Greek chronology. But Josephus' handling of that aspect of the story is poor (see at 1.101-2), and he spends more time on the exploits of Sethos and Harmais, which are irrelevant to his argument. They do, however, provide some relief after the dry list of kings, and their focus on sexual, as much as military, matters offers readers a diversion. Josephus probably here abbreviates a much longer narrative in Manetho to make the digression tolerable (cf. his abbreviations of Menander in 1.121-25). Manetho probably described the deployment of these "forces," gave more details on the military conquests, and at least named the unfortunate queen. On the dangers of digression, and the importance of variation, in rhetoric, see, e.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.3; 8.3.52. The conditions laid on Harmais set up the denouement of 1.100 in classic narrative style. To touch the queen, as part of the royal harem and guarantor of the succession, would constitute a challenge to the king's sexual and political authority.

<sup>348</sup> We can imagine more detail in Manetho himself, who speaks with Egyptian pride of Sethos as a proto-Alexander, an Egyptian conqueror as great as anyone revered by the Greeks (and much earlier). Although he had placed Sesostris earlier (in the 12<sup>th</sup> Dynasty), Manetho seems to have transferred some aspects of the Sesostris legend to Sethos (see Herodotus on Sesostris, 2.102-7; Diodorus Siculus on Sesosis, 1.53-58, with Gutschmid 454-55): these include his naval power, his conquests in the east and the treachery of his brother. On the historical conquests of Sethos I and Rameses II, see Labow 2005: 92, n.135. Roman writers also knew of a conquering Egyptian king Rhamses, with an enormous eastern empire (Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.60), and the identification of Sethos with Ramesses might recall this tradition for Josephus' Roman readers. This narrative of Egyptian international power undercuts Josephus' later claims of Egyptian political impotence (2.128-29, 133), though its remoteness in time limits the damage to his

case. Josephus gives no hint of recognizing a connection between Sethos and Sesostris, whom he elsewhere names in relation to another aspect of his legend (2.132). He clearly knew the passage in Herodotus about Sesostris (his citation of Herodotus in 1.169-70 is taken from that context), but elsewhere attributes the actions there described to the biblical figure Shishak (Isokos; *Ant.* 8.253, 260).

<sup>349</sup> The transgressions mirror the rules in 1.98, and the final phrase indicates their significance. On the Egyptian queen as part of the larger harem, see the entry on 'Harem' in Redford 2001.

<sup>350</sup> Reading ἱερωῶν with Hudson, Thackeray, Naber, and Münster, on the basis of Eusebius' *fana* ("sanctuaries") and Latin *sacra*. L reads ἱερέων ("priests"), followed by Gutschmid 456, Niese, and Reinach. Evidence for Egyptian religious titles could support either (Waddell 1940 ad loc.).

<sup>351</sup> Reading αὐτῷ with Niese minor and Münster.

<sup>352</sup> It appears that Josephus had no indication from Manetho concerning how far into Sethos' reign this event occurred: the "some time" in 1.100, followed by "immediately" here, are noticeably vague. This is awkward for Josephus as he wants to give a precise calculation of time from the expulsion of the Hyksos (see 1.94) to the flight of Harmais/Danaus; but in the former case he has only the complete reign-length of Tethmosis, and in the latter the reign-length of Sethos (see 1.231). His solution is to take Tethmosis' 25 years and 4 months as the period *after* he expelled the Hyksos, and to do the same with Sethos at 1.231 (he reigned 59 years after expelling Danaus). But clearly Danaus' flight took place sometime after the start of Sethos' reign, and Josephus actually, though silently, counts those 59/60 years in this context as the period *before* Danaus was expelled (see below on the total, 393 years, in 1.103). It is striking that in this "quotation" from Manetho Josephus does *not* cite the actual expulsion of Harmais/Danaus, although this is presupposed in 1.103 and stated in Josephus' own words in 1.231 and 2.16. But this is the crucial event that anchors his chronology. This could raise a suspicion that Manetho



102 The country was called “Egypt” after him; for he says that Sethos was called Aegyptus and Harmais his brother Danaus.<sup>353</sup>

(1.16) 103 So Manetho. It is clear from the years enumerated, if you count up the time, that the so-called shepherds, our ancestors,<sup>354</sup> left Egypt and settled in this land<sup>355</sup> 393 years before Danaus arrived in Argos,<sup>356</sup> yet the Argives consider him

*Conclusions  
from Manetho*

never recounted an expulsion of Hermais/Danaus, or never made the identification between Hermais and Danaus that Josephus attributes to him. But it is more likely that Josephus has misjudged what to quote and what to leave out: Manetho said that Hermais (=Danaus) was banished from Egypt and went to Argos, but Josephus omits to include his statement of the fact. Far from being watertight, his “proof” leaks at the crucial seam.

<sup>353</sup> I have placed this section outside the quotation, as it seems more summary and report than quotation, or even paraphrase. There is an evident oddity here. 1.103 begins as if everything before it was citation, yet the end of 1.102 appears to report what Manetho said (λέγει), and can hardly be part of the citation itself. Several solutions have been offered: i) closing the quotation after the first half of 1.102 (so Thackeray); ii) taking λέγει as in impersonal “one says” (Müller 129; Labow 2005: 93, n.142), not implying Manetho as its subject; iii) emending λέγει to λέγεται (“it is said,” Gutschmid 457); iv) taking the whole of 1.102 as an editorial addition to Manetho that Josephus found already incorporated in his text and took to be part of the citation (Meyer 1904: 75). None of these is impossible, but it is simpler to suggest that Josephus has mishandled the ending of the citation, and drifted into using his own voice rather than Manetho’s. We should also notice that Josephus has omitted the crucial facts necessary for his chronological calculation (the actual expulsion, the flight to Argos, and its date). One could adopt here a radical hypothesis, that Manetho made no such associations between the two figures as are here claimed for him: they are simply foisted on him by Josephus, who inevitably has to use his own words, rather than Manetho’s. But it is hard to imagine that Josephus had the ability to identify, in Sethos’ expulsion of Harmais, an equivalent to the legend of Aegyptus and Danaus, and thus a link with Greek chronology. It is more likely that he found this in his source, and that the identifications derive from Manetho, who elsewhere links Egyptian figures with Greek heroes (e.g., Thouris as Homer’s Polybus, and Osarcho as Heracles, Waddell 1940, frags. 55, 61).

Aegyptus and Danaus are brothers and eponymous figures in Greek legend. In Greek versions of the tale, first found in the epic poem *Danaïds* and developed in Aeschylus’ *Suppliants*, Aegyptus and his sons are gen-

erally depicted as the aggressors (see Garvie 1969: 163-83). Before Manetho, Hecataeus reports Egyptian accounts of Danaus as the leader of a colony from Egypt to Greece (*apud* Diodorus 1.28; 40.3). It may be a sign of Manetho’s sense of cultural superiority to Greece that he presents Danaus as the treacherous brother Harmais in this Egyptian tale, and Sethos/Aegyptus as the injured party.

<sup>354</sup> Josephus repeats the crucial claim that the “shepherds” were *our ancestors* (cf. 1.91-92): after this, when speaking in his own voice, he never again refers to them as “shepherds,” but as “us,” “our ancestors,” etc. (1.228, 232, 280; 2.16). In the same contexts he prefers to say that they “left,” rather than that they “were expelled.”

<sup>355</sup> On this geographical identification with Judea, see note to “possess” at 1.1.

<sup>356</sup> The dates in 1.94-97 add up to 333, but go only as far as the accession of Sethos, not the arrival of Danaus in Argos. Here Josephus was hamstrung by his lack of information about the dating of the Harmais rebellion within Sethos’s reign (see above, note to “kingdom” at 1.101). The difference in totals is due not to Josephus’ miscounting (or errors in transcription), but to his unannounced addition of 60 years to the total of the reigns in 1.94-97. Since he later records the figure of 59 in relation to Sethos’ reign (1.231, though *after* the expulsion of Danaus), it is likely that that is the source of the additional sum (although Gutschmid 459 objects that 59 is not 60): since Harmais/Danaus’ expulsion was hardly at the very beginning of Sethos’ reign, it might as well be located by means of the only available figure. Since Meyer (1904: 76), it has been commonly argued that Josephus’ total of 393 was derived from a source, which had added this 60 years to the 333 of the earlier king-reigns, and that Josephus inadvertently added this number on again in 1.231, thus counting Sethos’ reign twice (e.g., Laqueur 1928: 1078-79; Jacoby in *FGH* 609, p.90; Reinach 114). But it is equally possible that the double-counting was performed by Josephus himself, and consciously. He realized that he should add *something* to the 333-total of 1.94-97, had nothing specific to add apart from the 59/60 years, wanted to make this total as large as possible, and later wanted to reuse the 59 years to put a substantial gap between Sethos and Amenophis (see on 1.231-32). Thus silently, and slyly, he adds in the figure here



the most ancient person.<sup>357</sup> **104** So on two extremely important points Manetho has given testimony for us on the basis of the Egyptian writings:<sup>358</sup> first, that our arrival in Egypt was from elsewhere,<sup>359</sup> and secondly, that our departure from there was at such an early point in time as to predate the Trojan War by somewhere close to 1,000 years.<sup>360</sup> **105** As for what Manetho added, drawing not on the Egyptian writings but, as he himself admitted, on myths of unknown authorship,<sup>361</sup> I shall refute that in detail later,<sup>362</sup> demonstrating how unconvincing is his lying.<sup>363</sup>

to make the total 393, and counts it again at 1.231. Presumably he could hope that none of his readers would have the patience to do the awkward sums and detect this subterfuge.

<sup>357</sup> Greek: ἀρχαιότατος (either “most ancient” or “extremely ancient”). The dating of Danaus’ life is the crucial point of cross-reference for Josephus, but his vagueness suggests he is out of his depth. In Argive tradition, Danaus is not the most ancient figure: Inachus was considered more ancient by 10 generations.

<sup>358</sup> The language echoes the introduction, 1.73-74.

<sup>359</sup> This sudden emphasis on geographical origin is surprising. The general introduction to this section (1.69-72, echoing 1.1-5) suggests it is about *antiquity*, and Josephus signals that as his chief interest in 1.93 (cf. 1.227). But the importance of this subsidiary point, here given priority, is underlined by its repetition in 1.252, and it becomes a leitmotif in Josephus’ response to Chaeremon (1.298, 302), Lysimachus (1.305, 314), and Apion (2.8, 28, 122). Indeed, in his summary of his work (2.288-29), this point is again prominent; on the cultural significance of this, in a Roman context full of negative stereotypes of Egyptians, see Barclay 2004. This underlines the significance of the Hyksos story for Josephus: while all the “leper” stories (including Manetho’s) refer to native Egyptians, the Hyksos-history is manifestly about foreigners, whose alien identity (see on 1.75, 82) was manifest in their deep antipathy to Egyptians (1.75-81). For Josephus’ apologetic, where they came from matters less than the simple fact that they were *not* from Egypt. Theophilus’ adaptation of this section (Manetho’s first admission is that they were shepherds, 3.21) shows that he did not share Josephus’ sensitivity on this point.

<sup>360</sup> The wording is vague but hints at a careful calculation. Josephus never indicates how he dates Danaus in relation to the Trojan War, and his lack of candor on this fundamental chronological point suggests either ineptitude or, more likely, inability to do more than

guess. (Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 39 has 10 generations between Danaus and the Trojan War, about 400 years.) Josephus never dates the Trojan War (a subject of dispute in antiquity), but elsewhere places it before the beginning of Greek civilization (1.10-12; 2.155), so this statement represents a significant boost to Judean prestige. Elsewhere Josephus claims Moses’ constitution to be 2,000 years old (1.1, 36; 2.226; cf. *Ant.* 1.16), but never places this claim beside any other dated moment in the history of civilization.

<sup>361</sup> This distinction between two kinds of source is crucial for Josephus, because it enables him to affirm the Hyksos story but rubbish Manetho’s later narrative: the theme is repeated at the beginning (1.228-29) and end (1.287) of that later Manetho citation. He carefully omitted all reference to this other kind of source until this point, since elements in the Sethos-Harmais tale (1.98-101) might well have looked “mythical”; but it is inserted here both to bolster the truthfulness of Manetho’s evidence thus far cited, and to prepare the reader to doubt Manetho’s later material (1.229-51). Manetho probably referred to a multiplicity of sources, including, perhaps “myths” (cf. Waddell 1940, frags. 8/9/10). But Josephus’ neat correlation between the two parts of the Manetho narrative and the two kinds of source is much too convenient to be believable (see note to “tablets” at 1.73). The “unknown authorship” of the myths (literally, “without masters,” ἀδεσπότως) suggests that they are uncontrolled and irresponsible, as well as anonymous (cf. the adjective in 1.287).

<sup>362</sup> Josephus prepares the ground for 1.227-87, and the theme of “refutation” echoes the forensic language (ἐλέγχω and cognates) first found in 1.3, and repeated thereafter in connection with “lies” (1.4, 23, 73).

<sup>363</sup> “Unconvincing” (ἀπίθανος) is Josephus’ favorite epithet for Manetho’s second narrative (1.229, 267, 279, 287). The sentence ends with the climactic ψευδολογία (“lying”), echoing 1.3, although the ψευδ- language is used sparingly in 1.227-87 (only at 1.252, 267).

*Phoenician Evidence (1.106-27): Reading Options*

The Phoenician segment (1.106-27) is the shortest of the three collections of non-Greek evidence, and is purportedly based on Tyrian records. In fact Josephus uses no native Phoenician writers, but two Greek authors, Dios and Menander, with overlapping material. These are the same two authors, and the same citations, that he had employed in *Antiquities* (8.144-49), a fact he does not advertize. In this context, after a lengthy introduction (1.106-12), Josephus presents citations from Dios (1.113-115) and Menander (1.117-20), followed by a paraphrase of Menander's chronology (1.121-25). These lead to the conclusion that Solomon's temple was built 143 years before the founding of Carthage (1.126).

An educated *Roman audience* would recognize the Phoenicians in general, and the Tyrians in particular, as having roots in extreme antiquity (Herodotus 2.44; Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.22; Ulpian, *Digest* 50.15.1, preface). Josephus has already noted the Phoenicians' reputation for introducing writing to the Greeks (1.10), thus suggesting that they might have records older than anything known in Greece. A skeptical reader might suspect that such ancient sources consisted of self-glorifying "myths" (Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.22), but in Josephus' day there was a growing fascination with the possible authenticity of ancient Phoenician (and other "barbarian") sources from a period before the Trojan Wars. This was the mood Philo of Byblos (64–141 CE) could exploit in his purported citations of Sanchuniathon (Attridge and Oden 1981; Millar 1983: 64-66; on the general phenomenon, Bowersock 1994). Since readers familiar with the Virgilian myth would recognize the founding of Carthage (by Elissa/Dido) to predate Aeneas' arrival in Italy, Josephus' dating of Solomon's temple 143 years before this point (1.108, 126) might sound impressive.

However, skeptical Roman readers could have raised critical questions. The two authors cited, Dios and Menander "the Ephesian," were largely unknown in literary circles, while a central element in the narrative, the swapping of riddles, might smack of folklore, rather than sober history (cf. 1.114). While the Jerusalem temple was famous in Rome, Solomon is presented by both Josephus' sources as worsted in the riddle competition, and dubbed by Dios a "tyrant" (1.114)—a term with strongly negative connotations in the Roman political tradition. In general, it is hard to see how a reader who was unimpressed by Josephus' *Antiquities*, where these same "Phoenician" sources are cited (8.144-49; 9.283-87), would be any more inclined to believe Josephus this time around. In some respects he makes *less* effort here than in *Antiquities* to convince his readers of the existence and value of the Phoenician records (cf. *Ant.* 8.55, 144; 9.283).

We may imagine *Judean readers* pleased to hear confirmed their sense of the international significance of Solomon and his temple. The biblically literate would recognize echoes of the traditions found in 1 Kings, and developed in 2 Chronicles, especially in Josephus' introduction: there (1.110-111) he alludes to the exchange of goods and letters between Solomon and the king of Tyre, in echo of 1 Kgs 5:2-12; 9:10-14 and 2 Chr 2:3-16. On the other hand, the exchange of riddles between the two kings (in which Solomon is the loser!) is without biblical precedent, even if it vaguely evokes the tradition of Solomon's wisdom and the "hard questions" posed by the Queen of Sheba (1 Kgs 10:1-3; 2 Chr 9:1-4; cf. 1 Kgs 10:24; 2 Chr 9:23). That, despite his sources, Josephus asserts Solomon's superiority in this contest (1.111) might reassure Judean readers. As we know from Eupolemus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.30-34), Judean tradition was prone to amplify the international significance of Solomon and to embellish his dealings with Phoenician and other kings (Wacholder 1974; Holladay 1983: 93-156; cf. Theophilus in *Praep. ev.* 9.34.19). It would not matter if Josephus' Phoenician sources did not tally with the biblical account, so long as they were seen to magnify the Judean king and his temple.

*Early Christian readers* incorporated this segment in their arguments for the antiquity of the Hebrew people, but less extensively than its companion sections of Egyptian and Chaldean evidence. Theophilus uses this segment in *Ad Autolyicum* 3.22, but, with his focus on the chronological question, provides merely a précis of Josephus' introduction (1.117), followed by the relevant king-lists from Menander (1.121-26). For these purposes Dios is entirely dispensable, and the rest of Menander irrelevant. Even more drastic abbreviations are found in Tertullian, *Apol.* 19 and Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.13.13. In fact, Eusebius judged other material more valuable: he considered it unnecessary to "heap up proofs" (10.14.1), and had earlier cited Eupolemus' more entertaining material on Solomon at length (9.30-34, among "Greek histori-

ans”). Although his *Chronicon* cites our whole passage (54.1-56.19), it is located in the context of “Hebrew” witnesses (as from Josephus), since the work contains no section of “Phoenician” sources. Thus, after Theophilus, the citation of “Phoenician” evidence is of diminishing significance. Perhaps this Josephus offering was judged too meager, too indirect, or too complex to match the profile accorded to other chronological proofs. A parallel tradition, citing Laetus, recounted a marriage between Solomon and the daughter of Chiramus of Tyre, when Menelaus came to Phoenicia after the fall of Troy (Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 37; Clement, *Strom.* 1.114.2). This obviated the need for a tedious king-list between Hiram and the founding of Carthage, but it also was not elaborated in Christian apologetics.

*Historical scholarship* has paid rather little attention to this segment, compared to Josephus’ citations from Manetho and Berosus. Dios and Menander are otherwise unknown authors, whose date and stance are difficult to detect (see Mendels 1987: 131-43, suggesting a competitive and polemical edge against Judean versions of history). The cross-reference between the reign of Solomon and the Tyrian founding of Carthage has provided an important, if uncertain, clue to the dating of Judean history and the construction of Solomon’s temple in the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE (see Liver 1953; Green 1983). Regarding Phoenician history, the citations reveal little information beyond names of kings, and relate to a time (10<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE) otherwise poorly attested. Archaeology has yet to reveal the early Phoenician layers of the city, and written sources consist only of these materials and biblical stories about David’s and Solomon’s relations with Tyre (see Meyer 1931: 122-27; Eissfeldt 1948: 1884-86; Katzenstein 1973: 77-192; van Seters 1983: 195-99; Briquel-Chatonnet 1992: 40-58; further bibliography in Labow 2005: 99-100).

*My own reading* focuses on features of Josephus’ rhetoric, including his ability to make a little go a long way. It appears that Josephus had access to Dios and Menander only through some other source (possibly Alexander Polyhistor), and knew almost nothing about these authors or their sources of information. He wants a section of “Phoenician” material, but this is the best he can do: two obscure authors, relevant only because of their passing reference to Solomon, and already utilized in his *Antiquities*. He does not admit that he is recycling material from that earlier work: the rhetoric of *Apion* requires that he offer more to doubters of his earlier claims (1.1-5). He uses both fragments in full (despite their overlaps and irrelevancies) and insists, by mere assertion, on their foundation in Tyrian records.

We can also observe Josephus’ attempt to merge his voice with that of his “witnesses,” in fact to suggest to his audience how their voices should be heard. While he needs their authority, they are of limited value to his case unless he supplements their testimony with his own commentary. The fragments themselves are too brief to interrupt, but by a long and carefully phrased introduction (1.106-112) Josephus conditions our hearing of what follows. Like an authoritative “voice-over,” he allows us to hear his speakers only while telling us what they are saying. Thereby these awkward texts—which do not refer to the Jerusalem temple and mention Solomon only in slighting terms—are recruited into Josephus’ cause by suggestion and subtle manipulation. The authority of the Phoenicians’ history is thereby commandeered for the defense of their long-time foes, the Judeans.

*Phoenician  
evidence*

**(1.17) 106** I wish, therefore, to move now from these sources to what is recorded about our people among the Phoenicians,<sup>364</sup> and to provide the testimony from them.<sup>365</sup> **107** For very many years<sup>366</sup> among the Tyrians documents have been writ-

<sup>364</sup> Josephus is consistently good at flagging his main transitions, and now introduces his second section of non-Greek material; cf. 1.70-71, though the reference there to Tyrian hostility is forgotten in this portrait of friendship between Hiram and Solomon (1.109, 111). The sources’ passing references to Solomon and Jerusalem are here taken to refer to “our

people” (cf. 1.127, “our ancestors”).

<sup>365</sup> Greek: τὰς ἐξ ἐκείνων μαρτυρίας. The testimony/witness vocabulary is again prominent in this segment: the μαρτυρ- root occurs, besides here, at 1.112, 115, 127—all decisive points in the argument. As is clear at 1.112, the legal metaphor remains live. Although it is not here explicit that they witness to Judean *antiquity*

ten for public purposes and preserved with exceptional care,<sup>367</sup> relating to memorable matters in their internal affairs and as performed among others.<sup>368</sup> **108** In these it is written that the sanctuary in Hierosolyma was built by Solomon the king 143 years and 8 months earlier than the Tyrians' founding of Karchedon [Carthage].<sup>369</sup> **109** It is not unreasonable that the construction of our sanctuary should be in their records;<sup>370</sup> for Eirosos [Hiram],<sup>371</sup> the king of the Tyrians, was a friend of our king Solomon, a friendship he had inherited from his father.<sup>372</sup> **110** He shared Solomon's ambition for the splendor of the building: he donated 120 talents of gold and, cut-

*Solomon and  
Hiram*

(cf. 1.4, 69, 93, 104), the line of argument is closely parallel to that of the previous segment, and concludes in proof of an ancient date (1.126, anticipated in 1.108). Josephus can cite only Dios and Menander, neither of them "Phoenicians," but authenticates their material with reference to Tyrian records.

<sup>366</sup> L has only "many" (πολλῶν; cf. Latin), but I follow here the Eusebian evidence (παμπόλλων, with Niese, Münster et al., *pace* Gutschmid 462).

<sup>367</sup> The stress on written documents, carefully preserved, harks back to the argument of 1.6-29: words from the γραμμ- or γραφ-root proliferate at the start of this Phoenician segment (as well as here, in every section of 1.106-113 besides 1.110, and in 1.116-117). The Phoenician use of *writing* was important in the argument of 1.10, 28. "Documents for public purposes" (γράμματα δημοσία γεγραμμένα) could include all the varied material alluded to in this segment (king-lists, records of kings' achievements, royal letters), while their "public" character suggests they are reliable and open to scrutiny (cf. 1.9, 11, 20-21). Elsewhere Josephus had referred to Tyrian "archives" (*Ant.* 8.144; 9.283, 287) and challenged readers to consult the public-record officials in Tyre (*Ant.* 8.55). The claim that Dios and Menander followed documents can only be implied (1.112) or asserted (1.116), not proved.

<sup>368</sup> Reading παρ' ἄλλοις (with Münster, following Eusebius, *Chronicon*). An alternative, πρὸς ἄλλους ("in their dealings with others"; so Gutschmid 463, Niese minor, et al., emending πρὸς ἀλλήλους in L E S), makes equal, if not better, sense.

<sup>369</sup> Josephus cuts straight to the conclusion (1.126) in order to ensure that, whatever else we hear in the intervening sections, we learn this crucial chronological fact. By a sort of textual ventriloquism, he attributes to the Tyrian records his own claim, which depends on the following contestable assertions: i) that Dios and Menander accurately reproduce material from the Tyrian records; ii) that their material alludes not only to the friendship between Hiram and Solomon, but also to the building of the Jerusalem temple; and iii) that we may date that temple to the 12<sup>th</sup> year of Hiram's reign, and thus reach the figure of 143 years and 8 months,

from the chronological list in Menander (totalling 155 years and 8 months). The first is the presumption of this whole segment (1.112 and 1.116). The latter two are unannounced supplements to the Dios/Menander evidence (see note to "roof" at 1.110, and to "reign" at 1.126). Josephus assumes that his readers will need no further introduction to Solomon; the name was chiefly known in connection with magic, *Ant.* 8.46-49. He also takes for granted that the founding of Carthage lay in the distant past (see note to "Karchedon" at 1.125).

<sup>370</sup> Josephus' specific reference to the Jerusalem sanctuary masks its absence in the sources he proceeds to cite. Dios and Menander speak of the construction of temples (1.113, 118), but not of that in Jerusalem. The connection could have been cemented had Josephus dared repeat his citation of letters between the two kings (*Ant.* 8.51-54, invented from biblical precedents). Here it is simply taken for granted. He cannot refer here to biblical evidence (until 1.127): he must claim that even what he supplies from his Judean tradition is present in the Phoenician documents.

<sup>371</sup> Greek: Ἐἱρώμος, so spelled by Josephus here and in *Antiquities*. The Hebrew Bible names him Hiram (or Hirom), transliterated in LXX as Χιραμ. Eupolemus names the Tyrian king Souron. For the name and other bearers of it, see Katzenstein 1973: 81, n.22.

<sup>372</sup> The notion of friendship between the two kings derives from the Bible (1 Kings 5, 9, etc.), and is amplified by Josephus in *Ant.* 5.58. Neither Dios nor Menander suggest such: the posing of riddles is, for them, a symbol of competition, not friendship. But friendship makes plausible Hiram's contribution to the Jerusalem temple, and thus links the exchange of gifts (1.110) with the exchange of riddles (1.111). Although Judean tradition indicated that Solomon inherited the friendship from his father, David (2 Sam 5:11; 1 Kgs 5:1; 2 Chr 2:3; Eupolemus *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.33.1), Josephus here suggests that it was Hiram, not Solomon, for whom the relationship was second-hand. If this is not a simple mistake (cf. *Ant.* 8.50), it seems designed to make Solomon the more significant of the two kings.



ting down the finest timber from the mountain called Libanos, sent it for the roof.<sup>373</sup> Solomon gave him, in return, among many other gifts,<sup>374</sup> some territory<sup>375</sup> in Galilee in the place called Chaboulon.<sup>376</sup> **111** What drew them together in friendship most of all was their love of wisdom: they used to send each other problems, demanding a solution,<sup>377</sup> and Solomon was better in such matters, being generally wiser.<sup>378</sup> Many of the letters that they wrote to one another are preserved to this day among the Tyrians.<sup>379</sup> **112** To show that this claim about the Tyrian documents is not my concoction,<sup>380</sup> I shall present as my witness Dios, a man trusted for his accuracy in

Dios

<sup>373</sup> In what follows (1.113, 118), Dios and Menander mention the use of gold in Tyrian temples and the gathering of wood from Lebanon for temples (“the roofs of temples,” Menander, 1.118). But neither mentions, or even implies, that this activity includes temples outside Tyre, let alone one in Jerusalem. Hence the necessity of this introduction, to condition our reception of what follows. Josephus inserts biblical tradition under the guise of “Phoenician sources” to make the real sources confirm what he has declared them to say (cf. Labow 2005: 105-6). The Bible has Hiram donate gold, though not only for the temple (1 Kgs 9:14; cf. *Ant.* 8.141), and wood from Lebanon (1 Kgs 5:6, 9; 2 Chr 2:8, 16; cf. *Ant.* 8.52, 54, 58), though not only for its roof. Josephus specifies the roof to create a clearer link with Dios (1.113) and Menander (1.118; see Gutschmid 464). Josephus typically glorifies the Jerusalem temple and relishes stories of foreign kings who give it respect and expensive donations (e.g., Ptolemy I’s gifts in *Ant.* 12.57-84; see Cohen 1987). He refers again to Hiram’s donation in 2.19.

<sup>374</sup> The gift exchange (to match the exchange of riddles) places the two kings on an equal footing. 1 Kgs 5:11 refers to an annual levy of grain and oil for Hiram’s household (cf. *Ant.* 8.54, 57, 141), but the vaguer “gifts” looks less like tribute. Eupolemus goes so far as to specify that Solomon gifted the famous Tyrian golden pillar (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.34.18); see note to “Zeus” at 1.118.

<sup>375</sup> The text is corrupt (L: καὶ γῆ καὶ) and has been emended variously. I read (with Münster) ἄλλοις τε πολλοῖς καὶ γῆ.

<sup>376</sup> The place is variously spelled in the versions of this text, as also in the MSS of Josephus’ other references (*Ant.* 8.142; *War* 2.503; 3.38; *Life* 213; see Gutschmid 465). For the town, on the edge of Phoenician territory near Ptolemais, see Mason 2001: 185. This tradition, without support in the following citations, derives from 1 Kgs 9:11-13. The embarrassing biblical detail, that Hiram was displeased with the gift (contrast 2 Chr 8:1), is recounted by Josephus in *Ant.* 8.142, but omitted here. In this context he can allow no stain on the relationship between the two kings, and no question concerning Solomon’s generosity.

<sup>377</sup> In this case, as in *Ant.* 8.143, Josephus assimilates a tradition deriving not from Judean sources but from his “Phoenician” quotations: indeed, this is the only secure link between his introduction and the citations that follow. There is a faint echo of the riddles (LXX: ἀνίγματα) posed by the Queen of Sheba (1 Kgs 10:1; cf. *Ant.* 8.166-67), but those are not reciprocated. Placing this exchange under the rubric of “wisdom” puts this otherwise alien tradition on Judean territory, where Solomon was famed for this quality (see next note).

<sup>378</sup> Solomon’s wisdom is a biblical notion (from 1 Kings 3, 10, etc.) extensively developed in the Judean tradition, including the attribution to Solomon of the Book of Proverbs and *Wisdom of Solomon*. Josephus’ boldness here is striking, as his claim that Solomon was “generally wiser” partly *contradicts* the authors he is about to cite. In Dios (1.114-15), Solomon defeated Hiram, but was worsted by Abdemounos; in Menander (1.120), he was always matched by Abdemounos. Josephus cannot afford explicitly to correct the sources he cites (he needs their untarnished authority). But neither can he allow the impression to remain that Solomon was intellectually inferior (cf. 2.148 and the charge that Judeans are “untalented”). He thus ignores here the figure of Abdemounos, and makes an unqualified claim for Solomon’s superiority (cf. *Ant.* 8.143).

<sup>379</sup> Josephus effects a transition back to the topic of “Tyrian records,” allowing a strong introduction to his first source (1.112). The context suggests that the letters were about the problems they set each other, but, as *Ant.* 8.50-54 indicates, the only letters that Josephus knew concerned the construction of the temple (based on 1 Kings 5, a tradition developed in Eupolemus). It is striking that Josephus does not cite those letters here, given his confidence that anyone could trace them in the Tyrian archives (*Ant.* 8.55-56). But the discussion in *Antiquities* already shows his recognition that their authenticity might be open to doubt.

<sup>380</sup> Greek: ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ συγκεῖμαι. The verb σύκειμαι and its active counterpart συντίθημι are frequently used by Josephus in charges that his opponents have “concocted” their stories (e.g., 1.287, 293-94, 304, 312). The mention of letters, immediately preceding, is *not* sup-



Phoenician history.<sup>381</sup> In his history of the Phoenicians he writes as follows:<sup>382</sup>

**113** When Abibalos died, his son Eiromos became king.<sup>383</sup> He raised embankments in the eastern parts of the city and enlarged the town,<sup>384</sup> and the temple of Olympian Zeus, which was isolated on an island, he joined to the city by filling in the area in between, and beautified it with golden votive offerings.<sup>385</sup> He went up to Libanos and felled trees for the construction of temples.<sup>386</sup> **114** They say that the tyrant of Hierosolyma, Solomon,<sup>387</sup> sent riddles

*Dios on Hiram  
and Solomon*

ported by what follows, beyond the general reference to an exchange of riddles. If Josephus means others of his claims in 1.107-11, he does not specify. It is a problem for Josephus that neither Dios nor Menander makes reference to written sources. He has to make do with his own claims for their accuracy (1.112) and for their use of native records (1.116), but has created the impression that his own introduction in 1.109-111 is derived from those records, and is now *confirmed* by Dios and Menander.

<sup>381</sup> The phrase “I shall present” (παράθῆσομαι) mirrors 1.74 and is repeated for Menander at 1.116. The two authors, previously cited in *Ant.* 8.144-49, are here deployed in reverse sequence, so that Menander’s testimony can be followed by his chronology (1.121-25). On the relationship between the two authors, see note to “34” at 1.117. The claims here made for Dios are conspicuously vague. Josephus seems to know nothing about him (neither ethnicity nor date; cf. *Ant.* 8.147), which suggests he derived this citation from an uninformative source. That greatly limits the claims he can make on his behalf. Since there is no other independent reference to, or citation from, Dios, in extant literature, we can hardly compensate for Josephus’ ignorance; see Stern 1.123; *FHG* 4.398.

<sup>382</sup> Josephus probably guesses that Dios wrote a history of the Phoenicians—its focus may have been narrower (on Tyre) or wider; he can cite no book number. The quotation that follows is identical to that in *Ant.* 8.147-49, but Josephus cannot confess to such recycling.

<sup>383</sup> The form suggests that the citation is a fragment from a treatment of Tyrian history by reign-sequence, identical in style to Menander, but lacking his year-references (unless Josephus has omitted those for convenience). Abibalos’ name echoes the Phoenician God, Ba’al. If Hiram is an historical figure, if we can trust Menander’s chronology, and if we follow Timaeus’ date for the founding of Carthage (see note to “Karchedon” at 1.125), Hiram’s reign may be dated ca. 970–936 BCE (see Meyer 1931: 125-26; Katzenstein 1973: 81-115).

<sup>384</sup> The embankment seems to have provided both defense and levelling, allowing the eastern extension of the city; see Gutschmid 466-67. On the topography of Tyre, see Eissfeldt 1948: 1878-79

and Katzenstein 1973: 9-17.

<sup>385</sup> Dios speaks here, from a Greek perspective, of Olympian Zeus: Tyrians referred to Ba’al Shamaim (Lord of heaven; cf. *Ant.* 9.138). Dios refers to the filling in of the sea between the small, southern temple-island and the main city, itself an island several hundred meters offshore (before Alexander’s siege in 332 BCE joined it to the mainland). The linkage of the two islands is celebrated in Phoenician mythology and coins (Katzenstein 1973: 9). The gold provides some resonance with Josephus’ claim about Hiram’s contribution to Solomon (1.110); Menander is more specific about the golden pillar (1.118).

<sup>386</sup> This is a crucial item for Josephus, who has prepared our reception of it in 1.109-10. Dios speaks generally (Menander is more specific, 1.119), allowing Josephus to insinuate a reference to Solomon’s temple.

<sup>387</sup> The beginning of this section indicates that Dios is citing oral, not written, tradition. (In the parallel in *Ant.* 8.148, most MSS read φησί [“he says”], rather than φασί [“they say”], thus turning the rest of the citation into indirect speech: but all the versions, and editors, agree in our passage on φασί, and it would be strange for Josephus to slip from direct to indirect speech midway through a citation; see Gutschmid 468.) Dios seems to distance himself from commitment to this story, which might appear more legend than history, but Josephus has to ignore this move. For him it is important to claim that Dios is drawing on *written* sources (1.106-7, 111-12); he could not acknowledge that this key item of information (the only one to mention Solomon) has no higher status than the “myths” he lampoons in 1.105.

Dios introduces Solomon in relation to a well-known city (not a nation). The label “tyrant” may be an archaism, originally meaning no more than “king” (the term used by Menander, 1.120; cf. Gutschmid 468), but its nuances would surely damage Solomon’s reputation for readers in Josephus’ day. In the Roman tradition the term “tyrant” has overwhelmingly negative connotations (e.g., Cicero, *passim*; Seneca, *Ep.* 114.24; Juvenal, *Sat.* 8.223 [of Nero]; cf. Josephus, *War* 2.84; *Apion* 2.158). That Josephus lets this pass may indicate his inattention, or his desire to preserve the archaic flavor of the source.

to Eiromos and asked to receive some from him,<sup>388</sup> and whoever could not work them out paid money to the one who solved them.<sup>389</sup> **115** Eiromos agreed and, when he was unable to solve the riddles, spent much of his money as forfeit. Later,<sup>390</sup> a certain Abdemounos, a Tyrian man, solved the riddles which had been posed, and himself propounded others;<sup>391</sup> Solomon did not solve these and so paid Eiromos back, with a considerable sum in addition.<sup>392</sup>

In this way Dios has given evidence on our behalf in relation to the above statements.<sup>393</sup>

*Menander*

**(1.18) 116** But, in addition to him, I shall present also Menander the Ephesian.<sup>394</sup> He wrote about the events which took place during the reigns of each of the kings, among both Greeks and non-Greeks, taking care to learn history from the native

<sup>388</sup> Some versions (Latin, *Anecdota*) read, “asked to receive a solution from him” (cf. variants at *Ant.* 8.147); but the sense of the passage is of an exchange of riddles. Menander depicts the story otherwise (1.120: only Solomon sends riddles). Josephus’ picture of a mutual exchange (1.111) depends on Dios alone. Dios’ version is a classic honor-competition: whoever cannot solve the riddle loses face (and money) and places the reputation of his city in jeopardy. For Dios, the honor of Tyre is salvaged by the Tyrian Abdemounos (1.115), but Josephus has already presented the outcome otherwise (1.111). Although the solution of riddles (from dreams, oracles, or the Sphinx) is a common motif in Greek legend, a riddle-competition is rare: see *Vita Aesopi* 103 (noted by Troiani 100); Briquel-Chatonnet 1992: 55-56, n.145 (with Egyptian parallels).

<sup>389</sup> A compressed way of saying (apparently) that, in an exchange, if one king did not solve the riddle while the other did, the first paid a forfeit. One may suspect that Josephus, or his source, is abbreviating a longer narrative in Dios; alternatively, Dios is abbreviating a longer version of the legend.

<sup>390</sup> Translating εἰτα δέ (*Anecdota*, followed by Niese, Thackeray, and Münster) rather than εἰτα δή (L). Gutschmid (469), Naber, and Reinach prefer εἰτα δι’ (Syncellus, “with the aid of”), which preserves Eiromos/Hiram as the subject of the rest of the sentence and, in some respects, makes better sense.

<sup>391</sup> The name of Hiram’s assistant takes various textual forms here (cf. 1.120, and the parallels in *Antiquities* 8). Menander adds the twist that he was a young boy (1.120), thus further humiliating Solomon. On his place in Tyrian history or myth, see Briquel-Chatonnet 1992: 57-58.

<sup>392</sup> Tyre thus not only levels the score, but gains the upper hand: the tenor of the text is hardly friendly to Solomon or Jerusalem. This result, an embarrassment for Josephus, has already been neutralized by his introduction in 1.111, and the mere fact that Dios names the two kings as contemporary is, for him, the most impor-

tant feature of the text.

<sup>393</sup> The conclusion stands only because of its vagueness. Only some of the “above statements” (presumably those in 1.106-11) have been confirmed by Dios, in fact only those that Josephus already derived from Dios. Others have received no support, and one, on Solomon’s superior wisdom, has been partly contradicted.

<sup>394</sup> Josephus uses the same verb (παρατίθημι, “present”) as in 1.112, keeping the forensic metaphor alive. He employs here the same citation as in *Ant.* 8.144-46, but does not admit the repetition, or that he has cited this author elsewhere (*Ant.* 8.324; 9.284-88). The citation (1.117-20) adds nothing relevant concerning Solomon beyond what has been gleaned from Dios. But the agreement of voices is powerful testimony (1.26, echoed in 1.127), and Menander is needed to calculate the interval between Solomon’s era and the founding of Carthage (1.121-25). Labelling Menander “Ephesian” (he is given no gentilic in the three passages in *Antiquities*) makes awkwardly clear that he is not himself a Phoenician (contrast the claims for the authenticity of Manetho and Berosus. 1.73, 129). If an Ephesian historian could be labelled “Greek” (a natural, if not necessary, categorization), what is said here of Menander contradicts Josephus’ earlier criticisms of Greek historians: Menander takes care to learn his facts (1.116, σπουδάζω; cf. 1.20, 24) and consults native records (1.116; cf. 1.27). Josephus here says nothing more about Menander—his date or the title of his works (cf. *Ant.* 9.283: “Annals”). This, with the unmarked citation of his work in *Apion* 1.156-58, probably suggests that Josephus is dependent on a compilation of Menander excerpts, labelling him “Ephesian” on the basis of his source. The date and identity of this Menander are uncertain. He is referred to as Pergamene by Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 37 and Clement, *Strom.* 1.114.2, but the ancient testimony is sparse: see Laqueur in *PW* 15.762; Jacoby at *FGH* 783; Stern 1.119. Most date him no earlier than the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE.

records of each.<sup>395</sup> **117** So, writing about those who reigned in Tyre and coming to the time of Eiromos, he says this:

When Abibalos died, his son Eiromos inherited his kingdom; he lived for 53 years and reigned for 34.<sup>396</sup> **118** He created the embankment for the Broad Place<sup>397</sup> and dedicated the golden pillar in the sanctuary of Zeus;<sup>398</sup> he also went in quest of timber and felled cedar trees from the mountain called Libanos for the roofs of temples.<sup>399</sup> He demolished ancient temples and built new ones,<sup>400</sup> both to Heracles and to Astarte.<sup>401</sup> **119** He initiated the “Awakening” of Heracles, in the month of Peritios,<sup>402</sup> when he launched a campaign against

*Menander on  
Hiram and  
Solomon*

<sup>395</sup> The language echoes 1.27, and the notion of “learning” history matches the ethos of 1.37-42. Menander’s style seems to have been to record events and achievements reign by reign (as here, 1.117-20 and in *Ant.* 9.284-88; below, at 1.121-25, Josephus simply removes the “events”). We cannot tell how comprehensive Menander’s work was, in chronological or geographical range, but the claim here is suspiciously vague. Gutschmid (470-71) suggests that he wrote, in fact, only on the Phoenician cities. Strangely, Josephus does not here repeat from *Antiquities* the more specific claim that Menander translated the Tyrian archives (*Ant.* 8.144; 9.283); that would have strengthened the general claim of 1.107. On the nature of the Tyrian records, see the skeptical comments by van Seters 1983: 195-99.

<sup>396</sup> The citation extends to 1.120, but is given no closure. It corresponds, with minor variations, to the text cited in *Ant.* 8.144-46. Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* 3.22 extracted this first phrase as a preface to his use of 1.121-25; textually, he constitutes our earliest evidence for this material, but he, or his textual tradition, has corrupted many names and dates (see R. Grant 1970). On Eiromos (for the variant spellings of his name see Gutschmid 471-72) or Hiram I, see Katzenstein 1973: 77-115. 53 years is his total life-span, and includes his 34 years as king.

The similarities and differences between Menander and Dios in their accounts of this reign do not follow a clear enough pattern (of expansion or abbreviation) to be able to determine if one is dependent on the other. They may have drawn independently from a range of Tyrian traditions (Gutschmid 463, 472), but we do not know if Josephus, or his source, cited both in full.

<sup>397</sup> It is not clear if this is the same set of earthworks noted by Dios (1.113) or a different project, a harbour market, created in the city (Katzenstein 1973: 16). It is hardly the causeway connecting the island city to the mainland (*pace* Thackeray ad loc.); that was built by Alexander during his siege of Tyre (332 BCE).

<sup>398</sup> Herodotus (2.44) refers to a pair of pillars, one golden, the other emerald, in the temple of Heracles in Tyre (cf. Pliny, *Nat.* 37.45). It is unlikely that there were golden pillars in two temples, and the use of different

names of Gods probably reflects different ways of explaining Tyrian religion in Greek terms. The Phoenician God Ba’al could be interpreted as the Greek Zeus (see note to “offerings” at 1.113), but his manifestation in Tyre as Melkart was frequently taken to be the equivalent of Heracles (e.g., Arrian, *Anab.* 2.16; Diodorus 20.14.1). Menander seems to combine both traditions (or may intend to correct Herodotus). The fame of this pillar encouraged Judean legend to recount it as a gift from Solomon (Eupolemus *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.34.18; Theophilus *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.34.19; see Wacholder 1974: 217-23). Josephus knows both these authors, at least by name (*Apion* 1.216, 218), but makes no allusion to this tradition.

<sup>399</sup> “In quest of” follows the Eusebian tradition, ἐπί τε (with Gutschmid 473, Niese, Thackeray, Reinach and Münster), rather than ἔπειτα (“then”) or ἔτι δέ (“and also,” in *Ant.* 8.145, adopted here by Naber). The tradition parallels Dios (1.113), but its more specific mention of “roofs” fits Josephus’ introduction better (1.110, although a different Greek term is used). But the following sentence indicates that Menander was thinking of temples in Tyre, not Solomon’s in Jerusalem.

<sup>400</sup> Reading καινῶν, with Niese minor, Reinach, and Münster. Ἰερῶν καὶ ναούων (“and sanctuaries”; singular, καὶ ναόν, *Ant.* 8.145, Eusebius) is otherwise corrected as καινούων ναούων (“new sanctuaries”) by Dindorf, Thackeray, and Naber. It is possible that Menander had one version of the phrase and Josephus another; see Gutschmid 473-75. In antiquity, it was hard to justify the demolition of temples unless they were replaced with new and better ones (cf. 2.253-54).

<sup>401</sup> On Heracles as the Greek interpretation of Melkart, see above note to “Zeus.” Astarte (Ashtoreth) was well-known in the Greek world in her own right.

<sup>402</sup> The Greek term here translated “Awakening” (ἔγερσις) was understood by the Latin translator, and by many translators since, as meaning the “erection” of a temple (to Heracles); so, e.g., Whiston and Thackeray. But it is not clear why Heracles’ temple should be so singled out (L wrongly adds a reference to Astarte’s as well; see Gutschmid 476-77) nor why it should be dated so precisely. Menander is probably referring to the institution of an annual festival of the “Awakening” of

the Itycaioi,<sup>403</sup> since they did not pay their tribute, and after subduing them returned home.<sup>404</sup> **120** During his reign there lived Abdemounos, a young boy, who always mastered the problems which Solomon, the king of Hierosolyma, used to set.<sup>405</sup>

*Kings after Hiram*

**121** The period from this king to the founding of Karchedon [Carthage] is calculated in this way:<sup>406</sup> When Eiromos died, his son Baalbazeros inherited the kingdom; he lived for 43 years and reigned for 17.<sup>407</sup> **122** After him came his son Abdastartos, who lived for 29<sup>408</sup> years and reigned for 9. The four<sup>409</sup> sons of his nurse plotted

the God (cf. Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 392d-e; 1 Kgs 18:27-28); see Gutschmid 474-75. Marcus translates accordingly at *Ant.* 8.146. Katzenstein 1973: 92-93 demurs and reverts to the older interpretation, but the “parallel” text he cites includes the term “building,” which is absent here. The month of Peritios (in the Macedonian calendar) is February-March.

<sup>403</sup> The name of this rebel people is variously spelled in the versions of this text, here and in *Ant.* 8.146. It is impossible to be sure what Menander or Josephus wrote, and scholars are divided between those who reconstruct a reference to “Kitioi” (inhabitants of Kitium in Cyprus, an early colony of Tyre; see Katzenstein 1973: 84-86 and Stern 1.122, with reference to earlier scholars) and those who follow Gutschmid (479) in reconstructing Ἰτυκαιοίς (so Niese, Reinach, Thackeray and Münster), a reference to the colony of Utica in North Africa, well-known to Romans because of its part in the Carthaginian wars.

<sup>404</sup> Eiromos is portrayed as the pious and victorious conqueror of upstart subjects in the Tyrian empire (cf. Elulaios in *Ant.* 9.284). The material is irrelevant to Josephus, though harmless to his cause. But the tenor of this portrayal is hardly likely to support Josephus’ claim that Eiromos was worsted by Solomon (1.111).

<sup>405</sup> Variants in the name of this character abound, as at 1.115 (Gutschmid 469, 479). His designation “young boy” (lit. “younger boy”) twists the knife: the problems set by the king of Jerusalem are solved (lit. “defeated”) by a youth. Dios (1.114-15) did not include this detail, but did place this story in the context of an exchange of riddles between the kings. Menander sets no background at all, and thus has not even a temporary loss by Eiromos. We are a long way from Josephus’ version of events in 1.111.

<sup>406</sup> As he had with Manetho (1.94-103), Josephus follows his citations with a chronological table connecting a Judean person/event with an event widely recognized to be ancient. In both cases he excerpts from a much longer narrative simply the king-names and reign-dates, risking the tedium of unfamiliar names and figures for the sake of a “scholarly” appearance of chronological accuracy. In this case, the nearest forward date he can reckon to be familiar is the founding of Carthage, thus necessitating the listing of 10 kings

(1.121-25). (In *Ant.* 8.62 he had dated the construction of the temple backwards by reference to the founding of Tyre, 240 years earlier, but to repeat that here would make Judeans appear comparatively young, not ancient.) He does not admit that what follows is précis, but our suspicion that with each king Menander had a brief résumé of events somewhat like 1.117-20 is confirmed by the fuller material concerning Ithobalos (1.123) in *Ant.* 8.324. The procedure seems to have been simple enough, as Josephus had only to extract the first line of each chapter (cf. 1.117), where Menander gave the reign-length of each king. There is no good reason to doubt that Josephus’ figures originally added up to his total of 155 years and 8 months (1.126). But the various versions of this passage include several variants, which arose where numbers were put in alphabetical figures. I here note only the most significant variants. For full discussion, and methodological proposals, see Dochhorn 2001.

<sup>407</sup> For the variants on this and each name in the following list, see the apparatus in Niese and Münster, and discussion by Gutschmid ad loc. It is often impossible to tell what was in Josephus’ original text, and what in Menander (not necessarily the same thing). Editors are divided as to whether to read 17 years (with Theophilus and the Eusebian tradition) or 7 (with L, Latin and Anecdota); most read 17 (Niese, Thackeray, Reinach, Münster; cf. Gutschmid 480). Since we have no other evidence concerning this and most other kings in this list, we are dependent on Menander/Josephus for their dating. Working back from the (generally accepted) date of the foundation of Carthage in 814/813 BCE (see note to “Carchedon” at 1.125), Baalbazeros’ reign would date to ca. 935–ca. 919 BCE (Katzenstein 1973: 121-22).

<sup>408</sup> With L and Münster, and against the Eusebian tradition (reading 39, followed by Niese and Thackeray). As Gutschmid (480-81) pointed out, if he lived for 39 years he would have been born when his father was 13; though it is not clear that Josephus would have noticed his anomaly, it must be a corruption of Menander. His 9-year reign would fall in the period ca. 919–ca. 910 BCE (Katzenstein 1973: 126-27).

<sup>409</sup> The Greek in all the traditions reads oddly: “four (Synellus: three) sons ... the older of them” (πρεσβύ-



against him and killed him, and the oldest of them Methousastartos, the son of Deleastartos, reigned;<sup>410</sup> he lived for 54 years and reigned for 12. **123** After him was his brother Astharymos, who lived for 54 years and reigned for 9; he was killed by his brother Phelles, who seized the kingdom and reigned for 8 months,<sup>411</sup> having lived for 50 years. Ithobalos, the priest of Astarte,<sup>412</sup> killed him; he lived for 48 years<sup>413</sup> and reigned for 32. **124** He was succeeded by his son Balezoros, who lived for 45 years and reigned for 6.<sup>414</sup> **125** His successor was his son Mettenos, who lived for 32 years and reigned for 29.<sup>415</sup> His successor was Pygmalion Phygmalion,<sup>416</sup> who lived for 56 years and reigned for 47. It was in the seventh year of his reign that his sister fled and built in Libya the city of Karchedon [Carthage].<sup>417</sup> **126** The

τερος). Niese emends this last to “the oldest” (πρεσβύτατος). Gutschmid (481) emends the number to “two” (δύο), from “four” (Greek: δ’), but it is likely that something is missing from Menander’s version here.

<sup>410</sup> Following Theophilus and Latin, with Niese (see pp.xi-xiii), Thackeray, Reinach and Münster (cf. Katzenstein 1973: 127-28, thus dating Methousastartos’ reign to ca. 909–ca. 898 BCE). But L reads differently, giving no name or reign date for this “elder” brother: “the elder of them reigned; after them (μεθ’ οὐς) Astartos, son of Delaiastartos, who lived for 58 years and reigned for 12.” The Eusebian tradition (followed by Naber) is similar, but corrects the plural “after them” to the singular “after him” (μεθ’ οὐ). These are probably misreadings of the unfamiliar name Methousastartos, but Gutschmid suggests (481-82) that Menander declined to give the name of an upstart “son of a nurse,” but indicated that a puppet king, Astartos, reigned concurrently for those 12 years (“and the elder of them reigned; alongside him (μεθ’ οὐ) reigned Astartos ...”). See the full discussion in Dochhorn 2001: 95-100, supporting the text translated here, as what Josephus (though not what Menander) wrote.

<sup>411</sup> Here and at 1.126, Anecdota reads “18 months,” but editors unanimously follow the better reading, “8 months.” This is the only reference to months in the list, which makes it, and the total, look impressively exact. But all the other figures have presumably been rounded up or down (contrast the figures in Manetho, 1.94-102).

<sup>412</sup> The Eusebian tradition, oddly, records him as “king of Astarte” (as if the latter were a people or place), but his priesthood would justify his influential role in Tyrian society (cf. 1.118). This is the Ithobalos on whom Josephus cites Menander in *Ant.* 8.324. But he declines reference to that passage, or to the fact that the scriptures record this same figure (“King Ethbaal of the Sidonians”) as father of Jezebel (1 Kgs 16:31; *Ant.* 8.317; 9.138). The chronological list is best left uninterrupted, and neither reference to his earlier use of Menander, nor mention of the “idolatrous” queen

Jezebel, would suit Josephus’ rhetoric at this point. On Ethbaal’s reign (ca. 887–ca. 856 BCE), see Katzenstein 1973: 129-66.

<sup>413</sup> There are textual problems again. Latin and the Eusebian tradition support this figure, 48 (read by Niese, Thackeray, and Münster), which is to be preferred over L’s 68 (followed by Gutschmid 484-85, Naber, and Reinach) even though it would make Ithobalos father a son, Balezoros, aged 9. That is a problem probably unnoticed by Josephus.

<sup>414</sup> The text-traditions vary between 6 (L), 7 (Theophilus), 8 (Eusebius), and 18 years (Anecdota), but most editors follow L, as the only figure that fits the total in 1.126 (see Gutschmid 484). Katzenstein reads 26 here and 9 (not 29) for Mettenos, in order to align these dates with a notice of tribute from Tyrian kings from the annals of Shalmanezzer III, regarding the year 841 BCE (1973: 118-120). But it is methodologically dubious to alter Josephus’ text to fit an externally dated event: if his text is historically incorrect, it should remain so (see Dachhorn 2001: 85-87, 93).

<sup>415</sup> 29 is read by Theophilus and Eusebius (followed by Niese, Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster). L and Latin read 9 (followed by Naber and Katzenstein, 1973: 119).

<sup>416</sup> The variants are numerous and not easily unraveled (see Gutschmid and Münster ad loc.): as Gutschmid suggests (486), the name may have been doubled (giving both Greek and Phoenician versions) already in the text of Menander.

<sup>417</sup> We come at last to the event by which the chronology can be anchored, and thus the end of the list. Phoenician-Greek tradition knew this sister as Elissa (Justin, *Epitome* 8.4-6; Menander surely named her), but she was known to Romans also as Dido (the Latin translation here supplies the name); see Velleius Paterculus 1.6.4; and, most influentially, Virgil, *Aeneid* books 1 and 4. Josephus gives no aid to Roman readers in naming this famous woman, but did not need to. Most authors in antiquity followed Timaeus (*apud* Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.74) in dating



*Chronological calculation*

*Conclusions*

whole period from the reign of Eiromos to the founding of Karchedon adds up to 155 years, 8 months;<sup>418</sup> since the sanctuary in Hierosolyma was built in the twelfth year of his reign,<sup>419</sup> there were 143 years, 8 months between the building of the sanctuary and the founding of Karchedon.<sup>420</sup> **127** What need is there to add further evidence from the Phoenicians?<sup>421</sup> It may be seen that the truth is a matter of strong agreement<sup>422</sup> and that,<sup>423</sup> of course, the arrival of our ancestors in the land long preceded the construction of the sanctuary. For it was when they had conquered the whole land through warfare that they constructed the sanctuary.<sup>424</sup> I have clearly

the foundation of Carthage to 38 years before the first Olympiad (that is, 814/813 BCE); cf. Cicero, *Resp.* 2.42. One dissenting voice was that of Pompeius Trogus (in Justin, *Epitome* 18.6.9), who suggested 825 BCE. On both counts this was some time (61 or 73 years) before the founding of Rome (752/751 BCE), thus giving Solomon, in Josephus' calculation, an antiquity sure to impress Roman readers.

<sup>418</sup> This figure is secure in the textual tradition, and constitutes the total of all the reign years from (and including) Eiromos to Pygmalion, minus the 40 years after the flight of Pygmalion's sister. The reign dates given above (following the Niese-Thackeray-Reinach-Münster consensus) tally with this total, but do not represent any one textual tradition; all appear to be corrupt, in varying ways. On the methodology, see Gutschmid 485-86; Green 1983: 382-87; Dochhorn 2001.

<sup>419</sup> It is not at all clear whence Josephus derived this figure, and he does not divulge his rationale. 1 Kgs 6.38 (cf. LXX 3 Kgdms 6:1) records that the temple was finished in the 11<sup>th</sup> year of *Solomon's* reign, while in *Ant.* 8.62 Josephus says it was begun in the 11<sup>th</sup> year of Eiromos' reign. Here the context and calculation require the 12<sup>th</sup> year to be that of Eiromos' reign, but the figure is certainly not derived from Menander or Dios, who do not mention Solomon's temple at all (*pace* Stern 1.122). Gutschmid (488-89; followed by Katzenstein 1973: 82-83) suggested that Josephus found in the Tyrian annals a reference to the building of the temples of Astarte and Melkart/Heracles in the 11<sup>th</sup> year of Eiromos' reign. On this theory, in *Ant.* 8.62 Josephus applied that figure to the building of Solomon's temple, while here he added another year, to make it the 12<sup>th</sup>. This seems to take over-seriously Josephus' assertion that his claims are based on material "in the Tyrian records" (1.108; cf. Green 1983: 380-82). It would be simpler to conclude that Josephus misremembered, or misused, 1 Kgs 6:38 (or LXX 3 Kgdms 6:1) in two different ways: first, in thinking it referred to the 11<sup>th</sup> year of Eiromos' reign (*Ant.* 8.62), then in turning 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> as the (finishing?) date for the temple. Some such mental calculation, based on a biblical source, would explain why Josephus offers no source or explanation

for this figure, despite its influence on his conclusion (cf. 1.108; Dochhorn 2001: 91-92).

<sup>420</sup> Thus we reach the "proof" of the claim first announced in 1.108. It is characteristic of Josephus that he should wish to date, in particular, the temple, rather than the life or reign of Solomon. From other passages we can detect that his preferred chronological framework relates events to the history of the temple, in its various forms (see, e.g., *War* 6.269-70, 437-42; *Ant.* 8.61-62). He has no other, and no universal, chronological scheme by which to place the founding of Carthage (and the construction of the temple) in relation to other events, for instance, Danaus' migration to Argos, or the Trojan War (1.103-4). Thus his first two dating projects (of the exodus and of Solomon's temple) appear uncoordinated, except in purveying a general impression of great antiquity.

<sup>421</sup> The "evidence" theme ends this segment as it began (1.106); cf. the conclusions to the two neighbouring segments (1.104, 160). The rhetorical question (a technique used sparingly in this work) answers itself, but there is reason to doubt that Josephus had anything more "Phoenician" to add, in any case. The two overlapping sources, with their limited references to Solomon, will have to suffice, but are presented as more than sufficient (cf. 1.215).

<sup>422</sup> The agreement referred to could be that between the Phoenician sources and the Judean records (cf. 1.128, 160; *Ant.* 8.55-56). But Josephus has made no explicit reference to the latter as yet—though he will do in the next sentence. It could also refer to that between the two Phoenician sources, whose rough agreement is evident, despite differences of detail. In either case, the point would echo 1.26.

<sup>423</sup> Reading προάγειν (infinitive, dependent on βλέπεται, "it may be seen") with Anecdota, followed by Niese, Reinach, and Münster. Alternatively, L E S and Eusebius read προάγει (the start of a new clause, followed by Gutschmid 490, Naber, and Thackeray).

<sup>424</sup> Josephus wishes to antedate the existence of "our ancestors" beyond the earliest limit of the Phoenician evidence. Hence this further vague assertion, echoing references to "our ancestors" in 1.91, 103. Elsewhere, Josephus gives a very precise figure for the

demonstrated these things on the basis of the sacred books in the *Ancient History*.<sup>425</sup>

*Chaldean Evidence (1.128-60): Reading Options*

Josephus' Chaldean segment (1.128-60) constitutes the third and last of the non-Greek testimonies and, as with Egypt, draws on only one author. After a lengthy introduction (1.128-34), Josephus cites part of Berossus' account of the life of Nebuchadnezzar (1.135-41), and mentions supplementary evidence (1.142-45), before giving a précis of Babylonian chronology to the time of Cyrus (1.146-53). In its structure, this segment thus mirrors exactly the procedure employed in its two predecessors: citation is followed by a chronological outline that relates the narrative to an event or person recognizable to Josephus' readers. The only significant difference is the addition of cross-references to "Phoenician records" in 1.143-44, 155-58; these enable the conclusion that the non-Greek sources agree among themselves, and thus agree, in common, with Judean sources (1.159-60).

Josephus could presume instant recognition of the label "Chaldean" among his *Roman readers*. In first century Rome the term denoted, primarily, a type of "astrologer" presumed to draw on ancient Babylonian traditions, and known to specialize in horoscopes and predictions of death (Cramer 1954: 68-69, 72, 131-44). Josephus is aware of this connection (see 1.129), but also mirrors the ambiguity in Rome as to whether the term "Chaldean" denotes an ethnic group, a special profession (of priests or philosophers), or an astrological tradition (cf., e.g., Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.1.6; Cicero, *Div.* 1.2). Although Chaldean astrology was suspect to those who doubted all forms of divination (e.g., Cicero, *Div.* book 2; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.554-64), and although "Chaldeans" and other astrologers were occasionally the target of repression by nervous Roman governments (Valerius Maximus 1.3.3 [expulsion in 139 BCE]; cf. Cramer 1954: 248-81 on subsequent imperial legislation), their predictions were widely sought and respected, as they were believed to be founded on accurate observation and extremely ancient calculation of planetary movement (Diodorus 2.29-31; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.22: *genus hominum ... quod in civitate nostra et vetabitur semper et retinebitur*). Roman readers who gave even partial credence to the belief that the Babylonians had preserved "extremely ancient records" (1.130)—one tradition suggested they stretched back almost half a million years (Cicero, *Div.* 2.97; Diodorus 2.31.9; Pliny, *Nat.* 7.57)—would thus be inclined to treat this segment with some respect.

It appears that Roman readers also had some interest in the city of Babylon, even if it was outside the Roman Empire, and conceived to be a once great city now largely in ruins. The fame of its walls, its temples and its "hanging gardens" lingered long in Hellenistic and Roman imagination, together with accounts of the decisive moments when the city had been captured (after Herodotus 1.178-87, see, e.g., Diodorus 2.7-10; Pliny, *Nat.* 6.30.121-22; Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.1.5; Curtius Rufus 5.1.16-39). Thus, although Berossus himself was largely unknown to Roman readers (see note to "Chaldean" at 1.129), and although much of the material here cited, including

interval between the exodus and the construction of the temple: at *Apion* 2.19 he gives the figure of 612 years (cf. *Ant.* 20.230), while in *Ant.* 8.61 he cites 592 years (cf. *Ant.* 7.68). It is not clear why Josephus did not offer one or another figure here, but the vagueness means he does not have to explain why it took so long to conquer the land and construct a temple.

<sup>425</sup> The appeal is to the extended narrative of *Antiquities* books 5-8, not just the calculation given at *Ant.* 8.61-62. That the earlier work is based on "the sacred books" (cf. 1.1, 54) lends it authority. Since doubt concerning the credibility of *Antiquities* is the first reason

cited for the present work (1.1-2), Josephus can hardly refer back to that work as the *basis* for his present argument. Thus he rarely mentions it after the introduction (otherwise only at 1.54, and here in book 1; then at 2.136, 287), although his material often builds on, or even repeats, the earlier work (not least in this Phoenician segment; see Introduction, § 2). In this context, the main proof is established on the basis of non-Judean sources, and this supplementary point carries little argumentative weight. But the comment indicates that Josephus has conceded nothing to his critics.

(once again) the lists of names and dates, must have appeared alien and tedious to Roman readers, the account of the construction of Babylon (1.139-41) could have revived attention. What is more, the main story line, of kings, battles and conquests, is recognizably “historical” in genre, even if the reference to the flood (1.130) looks suspiciously “mythical.”

Beyond the issue of credibility, however, lies the question of the image of Judeans. In the Egyptian and Phoenician sections, Josephus had been able to present his ancestors in culturally heroic terms (as conquerors of Egypt, or intellectuals of international standing), but here his source’s reference to the Judeans is unavoidably deprecatory—as captives of a Babylonian king. Although Josephus’ mention of the rebuilding of the temple helps mitigate this dishonor, the retelling of this story after 70 CE would surely reinforce Roman perceptions of a people repeatedly conquered by superior world empires (cf. 2.125-34). This is a price Josephus has to pay: he has no more honorific Chaldean testimony to cite.

For *Judean readers* of this segment, much would be familiar from their own scriptural traditions: the Babylonian captivity and subsequent refounding of the temple under Cyrus were topics prominent in the scriptural histories (2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Jeremiah, etc.) and recycled in many subsequent forms (the Book of Daniel; the Aramaic *Prayer of Nabonidus* [4Q242]; 4 Ezra, etc.). A Judean reader familiar with these scriptures could certainly insert figures such as Daniel and Ezra into Josephus’ Babylonian narratives, as Josephus himself does in his *Antiquities*, and the claimed agreement between all the sources here strongly affirms the historicity of the Judean records. Unlike the citations from Manetho, little here is at odds with the scriptural account, while Josephus’ careful insertion of references to the temple (1.132) places this Chaldean material on a grid recognizable to all Judeans. But what would it mean for Judeans to read this account of the temple’s destruction and subsequent rebuilding, at a time when the temple has again been destroyed? In the former case, after a span of merely two generations, the conquering empire was itself defeated, and the temple rebuilt under a new regime. Could the retelling of this narrative suggest, in some minds, a parallel with their own historical situation (cf. 2 Baruch) and a comparable hope? Josephus’ comments elsewhere (*Ant.* 4.314) suggest such a reading is not impossible.

*Early Christian readers* showed some interest in this segment of *Apion*, though it appeared to them valuable less as a proof of antiquity than as a point of co-ordination between biblical and Babylonian chronologies. Theophilus, who uses Josephus’ Egyptian and Phoenician segments in *Ad Autolyicum* 3.20-22, makes no reference to this Chaldean material in that context: it could hardly compare with them as evidence of great antiquity, since it stretches back no further than about 50 years before Cyrus. But he does deploy this material (without acknowledging Josephus) as a tail-piece to his argument (3.29), where the emphasis lies on the harmony between biblical and Babylonian accounts. Tertullian (*Apol.* 19) makes the barest mention of Berossus, but declines to go into “tedious” detail: with a rhetorician’s training, he senses that Josephus’ material would try the patience of even sympathetic readers. But other Christian writers also had independent access to Berossus (perhaps via the excerpts in Alexander Polyhistor), and both Tatian (*Ad Gr.* 36) and Julius Africanus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10) use the account of Nebuchadnezzar’s capture of Jerusalem to align Hebrew and Babylonian chronologies; in the latter case, by dating Cyrus to the 55<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, Africanus also co-ordinates them both with the Greek chronological schema. Eusebius deploys both tactics, citing Berossus both through, and independently of, Josephus. In *Praep. ev.* 9.40, he cites chosen sections from this segment, complete with Josephus’ interpretation of the material, but never identifies these as deriving from Berossus: since this book is about *Greek* writers who mention the Hebrews, he does not declare the identity of Josephus’ source, but attributes it all to Josephus. He can then supplement it with a lengthy citation from another “Greek” account of the Babylonian empire, taken from Abydenus (9.41; contrast the passing mention of “Chaldean” evidence in 10.13.13). On the other hand, Chaldean material constitutes the major opening section of Eusebius’ *Chronicon*, where he cites large sections of Berossus, derived from Alexander Polyhistor, together with a lengthy citation from Abydenus, and the whole of our segment from Josephus’ *Apion* (*Chron.* 21.3-25.25). Thus, Josephus’ researches, including his chronological calculations, played some part in inspiring an important intellectual endeavor among early Christians. But the latter also developed their own

tools and discovered their own resources to construct a far more comprehensive chronological database.

*Scholarly interest* in this segment has been limited. We are extremely fortunate to know from cuneiform inscriptions much more about Nebuchadnezzar and his successors than can be deduced from Berosus here (see, e.g., Wiseman 1956 and 1985; for a full listing of primary sources, see Labow 2005: 129, n.21). His work is thus of interest chiefly for his presentation of Babylonian history in the new conditions of the Seleucid kingdom (see Schnabel 1923; Burstein 1978; Kuhrt 1987). The fragments that Josephus cites here can be placed in some relation to the other, often fuller, material utilized by Eusebius, but our text provides nothing beyond what Josephus had already used in *Antiquities* 10, and the excerpts from Berosus are too brief to enable us to build a satisfactory profile of Berosus' "apologetic historiography" (Sterling 1992: 104-17).

*My own reading* highlights the subtle struggle for power in the deployment of cultural traditions. As in the previous two segments, Josephus exploits the cultural potency of his non-Greek source, in this case the "Chaldean" reputation for the preservation of ancient records. He has scavenged a single reference to "Judeans" in a Chaldean source, and cannot avoid the negative image it portrays of Judeans as captives. But in Josephus' calculus, the honor of this mention by a reputable source outweighs the dishonor of the narrative itself: a passing and dismissive reference to "Judeans" can be made a central pillar in the defense of Judean honor. Underlying this tactic is a quiet submission to specifically Greek cultural requirements: it is only because Berosus wrote for Greeks that Josephus can use him at all, and his reputation among Greeks is, for Josephus, a key aspect of his accreditation (1.130). Josephus thus constructs from Berosus' pride in the history of Babylon, and from the demands of hellenistic culture, a vigorous defense of the Judeans' international significance: foreign cultural traditions are re-employed to serve Judean interests.

As in the Phoenician segment, almost all the source material here is recycled from *Antiquities*, though this tactic is never acknowledged, for rhetorical reasons. Josephus again has to suggest, in introduction and interpretative comment, what he most wants readers to find in this source, providing the commentarial "voice-over" in repeated references to the Jerusalem temple, on which Berosus is notably silent. There is less conflict with his source here than with the Egyptian and Phoenician evidence: but we shall note his determined efforts to make Berosus the mouthpiece for his own assertions.

Since the main sub-theme of this segment is the agreement between sources, it is important to note that Josephus always insists that others' sources agree with "ours," not the other way around. Even while foregrounding non-Judean histories, the touchstone remains the Judean scriptures. Similarly, in co-ordinating different chronological schemes, Josephus calibrates others' traditions in relation to what he and his Judean tradition consider the central events—the history of the Jerusalem temple. Josephus is eager to find a common chronological scheme, but it will be anchored by the pivotal moments in Judean history—the destruction and rebuilding of the temple—even though these are ignored by the Chaldean and Phoenician sources cited here. As post-colonial studies show, the writing of history is of decisive significance in cultural negotiations: Josephus here struggles to make his tradition the grid to which others' historical schemes conform.

**(1.19) 128** I shall now straightaway describe what is recorded and reported concerning us among the Chaldeans;<sup>426</sup> there is considerable agreement on this as on other

*Chaldean  
evidence*

<sup>426</sup> Josephus makes nothing more here of his claim that Judeans have Chaldean ancestry (1.71); the Chaldean sources he uses betray no recognition of such a relationship. The Chaldean evidence comes third in accordance with the historical sequence of the events recorded; this arrangement also allows cross-reference to Phoenician records (1.143, 155-58), the subject of

the previous segment. The use of the term "recorded" (ἀναγεγραμμένα) recalls the heavy use of γραμμ-terminology in the previous segment (see note to "care" at 1.107) and the emphasis on Chaldean "records" in 1.28. Here Josephus makes little more of this point beyond the references to "records" in 1.130, 143. For once, Josephus' claim that the records concern "us"



*Berosus*

points between these sources and our writings.<sup>427</sup> **129** As witness to this stands Berosus,<sup>428</sup> a Chaldean by descent,<sup>429</sup> but well-known to those engaged in learning, since he published for the Greeks works on astronomy and on the subjects of philosophical inquiry among the Chaldeans.<sup>430</sup> **130** Now this Berosus, following the most ancient records,<sup>431</sup> gave an account, like Moses, of the flood and the destruction in

(the Judean people) is justified: his source actually mentions Ἰουδαῖοι (1.137).

<sup>427</sup> The notion of agreement between sources, adumbrated in 1.127, harks back to the principle of 1.26 and becomes the *Leitmotif* of this Chaldean segment: see 1.130, 143-44, 154, 160. The two dimensions—agreement among non-Judean sources, and agreement between them and Judean scriptures—coalesce in the conclusion at 1.160. This motif in fact eclipses that of the Judeans’ “antiquity,” partly because the historical references here (7<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE) are not particularly ancient, and partly, perhaps, in the hope that if Judean sources can be proved accurate at this point, their historical value is bolstered in general. Only at the very end, in 1.160, does Josephus mention the theme of “the antiquity of our nation” (on the reference to Noah see note to “race” at 1.130). Josephus does not here attempt to claim, as he had in *Ant.* 1.158, that Berosus made mention of Abraham. That would have been an even more spectacular proof of antiquity than that afforded in the Egyptian and Phoenician segments. But the claim was speculative—Berosus’ “just man” is, Josephus acknowledged, not named as Abraham—and perhaps judged too weak to mount here. But he perhaps has Abraham in mind in the reference here to “other points.”

<sup>428</sup> Greek: Βηρώσος or Βηρωσσός. Josephus knows the title and number of books in his work (1.142), but probably had access to him only through the excerpts he found in Alexander Polyhistor (see Gutschmid 492 and Schnabel 1923: 166-68). Josephus had referred to him on several occasions in *Antiquities* (1.93, 107, 158; 10.20, 34, 219-26), and here re-uses the Noah and Nebuchadnezzar material, adding (in *Apion* 1.146-53) a précis of the material he had foreshortened and not attributed in *Ant.* 10.229-32. A comparison of *Apion* 1.143-44 with *Ant.* 10.227-28 suggests that Josephus also had access to a compendium of material on Nebuchadnezzar, probably joined by Alexander Polyhistor to his Berosus-citation on this king. Berosus (ca. 330-250 BCE) was a contemporary of Alexander the Great and dedicated his history of Babylonia to Antiochus I (324-262 BCE). He may have been a priest of Marduk-Bel (Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 36) and certainly had good access to cuneiform records. Like Manetho, his native history was designed to impress the new hellenistic rulers of his country, but his precise cultural and political purposes are a matter of speculation, given

the fragmentary state of his work (see Kuhrt 1987: 48-56 and Sterling 1992: 115-17). The fragments are gathered by Jacoby in *FGH* 680 (and translated by Burstein 1978 and Verbrugge & Wickersham 1996, each with different numbering systems; I here follow Jacoby). Josephus continues to use “witness” language (cf. 1.74, 112), though the legal metaphor is not prominent in this segment until its conclusion (1.160).

<sup>429</sup> Cf. the claim for Manetho in 1.73, giving authenticity to their testimony. Josephus prefers to use the label “Chaldean” rather than “Babylonian” (also for the title of Berosus’ work, 1.142). He appears to understand the term as an ethnic and geographical label (cf. *Ant.* 1.144-46, 151-59), but is also aware of its usage in the Greco-Roman world as a label for astrologers (cf. *War* 2.112; *Ant.* 10.194-99, echoing Daniel), and alludes to that reputation in this section.

<sup>430</sup> The context indicates that the learning (παιδεία) here is specifically “Greek” (cf. 1.73). Despite the animus in 1.6-27, Josephus is beholden in certain decisive respects to Greek culture and constructs his readers as people conversant with that tradition (cf. 1.16, 51). Here Berosus’ publication of works for Greeks seems to signal not just how he happens to be known, but also why he is culturally important; his work is somewhat parallel to Josephus’ own writings, publishing native traditions for hellenized readers. It is notable that Josephus does *not* say that he is well-known as a historian, and our few testimonia (see *FGH* T 1-11) indicate that his rather meager reputation was chiefly as an astrologer (see, e.g., Seneca, *Nat.* 3.29.1; Pliny, *Nat.* 7.123; only Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 14.14 refers to his Babylonian history). Hence Josephus refers to “astronomy” in this introduction (cf. 1.14; “philosophy” is added to ensure its respectability; cf. Gutschmid 491). On the general reputation of Chaldeans as astrologers, see Reading Options, above. On the contested question of whether the astrological material attributed to Berosus was actually written by him, see Burstein 1978: 31-32 and Kuhrt 1987: 36-44.

<sup>431</sup> On Roman perceptions of the antiquity of Babylonian records, see Reading Options, above. Josephus’ claim is inexact, and does not include the suggestion that Berosus *translated* these records (cf. 1.73). Berosus appears to have maintained that the Babylonians had preserved with great care records spanning 150,000 years (*FGH* 680, frag. 1). If Josephus knew this claim,



it of humankind,<sup>432</sup> and of the ark in which Noah, the founder of our race,<sup>433</sup> was saved when it was carried onto the peaks of the Armenian mountains. **131** Then, listing Noah's descendants and adding their dates,<sup>434</sup> he comes to Naboupolassaros,<sup>435</sup> the king of Babylon and the Chaldeans,<sup>436</sup> **132** and while relating his exploits he describes how he sent his own son Naboukodrosorus [Nebuchadnezzar]<sup>437</sup> with a large army against Egypt and against our land, when he learned that they had rebelled,<sup>438</sup> he defeated them all and burned the sanctuary in Hierosolyma,<sup>439</sup> and ut-

*Babylonians  
and Judeans:  
précis*

its figure may have seemed too fantastic or simply wrong (cf. 1.1, 39).

<sup>432</sup> Josephus had cited Berosus on this point in *Ant.* 1.93, but here, in place of citation, makes this general claim, which supports the notion of "agreement" between the records of the two nations (1.128). We know that Berosus did relate a version of the Babylonian flood-myth (*FGH* 680, frags. 4a and 4b), though the hero there is called Xisouthros. The Greek version of the myth named the hero Deucalion, whom Philo equated with Noah (*Praem.* 23; cf. Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* 3.29). But such cultural equations were vulnerable to criticism (e.g., by Celsus *apud* Origen, *Cels.* 1.19; 4.11, 42), and it was more convenient for Josephus to leave Berosus' figure unnamed.

<sup>433</sup> Greek: ὁ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἀρχηγός. Although this segment is meant to be about references to "us" (Judeans, 1.128), it is hard to see how Noah could be said to be specifically the "founder" of the Judean nation. According to *Ant.* 1.144 the Chaldeans are numbered among the descendants of Noah (via Shem), and Josephus holds the Chaldeans to be the "founders" of the Judean people (*Apion* 1.71). But Noah's descendants included all other nations as well (see *Ant.* 1.122-47), so the claim here seems to embrace the whole human "race" (I use the term only in this neutral context). Yet, only Judean readers would recognize "Noah" as the name of this foundational figure.

<sup>434</sup> This suggests that Josephus knew Berosus' dating scheme, which we know from elsewhere (*FGH* 680, frag. 5a) as including 86 kings between the flood and the Medes' capture of Babylonia, all named and with reign-dates totalling 33,091 years. Josephus knew Berosus' age-figures were enormous (*Ant.* 1.106-7) and may have considered them too incredible to cite. The result is that he gives no indication of where to place the following historical events in a wider chronological framework; it is only later that he will connect Babylonian history to a widely known figure, Cyrus. For the moment, by simply juxtaposing Nabopalasar with Noah, he leaves the impression of great antiquity. Following his own reckoning (*Ant.* 1.82-88), he is jumping here about 1,600 years.

<sup>435</sup> Once again the texts record various versions of this name (Gutschmid 492-93; Münster ad loc.). Here and elsewhere I follow Münster's choice.

<sup>436</sup> The double formula preserves the loose association between the epithets "Babylonian" and "Chaldean" (cf. 1.133, 138), necessary to fit the "Chaldean" evidence into a Babylonian political and historical framework. Josephus now begins (1.132-33) a crucial preparatory précis of the following citation (1.135-41). As in 1.106-11, he focuses the reader on the Judean dimensions of the citation, and inserts the key data that he wishes to be heard in what follows.

<sup>437</sup> The name is variously transmitted. L (Latin) and Theophilus conform to LXX, Ναβουχοδοσοός; see Gutschmid 497-98. For the history of this famous king (605-562 BCE), see Wiseman 1985.

<sup>438</sup> This summary of 1.135, 137 profiles "our land" (presumably Judea), although it is not mentioned by Berosus himself. Its juxtaposition with Egypt suggests its historical importance, and the rebellion is described in terms general enough to accord with biblical narrative (the disloyalty of Judean kings), although Berosus himself mentions the rebellion only of a satrap (1.135). The "large army" (inflating the statement in 1.135) makes the Judeans' defeat less ignominious.

<sup>439</sup> The subject is presumably Nebuchadnezzar, but the change is not clear in the Greek, as Josephus compresses the narrative severely. At the same time, there is a strategic expansion, to include reference to the Jerusalem temple, which was apparently *never* mentioned by Berosus himself (if it had been, Josephus would surely have cited the reference). Josephus attributes mention of the temple not only here, but also at 1.145 (cf. 1.154, 160). The addition is necessary not only because Josephus considers the destruction of the temple the most important event in Nebuchadnezzar's reign, but also because it is crucial for the chronological calculations which follow (1.154, 159). On Josephus' reaction to the apparent humiliation of this event, see 2.129-32. The temple was destroyed in 587/6 BCE (Wiseman 1985: 36-39); see 2 Kings 25 with biblical parallels and *Ant.* 10.144-48 (indicating how central this event was to Josephus' understanding of history).

terly uprooted all our people, and transferred them to Babylon,<sup>440</sup> with the result that the city was deserted for seventy years until Cyrus, the first king of the Persians.<sup>441</sup> **133** He says that the Babylonian<sup>442</sup> conquered Egypt, Syria, Phoenicia, and Arabia, surpassing in his exploits all who had previously ruled over the Chaldeans and Babylonians.<sup>443</sup> **134**<sup>444</sup> I shall present Berossus' own words, which go like this:<sup>445</sup>

*Berosus on  
Nabopolassar  
and  
Nebuchadnezzar*

**135** When his father Naboupolassar<sup>446</sup> heard that the satrap appointed over Egypt and the regions of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia had rebelled,<sup>447</sup> since he was no longer able to endure the hardships himself, he appointed his son Naboukodrosoros, who was still in his prime,<sup>448</sup> over some parts of his army, and sent him out against him.<sup>449</sup> **136** Naboukodrosoros engaged the rebel, overpowered him in a pitched battle,<sup>450</sup> and brought the district again under their

<sup>440</sup> Josephus highlights the Judean captives from among those Berossus will list in 1.137, and compresses the different phases of captivity (cf. *Ant.* 10.98, 101, 149) into a single event, to match Berossus' account.

<sup>441</sup> Reading πρώτου ("the first") with Münster (and Reinach), following Eusebius. This summary covers both the citations to follow (1.135-41, 146-53), but the biblical figure of 70 years (Jer 25:12; 29:10 [=LXX 36:10]; Dan 9:2; Zech 1:12; *Ant.* 10.112, 184; 11.1; 20.233) is not justified by the later calculations (1.154, 159), and is quietly forgotten. Its inclusion here suggests how much Josephus writes this introduction in biblical mode, while claiming to say no more than Berossus. For the utter desertion of the city (excusing the failure to rebuild the temple for two generations), cf. *Ant.* 10.184.

<sup>442</sup> As in *Ant.* 10.104, 124, 131, Josephus avoids repeating the awkward name (cf. 1.142 below). Historically he might be better labelled "Chaldean" (Gutschmid 494).

<sup>443</sup> The range of places conquered mirrors 1.135, 137, with the addition of Arabia. The insistence on Nebuchadnezzar's unmatched achievements certainly goes back to Berossus, and was echoed by other historians (see 1.144). The extent of his empire might interest Roman readers, but also places the conquest of Judea in a larger context which renders the Judeans' defeat excusable. In the same vein, Josephus considered the crushing of the Judean Revolt inevitable considering the might and world-empire of Rome (cf. Agrippa's speech in *War* 2.345-401).

<sup>444</sup> I omit here (with Niese, Naber, Reinach, Thackeray, and Münster) a sentence that appears to constitute a reader's gloss: "Then again, placed a little lower down, Berossus is again cited in the history of antiquity" (in LES but not Latin or Eusebius). Niese's confidence on this matter (xiv) seems justified, despite the defense mounted by Gutschmid (494-95) and the doubts of Troiani (39-40). The gloss seems to point forward to the second citation in 1.146-53.

<sup>445</sup> The same verb, "present" (παράτιθημι) is used in the introduction to Manetho (1.93) and Dios (1.112),

though it here lacks the complement "as a witness." Josephus stresses that his citation is verbatim, which it might well be, though it is certainly not the whole of Berossus' account of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (cf. 1.142) and it may have been already compressed or excerpted by Alexander Polyhistor. Josephus does not declare that he had used the exact same citation in *Ant.* 10.220-26.

<sup>446</sup> On the spelling of this name, and that of his son, see above at 1.131-32. As victor over the Assyrians, the reign of Nabopolassar (626-605 BCE) founded what is now known as the Chaldean or neo-Babylonian empire; see Kuhrt 1995: 589-610 and Wiseman 1985: 5-7.

<sup>447</sup> In fact there was no "satrap" (a Persian term) over these territories, which were ruled independently by Necho II of Egypt (609-594 BCE). Berossus presents a clash between two rival powers as a rebellion by an appointed subordinate. It is curious that the names of key people and battle-sites (1.136) are not mentioned: it is possible that they were omitted in Polyhistor's abbreviation of this source, or that Josephus has strategically cut them out. On what Berossus might have meant by Coele-Syria (including Judea?), see Stern 1.14; Labow 2005: 138, n.54.

<sup>448</sup> One should perhaps omit "still" (so Gutschmid 498, following Latin and *Ant.* 10.220).

<sup>449</sup> On the build-up to the battle of Carchemish, as Egypt and Babylon jockeyed for power on the upper Euphrates, see Wiseman 1956: 20-23; 1985: 12-15.

<sup>450</sup> The version in *Ant.* 10.221 uses a more normal verb ("defeated," ἐκράτησε), while the best witnesses to this text have "overpowered" (ἐκυρίευσε, see Gutschmid, 499 and Münster ad loc.). This might suggest that Josephus takes this citation direct from his source (Polyhistor) rather than from his own *Antiquities*. The battle, curiously here unnamed, was at Carchemish on the Euphrates, in 605 BCE (Wiseman 1956: 23-27, 67-69; 1985: 13-15). Readers familiar with the biblical narrative would recognize the event (2 Chron 35:20; Jer 46: 2-12) and Josephus narrates it himself elsewhere (*Ant.* 10.84-86), but it suits him to keep it and its aftermath unspecified, since he wishes this and the next sec-

rule.<sup>451</sup> And it happened that at this time his father, Naboupolassaros, fell ill in the city of the Babylonians and died, having reigned for twenty-one years.<sup>452</sup> **137** When, not long after, Naboukodrosoros heard of his father's death, after he had settled affairs in Egypt and the rest of the district,<sup>453</sup> and appointed some of the Friends<sup>454</sup> to take charge of the captives—Judeans,<sup>455</sup> Phoenicians, Syrians, peoples bordering Egypt<sup>456</sup>—and to convey them to Babylon, together with the heavily-armed troops<sup>457</sup> and the rest of the spoils, he himself rushed ahead with a small escort and got to Babylon across the desert. **138** Finding affairs being administered by Chaldeans, and the kingdom being preserved by their noblest figure,<sup>458</sup> he gained mastery of his father's empire, intact. He ordered that the captives, on ar-

*Captives  
brought to  
Babylon*

tion to be heard to include the much later destruction of Jerusalem (587 BCE; see Begg and Spilsbury 2005: 290-92, n.948).

<sup>451</sup> The statement reflects the assumption of 1.135 that the territory was originally, and rightly, Babylonian; in reality, the aftermath of the battle saw the extension of the Babylonian empire at the expense of Egypt, over a period of several years (Wiseman 1956: 25-28).

<sup>452</sup> L E S read 29, but all other witnesses agree on 21, which is confirmed as historically accurate by a fragment of a chronicle (British Museum 21946), which also gives the precise day of his death (8<sup>th</sup> day of the month of Ab = 15/16<sup>th</sup> August, 605 BCE). For the Babylonian account of this battle see Wiseman 1956: 67-69.

<sup>453</sup> The Greek (τὰ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον πράγματα) could be translated “the affairs concerning Egypt”; if Berosus suggests that Nebuchadnezzar got to control Egypt, the claim is wholly unhistorical. The context here, the brief interval after Carchemish and before Nebuchadnezzar's enthronement, suggests that Berosus is referring only to events in 605 BCE (see Gutschmid 496-97). If so, the captives mentioned in this section, including the Judeans, would be prisoners captured from Necho's army at Carchemish or other garrisons (cf. Begg and Spilsbury 2005: 291, n.956), not the result of the extensive, but rather later, campaigns in Syria and Phoenicia. It is uncertain whether Berosus returned at a later point in his narrative (after his account of the rebuilding of Babylon) to the eastern campaigns of Nebuchadnezzar, including his eventual sack of Jerusalem (587 BCE). But if so, Josephus does not know that part of his work, and he has to make do with the one, passing, reference to “Judeans” to which he has access. Although he knows that the destruction of the temple did not take place until the 18<sup>th</sup> year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (1.154), his reference to that event both before (1.132) and after (1.145) this citation encourages readers to hear in this reference to Judeans and their settlement in Babylon (1.137-38) an allusion to the Babylonian conquest of Judea and Jerusalem. He had related the successive stages of subjugation of Judea in *Ant.* 10.84-150, closely following the biblical account.

He cannot find in Berosus the justification to repeat any of that narrative here.

<sup>454</sup> Here and in 1.148 φίλοι (“Friends”) is technical (Hellenistic) terminology for court advisers or officials.

<sup>455</sup> The relative insignificance of these captives is indicated by their mention in a subordinate clause (the main verb comes only at the end of the section). For Josephus, this whole segment of his work hinges on the mention of Judeans in this list of captives within this subordinate clause. Since Judea is not explicitly mentioned in the list of territories in 1.135, and since the presence of “Judeans” here is essential for Josephus' whole argument, it has been suggested (e.g., by J. Lewy) that Josephus himself has introduced the name into Berosus' text. Reinach's counter-arguments (27, n.3) are not very strong, and we have reason to suspect that Josephus does sometimes tamper with his sources (see, e.g., at 1.82, 84). Eusebius' inclusion of this reference (*Chron.* 22.18) is not independent of Josephus (*pace* Reinach), and the slightly clumsy Greek (τε καὶ ... καὶ ...) might betray the hand of Josephus. The question must remain open, but even if we trust Josephus at this point, the contrast between his perspective and the political interests of his source is striking.

<sup>456</sup> Greek: [καὶ] τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἔθνῶν. Both text and meaning are unclear. With our earliest witnesses (L E S, Latin, Eusebius) and Gutschmid 501-2, I read the phrase without the καὶ, and take it to mean “the peoples bordering Egypt,” in apposition to “Syrians,” or to the previous three names. If καὶ is added (as by Niese and Münster, on the basis of *Ant.* 10.222), an additional group is referred to, perhaps “Arabians” (Reinach 114), or “the peoples in [or related to] Egypt.”

<sup>457</sup> Marcus (at *Ant.* 10.222) and Burstein 1978: 27 translate “with the bulk of his force.” But Gutschmid (502) gives good reason to support this translation of μετὰ τῆς βαρυτάτης δυνάμεως.

<sup>458</sup> The Latin suggests the plural (*optimatibus*), but Gutschmid (503-4) defends the singular, which is followed by most editors. Again, a key figure in the story is left unnamed, perhaps to aid the implicit transposition of this story to a later date. It is not clear whether Berosus represented “Chaldeans” as an ethnic group or a special profession.

rival, be assigned settlements in the most suitable locations in Babylonia,<sup>459</sup> **139** and he himself lavishly decorated the temple of Bel and the other temples from the spoils of the war,<sup>460</sup> and, having examined both the existing, original city and another, to be joined to it, outside its bounds,<sup>461</sup> to ensure that besiegers should not again be able to turn back the river<sup>462</sup> and swoop down on the city,<sup>463</sup> he surrounded the inner city with three walls, and the outer city with three, the former made of baked brick and bitumen, the latter of plain brick.<sup>464</sup> **140** When he had walled the city in this remarkable way and decorated the gateways in a fashion suited to their sanctity,<sup>465</sup> he built in addition to his father's palace another palace adjoining it,<sup>466</sup> whose height<sup>467</sup> and general opulence it would perhaps take too long to describe<sup>468</sup>—except to say that, despite its extraordinary size and splendor, it

<sup>459</sup> This notice serves as an etiology for the presence of substantial western populations in Babylon, still in Berosus' day. Josephus often refers to Judeans still living in Babylonia in the first century CE (e.g., *Ant.* 17.26; 18.310-79; *Apion* 1.33).

<sup>460</sup> For Berosus, the only temples worth mentioning are the magnificent structures in his native city; the fate of the Jerusalem temple, which means so much to Josephus, is a matter of indifference. Where the Judean tradition anxiously traces the fate of the holy objects from the temple in Jerusalem (e.g., *Ant.* 10.145, 154, 233; 11.14-15), Berosus celebrates the dedication of "spoils" to Babylonian Gods. "Bel" is the Babylonian God "Marduk," whose great temple (the Esagila) adjoined the world-famous "ziggurat." See Wiseman 1985: 64-73 and Unger 1970: 165-87. For other temples in Babylon, see Unger 1970: 135-64.

<sup>461</sup> The text is patently corrupt and editors offer a wide variety of conjectures. There is full discussion in Gutschmid 506-8; Giangrande 1962: 109-14; Gianotti 2002; cf. Münster ad loc; Hansen 2001: 71-72. I here translate the Greek reconstructed by Giangrande: τὴν τε ὑπάρχουσαν ἐξ ἀρχῆς πόλιν καὶ ἑτέραν ἕξωθεν προσχωρησομένην κατανοήσας. The last two words are a matter of conjecture, influenced by the Latin, although all the versions, including Eusebius, seem to be guesswork themselves; Gianotti and others read ἀνακαινίσας ("having renewed") at the end of the clause. It is possible that something is missing (cf. Abydenus in *FGH* 685, frag. 6). Giangrande argues, probably correctly, that the "outer" city is that founded or rebuilt on the other (right) bank of the Euphrates, from where the city was previously vulnerable.

<sup>462</sup> The unusual verb (ἀναστρέφοντας) seems to view the matter from the perspective of the besieged (Giangrande 1962: 111); it amounts to a "diversion" of the river's course. The "again" suggests allusion to an earlier narrative when this tactic had been used to overrun the city.

<sup>463</sup> The Greek in L (κατασκευάζειν) is very difficult and, despite Gutschmid's defense (508, translating

"suborn the river against the city"—he envisages a damn downriver which would flood Babylon), it should probably be emended; I follow Giangrande's κατασπιλάζειν (1962: 110-12). In fact, Cyrus was to capture Babylon by diverting the river and entering via the river bed (Herodotus 1.191; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 5.9.19).

<sup>464</sup> The walls of Babylon were particularly famous in antiquity; see, e.g., Herodotus 1.178-79; Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.1.5; Diodorus 2.7; Curtius Rufus 5.1.16, though no comment is made here on their height or thickness. The ancient sources repeatedly mention brick and bitumen. By the "inner city" Berosus does not appear to mean the walls along the river (cf. 1.149 for Nabonidus' work), but the old "heart" of the city on the left bank of the river, its sturdier walls reflecting, perhaps, its higher status (cf. Gutschmid 510-12; Unger 1970: 59-63; Labow 2005: 142, n.72).

<sup>465</sup> Josephus continues to cite his source, although it has already gone well beyond what is relevant to his purpose. But the fame of the buildings in Babylon (walls, gates, palaces, gardens, bridge) could retain the interest of his readers. Bronze gateways in the walls are mentioned by Herodotus 1.179 and Abydenus (*FGH* 685, frag. 1), though Berosus may here refer to particular gates (e.g., the Ishtar gate), which were sites of special religious significance (cf. Gutschmid 512-13); for the inscriptions and ancient references, see Unger 1970: 65-75.

<sup>466</sup> For Nebuchadnezzar's palace, jutting out on the north of the city, see Wiseman 1985: 53-56; Unger 1970: 216-22.

<sup>467</sup> The text is corrupt; see Gutschmid 515-16, part of whose solution (ὦν τὰνάστημα) is adopted by Niese minor and Münster; cf. *Ant.* 10.225.

<sup>468</sup> Since Berosus' purpose is to extol Nebuchadnezzar, and to attribute to him the famous buildings of Babylon (cf. 1.142), one can suspect that here either Alexander Polyhistor (Josephus' probable source) or Josephus himself is abbreviating Berosus' account; the same sentiment is offered, but in slightly different words, in *Ant.* 10.225.



was completed in fifteen days.<sup>469</sup> **141** In this palace he built high stone terraces<sup>470</sup> and gave them a scenery closely resembling mountains, planting them with all sorts of trees, thus constructing and landscaping the so-called “hanging garden,”<sup>471</sup> because his wife, who had been raised in the region of Media, hankered after the mountain environment.<sup>472</sup>

**(1.20) 142** This is how he tells the history of the above-named king,<sup>473</sup> with much additional material, in the third book of the *Chaldaica*,<sup>474</sup> in which he censures Greek historians for wrongly thinking that Babylon was founded by the Assyrian Semiramis, and for falsely recording that the wonders constructed within it were due to her.<sup>475</sup> **143** On these matters the Chaldeans’ record must be considered trustworthy.<sup>476</sup> Besides, what is recounted in the Phoenicians’ archives<sup>477</sup> concerning the king of

*Accuracy of  
Berosus*

<sup>469</sup> The text at the beginning of this clause (“except to say ...”) is corrupt and variously reconstructed, but the general meaning is clear. The 15-day construction is related as a matter of pride in an inscription (see Unger 1970: 222), which Berosus presumably knew. Abydenus (*FGH* 685, frag. 6b) transfers the same figure to the construction of the walls.

<sup>470</sup> A plausible translation of ἀναλήματα (cf. Thackeray ad loc. and Burstein 1978: 27); Marcus at *Ant.* 10.226 translates “retaining walls”; cf. Gutschmid 518.

<sup>471</sup> Berosus played to the special Greek interest in this feature, which was counted as one of the 7 “wonders of the world” (Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.1.5; Diodorus 2.10), its engineering much discussed. Since this interest was inherited by the Romans (Curtius Rufus 5.1.31-35), Josephus is content to close his citation at this high point. For the archaeology, based on Koldewey’s excavations, see Unger 1970: 216-22 and Wiseman 1985: 56-60, with plate II.

<sup>472</sup> Diodorus 2.10 and Curtius Rufus 5.1.35 give another version (the garden was planted by a Syrian king for his Persian concubine). Nebuchadnezzar’s wife (again, oddly not named) was Amytis, the daughter of Astyges, a king of Media (cf. Berosus in *FGH* 680, frag. 7d).

<sup>473</sup> As in 1.133, Josephus avoids the difficult name (also in 1.143-44 below). Josephus breaks from his citation to allow an interval before the chronological précis (1.146-53); cf. 1.91-93, 121. He uses the interval to bolster the credibility of Berosus (by contrast with Greeks, and through confirmation from other historians, 1.142-44) and to insert another reference to the temple (1.145).

<sup>474</sup> The “additional material” may be items left out from 1.135-41 (see notes above), but also, and more particularly, the further narrative of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign, which lasted 43 years and must have been told at fuller length; on the gap in Berosus between 1.141 and 1.146 see Gutschmid 523-25. It is not clear whether Josephus knew this other material, or just knew of it

from Polyhistor. The naming of the “third book” (cf. 1.74, 144) conveys the impression of autopsy and accurate citation. The work was more commonly, and perhaps rightly, known as the *Babyloniaca* (Kuhrt 1987: 33-34) but Josephus wishes to keep “Chaldean” at the forefront of his readers’ minds. The third book covered history from Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great.

<sup>475</sup> This comment is not paralleled in *Antiquities* 10, indicating a particular strategy of this work. As in 1.73 (Manetho vs. Herodotus), Josephus uses this motif to strengthen his own censure of Greek historiography (1.6-27) and to stress its unreliability concerning non-Greek nations (1.27). At the same time, Berosus’ authority is bolstered, on the assumption that he would know (and tell) the truth on this matter (see 1.143). The Greek tradition (from Ctesias onwards) did attribute the wonders of Babylon to Semiramis (an Assyrian queen of the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE): see, e.g., Herodotus 1.184-85 (Semiramis and Nitocris); Diodorus 2.7-10; Curtius Rufus 5.1.24. Berosus’ insistence on this point may be more than simply the historian’s habit of disagreeing with predecessors (Kuhrt 1987: 53). It seems to represent a claim for Nebuchadnezzar as an unparalleled political and cultural hero. In this regard, Josephus senses Berosus to be an ally in resisting Greek versions of history.

<sup>476</sup> The question of trust is critical, as was clear at the outset (1.2; cf. 1.161). Josephus’ appeal for trust in native authors (he uses the πιστ-root, as in 1.2 and 1.112) depends on the assumption that they have followed native, ancient, and trustworthy records (cf. 1.28-29). The foundations of the whole unit 1.69-160 are here laid bare, together with its limitations. Josephus cannot do more than assert that native records “must be” trustworthy; he cannot allow the possibility that they too might be partial and propagandistic. The next sentences give support to Berosus’ account, but only at select, and very general, points.

<sup>477</sup> The vague reference prefigures the use of “Phoenician records” in 1.156-58 and links back to the previous segment (1.106-27). In the next section (1.144)



the Babylonians agrees with what is said by Berosus, that he subdued Syria and the whole of Phoenicia.<sup>478</sup> **144** Indeed, Philostratus, also, agrees on these matters when he mentions in his history the siege of Tyre,<sup>479</sup> as does Megasthenes in the fourth book of his *Indica*,<sup>480</sup> in which he tries to prove that the above-named king of the Babylonians surpassed Heracles in bravery and the scale of his exploits; for he says that he subdued most of Libya and Iberia.<sup>481</sup> **145** What was said above concerning the sanctuary in Hierosolyma—that it was burned down by the Babylonians when they invaded,<sup>482</sup> but began to be rebuilt when Cyrus succeeded to the kingdom of Asia<sup>483</sup>—will be clearly demonstrated by the statements of Berosus here presented.<sup>484</sup> **146** For this is what he says in his third book:

Josephus will reuse two of the three cross-references he had deployed in *Ant.* 10.227-28. Only two of those (Megasthenes and Philostratus) are relevant to his present concern with Nebuchadnezzar's western campaigns; in place of the third (Diocles), Josephus here includes a general reference to Phoenician "archives." If he is not making this up entirely, Josephus may be alluding to material claimed as a source by Philostratus (thus counting his material twice) or to what he knows from Menander (whom he associates with Tyrian "archives" in *Ant.* 8.144; 9.283). See further note to "well" 1.155.

<sup>478</sup> The theme of "agreement" pervades this segment (see note to "writings" at 1.128); the specific root συμφων- recurs, after here, at 1.144, 154, and 160. The subjugation of Syria and Phoenicia vaguely parallels the list of captives in 1.137, but hardly supports Josephus' specific claim about the Judeans and their temple.

<sup>479</sup> The 13-year siege of Tyre (see note to "years" at 1.156) would be mentioned in any account of Phoenician history, but we (in common with Josephus' first readers) know almost nothing more about this Philostratus than his name. At *Ant.* 10.228 Josephus had listed Philostratus' works, including a *Phoenica*; once again Josephus does not admit that he repeats and abbreviates himself. The unspecific "on these matters" allows a general overlap with the material in the "archives" (1.143).

<sup>480</sup> The title of the work and the number of the book convey scholarly accuracy. Megasthenes (early 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE) was the main source of Greek knowledge on India (see Sterling 1992: 92-101 and further literature in Bar-Kochva 1996a: 199 n.60), but it is doubtful that Josephus knew him at first hand. His reference not only mirrors his own statement in *Ant.* 10. 227, but also closely matches one in Abydenus (*FGH* 685, frag. 6, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep.ev.* 9.41.1). It is highly likely that both authors are drawing (independently) from Alexander Polyhistor (see Gutschmid 526-27). The comment hardly fits here (it has nothing to do with the campaign in Syria and Palestine), but is included as a third

witness. It reveals how woodenly Josephus reduplicates material from *Antiquities* 10, again without acknowledgement. Had Josephus read Megasthenes' work, he could have cited him in the next segment as a Greek author who referred to Judeans (see Stern 1.45-46).

<sup>481</sup> What Megasthenes said can be more accurately ascertained from Strabo, *Geogr.* 15.1.6: Nebuchadnezzar had a greater reputation among the Chaldeans than even Heracles, and led an expedition to the Pillars (cf. Abydenus, as referenced in the previous note). For the context of the statement see Bar-Kochva 1996a: 201-2. Josephus distances himself from the claim for Nebuchadnezzar, but leaves Heracles' exploits unchallenged, assuming his readers' acquaintance with the Heracles myths concerning Libya (the giant Antaeos) and Iberia (the triple-bodied monster, Geryon).

<sup>482</sup> Again Josephus makes Berosus his mouthpiece for the critical datum—the destruction of the temple—on which the citation had been conspicuously silent; the tactic mirrors and strengthens the strategic introduction in 1.132.

<sup>483</sup> The only place where something like this was said "above" is in Josephus' own introduction at 1.132, though even there no mention had been made of the rebuilding. And it will hardly be "demonstrated" by the Berosus "citation" to follow (1.146-53), which mentions Cyrus, but ignores the Jerusalem temple; for that we have to wait for Josephus' own comment in 1.154. Josephus' attribution of the key data to his source is remarkably brazen and could surely only convince a rapid, or a wholly sympathetic, reader. Gutschmid's suggestion (532) that this represents mere negligence on Josephus' part, or the use of a secretary, seems naïve (rightly, Labow 2005: 128, n.18). The interval before the temple rebuilding is no longer recorded as 70 years (as in 1.132); soon (1.154) it will be scaled down to 50.

<sup>484</sup> The confident tone masks the weakness of the argument. What follows appears to be a précis of Berosus, in order to reach the reign of Cyrus as quickly as possible, giving only the dates necessary for the calculation to follow. Josephus seems to have known and used this material in *Ant.* 10.229-31, but had not attrib-

After starting the wall mentioned above,<sup>485</sup> Naboukodrosoros fell ill and died, having reigned for 43 years;<sup>486</sup> his son, Eueilmardouchos,<sup>487</sup> became master of the kingdom. **147** His regime was lawless and debauched,<sup>488</sup> and when a plot was laid by his sister's husband, Neriglisaros,<sup>489</sup> he was assassinated, having reigned for 2 years.<sup>490</sup> After his assassination, Neriglisaros, who plotted against him, succeeded to the throne and reigned for 4 years.<sup>491</sup> **148** His son, Laborosoardocho,<sup>492</sup> ruled the kingdom, though only a child, for 9 months;<sup>493</sup> but, since he displayed in many ways an evil character, a plot was forged and he was beaten to death by the Friends.<sup>494</sup> **149** At his death those who had plotted against him gathered and jointly conferred the kingdom on a certain Nabonnedos,<sup>495</sup> who was from Babylon and one of their conspiracy. During his reign the walls of the Babylonians' city alongside the river were embellished with baked brick and bitumen.<sup>496</sup> **150** When his reign was in its seventeenth year, Cyrus emerged from Persia with a large army<sup>497</sup> and, when he had subdued all the rest of Asia,<sup>498</sup> advanced on Babylonia. **151** When he learned of his approach, Nabon-

*Subsequent  
kings of  
Babylon*

*Cyrus comes  
from Persia*

uted it there to Berosus, simply weaving it into his own story. The précis functions exactly as in the parallel passages in 1.94-102 and 1.121-25: it links a previous citation containing a reference to "us" to a date recognizable as a chronological marker (in this case, the reign of Cyrus). Here, as in the previous cases, it is significant that Josephus has to make his link to a Greek (or at least hellenized) knowledge-base (Cyrus being well-known in the Greek world). Despite his critique of Greek historiography, his non-Greek sources are not, in the end, accorded the right to operate by their own chronological schemes.

<sup>485</sup> Not the walls (plural) of the city of Babylon, as they were mentioned at the beginning of this long reign, and much has been left out in between (see note to "Chaldaica" at 1.142). The reference is probably to the "Medean wall" defense system (between the Tigris and Euphrates); see Xenophon, *Anab.* 2.4.12 and Wiseman 1985: 60-61. If Josephus derives this material from Alexander Polyhistor, he may not know to what it refers. Readers might mentally connect this wall to those of 1.139 and thus not notice the interval between.

<sup>486</sup> 605-562 BCE; his 43-year reign is also mentioned in the Uruk king-list.

<sup>487</sup> For textual variants here, see Gutschmid 533-34 and Münster ad loc. The name is spelled quite differently in *Ant.* 10.229, 231, but here accords more with the biblical version (2 Kgs 25:27-30: Evil-Merodach).

<sup>488</sup> Berosus' moral tone justifies the change of regime; his pride in the Babylonian kingdom does not mean whitewashing all its rulers. In *Ant.* 10.229-31 Josephus had followed the biblical story (2 Kgs 25:27-30 = Jer 52:31-34) in recording this king's kindness to "Jechonias"; he also attributed to him there an 18-year reign (see Begg and Spilsbury 2005: 294, n.987). Here Josephus seems unable, or at least unwilling, to reconcile Berosus' account with that of his scriptures.

<sup>489</sup> On the spelling of the name, see Gutschmid 534-36 and Münster ad loc. On his wife, the king's sister,

Kassaya, see Wiseman 1985: 10-11 and Burstein 1978: 28, n.110. *Ant.* 10.231 gives a slightly different account.

<sup>490</sup> 562-560 BCE.

<sup>491</sup> 560-556 BCE. *Ant.* 10.231, where he is named Eglisaros, erroneously records a reign of 40 years. See Wiseman 1956: 37-42; Labow 2005: 149, n.96.

<sup>492</sup> The name has too many variants in the textual tradition to unravel Josephus' original version (Gutschmid 536-37); in the Babylonian texts he is styled Labasi-marduk.

<sup>493</sup> In the year 556 BCE.

<sup>494</sup> The moral accusation seems forced but justifies the coup (cf. 1.147). The Nabonidus stele gives a theological explanation (his accession to power was against the will of the Gods), *ANET* 1.309 (iv). Abydenus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep.ev.* 9.41.4) records the same violent changes of regime but without comment.

<sup>495</sup> This name again has variants (Gutschmid 538; Münster ad loc.); Nabu-na'id reigned from 556-539 BCE. Herodotus 1.188 refers to him as Labynetus, son of Nicotris.

<sup>496</sup> Berosus' concern with walls (cf. 1.139, 146, 152) perhaps reflects his focus on military action. This seems to be recorded as an improvement on the work of Nebuchadnezzar (1.139). In *Ant.* 10.231 Josephus identifies this king ("Naboandelos") with Baltasares (Belshazzar, who was in fact his son and co-regent), and thus incorporates at this point the narrative of Daniel 5; but the connection looks artificial and is not repeated here.

<sup>497</sup> Cf. *Ant.* 10.247. The reign-year is what enables the following calculation, with all its complications (see at 1.154). Josephus gets to the point in this précis where hellenized readers will start to feel on familiar territory; the year is (by our reckoning) 539 BCE.

<sup>498</sup> Eusebius' accounts read "all the rest of his kingdom" (followed by Niese, Thackeray, Münster ad loc.). But since Babylonia is his kingdom, this would make

*Cyrus captures  
Babylon*

nedos went to meet him with the army and faced him, but was defeated in battle, fled with a small escort, and was shut up in the city of the Borsippians.<sup>499</sup> **152** Cyrus captured Babylon<sup>500</sup> and gave orders that the outer walls of the city should be razed to the ground because the city seemed to him formidable and difficult to capture;<sup>501</sup> he then set off for Borsippa to besiege Nabonnedos. **153** As Nabonnedos did not wait for the siege but gave himself up in advance, Cyrus treated him generously, gave him Carmania as his residence, and expelled him from Babylonia.<sup>502</sup> Nabonnedos spent the rest of his days in that land and ended his life there.<sup>503</sup>

*Chronological  
calculation*

**(1.21) 154** These words contain the truth in agreement with our books;<sup>504</sup> for it is written there that Naboukodrosoros devastated our sanctuary in the eighteenth year of his reign<sup>505</sup> and it was left without trace for 50 years,<sup>506</sup> and in the second year of

little sense. With Gutschmid (540), I follow the reading of L E S (reflected in Latin and adopted by Reinach).

<sup>499</sup> Berosus' evident admiration of Cyrus allows him to record the full ignominy of the collapse of the neo-Babylonian dynasty. Josephus here contradicts his account in *Ant.* 10.247 (implying the capture of Nabonidus in the city), which is similar to the versions of this historical turning-point in Herodotus 1.188-91 and Xenophon, *Cyr.* 7.5. Berosus' account reflects more closely the version in the Nabonidus Chronicle; see Beaulieu 1989: 219-32.

<sup>500</sup> Herodotus 1.188-90 already knew different accounts of how this epic event took place (Cyrus entered Babylon on 29<sup>th</sup> October, 539 BCE). After so much emphasis on the defenses of the city, Berosus may have left the means of capture deliberately unspecified.

<sup>501</sup> As well as being a back-handed compliment to Nebuchadnezzar (cf. 1.139), this notice might serve to explain why the once-famous walls of Babylon were no longer extant; the same is recorded of Darius in Herodotus 3.159.

<sup>502</sup> Cyrus is presented sympathetically. Babylonian and Achaemenid records contain very varied evaluations of Nabonidus, but often criticise him for religious neglect (Beaulieu 1989; Sack 1992; Kuhrt 1995: 598-603; *ANET* 1.308-11). Carmania (modern Kerman) is in south-central Iran; cf. Abydenus *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.41.4 (also derived from Berosus).

<sup>503</sup> There is little in the last part of this précis (1.151-53) which is directly relevant to Josephus' purpose. He may include it simply to bring the story of Nabonidus to conclusion, or to maintain the interest of readers who knew of Cyrus' capture of Babylon (though he has little detail to offer). But Nabonidus was also known in Judean mythology (see Prayer of Nabonidus [4Q242]), and readers of many sorts might be interested to reflect on the change of empires (cf. 2.127). It is possible that some readers could hear a contemporary resonance. The Babylonian empire which destroyed the first temple was itself wiped out in due course, and a new

temple was built: could the cycle repeat itself after the destruction of the second temple? Josephus might be reluctant to suggest this (cf. his caution on the subject of Daniel's prophecies in *Ant.* 10.208-10, 272-81), but could leave the deduction for others to draw.

<sup>504</sup> The theme of "agreement" between sources has already been signalled (1.128, 143). The "agreement" between Berosus and the Judean scriptures will soon be supplemented by a triangular point of agreement, with Phoenician records (1.155-58), building to the conclusion at 1.160. The language echoes the principle of 1.26. In order to establish this "agreement," Josephus has to adjust both Berosus and the Bible: the former by inserting into his chronology the date of the destruction of the temple (an event absent from his record), the latter by reducing the biblical figure of 70 years (1.132) to something closer to 50.

<sup>505</sup> Josephus has to find this in "our books," since the event goes unmentioned in what he knows of Berosus. Although he had found something close to what he wanted in the reference to Judean captives (1.137), he knew that Berosus placed this at the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, not in its 18th year. Josephus thus relies on a (slightly inexact) memory of the biblical account: 2 Kgs 25:8 = Jer 52:12 says the temple was burned in Nebuchadnezzar's 19<sup>th</sup> year; Jer 52:29 talks of captives in the 18<sup>th</sup> year (cf. *Ant* 10.146). The surviving Babylonian Chronicle refers to Nebuchadnezzar's campaign in Judea, but is missing for the years in which the temple was destroyed (Wiseman 1956: 32-38).

<sup>506</sup> 50 is the figure read by Eusebius and followed by all modern editors (see Gutschmid 543-44); L and Latin read 7. The 50 corresponds roughly to the computation of the reign-dates in the citation of Berosus: 43 years plus 2, plus 4, plus 9 months, plus 17 years, minus 18 (the 18<sup>th</sup> year of Nebuchadnezzar), plus 2 (the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of Cyrus) = 50 years and 9 months. (On its relation to the 54 years of the Phoenician records, see note to "addition" at 1.159.) Josephus does not make

the reign of Cyrus the foundations were laid,<sup>507</sup> and, again, in the second year of the reign of Darius it was completed.<sup>508</sup> **155** I shall add the Phoenician records as well<sup>509</sup>—for one must not pass over the abundance of proofs.<sup>510</sup> The calculation of dates goes like this.<sup>511</sup> **156** In the reign of king Ithobalos,<sup>512</sup> Naboukodrosoros besieged Tyre for 13 years.<sup>513</sup> After him Baal reigned for 10 years.<sup>514</sup> **157** Thereafter judges were appointed: Ednibalos, son of Baslechos, was judge for 2 months, Chelbes, son of Abdaeos, for 10 months, Abbalos, the high-priest, for 3 months; Mytynos and Gerastartos, son of Abdelimos, were judges for 6 years,<sup>515</sup> after whom

the full calculation of reign years, followed by the necessary adjustment, as in 1.126; the sums would have been messy. Although this figure of 50 might have been influenced by Dan 9:25 (7 weeks of years), it is probably best explained as a strategic downward adjustment of the biblical 70 years (1.132) to bring it into line with Babylonian and Phoenician records. Modern scholarship accords with these in dating the destruction in 587 BCE and the second year of Cyrus as 537 BCE (i.e., 50 years). The further reference in this section to the completion of the temple (in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of Darius) might represent Josephus' attempt to salvage the possibility of the full 70 years after all (see below).

<sup>507</sup> Although Cyrus is named in Josephus' non-biblical sources, his decree for the reconstruction of the temple, and the dating of this event, are not. Josephus has to rely here on Ezra 3:8 (cf. Ezra 1:1).

<sup>508</sup> Since Darius is not mentioned in the Chaldean or Phoenician sources cited here, we may ask why Josephus adds this notice. He provides no means to date Darius in relation to Cyrus, and thus no indication of how much later we should consider Darius' 2<sup>nd</sup> year. It seems that he records this detail either because he simply knows it and wishes to complete the story of the temple-reconstruction, or because he hopes this non-specific addition will satisfy those who remember the biblical figure of 70 years, cited earlier (1.132). If the latter, the lack of a full computation of years suggests he does not want this matter pressed too far (Darius' 2<sup>nd</sup> year, in 520 BCE, would be about 67 years after the destruction). If the former, it is odd that his figure tallies neither with his account in *Ant.* 10.107-8 (which has the completion of the temple in Darius' 9<sup>th</sup> year) nor with the biblical version (Ezra 6:15: Darius' 6<sup>th</sup> year). (Eusebius' variants for "second" ["sixth" or "tenth"] may represent an effort to correct this discrepancy; see Gutschmid 544-45.)

<sup>509</sup> For the significance of Phoenician "records," see 1.106; as in the "Phoenician" segment, Josephus' source concerns specifically Tyre (see 1.160). As in 1.143, Josephus claims here to go straight to source: no author is named. It is possible that he here uses Philostratus, whom he had named just above (1.144); part of what follows overlaps with what is reported of

Philostratus in *Ant.* 10.228. But it is more likely that his source is Menander (so also Gutschmid 545-46), of whom he knows several fragments and whose style is close to the following citation (cf. 1.121-25); cf. Labow 2005: 154, n.114. Since he has already labelled Menander an "Ephesian" (1.116), he may prefer to keep his identity hidden in citing this "Phoenician" material. Alternatively, Josephus may have derived this material, in anonymous form, from Alexander Polyhistor.

<sup>510</sup> The impersonal form makes this seem less a choice than a necessity (and helps excuse yet more obscure names and difficult calculations). The "abundance" of proofs is in fact only one more, added to the one already offered, but the tone is building in confidence to the climax of 1.160. The citation to follow overlaps with Berosus only in the names Naboukodrosoros and Cyrus, but the unique triangular congruence (Chaldean, Phoenician, and Judean) is all that matters to Josephus.

<sup>511</sup> What follows is almost certainly a drastic précis (by Josephus himself or an intermediate source); for this reason it is not here indented (cf. 1.121). Not much more than names and reign-dates are here extracted from material which probably had fuller details of events (e.g., on the siege of Tyre).

<sup>512</sup> On Ethbaal II (reign ca. 591–573 BCE), see Katzenstein 1973: 325-28. For the final calculation (1.159), Josephus either needs the full length of this reign (not given) or must operate on the assumption that the reign ended with the end of the siege (see Gutschmid 547).

<sup>513</sup> This very famous siege, which ended with the capitulation of Tyre, probably lasted ca. 585–ca. 573 BCE (Katzenstein 1973: 330-32; Labow 2005: 155, n.117 suggests 598–583 BCE). Josephus believes he can cross-refer from this event to the destruction of Jerusalem (see 1.159).

<sup>514</sup> Baal II (ca. 573–564 BCE). He was presumably a puppet king of the Babylonian empire, after the crushing of Tyrian independence.

<sup>515</sup> Again, the names vary in the different versions; see Gutschmid, 547-48; Münster ad loc.). The appointment of judges, parallel to Gedaliah in Judea, presumably reflects Babylonian control in the interruption of



Balatoros was king for 1 year.<sup>516</sup> **158** When he died they sent for Merbalos and summoned him from Babylon, and he reigned for 4 years; when he died they summoned his brother Eiromos, who reigned for 20 years.<sup>517</sup> It was during his reign that Cyrus became ruler of the Persians.<sup>518</sup> **159** So the whole period is 54 years, with 3 months in addition;<sup>519</sup> for it was in the seventh year of the reign of Naboukodrosoros that he began to besiege Tyre,<sup>520</sup> and in the fourteenth year<sup>521</sup> of the reign of Eiromos that Cyrus the Persian seized power.<sup>522</sup> **160** The Chaldean and Tyrian materials are in

*Conclusions*

the Tyrian royal line (see Katzenstein 1973: 333-34, 340-41).

<sup>516</sup> The Greek translated here “after” (μετὰξὺ) normally means “between,” and some interpreters, suspecting that Josephus has omitted this year in his final calculation (1.159), take this year to be a period of co-rule in the midst of the period of the judges. But the following statement suggests that his rule was immediately followed by that of another king, and the Greek can sometimes mean “after” (so Gutschmid, 549, with reference to *War* 2.221 and *Acts* 13:42, *pace* Labow 2005: 156, n.121). The year would be ca. 556 BCE.

<sup>517</sup> The two members of the Tyrian royal family had presumably been taken as hostages to Babylon. On Hiram III (ca. 552–532 BCE) see Katzenstein 1973: 344.

<sup>518</sup> Josephus’ source is, crucially, silent on when this event took place in Hiram’s reign and it is not even clear how it relates to the fall of Babylon (which is presumably when Josephus counts the “reign of Cyrus” to begin, 1.154). Josephus has to supply the missing data in the next section.

<sup>519</sup> What does Josephus mean by “the whole period”? The immediate context would suggest that he refers to the period of the Tyrian kings just mentioned. If we start with the 13 years of Ithobalus’ rule (Josephus has no other figure for that king) and go on to the end of Eiromos’ reign, we get 55 years and 3 months; thus, Josephus has done his sums wrong, or has not counted the 1 year of Balatoros (see note to “year” at 1.157), or one of the figures in the text has been corrupted in transmission. On this understanding, the following statements, prefaced by “for” are not an explanation of how he reached 54 years and 3 months, but an adjustment around that figure (perhaps intended to suggest how it could tally with the “50 years” of 1.154, which relates to the history of the temple).

A more radical solution, suggested by Gutschmid (551-55), takes the following “for” to act in its proper sense as an *explanation* of our present clause: the “whole period” referred to here is the period of the desolation of the temple (not the summation of the Tyrian reigns). On this reading, Gutschmid thought Josephus’ original text at this point said “50 years” (it

was soon adjusted by scribes who misunderstood his sense and took out the year of Balatoros); the following calculations would end in a 50-year interval if we read “seventeenth” instead of “seventh” year in the next clause. This is probably over-ingenious (and overly speculative). The mathematical co-ordination of different chronologies is not Josephus’ strong-point, and it seems most likely that he first adds the years from the Tyrian list, but realizes that some adjustment is needed to tally this with the time-periods derived from Babylonian and Judean chronologies. But he was either unable or unwilling to spell out the (rather complex) steps required for this procedure and was content simply to assert how he would co-ordinate the dates provided in his sources.

<sup>520</sup> The statement is an attempt to relate the Tyrian reference to the siege of Tyre (1.156) to the Judean reference to the destruction of the temple (1.154), by comparison of their relative placing in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. (Misunderstanding this clause to explain the previous statement, Latin suggests that this is the seventh year of the reign of Ithobalos; see Labow 2005: 147, n.125 and Katzenstein 1973: 328.) Taking a little support from L (which has ἐπί where one would expect ἔτει, “year”), Gutschmid (552-55) emends the text to read “in the seventeenth year.” On the basis of this and the following clause, the Tyrian record would imply a time interval of 50 years and 3 months between the destruction of the temple and the second year of Cyrus, thus matching 1.154 (see previous note). If the text is read as “seventh,” the figure is reduced to 40 years and 3 months. We have noted a similar slipperiness with numbers at 1.103, though here it represents Josephus’ inability to make the figures match.

<sup>521</sup> Eusebius, *Chronicon* here reads “fourth,” but all editors consider that mistaken (Gutschmid 555; Münster ad loc.).

<sup>522</sup> It is not clear whence Josephus derived this assertion that Cyrus’ rise to power was in Hiram III’s fourteenth year. He certainly needs a figure to relate the Tyrian to the Babylonian and the Judean chronologies. As noted above, the Babylonian reckoning would have 50 years and 9 months between the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar and the second year of Cyrus (see note



agreement with our writings on the subject of the sanctuary,<sup>523</sup> and my evidence from these statements for the antiquity of our people is consistent and incontestable.<sup>524</sup> Thus I think that what I have now said is sufficient for any who are not excessively contentious.<sup>525</sup>

*Greek Evidence (1.161-218): Reading Options*

The final, Greek, segment in the collection of “witnesses” is both the longest of the four and in many respects the most important. Although Josephus’ initial tactic was to place greater weight on non-Greek evidence about antiquity (1.6-26), he is aware that material from Greek authors must be supplied as well (1.2-5, 58-59, 72): he cannot discount altogether the cultural prejudice in favor of Greek historiography. Josephus thus gathers 7 sources (he emphasizes how numerous they are, 1.161, 215), of unequal length and significance. While this segment concludes the Part on “antiquity,” only some of the authors cited are themselves “ancient” and none of the testimony stretches as far back in history as the non-Greek material. Josephus subtly alters his criteria to permit *any* mention of Judeans, and widens the literary net to include “writers” of all sorts (including a poet, 1.172).

Two of Josephus’ sources had been used in his *Antiquities* (Herodotus and Agatharchides), but the other five are new. A quotation concerning Pythagoras forms a strong opening (1.162-65), but Josephus then groups three citations (from Theophrastus, Herodotus, and Choerilus) which make at most *indirect* reference to Judean people or customs (1.166-75). Thereafter, at the centre of the segment, and cited at greatest length, are the key witnesses: Clearchus (quoting Aristotle, 1.175-82) and Hecataeus (1.183-204). The positive tone established by these hefty quotations enables Josephus to finish his collection with one further author, Agatharchides (1.205-12), even

to “years” at 1.154). The Tyrian reckoning would have 40 years and 3 months between the same two points: 55 years and 3 months (the total from the beginning of the siege to the end of Hiram III), minus 11 years (the difference between the seventh and the eighteenth years of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign), minus 6 years (Cyrus’ accession to power, before the end of Hiram III), plus 2 years (Cyrus’ second year). Both calculations depend on the adoption of the (approximately) biblical figure of the eighteenth year as the point when Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the temple (see note to “reign” at 1.154), but neither support the otherwise biblical figure of a 70-year interval (see note to “Persians” at 1.132). Josephus utilizes his Judean sources when convenient, and quietly ignores them when they impede his apologetic purpose.

<sup>523</sup> Although the text is slightly corrupt (missing the verb), the sense is clear enough (see Gutschmid 555-56). Josephus’ concluding statement first emphasizes the *agreement* between the sources (cf. 1.128), now a three-way co-ordination between Chaldean, Tyrian, and Judean traditions. Inasmuch as they do agree (on the names of Naboukodrosoros [Nebuchadnezzar] and Cyrus), they certainly reflect historical truth. But they hardly agree “on the subject of the temple” as it is only the Judean sources which refer to that. Once again (as

in 1.132, 145), Josephus *inserts* the crucial datum.

<sup>524</sup> “Consistent” (ὡμολογημένη) is from the same root as the noun translated “agreement” (ὁμολογία) in 1.128: the terms thus form an *inclusio*. “Evidence” (μαρτυρία) is a reprise of the legal terminology that suffuses this whole Part. “Antiquity” has not been a significant theme in this Chaldean segment, as the destruction of the temple was not particularly ancient history (and it is doubtful whether critics of Josephus would have bothered to deny its historicity). But the reappearance of the word helps to bind all three non-Greek segments together. With “incontestable” (ἀναντίρρητος; hapax in Josephus), Josephus raises the rhetorical pitch, in a statement of confidence that pre-empts further questions.

<sup>525</sup> For claims to “sufficiency” cf. 1.1, 58, 182. The tone throughout this Part has been moderate, relying on historical reasoning rather than invective (the strategy of λόγος rather than πάθος or ἥθος). But just as the introduction suggests that behind historical doubts may lie malice (1.72), so this conclusion hints that anyone unpersuaded by reason must have ulterior motives. The placement of such a comment at the end of the non-Greek material adds spice to what has otherwise been a bland, and somewhat laborious, argument.

though his stance is expressly critical. The segment is rounded off with an explanation and illustration of others' malicious silence about Judeans (1.213-14), before the conclusion to the whole Part lists a plethora of additional witnesses who might have been called (1.215-18).

Although the topic of the whole Part is "antiquity" (1.215), that theme is rarely mentioned in this segment. The emphasis shifts to Greek "admiration" of Judeans and their culture: the theme is signalled immediately in 1.162, and recurs throughout, especially in the two central witnesses, Clearchus and Hecataeus. This compensates for the lack of evidence for antiquity in this segment, and prepares the way for the encomium on the Judean constitution in 2.145-286. Agatharchides' evidence is the exception to this rule, but Josephus takes care to turn his criticism into praise (1.212), highlighting themes of law-observance and piety that are central to his presentation of Judean culture.

This miscellany of material was liable to create a mixed impression on Josephus' *Roman or Romanized readers*. Most of the sources used derive from or concern famous figures: Pythagoras, Herodotus, and Aristotle were universally familiar names, and those with an advanced education would know of Theophrastus and Hecataeus. Although it might have been tempting for Josephus to cite Greek authors who supposedly wrote about Abraham and other Judean patriarchs (cf. *Ant.* 1.159), or who "referred" to Noah under other names (*Ant.* 1.94; see 1.216), these would perhaps have stretched the credulity of his readers too far. Josephus knew of several authors who made extensive reference to Moses as a figure of great antiquity (cf. 2.156), but these were either (by his categorization) Egyptian, or hostile, or both. He thus makes do with lesser scraps of evidence, or witnesses to more recent Judean history.

Many Roman readers could have shared Josephus' assumption that Herodotus' circumcised "Syrians" were Judeans (see note to "this" at 1.171), and Josephus makes use of his contemporaries' understanding of "Solyma" and their knowledge of the "Bituminous Lake" to support his daring association between Judeans and Choerilus' exotic warriors (1.172-75). But some of Josephus' claims require a highly sympathetic reading: a sceptic might wonder why Hermippus links Pythagoras' obscure taboos with Judeans (1.165) and might interpret the Tyrians' ban on the Korban oath as a sign of its depravity, not its excellence (1.166-67). Doubts could also arise over the authorship of Josephus' citations from "Hecataeus" (cf. Herennius Philo, as reported in Origen, *Cels.* 1.15). More generally, however, Roman criticisms of Greek historiography, exploited and developed by Josephus in 1.6-27, might make a critical reader wonder why Josephus now sets such store by the class of historian he had earlier discredited (e.g., on Herodotus, cf. 1.16, 66, 73). That is an internal tension that Josephus makes no attempt to resolve.

The presentation of Judeans in this segment bears many features that resonate well with the Roman tradition, but also some that could have caused offense or ridicule. The depiction of Judean culture as philosophical (Pythagoras; Clearchus/Aristotle), and tenacious in the face of danger (Ps.-Hecataeus) might impress; further, Ps.-Hecataeus' description of the Judean temple-cult (1.195-99) could appeal to a Roman ideal of simplicity and solemnity (see Appendix 6). On the other hand, to cite Ps.-Hecataeus' account of the destruction of pagan altars (1.193) and to celebrate Mosollamus' ridicule of augury (1.200-204) would be well received only among those already sympathetic to Judean religious peculiarities. Might this not confirm a negative image current in Rome, that Judeans practiced a contrary and scandalous religion (e.g., Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.96-106; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5)? On the topic of augury, Josephus could perhaps exploit the philosophical doubts of the educated, who considered it irrational to trust birds to bring messages from the gods (e.g., Cicero, *Div.* 2.76-83); but augury retained a significant place in Roman practice, at least for military affairs (cf. Cicero, *Div.* 1.105-8; for the ambiguities in Cicero's tractate see Schofield 1986; Beard 1986). Potentially most damaging is Agatharchides' criticism of Judean sabbath "superstition". Since Roman authors regularly considered Judeans "lazy" in this regard, and recounted occasions when Jerusalem had been captured by Rome on the sabbath (see note to "day" at 1.209 and note to "custom" at 1.210), the recycling of this story threatened to damage Judean honor in Rome. Josephus' attempt to overturn this criticism (1.212) might repair some of that damage, but it might also shock those who presumed that patriotism should never be compromised (cf. Josephus' efforts in *War* 1.146-48).

*Judean readers* might be surprised by certain features of this segment, for instance the identification of their ancestors as members of Xerxes' army (1.172-75). They might also resent Herodotus' claim, unchallenged by Josephus, that Judeans had learned the practice of circumcision from the Egyptians (1.169-70). On the other hand, this accumulation of evidence that Greek authors not only knew about, but also admired, Judeans and their culture, could only boost Judean pride. Educated Judean readers might be familiar with a long-established tradition in hellenistic Judaism connecting Judean and Greek culture, and according Judeans priority in age and superiority in virtue. This tradition was at least as old as Aristobulus (2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE), whom Josephus appears to have known and used in his statement on Pythagoras (1.166); 1.218 suggests that Josephus knew (at least parts of) other Judean authors with similar interests. By Josephus' day, it had become common to assert that Moses' ideas were copied by Pythagoras and Plato (see note to "expression" at 2.168). It was also common to relate "Greek" admiration of Judeans, a theme as old as *Letter of Aristeas* (2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE). Josephus had used this text in *Antiquities* 12 and might have deployed it further here, but prefers a parallel pseudepigraph, by Ps.-Hecataeus (see Appendix 2). Josephus' heavy use of this Judean precursor, and his own careful editing of other material, leaves little that a Judean reader would not endorse.

*Early Christian readers* made rather less use of this segment than of the other witnesses to Judean antiquity, since its evidence was nothing like as old as that provided by Egyptian or Phoenician sources. Clement of Alexandria constructs a partially parallel argument that Greek philosophy is comparatively recent and draws from non-Greek sources (*Strom.* 1.14-20). In the course of this Clement alludes to the Clearchus story (*Strom.* 1.15.70.2) and includes a passage from Megasthenes which would have been useful to Josephus (1.15.72.5), but the argument is differently focused and far richer in detail. When it comes to Greek philosophy's debt to Judeans, Clement cites Aristobulus, not Josephus (1.22). Eusebius, however, does make use of this segment in book 9 of *Praeparatio Evangelica*. He clearly found little of value here on Judean antiquity: when he treats this theme in 9.11ff. he cites Greek references to patriarchal figures and primeval history (including the Greek authors in Josephus' *Antiquities* 1), but uses nothing from our segment, except its generalized conclusion and impressive list of names (1.215-18, in *Praep. ev.* 9.42). In the first part of book 9, however, Eusebius illustrates how Greek philosophers admired Judean culture. This echoes a prominent theme in our segment, and Eusebius chooses passages from Josephus' strong examples (Clearchus and Hecataeus), together (oddly) with Choerilus, to illustrate his point (*Praep. ev.* 9.4, 5, 9). However, he interweaves these with other material drawn from Porphyry and Clement. While Josephus' segment has inspired him to gather evidence on Greek philosophical admiration of Judeans, Eusebius has a fuller range of resources at his disposal and can leave aside the material in Josephus that is either weak or irrelevant to this theme. Eusebius, for instance, knows a more helpful passage from Theophrastus than that cited by Josephus (*Praep. ev.* 9.2), and in any case, as a Christian, would not rate the Corban oath as highly as Josephus (cf. Mark 7:10-13).

In the *history of scholarship*, this segment of *Apion* has fascinated those tracing the relationship between "Hellenism" and "Judaism," and inspired a whole industry of reference-collections. Given the West's preoccupation with its "classical" roots, this segment of witnesses was bound to elicit greater attention than the others, and the symbolic weight attached to the relationship between the Greek and Judean traditions ensured that Greek references to Judeans, and Josephus' references to Greeks, would intrigue post-Enlightenment scholars (see Shavit 1997; Martin 2002). Two products of this cultural interest follow a strategy similar to that of Josephus: Reinach's *Texts d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Juifs et Judaïsme* (1895), followed and expanded by Stern's 3-volume *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (1974-84). These highly influential collections gather fragments with explicit or implicit relevance to Judaism, and are inclined to follow Josephus' judgment on questionable cases. Stern, for instance, while considering Choerilus irrelevant, believes that Herodotus was referring to circumcised Judeans and that Josephus' citations from "Hecataeus" are authentic. The sources cited here continue to be the subject of intense analysis regarding Greek attitudes to Judeans. In some cases Josephus has provided rare evidence for otherwise little-known authors (e.g., Agatharchides); in others, his claims

have spawned huge debates on authorship, notably with regard to “Hecataeus” (see Appendix 2). Once again, scholars have generally read *through* Josephus to the authors and sources lying behind his text. Remarkably little attention has been paid to his own rhetorical and cultural strategies.

*My own reading interests* focus on Josephus’ cultural politics in relation to his sources. Some of Josephus’ tactics here are by now familiar from the preceding segments. Josephus is to a large degree dependent on the choices and judgments of his sources—and, despite his earlier dismissal of Greek historiography, admits “it is necessary” (δεῖ) to include this long Greek segment (1.161). He has, in fact, remarkably little to go on: most of his authors are barely interested in Judeans, if they even knew about them. The rhetorical strategy of this Part requires the full trustworthiness of his “witnesses”, and Josephus cannot contradict his sources in this context. He has to cite without comment Herodotus’ claim that Egyptians taught their neighbors the custom of circumcision (1.169-70), together with Clearchus’ assertion that Judeans were descended from Indian philosophers (1.179). Such are the limits of the material at his disposal that he even takes Choerilus’ description of the tonsured speakers of the Phoenician language as a reference to Judeans (1.173-74). But he is skillful in interpreting, curtailing, and editing these sources, exaggerating or even inventing their reference to Judeans. Following his Judean precursor who wrote a whole book on Judeans in the name of Hecataeus, Josephus thus channels the prestige of Greek culture into affirmation of his own tradition. His absorption with his own ethnic interests gives him the confidence to make Greek authors his tools.

But there is a further aspect of this complex phenomenon that is illuminated by sensitivity to postcolonial thematics. The Greek authors whom Josephus cites (i.e., all except “Hecataeus”) display classic features of an “Orientalism” that fixes “the other” in a fascinated gaze largely shaped by its own cultural prejudices. Bickerman (innocent of postcolonial theory) noted how, when they encountered barbarian self-perceptions, Greek historians felt it their duty “to rectify the barbarian account or to substitute a scientific account for it ... A Greek enquirer in a foreign land did not feel himself bound by the question of what his informant actually meant. The construction he put upon the barbarian account was rather faithful to the historical reality of his own system” (1952: 71). This is a key insight in the analysis of “Orientalism,” which traces how reactions to the exotic “other” can be either negative or effusively positive, but in both cases are over-determined by the needs and neuroses of the hegemonic culture. Herodotus’ explanation of the diffusion of circumcision and Clearchus’ false genealogy exemplify the imposition of Greek models on cultures little studied and barely understood. Clearchus’ delight in the exotic foreigner and Hieronymus’ failure to notice the local Judeans are equal, if opposite, samples of the implied superiority of those who write “universal” history on their own terms. Clearchus’ admiration of a Judean because he was “Greek” in language and “soul” perfectly illustrates Greek cultural condescension, while Agatharchides’ critique of Judean “superstition” measures the value of a “barbarian” culture by a specifically Greek criterion of rationality. In this form of analysis it makes little sense to divide these sources into “pro-” and “anti-Jewish” camps: they are all interpreting Judeans (or other “barbarians”) with crude categories derived from their own cultural system (see Barclay forthcoming c).

Josephus’ response is a complex mixture of acquiescence and protest, displaying both mimicry and subaltern self-determination. On the one hand, he fawns over the cultural “sophistication” of his sources (e.g., 1.175), proud to have Judeans accepted in the elite circles of philosophical debate. He is delighted to cite “Hecataeus,” whose narrative of Mosollamus deploys exactly the virtues that Agatharchides extols—the “strength of soul” to ridicule “superstition.” On the other hand, Josephus vigorously defends his own tradition against this standard of rationality, when the clash becomes unavoidable: Agatharchides’ judgment is simply wrong and his contrary opinion is nothing but malice (1.212). Likewise, Josephus cannot accept Hieronymus’ silence as evidence of Judean insignificance: it must be assumed that they were worth mentioning, and “unhealthy causes” alone have prevented the historian from giving them the honor they deserve (1.213-14). Moreover, in the conclusion it emerges that Josephus’ citation of Greek sources has by no means compromised his irrefragable conviction that Judean scrip-



tures remain the ultimate standard of truth (1.216-18). This intriguing duality in Josephus' cultural reaction is a fine sample of that "hybridity" detected in the postcolonial condition: both absorbing and resisting the cultural co-ordinates of the "Greek" tradition, Josephus partly refashions both "Greek" and "Judean" identity. His Greek authors (apart from Agatharchides) become admirers of all things Judean, while his Judeans become philosophers on a level with Greek intellectuals. His own position, building on centuries of cultural interaction with the "Greek" tradition, can hardly represent some essentialized version of "authentic" Judeanness, but it is in that hybrid and ambivalent condition that he both distinguishes Judean from Greek and matches the one with the other (see further, Introduction, § 13).

**(1.22) 161** However, it is necessary to satisfy also the inquiry of those who disbelieve the records among the barbarians<sup>526</sup> and see fit to believe only Greeks,<sup>527</sup> and to supply many examples also of these who knew about our nation, and to present them<sup>528</sup> where they made reference to it, as they had occasion to do, in their own compositions.<sup>529</sup> **162** Pythagoras the Samian,<sup>530</sup> then—an ancient figure<sup>531</sup> and one reckoned to surpass all those who philosophized in wisdom and in piety with regard to the deity<sup>532</sup>—clearly not only knew about our customs<sup>533</sup> but was also especially

*Greek evidence  
necessary*

*Pythagoras*

<sup>526</sup> Reading, with Reinach and Münster, ταῖς ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις ἀναγραφαῖς. "Records" reinforces Josephus' emphasis on accurate historical sources (see note to "laws" at 1.7). On the translation of βάρβαρος, see note to "Greeks" at 1.58.

<sup>527</sup> Josephus echoes and now fulfils his earlier promises in 1.5, 59, 72. The question of belief or disbelief, first raised in 1.2, 6, is clearly a matter not merely of historical evidence but also of cultural inclination. Despite providing what he considered "proofs" (πίστεις, 1.72) in the previous segments, Josephus knows that he is contending with a cultural prejudice that will "see fit" (ἀξιόω, cf. 1.2) to credit some sources rather than others. As elsewhere, Josephus portrays this as "Greek" arrogance in relation to all things "barbarian" (βάρβαρος), rather than as incredulity aimed specifically at his Judean claims. Nonetheless, he maintains a cool tone: he is answering an "inquiry" (ἐπιζήτησις), not countering "malice" (cf. 1.2-5).

<sup>528</sup> For the verb (παρατίθημι) cf. 1.74, 93, 112, 116, etc. Niese considered its presence here (in the form παραθέσθαι) grammatically awkward and textually suspect.

<sup>529</sup> The issue as stated in 1.2 was whether *any famous Greek historians* made reference to Judeans, and thus proved their antiquity. The criteria have now been diluted. While it is necessary to be "Greek" (in a broad sense, including Ionian), not all of the authors to be cited are famous, and several would not fit the category of "historian." Although Josephus had specified "historian" in 1.2, 5, his search for "witnesses" was less specific (1.4) and had broadened in 1.58, 72 to συγγραφεῖς, "writers." In this segment, Josephus is careful to begin (1.163) and end (1.213-14) with explicit reference to "history" (verbs and nouns from the ἵστορ-*root*; also at

1.168, 176). But otherwise he uses the more general root συγγραμ- (e.g., 1.183, 213; here συγγράμματα), under which label he can include even a poet (1.172). It is now necessary only to "refer" to Judeans: the proof of their "antiquity" may be hinted at in 1.162, but is not made explicit in this segment until the conclusion (1.217).

<sup>530</sup> Josephus' first example would be recognized as chronologically anterior to the others, and also could claim wide cultural recognition. In fact, the reference to Judeans comes not from Pythagoras, but from his interpreter, Hermippus: by this elision Josephus takes a questionable cultural explanation of some of Pythagoras' "symbols" as proof of very ancient knowledge of Judeans. Introduced, without hesitation, as a "Samian," Pythagoras appears incontestably Greek. But his ethnicity and birth-place were actually matters of controversy in antiquity (see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius 8.1; Clement, *Strom.* 1.14.62; Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 1, 5)—a fact that Josephus acknowledges later in this work (2.14).

<sup>531</sup> In 1.14 he is included among the oldest Greek philosophers, and some considered him the first to merit that title (Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 58). Josephus seems unwilling or unable to give a precise date (he is designated comparatively recent in 2.14), but the adjective hints at his ability to prove the "antiquity" of Judeans; he probably lived in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Hermippus, who alone is responsible for the reference to Judeans, is left undated (1.163).

<sup>532</sup> Pythagoras was famed for an eclectic range of "wisdom," as his much-recycled stories, anecdotes and sayings reveal. But a constant theme is his regard for the Gods and concern for proper rites in worship (e.g., Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 134-56); cf. in this work, at 1.14.



keen in his emulation of them.<sup>534</sup> **163** There is no composition acknowledged as authentically his,<sup>535</sup> but many people have written historical accounts of him, and the most distinguished of these is Hermippus,<sup>536</sup> a man scrupulous in all his historical work.<sup>537</sup> **164** In the first book *On Pythagoras*<sup>538</sup> he states that Pythagoras often said, when one of his companions had died (a man called Kalliphon, a Krotonian by descent),<sup>539</sup> that this man's soul accompanied him night and day;<sup>540</sup> and that Pythagoras used to give instructions<sup>541</sup> not to walk over a spot where a donkey sank

Josephus elsewhere makes use of this reputation to claim a general congruence between Pythagorean and Judean theology (see 2.168), building on the connection suggested by Aristobulus (see below, note to "philosophy" at 1.165). The notion of Pythagorean pre-eminence in this matter is purely Josephan.

<sup>533</sup> The Greek is more vague (τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν), but anticipates the fuller statement in 1.165. The "clearly" (δῆλος) pre-empts any doubts that might arise from the details to follow (1.164)—a rhetorical tactic common in this segment (the same term is used in 1.166, 174, 185).

<sup>534</sup> "Especially" is a necessary, but unusual, rendering of the Greek ἐκ πλείστου (see Gutschmid 557); I dissent here from Thackeray's translation, "in those distant ages," although it has that sense in *Ant.* 15.223. Josephus immediately foregrounds the theme of emulation, which will become increasingly dominant in this segment of his work, and which anticipates a key topic in book 2 (see note to "degree" at 2.280). The vocabulary he uses (here: ζηλωτής) suggests both admiration (even envy) and imitation. It seems that Josephus can make little sense of the supposed connection between Pythagoras' obscure taboos and Judean customs; all that is important is that (according to Hermippus) there was a connection by derivation from Judean "beliefs" (1.165). That is the point that Josephus will reiterate in 1.165, giving his own interpretation of what Hermippus may have intended as ridicule.

<sup>535</sup> This was, in fact, a disputed subject: some insisted that Pythagoras left no writings (Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 57), others listed his works (Diogenes Laertius 8.6-7; cf. Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 146). In 1.14 Josephus had numbered Pythagoras among the oldest Greek writers, while noting skepticism on this topic. Here he needs to be dogmatic in denying the existence of authentic works, so that Hermippus can appear not a secondary source but the best available representative of Pythagoras' views.

<sup>536</sup> Hermippus was not well-known to educated Romans (among the very scanty references, Pliny, *Nat.* 30.4, refers to him as a writer on magic), and has to be given special praise here as the only source on Pythagoras whom Josephus can use. Josephus does not date or place him, perhaps from ignorance; his date (second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE) would indicate how large

a gap stood between him and Pythagoras. The fragments of his work are collected in *FGH* IVA (= Bollansée 1999). A disciple of Callimachus in Alexandria, he wrote biographies of philosophers and legislators, and not always in flattering terms. The detailed information in the next section may suggest, but does not prove, that Josephus draws directly from Hermippus.

<sup>537</sup> Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Is.* 1.2 (describing Hermippus as "accurate"). Josephus needs this commendation to secure the authority of what follows, but the contrast with his critique of Greek historiography in 1.15-27 is startling: there "scrupulous" (ἐπιμελής) is the last adjective one would apply to an historian in the Greek tradition (cf. 1.7). Josephus' evaluation is clearly dependent on rhetorical contingency.

<sup>538</sup> Diogenes Laertius 8.10 refers to the 2<sup>nd</sup> book of this work. The remaining fragments, collected in Bollansée 1999: 32-37, indicate a highly skeptical, even cynical, treatment of the revered philosopher, explaining his supposed descent to Hades, for instance, as a clever trick (frag. 24). This suggests that the material to follow might be intended by Hermippus not to bolster, but to diminish, Pythagoras' reputation. Although Pythagoras was famed for his travels in the east, learning from Egyptian and Chaldean wise men (Diogenes Laertius 8.3; Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 6, 11-12), the notion that he borrowed customs from Thracians and Judeans is almost unique, and may have been intended to denigrate, even ridicule, his famous taboos. The fact that Josephus cites verbatim only one sentence from Hermippus (1.165) and paraphrases the rest reduces us to speculation on this matter, but also arouses our suspicion.

<sup>539</sup> Probably the same Kalliphon as mentioned in Herodotus 3.125, though he is there said to be from Cnidus (Bollansée 1999: 233-34). Kroton is the town in southern Italy where Pythagoras settled after leaving Samos.

<sup>540</sup> The anecdote illustrates not the famous Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of souls, but belief in the continuing presence of the dead as *daimones* (Diogenes Laertius 8.32; Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 139, 148; Bollansée 1999: 234).

<sup>541</sup> Bollansée (1999: 235-36) rightly insists that the

to its knees,<sup>542</sup> to refrain from waters that make one thirsty<sup>543</sup> and from all slander.<sup>544</sup> **165** Then, after this, he adds the following:<sup>545</sup> “He used to practice and say these things, imitating the beliefs of Judeans and Thracians, and adopting them for himself.”<sup>546</sup> For that man is correctly said to have adopted many of the Judeans’ rules for his philosophy.<sup>547</sup>

Greek be construed such; the one issuing these instructions is Pythagoras, not the soul of Kalliphon (*pace* Thackeray, Blum et al.). Pythagoras was the source for heterogeneous and famously cryptic instructions or prohibitions, termed σύμβολα. Their interpretation was the topic of much debate, reverent or otherwise (e.g., Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 41-44; Plutarch, *Mor.* 727b-730f).

<sup>542</sup> This is probably the right translation of μη διέρχεσθαι τόπον, ἐφ’ ὃν ἂν ὄνος ὀκλάσῃ. The taboo is otherwise unattested and very obscure. It is likely that Josephus and his biblically literate Judean readers would hear an echo of the Balaam story (Num 22:22-35), in which the ass collapses in the presence of an angel (Josephus, in retelling this story at *Ant.* 4.109, uses the same verb, ὀκλάζω; cf. Gutschmid 559, Troiani 111). But this resonance could not have been heard, or intended, by Pythagoreans, or by Hermippus (there is no evidence that Alexandrian scholars of his day read the LXX). For the former, there is a possible but remote link to Pythagoras’ famous saying about helping a man not to take off his burden, but to shoulder it (Plutarch, *Mor.* 728c), or to Pythagorean disgust for the donkey’s habit of defecating towards the east (Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.28). Labow suggests some connection to the Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of souls, with the donkey inhabited by the soul of a man who was wicked in his previous life (2005: 183, n.60).

<sup>543</sup> The cryptic phrase τὰ δίψια ὕδατα can only invite speculation. It should be translated as here (“thirst-making,” not “stagnant” water; see Gutschmid 559; cf. John 4:13-15). It may be associated with the Pythagorean concern for pure water (and simple food, Diogenes Laertius 8.13; Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 69), or related to taboos concerning salt, the sea, or sea-food (Plutarch, *Mor.* 364a; 729a; Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 41, 45; so Gutschmid 559-60). What Hermippus or Josephus made of this is anyone’s guess.

<sup>544</sup> This mixture of moral rules with ritual taboos is typical of the Pythagorean tradition, which emphasized respect for the Gods and for one’s parents (Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 38; Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 125, 195, 257). One may presume that Josephus would hear an echo of Judean traditions, such as Deut 5:11 and LXX Exod 22:27 (alluded to in 2.237).

<sup>545</sup> Josephus cites only one sentence from Hermippus, and the vague connection (“after this”) leaves unclear how Hermippus connected the 4 disparate items just listed with Judeans and Thracians. One may sus-

pect that, if he knew his source first-hand, Josephus has carefully selected (and censored) what Hermippus said. Origen (*Cels.* 1.15) reports at second-hand a statement from Hermippus’ *On Lawgivers* that Pythagoras borrowed his philosophy from Judeans. It is not clear whether this is indeed a second, parallel, comment by Hermippus, or an inaccurate allusion by Origen to our passage (see Gutschmid 557-58; Bollansée 1999: 108-13).

<sup>546</sup> It was common to trace Pythagorean tenets to eastern nations, among whom he was said to have travelled (see above, note to “Pythagoras” at 1.164): the most common sources of inspiration were Egyptian priests, and Chaldeans or Magi. Pythagoras’ connections with Thrace usually indicated his influence on them (e.g., through his slave Zamolxis, Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 14-15; cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* 7.3.5), but Iamblichus reports that he was instructed in theology by an Orphic initiation in Thrace (*Vit. Pyth.* 146). Porphyry cites Antonius Diogenes as listing Hebrews alongside Arabs, Egyptians, and Chaldeans as an influence on Pythagoras (*Vit. Pyth.* 11), and Hermippus’ comment here may be parallel to that (or its root).

But what connected the 4 items of 1.164 to the “beliefs” (δόξαι) of Judeans and Thracians? Josephus’ (tactical?) paraphrase makes that question largely unanswerable, but there is no reason to think that all 4 were associated with Judeans (or with both nations). Unfortunately, we know almost nothing about Thracian beliefs and customs, and so cannot detect the connections Hermippus may have drawn in that direction. Jacobson’s speculative connections (1976) between the last 3 items and the Jewish scriptures are followed too uncritically by Bollansée (1999: 236-48); they depend on Hermippus knowing an Alexandrian proto-rabbinic commentary on the Pentateuch (indicating, e.g., that “thirst-making water” refers to falsehood). Of the 4 topics in 1.164, it is hard to imagine how the accompaniment of a dead man’s soul, the avoidance of “thirst-making” water and the ban on slander could have been linked by Hermippus to distinctively Judean concerns; the last may be supported by Judeans, but was hardly unique to them. The second, concerning the donkey, might fit the association of Judeans with Typhon (whose animal was the ass), such as we find in another 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE Alexandrian, Manetho (1.237; see van Henten and Abusch 1996; Appendix 3). This tradition is strongly pejorative, and it is possible that

Theophrastus

**166**<sup>548</sup> Also among the city-states our nation was not unknown long ago,<sup>549</sup> and many of our customs have by now permeated some and been deemed worthy of emulation by some people.<sup>550</sup> Theophrastus makes this clear in the work *On Laws*:<sup>551</sup> **167** he says that the laws of the Tyrians forbid the swearing of foreign oaths, among which he numbers, alongside some others, the oath called “Korban.”<sup>552</sup> This is to be

Hermippus’ comment simultaneously ridiculed both Pythagoras and Judeans. This must remain speculative, but ridicule of Pythagoras’ taboos would match the generally negative evaluation that we find elsewhere in Hermippus’ work. If Josephus knew Hermippus only at second-hand he may have missed his negative tone. If he drew directly from Hermippus, his achievement is remarkable: he has so selected and shortened Hermippus’ snide remark as to make it sound like a compliment to Judeans. Once again, his introduction (1.162) and conclusion (next sentence) so condition the hearing of his citation as to lead readers, even today, to assume that Hermippus treated both Pythagoras and Judeans with respect.

<sup>547</sup> Pace Niese, this final sentence should be read (with Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster) as Josephus’ own comment, not a continuation of the citation from Hermippus: it reinforces, narrows, and exaggerates what Hermippus has just said and gives Josephus, as always, the last word. By removing reference to Thracians, it focuses only on Pythagoras’ debt to Judeans and establishes the positive tone in which Josephus wishes the previous comment to be heard. The slightly strange phrasing of the sentence (“it is said ...”) is easily explained: Josephus knows, but does not attribute, the nearly identical comment of Aristobulus on this topic. Josephus’ Greek runs: λέγεται ... πολλὰ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίων νομίμων εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ μετενεγκεῖν φιλοσοφίαν; Aristobulus, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.1 reads: Πυθαγόρας πολλὰ τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν μετενεγκας εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δογματοποιίαν κατεχώρισεν.) The congruence of vocabulary is too close to be accidental (so also Gorman 1983: 32-33) and we must conclude that Aristobulus is a hidden influence on Josephus’ thinking here, as elsewhere (cf. 2.168, 190; see Appendix 5). If so, it is intriguing that Josephus does not cite Aristobulus in this connection as a “Greek” proving Pythagoras’ emulation of Judeans (cf. 2.218 on other Judean authors named within this category). Perhaps he reckoned that his name would gain no recognition outside Judean circles.

<sup>548</sup> After Hermippus’ direct reference to “Judeans,” Josephus moves to 3 sources whose “references” are at best indirect: Theophrastus, Herodotus, and Choerilus (1.166-74). In each case he has to argue that the author really meant to speak of “Judeans” although he never used the term.

<sup>549</sup> In contrast to the individual Pythagoras, Josephus stresses the knowledge of Judeans among whole “city-states” (πόλεις); the term sounds Greek enough, although the only example to be cited will be the Phoenician city, Tyre (whose knowledge of Judeans has already been demonstrated in 1.106-27). The vague “long ago” (πάλαι) leaves unclear how old is the tradition that Theophrastus records. The claim that “our nation” was known masks the fact that Theophrastus’ tradition apparently did *not* identify the “Korban” oath as specifically “Judean.”

<sup>550</sup> Josephus reinforces the sub-theme of this segment, introduced in 1.162, 165 (ζῆλος [“emulation”] here echoes ζηλωτής in 1.162). The language of “permeation” (διαφοιτάω) will be repeated in 2.282-84. Since what Theophrastus records is the *banning* of the Korban oath, Josephus’ reasoning requires a triple inference: that the Korban oath is specifically “Judean,” that its ban indicates its popularity, and that this betokens the emulation of Judean customs in general. Only the first inference is supported in what follows. The second and third are hardly self-evident; cf. Josephus’ use of the Greek oath νῆ Δία (1.255).

<sup>551</sup> Josephus assumes that Theophrastus, the pupil and successor of Aristotle, is well-known; he could hardly be claimed to be “ancient” (372—288/7 BCE). Little of his enormous output of works has survived, but he was famous enough in the Roman world to justify a biography by Diogenes Laertius (5.36-57). His work of comparative constitutional law, originally in 24 books, is extant only in fragments (see Szegedy-Maszak 1981; our material is frag. 22); it was known to Roman experts such as Cicero (*Fin.* 5.4). Josephus’ knowledge of Theophrastus is clearly limited: had it been broader, he could have used an explicit reference to “Judeans” in the work *On Piety* (preserved in Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.26).

<sup>552</sup> The banning of foreign customs is expressly praised in 2.255-70, but is here taken to signal not the danger but the popularity of the Korban oath (“deemed worthy of emulation,” 1.166): Josephus is operating with a hidden value code that presupposes the worth of this “Judean” custom. By paraphrasing Theophrastus, Josephus can omit all other oaths listed, which might indicate the equally strong “emulation” of other nations’ customs. If Theophrastus had labelled this oath “Judean,” Josephus would surely have said so.

found nowhere except among Judeans alone and signifies, as one might translate from the Hebrews' language, "gift for God."<sup>553</sup>

**168** Besides, not even Herodotus the Halicarnassian was ignorant about our nation,<sup>554</sup> but evidently refers to it in a certain way.<sup>555</sup> For, while recounting the history of the Colchians in the second book, he says as follows:<sup>556</sup>

*Herodotus*

**169** The Colchians, Egyptians and Ethiopians—he says—are the only people who, from the beginning, circumcise the genitals.<sup>557</sup> The Phoenicians and the Syrians in Palestine them-

<sup>553</sup> Greek: δῶρον θεοῦ (interpreted as an objective genitive). Josephus' assertion was bound to carry weight in Rome, where very few of his readers would know Hebrew (or Aramaic). His tactic, to insist on only one possible referent (cf. 1.171), is aided by the reference to the language of the "Hebrews," a term he employs for the Judeans of antiquity or those who speak their ancient language (*Antiquities* 1-8 *passim*; 10.8; 14.255; 18.228). In fact "Korban" (קֹרְבָן) is an Aramaic, as well as a Hebrew, term. We have no evidence for its use outside Judean culture, but Aramaic was commonly used in the region and it is possible that the oath was of wider currency. Josephus' interpretation of the term as "gift for God" makes explicit what is implied by its religious use (cf. the translations in LXX Lev 1:10; 2:4, etc.; *Ant.* 4.73; Mark 7:11). The term was first used to indicate (even label) materials dedicated to the temple, and could subsequently be employed in vows, devoting the relevant goods, and thus making them inaccessible to others; see Fitzmyer 1971: 93-100; Rengstorff in *TDNT* 3.860-66. The procedure would be familiar, perhaps, to Josephus' Judean and Christian readers (cf. Ps.-Philo, *Hypoth.* 7.3-5; Mark 7:6-13). However, Theophrastus here describes the word as an *oath*, as if in some self-imprecation, such as "may I (or some benefit belonging to me) be Korban, if ... " (see Gutschmid 561; for such vows of abstinence, see the Mishnaic tractate *m. Nedarim*; Derrett 1970: 364-65; Baumgarten 1984-89: 5-8). This seems to have been an oath used by Judeans, but Josephus does not explain how it functions.

<sup>554</sup> The "not even" suggests that Herodotus (5th century BCE) is a prize exhibit. He would have been recognized as a "famous Greek historian" (1.2), but the passage to be cited here was apparently not widely accepted as a reference to Judeans. Josephus can do no more here to prove his case than what he had already offered in *Ant.* 8.262: once again he does not acknowledge the repetition from his earlier work. In parading Herodotus as a truthful witness to Judean antiquity, Josephus cuts against his earlier dismissal of him as a purveyor of lies (1.16, 73). While he had corrected Herodotus' "errors" on several occasions in *Antiquities* (8.253, 260; 10.19), he cannot afford to raise doubts on

his veracity in this context. He thus lets pass even Herodotus' claim that "the Syrians in Palestine" had learned circumcision from the Egyptians, although that threatens to subvert the sub-theme of this segment, that other nations had learned their customs from Judeans (1.162, 166).

<sup>555</sup> "Evidently" translates Josephus' φαίνεται, which cannot here mean the hesitant "appears to"; cf. Herodotus' use of the verb in 1.170 and Josephus' φάνερον in the parallel *Ant.* 8.261. As elsewhere, Josephus' introduction and conclusion (1.171) clear up the ambiguity of the citation itself. "In a certain way" half-acknowledges that the reference is indirect.

<sup>556</sup> Josephus clearly knew well the section on Egyptian history in Herodotus 2.99-182: he alludes to 2.99-100 in *Ant.* 8.157, cites parts of 2.102-4 in *Ant.* 8.253-62 (as again here), and alludes to 2.141 in *Ant.* 10.17-20. He here quotes far more of the text than he had paraphrased (very loosely) in *Ant.* 8.262, but his presentation of the passage as concerning the Colchians masks the fact that the larger context is the history of Egypt, and the immediate theme the reign of Sesostris. Since he had cited Manetho's criticism of Herodotus on Egyptian history (1.73), and given an alternative account of the reign of "Sethos" (1.98-102), it was convenient to suggest that this passage concerned a different matter.

<sup>557</sup> For once we can check Josephus' citation against the original (Herodotus 2.104). He has cut into Herodotus' text mid-sentence, and slightly alters the wording at the beginning (hence, perhaps, the oddly inserted "he says"; cf. 1.187, 189, etc.); otherwise, however, he is almost entirely faithful to Herodotus, even keeping some of his Ionic forms (in contrast to the paraphrase in *Ant.* 8.262; see Inowlocki 2005: 384-86). In context, Herodotus is trying to prove that the Colchians (in the Pontus region) are of Egyptian descent, a residue of Sesostris' conquering army. The clinching proof is their practice of circumcision, which he thinks must have been derived from Egypt. The argument is typical of his diffusionist theory of culture, and his "Orientalist" attitude to the Near East: immensely impressed by Egypt, he is almost totally ignorant of Semitic cultures, and imposes on his observations a dis-



selves acknowledge that they learned it from the Egyptians.<sup>558</sup> **170** The Syrians who live beside Thermodon and the river Parthenios, and the Macronians, their neighbors, say that they learned it recently from the Colchians.<sup>559</sup> These are the only people who are circumcised and they evidently take their lead from the Egyptians.<sup>560</sup> As for the Egyptians and Ethiopians, I am unable to say which learned it from the other.<sup>561</sup>

**171** He said, then, that the Syrians in Palestine were circumcised.<sup>562</sup> But among those who inhabit Palestine only the Judeans do this;<sup>563</sup> knowing this, then, it was about them that he spoke.<sup>564</sup>

tinctly Greek theory of cultural influence. He regards circumcision as an exotic and unattractive practice (cf. 2.37, 105), but is satisfied with this superficial explanation of its currency in disparate nations. Josephus cannot correct the “facts” that his Greek witnesses provide, and lets Herodotus’ statements stand, although his own sacred texts directly contradict this account of the origin of Judean circumcision. For Egyptian circumcision, see note to “circumcised” at 2.141 and Labow 2005: 186, n.72,

<sup>558</sup> This is the crucial statement, to which Josephus will return in 1.171, and which he had already cited in *Ant.* 8.262. For Josephus everything hinges on the identity of those whom Herodotus refers to as “Syrians in Palestine.” Herodotus says he had visited “Palestine” (2.44, 106) and in 7.89 indicates that he means by this the coastal strip which runs between Phoenicia and Egypt (cf. “Palestinian Syria”: 1.105; 2.106; 3.91; 4.39; “Palestinian Syrians”: 3.5). Since the term *ῥουδαῖος* was not used by Greek-speakers before the hellenistic age, it is possible that Herodotus could refer to Judeans under some other label, but one might expect that to be simply “Syrians” (cf. Gutschmid 566). It is unlikely that Herodotus had any contact with Judeans, who lived inland and would hardly feed him the information Herodotus here claims. (Gutschmid [565-67] plausibly conjectures that Herodotus draws on an Egyptian claim that Syrians copied circumcision from them, and, finding a relic of Sesostri’s campaign in “Palestinian Syria,” concocts this spurious connection.) Thus, although Josephus may be right that in *his* day the only people in this region who practiced circumcision were Judeans (1.171), it is uncertain whether this was also the case in Herodotus’ time, and unlikely that Herodotus is referring to them specifically here (*pace* Stern 1.3-4; Lloyd 1988: 23, et al.). One can understand why Josephus’ critics might fail to recognize any reference to Judeans here (cf. 1.2), but also why, when the Judean practice was widely known, other authors would build on this notice in Herodotus to advance the claim that the Judeans were Egyptian colonists (Diodorus 1.28.2-3; 55.4-5).

<sup>559</sup> This whole section is superfluous for Josephus’ argument: his comment in 1.171 focuses entirely on the last sentence in 1.169. It reinforces the point, with

which Josephus could hardly agree, that all practice of circumcision derives from Egypt (or Ethiopia). One might suspect that he wished to “pad out” the otherwise meager citation of 1.169. On the rivers here named, and the Macronians, all in modern north-east Turkey, see Troiani 113 and Lloyd 1988: 23-25. Herodotus assumes that a “recent” practice must be derived from some other, and older, tradition (on his fallacious reasoning, see Lloyd 1975: 147-49).

<sup>560</sup> In his limited knowledge of the practice of circumcision, Herodotus omits Arabs and other Semitic groups. His crude cultural map is hardly acceptable from a Judean perspective, but Josephus lets it pass without comment. In fact, Josephus later uses Herodotus to taunt Apion (2.142), and it is notable that circumcision is not mentioned among the Judean laws and customs discussed in 2.145-286.

<sup>561</sup> This characteristic Herodotean gesture to the limits of his knowledge does nothing to dilute the confident identification of Egypt as *fons et origo* of “Syrian” circumcision. The following sentence, which Josephus omits, suggests that this diffusion came about by a “mixing” of the peoples—clearly a step too far for Josephus who strenuously denies any “mixing” of Judeans and Egyptians (1.229, 252-53, 278).

<sup>562</sup> This restatement of 1.169b ignores Herodotus’ further claim that such people acknowledged their cultural dependency on Egypt. For Josephus, the only question is whom Herodotus is talking about.

<sup>563</sup> Josephus simply asserts this as a fact (cf. *Ant.* 8.262, whose final sentence seems to add uncertainty). He can draw on the Roman perception that circumcision is not a “Syrian” custom, but is distinctly and strongly associated with Judeans (e.g., Petronius, *Sat.* 102.14; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.2; Suetonius, *Dom.* 12.2). Whether, in fact, other inhabitants of Palestine practiced circumcision is not clear. Some evidence for its widespread practice is not reliable (Philo, *Spec.* 1.2; Barnabas 9.6; Jerome’s commentary on Jer 9:25-26), and much depends on what is meant by “Palestine” and whether we are speaking of Herodotus’ or Josephus’ era (they are more than 500 years apart); see Stern 1.3-4; Cohen 1999: 45.

<sup>564</sup> The confident conclusion wraps up the discussion. The “this” he knew was that Judeans alone prac-



172 Also Choerilus, an older poet,<sup>565</sup> refers to our nation, as joining the expedition of Xerxes, king of the Persians, against Greece.<sup>566</sup> After listing all the nations, at the end he included ours as well, in these words:<sup>567</sup> *Choerilus*

173 Behind them crossed a people, remarkable to see,<sup>568</sup>  
 Releasing from their mouths Phoenician speech,<sup>569</sup>  
 They lived in Solyman hills beside a broad lake,<sup>570</sup>  
 With dishevelled topknots, round-shaven,<sup>571</sup> but above

tice circumcision (*pace* Gutschmid 567); it is crucial for Josephus that Herodotus consciously referred to Judeans, otherwise the reference can hardly be intentional. Why Herodotus should refer to Judeans under the name of “Syrians in Palestine” is not, however, explained. A few decades later, Celsus used this Herodotean tradition to argue that Judeans were nothing special: their customs were derived from others (*apud* Origen, *Cels.* 5.41; cf. 1.22). Origen’s reply, that Judean circumcision is very different from that employed by others (5.47-48), reflects a Judean sense of cultural distinction. But Josephus is debarred from that objection by his decision to leave his positive witnesses unquestioned.

<sup>565</sup> Choerilus is the third in the trio of “indirect” witnesses. Josephus makes clear that his poetry concerns an historical event, but a skeptic could object that the genre lends itself to “myth” more than “history.” A younger contemporary of Herodotus, who flourished at the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE, Choerilus of Samos pioneered the presentation of recent history (the Persian invasion of Greece) in epic verse. He was famous in his own day and in the immediately succeeding generations, but his works have since been lost, and in the Roman world he gained only sporadic mention in *recherché* circles (see Huxley 1969). Josephus is thus dredging up a somewhat obscure witness, whom he may know either via Ephorus (so Gutschmid 577-78) or through some earlier Judean researcher. His description as “older” (ἀρχαιότερος is the more secure text) gives a vague sense of antiquity to his witness (cf. 1.162, 166): it is not clear whether Josephus thought he was older than Herodotus, or, more likely, older than most other poets.

<sup>566</sup> Choerilus’ poem (which attracted various titles, Huxley 1969: 14) apparently recounted the crossing of the Hellespont by Xerxes’ army (480 BCE), and was heavily influenced by Herodotus’ catalogue of nations (7.59-100; cf. Momigliano 1975a: 77). This provides an occasion for a display of the hostile and exotic “barbarian,” whose “otherness” helps define the civilized “Greek” (see Hall 1989). Josephus accepts the categorization of his nation in these terms, although participation in this expedition accords with nothing in the Judean tradition and somewhat contradicts his own as-

sertion of Judean isolation (1.60-68).

<sup>567</sup> Their position at the end might suggest that this is the climactic example of the distant, and “freakish” barbarian. Although Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 9.9) accepted this passage as a reference to Judeans, modern editors are rightly skeptical: see Gutschmid 571-75 and Stern 3.5-7 (relegated to the Appendix).

<sup>568</sup> There are minor textual variants in these 5 lines between L and the version in Eusebius: Choerilus’ archaic Greek was naturally modified in transmission. Choerilus’ introduction alerts the reader to the outlandish spectacle to follow. The adjective “remarkable” (θαυμαστόν) encodes a cultural distance, though Josephus might hear it in a positive sense (“admirable”); cf. 1.175 (θαυμάζω); 2.179, 233.

<sup>569</sup> Language played a crucial role, for Greeks, in determining cultural location. “Phoenician speech” places this nation on a known linguistic map (cf. 1.10), but classifies them as descendants of a far-flung “barbarian” nation. As Josephus has just made clear (1.167), the Judeans’ language was Hebrew, not “Phoenician,” but he will not correct this depiction of “our nation.”

<sup>570</sup> This is the only line of value for Josephus’ argument, on which alone he comments in 1.174. “Solyman hills” is an intertextual echo of Homer, *Od.* 5.283, placing this exotic people on terrain familiar to a Greek audience, even if arguments would arise about its exact location (Strabo, *Geogr.* 1.2.10). The “broad lake” is non-specific and open to multiple identifications. Although the adjective here used (πλατύς) could also, in relation to water, develop the special sense of “salty” (Collace 1976), it appears that neither Choerilus nor Josephus understood it in that sense (Gutschmid 568-69). Josephus uses the comparative πλατυτέρα in its normal sense in 1.174, and it is the noun, rather than the adjective, that makes him think of the Dead Sea.

<sup>571</sup> Choerilus shows his penchant for obscure vocabulary (“round-shaven” translates τροχοκουράδες, hapax in all Greek literature from antiquity), the language as exotic as the habit it describes. The “dishevelled” (or “squalid,” ἀυχαλέοι) hair connotes the wild character of this people, while the head-shaving (derived from the depiction of Arabs in Herodotus 3.8) suggests an “unnatural” configuration of human identity. Josephus leaves unmentioned the fact that this style of hair is

They wore the skins of horses' faces, dried with smoke.<sup>572</sup>

**174** It is clear to everyone, I think, that he is referring to us,<sup>573</sup> since the Solyman hills are in our country, and we inhabit them,<sup>574</sup> and there is the so-called Bituminous Lake; for this is broader and bigger than all the lakes in Syria.<sup>575</sup> **175** So Choerilus makes reference to us in this way.<sup>576</sup>

*Clearchus*

That they not only knew about the Judeans but also admired any they encountered<sup>577</sup>—I am not talking about the most worthless Greeks but those who are especially admired for their wisdom<sup>578</sup>—is easy to determine.<sup>579</sup> **176** For Clearchus, a

specifically forbidden to Judeans (Lev 19:27; cf. Jer 9:26).

<sup>572</sup> This climactic visual peculiarity suggests a “savage” affinity to the animal world (cf. the wearing of animal skins by Bacchants). The detail is drawn from Herodotus 7.70, where it applies to the Asiatic “Ethiopians.” That Josephus takes the whole description, loaded with cultural disdain and utterly inappropriate, as a reference to the Judean nation, indicates what humiliations he is prepared to undergo for the sake of being mentioned by ancient Greek sources.

<sup>573</sup> The use of “clear” (δηλον) appears to settle doubt (cf. 1.161, 166, 174, 185), though the “I think” might be heard to shake the confidence that everyone will interpret Choerilus in the required fashion. Josephus’ proof depends on ignoring every detail except the geographical reference. Since the “Solyman hills” are mentioned by Homer in proximity to a reference to Ethiopia, and since his last line echoes the Herodotean depiction of Ethiopians, most commentators conclude that Choerilus’ literary invention would evoke for his first hearers an “Ethiopian” people; in this case, the “lake” could refer to the Red Sea or even the Persian Gulf (cf. Herodotus 7.89; Gutschmid 575-77; Huxley 1969: 18-20). An alternative is possible: following Homer, *Il.* 6.184, 204, a people called the “Solymi” were often placed in the region of Lycia or Pisidia (e.g., Herodotus 1.173.2; Strabo, *Geogr.* 1.2.10, 28; 13.4.16; cf. Labow 2005: 188, n.82). But it is unlikely that these would be placed last in Choerilus’ list.

<sup>574</sup> On Josephus’ geographical identification with Judea and the present tense, see note to “possess” at 1.1. Josephus exploits a literary custom in his contemporary Rome, which would make this argument more persuasive for his Roman readers than for us. There is abundant evidence that after the Judean War Flavian authors (and their immediate successors) referred to Jerusalem as “Solyma”: see, e.g., Flaccus, *Argon.* 1.13; Martial 7.55.7; 11.94; Statius, *Silv.* 5.2.138; Pausanias, *Descr.* 8.16.4-5. Tacitus even connects this name with the Homeric “Solymi” in proffering one theory for the origin of Judeans (*Hist.* 5.2.3; see Gutschmid 572; Lévy 1946: 334-39). Thus the reference to “Solyman hills”

might well evoke “Jerusalem” in the minds of Roman readers. Elsewhere, Josephus says that the city was first known as “Solyma” (*War* 6.438; *Ant.* 1.180) and he may connect this to Homer (*Ant.* 7.67, if the text is secure). But the reference here to the “Solyman hills” is unique and clearly created by the need to match Choerilus’ description.

<sup>575</sup> Josephus takes the reference to Phoenician language and Solyman hills to justify comparing lakes specifically in “Syria.” He frequently refers to the Dead Sea as the “Bituminous Lake” (e.g., *War* 1.657; 3.515; 4.476-85), the name by which it was also known in Rome (Diodorus 19.98; Pliny, *Nat.* 2.226; 5.71-73; Galen, *Simpl.* 4.20; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.6.2-4). He thus appeals to a geographical landmark familiar to his Roman readers and strongly associated with Judeans. Few would know enough to contest his assertion about its comparative size, in which he makes a verbal connection (“broad–broader”) with the citation from Choerilus.

<sup>576</sup> The conclusion returns to the opening assertion (1.172), which was reinforced in the opening comment of 1.174: repetition helps support the dubious evidence.

<sup>577</sup> The last two authors have, on a generous estimate, done no more than allude to Judeans. But Josephus can now cite an explicit reference to a Judean, and can also repeat the sub-theme of this segment, the admiration of Judeans (cf. 1.162, 166, 173). The story he will cite concerns only a single Judean, but by trimming the citation to focus on his people and its philosophical reputation, Josephus makes the story appear applicable to *any* Judean Aristotle could have encountered. The “admiration” is clear in the story itself (the θαυμασ-root will recur in 1.177, 182), though Josephus leaves somewhat vague what was so admired.

<sup>578</sup> Josephus refers primarily to Aristotle, the speaker in the story to follow, and perhaps secondarily to Clearchus, handsomely praised in the next section. That Josephus should add this comment is extremely revealing of his cultural strategy. He seeks mention (and preferably praise) from, above all, the very noblest of Greeks (see at 1.2)—their nobility being measured on a scale devised by Greek intellectuals themselves. The

pupil of Aristotle and second to none among peripatetic philosophers,<sup>580</sup> says in the first book *On Sleep*<sup>581</sup> that his teacher Aristotle recounted the following about a certain Judean man<sup>582</sup> (he attributes the words to Aristotle himself).<sup>583</sup> The text goes like this:

177 “Yet, it would take a long time to recount the full details,<sup>584</sup> but it would not be amiss to describe those aspects of the man which indicate something extraordinary, and likewise philosophical.<sup>585</sup> Be fully aware, Hyperochides,” he said, “that I will give you the impression of saying something equivalent to dreams.”<sup>586</sup> Hyperochides<sup>587</sup> replied modestly, “It is

*Aristotle and a Judean*

social snobbery in the adjective “the most worthless” (οἱ φαυλότατοι; cf. 1.53, 210; 2.3, 236, 278; where it has a *moral* tone I translate “despicable”) reflects the stance of an educated elite, whose “wisdom” (σοφία) or “education” (παιδεία, 1.181) is defined by their own culturally specific standards. In this context (contrast *Ant.* 20.262-65), Josephus is required to adopt this status-evaluation, even though this means that such Greeks’ admiration of Judeans will amount to little more than admiration of themselves (for being “like us”; see 1.180-81). His strategic admiration of “Greek” philosophy is also evident elsewhere (2.168, 239, 281).

<sup>579</sup> This constitutes another claim that what follows is completely unambiguous (cf. the use of “clear” and “evident” in 1.162, 166, 168, 174, etc.).

<sup>580</sup> Although what follows is cited from Clearchus, he is merely the medium (cf. 1.182) for the words of Aristotle, who is mentioned no less than 5 times in this passage (Clearchus only twice); since he is only the “pupil” of Aristotle, it is the teacher’s words, and the teacher’s opinions, that count. Aristotle was universally known, Clearchus only in scholarly circles, and Josephus neither dates nor locates him. Born in the 340s BCE in Soli (Cyprus), he was a pupil of Aristotle, but attempted to reconcile Aristotelian and Platonic thought on many issues. The meager fragments from his many works are collected by Wehrli (1948). Josephus’ high evaluation of his intellectual ability is not shared by scholars, but seems to have been adopted by some dilettanti in antiquity (cf. Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 701c). Although he may have travelled as far as Bactriana (Afghanistan), his knowledge of “eastern” philosophy was extremely limited (1.179).

<sup>581</sup> Josephus may have known this at first hand (he certainly wishes to convey this impression), and later extends an invitation to readers to consult the work themselves (1.182). If this is not an empty gesture, it suggests some confidence that he knew what it contained. If so, his peculiar truncation of the tale raises all the more suspicion (see note to “endurance” at 1.182). The topic of sleep interested philosophers as it suggested that the soul had a life separate from the body, and if separable, arguably immortal. On Clearchus’ in-

clination to the Platonic (and early Aristotelian) viewpoint on this subject, see Wehrli 1948: 47.

<sup>582</sup> Josephus foregrounds the one thing important for his argument: the ethnicity of the character concerned. It accords with this that he cites only the introduction (1.177-81) to what was clearly a longer story, since this was where the man’s ethnicity was made explicit. Clearchus’ story concerned a remarkable man who was also a Judean (cf. 1.183); Josephus presents it as a tale of a Judean man who was also remarkable.

<sup>583</sup> L’s Greek (παρατιθείς, “citing”) should here be emended (with Gutschmid 579 and most modern editors, except Münster) to περιτίθησι (“he attributes”; cf. Latin: *ascribit*). This indicates that the voice immediately to be encountered is that not of Clearchus (as narrator) but of Aristotle. The text seems to have had the form of a dialogue between Aristotle and his pupils. Aristotle, rather than Clearchus, is cited directly, as he carries the greater authority (see Inowlocki 2005: 384).

<sup>584</sup> The citation begins *in medias res*. *Pace* Lewy 1938: 223-24, it is not clear that a summary of the man’s extraordinary powers had already been given.

<sup>585</sup> The two characteristics are not a hendiadys (*pace* Gutschmid 579), but their juxtaposition, which might appear odd, will be justified in what follows. “Something extraordinary” translates θαυμασιότητά τινα, the θαυμασ- root (see at 1.175) suggesting admiration or amazement at something marvellous or even “miraculous.” No single English term can cover the semantic range of this word, but “extraordinary” conveys the sense of something abnormal or prodigious. Lewy’s “certain gifts of magic” (1938: 206) presses the sense too far in one direction.

<sup>586</sup> Münster follows Eusebius codex B in omitting θαυμαστόν (read in L E and emended by Gutschmid 580-81). In what follows, the fact that the Judean encountered by Aristotle was thoroughly hellenized does not constitute something “extraordinary,” and Josephus’ summary of the main story applies the adjective vaguely to his “endurance” (1.182). But this comparison with dreams suggests something distinctly “paranormal”; see note to “endurance” at 1.182.

for this very reason that we all want to hear it.” 178 “Well then,” said Aristotle, “in accordance with the rules of rhetoric, let us first describe his ancestry,<sup>588</sup> so we don’t disobey the teachers of narrative-technique.”<sup>589</sup> “Tell us,” said Hyperochides, “if you wish.”<sup>590</sup> 179 “This man, then,<sup>591</sup> was a Judean by descent from Coele-Syria.<sup>592</sup> These people are descendants of the philosophers in India.<sup>593</sup> Among the Indians, they say, the philosophers are called Calanoi,<sup>594</sup> and among the Syrians, Judeans, taking their name from the place; for the place they inhabit is called Judea.<sup>595</sup> The name of their city is extremely contorted:<sup>596</sup> they call it

<sup>587</sup> An Athenian pupil of Aristotle. The dialogue was perhaps set in Athens (and thus in the years 335-323 BCE); see Gutschmid 581.

<sup>588</sup> Greek: τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ. I translate γένος normally as “people” (see note to “people” at 1.1) and, in the phrase Ἰουδαῖος [or equivalent] τὸ γένος as “Judean [or equivalent] by descent” (as just below, at 1.179). In both cases genealogy and ancestry are in view (“people” in the sense of “descent-group”), and “ancestry” may be the best translation here.

<sup>589</sup> Translating ἀπαγγελῶν (Eusebius’ superior reading of the text, followed by all editors): the term covers many kinds of narrative report (cf. *War* 1.14; *Ant.* 4.122, etc.). Since Aristotle himself set the ground-rules of much of rhetoric, his “compliance” is somewhat ironic, and it self-consciously draws attention to elite codes of discourse (cf. Isocrates, *Evag.* 12). The statement shows that the following sentences on the origin of the Judean are purely introductory: the main point of the story is what follows, and what Josephus omits.

<sup>590</sup> This rather elaborate introduction is unnecessary for Josephus’ argument and suggests that his citation is complete as far as he chooses to quote. But it also indicates the social and cultural ethos in which Clearchus will introduce the Judean: here “gentlemanly” manners and suave “sophistication” set the elite framework into which his “oriental” wisdom will have to fit.

<sup>591</sup> Niese minor and Münster add ἔφη (“he said”), but the change in speaker from the end of 1.177 is clear enough. The limited interest in this Judean is suggested by the fact that he remains anonymous throughout: his importance for Clearchus lies only in what his behavior (or powers) can illustrate for philosophy.

<sup>592</sup> “Judean by descent” translates τὸ γένος Ἰουδαῖος (see above note to “ancestry” and Cohen 1994); cf. parallel phrases in 1.73, 129, 164, etc. On what was then understood by the geographical term “Coele-Syria” see Stern 1.14. What follows indicates that Judeans are only interesting for Clearchus inasmuch as they can be depicted as “philosophers,” that is, within a Greek framework of cultural analysis.

<sup>593</sup> Hellenistic admiration for the ancient traditions of oriental sages (Egyptian priests, Persian “Magi,” Babylonian “Chaldeans,” and Indian “Brachmans”) depended on remarkably little knowledge about these

cultures. Following slight encounters with Judean religion, it was relatively easy to place them in the same category of philosophical easterner (so Theophrastus *apud* Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.26; cf. Hecataeus *apud* Diodorus Siculus 40.3), and to consider them a special class of Syrian, parallel to the Brahmins among Indians (Megasthenes *apud* Clement, *Strom.* 1.15.72.5). Clearchus here follows this trend, but goes one step further in positing a genealogical descent from Indian philosophers, a crass simplification of cultural terrain that he shows little interest in exploring. Elsewhere (*apud* Diogenes Laertius 1.9; Wehrli 1948: frag. 13) he made the Indian philosophers descendants of the Magi, positing a single genealogical tree conveniently joining the whole “Orient” in terms that Greeks could comprehend (see Jaeger 1938: 138-42; Hengel 1974: 256-58). Josephus reports this absurd explanation of Judean origins, despite his insistence elsewhere on a very different account (1.1, 71; cf. his variable sensitivity to alternative versions in 1.82, 104). Once again, he lets erroneous comments pass without criticism, submitting himself to the ignorant viewpoint of this “wisest” of Greeks (1.175).

<sup>594</sup> In Hellenistic accounts of the “gymnosophists” or “Brachmans” (Brahmins) of India, a special place is often accorded to Calanus, in tales of Alexander: see the accounts in Arrian, *Anab.* 7.2-3; Strabo, *Geogr.* 15.1.61-68; Plutarch, *Alex.* 65, 69. Calanus is usually depicted as one of the Brahmins, but Clearchus here invents a label “Calanoi” for this class of Indian philosopher, an alteration of the tradition that suggests ignorance rather than purposeful manipulation.

<sup>595</sup> Clearchus’ comment suggests that “Syria” is well-known to his readers, but “Judea” less so. His understanding of the label “Judean” seems to be primarily geographical and ethnic: they are natives of a land called “Judea” (cf. Introduction, § 9 on Josephus’ understanding of the label). But at the same time, in a confusion of categories, the label depicts a class of philosophers among the Syrians: cf. Theophrastus’ depiction of Judeans as φιλόσοφοι τὸ γένος (*apud* Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.26).

<sup>596</sup> σκολιόν means “crooked,” “bent,” or “contorted.” The sentence serves to distance and demean Judeans as an alien, somewhat barbaric, people with strange place-names. It is an ancient precursor to numerous colonial



Hierousaleme.<sup>597</sup> **180** Now this man, both because he was welcomed as a guest by many<sup>598</sup> and because he was in the habit of coming down from the highlands to the coast,<sup>599</sup> was Greek<sup>600</sup> not only in his speech but also in his soul.<sup>601</sup> **181** At that time we were staying in Asia,<sup>602</sup> and this man visited the same places and encountered us and some other scholars, testing our wisdom,<sup>603</sup> but as he had been in the company of many educated people,<sup>604</sup> it was he, rather, who conveyed some of what he had.”<sup>605</sup>

**182** Such were Aristotle’s words, as found in Clearchus,<sup>606</sup> and he further relates in

occasions for laughter or pretended alarm at the “weird” names of native people and places.

<sup>597</sup> Greek: ἱεροσαλήμη. As Gutschmid rightly insists (584) the text should not be emended to bring it into line with the more usual hellenistic name ἱεροσόλυμα (e.g., Hecataeus *apud* Diodorus Siculus 40.3.3). Clearchus deliberately conveys, or invents, a linguistically ugly version of the name (cf. Lysimachus’ ploy in 1.311).

<sup>598</sup> This and the next clause seem designed to explain how this Judean attained the cultural level necessary to participate in philosophical discourse as an equal (cf. 1.181). His native philosophical wisdom alone did not qualify him: he needed the socialization provided by the hospitality of the elite, whose educated company could mold both his speech and his soul (see Bar-Kochva 1999: 242-43).

<sup>599</sup> The present participle suggests this was a “habit” (so translated here; see Bar-Kochva 1999: 242-43; for questions on the text, see Gutschmid 585). The coast is presumed to be the normal location for Greek civilization, where the Judean could truly learn to be “Greek.” It is normally assumed that the highlands in question are those of Asia (see 1.181; so Gutschmid 585-86; Troiani 116), but it is just possible that Clearchus is speaking of descent from the Judean hills to the Phoenician coast (Lewy 1938: 207, n.11, following Nock). In either case, this account stands in some tension with Josephus’ claim that Judeans kept to themselves, remote from the sea (1.60).

<sup>600</sup> Latin *gratissimus*, apparently a corruption of *graecissimus*, makes it possible that the original was a superlative, “extremely/perfectly Greek” (ἑλληνικώτατος); see Gutschmid 585.

<sup>601</sup> This is apparently the highest possible accolade from a Greek philosopher, that a man be Greek in his “soul” (ψυχή, the site of his beliefs, morals, and reasoning capacity). In this perspective, the best “barbarian” is one who has become a “Greek.” Josephus rightly regards this comment as praise, but thereby colludes with its massive cultural condescension. One is reminded of Macaulay’s famous minute setting out British policy in India, which was designed to produce natives who are “Indian in blood and colour” but “English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect” (Macaulay 1835/

1972: 249). Clearchus’ comment represents not so much hellenistic “policy” as hellenistic prejudice. It is ironic that contemporary Jewish scholars hail this sort of praise as “pro-Jewish” (Feldman 1993: 201-7).

<sup>602</sup> Aristotle stayed in Assos (in Mysia) in 348-345 BCE. This story has been taken as evidence for the early residence of Judeans in Asia, but it may be entirely fictional, or the Judean a visitor rather than a resident (see Barclay 1996a: 260-62).

<sup>603</sup> Translating αὐτῶν τῆς σοφίας as “our wisdom” (with Bar-Kochva 1999: 243), since the context suggests an inclusive reference to the two groups just mentioned. The story is told so much from Aristotle’s perspective that the Judean is said to encounter “us” not “we” him. The description evokes a “gentlemanly” environment of leisured travel and debate, according to the Judean the right to probe “our” wisdom.

<sup>604</sup> Following Eusebius’ text, universally agreed to be superior. “Educated” (ἐν παιδείᾳ) once again privileges a specifically Greek understanding of culture. This clause precedes and thus modifies the appreciation for what the Judean contributed of “what he had.” While allowing for this contribution from a different cultural tradition, Clearchus insists that its necessary condition was his socialization in the company of educated Greeks. His wisdom is not accepted as a fully independent entity—only as he has become “Greek” in his soul.

<sup>605</sup> On the translation (the μᾶλλον does not mean he had “more” to offer), see Bar-Kochva 1999: 243-47 (in agreement with Thackeray and Blum). As noted above, the previous clause sets the context in which his particular cultural contribution can be made. Clearchus shows interest in, even respect for, the Judean’s ideas—so long as he speaks in terms Greeks can recognize. Such ambiguity is common in the Greek (and “Orientalist”) fascination with “the east” (see Reading Options, above). The narrative probably continued by showing what particular contribution this Judean had to bring; for Josephus’ reasons to cut it short, see commentary on the next section.

<sup>606</sup> Clearchus is purely the channel for the praise of this Judean, which sounds more impressive coming from Aristotle himself.



detail the immense and extraordinary endurance<sup>607</sup> of the Judean man in his mode of life,<sup>608</sup> and his moderation.<sup>609</sup> Those who wish may find out more from the book itself; I am guarding myself against citing more than is sufficient.<sup>610</sup>

*Hecataeus*

**183** Clearchus, saying these things in passing—he was dealing with a different subject—made reference to us in this way.<sup>611</sup> By contrast, Hecataeus the Abderite,<sup>612</sup> a man who was both a philosopher and extremely able in practical affairs,<sup>613</sup> who

<sup>607</sup> “Extraordinary” translates another word from the θαυμασ-*root* (here θαυμάσιον), echoing 1.177 to give the impression that the whole story concerned this moral characteristic. “Endurance” (καρτερία) was widely associated with Calanus and Indian philosophers (e.g., Arrian, *Anab.* 7.2-3; Philo, *Prob.* 93-96; Josephus, *War* 7.351-57), and may have been transferred to Judeans by Clearchus, following the association suggested in 1.179. (On Clearchus’ possible polemical strategy here, see Bar-Kochva 1997; 1999: 247-49, rightly stressing that this Judean is incidental to Clearchus’ philosophical interests.) In any case, Josephus will list it as one of the key characteristics of Judean culture (2.146, 170; see note to “labors” at 2.146). It is intriguing that Josephus did not include some account, even in paraphrase, of the Judean’s endurance (and moderation), but truncates the tale at this point. It is possible that he knew no more of Clearchus’ text than this (drawing off someone else’s excerpts), but it is also possible that he knew what followed and disliked it. Following Havet and Gutschmid 587-88, Lewy (1938) presented an intriguing hypothesis, identifying this Judean with the hypnotist described by Clearchus in another fragment from this work (Wehrli 1948: frag. 7). This figure is related to have drawn the soul out from a sleeping (and senseless) child, thereby demonstrating the independence of soul and body. Lewy’s argument is not wholly convincing: the hypnotist is not identified as a Judean, and the story does not correlate to Josephus’ “endurance” and “moderation”—which may, however, relate to another anecdote, as Lewy suggests (concerning a man who never slept and lived on “ether” alone). But something is needed to justify the mysterious language of 1.177 (especially the “dream-like” characterization), and it is possible that Josephus has invented these general moral virtues to substitute for the depiction of a Judean magician of some kind. For an alternative account (the Judean as a type of Indian ascetic) see Bar-Kochva 1997.

<sup>608</sup> δίαίτα has a semantic range wider than food/diet, even if this latter is sometimes foregrounded; cf. Josephus’ later uses of the term in 2.173-74, 235, 240 (plural).

<sup>609</sup> σωφροσύνη is a preeminent philosophical virtue, listed by Josephus in 2.170 (with καρτερία) as one of the four cardinal virtues of Judeans. The neatness of fit

with his own depiction of Judean culture is suspicious. In such a drastic paraphrase of Clearchus he can choose the terms he wants.

<sup>610</sup> Josephus often appeals to the criterion of “sufficiency” when he wishes to close a discussion (cf. the matching vocabulary, from the ἰκαν-*root*, in, e.g., 1.58, 287; 2.288). He has done enough to fulfil the limited (but main) aim of citing another Greek reference to Judeans. But this may also provide a convenient excuse to avoid citing more of Clearchus. His suggestion that the interested could look it up themselves once again constructs his audience as an educated and leisured elite (cf. 1.16). The gesture may be purely rhetorical, given the practical difficulties (for other than full-time scholars) in locating hellenistic philosophical literature.

<sup>611</sup> The stress on Clearchus’ minimalism is designed to contrast with the following statement on Hecataeus, but threatens to undercut the claim that Clearchus had spoken on this topic “in detail” (1.182). The “different subject” is never clarified (see at 1.176, 182).

<sup>612</sup> Although Abdera is in Thrace, Hecataeus is sufficiently “Greek” to be included in this segment. On the real Hecataeus, whose work on Egypt was the basis for Diodorus’ account of that land, see Jacoby 1943: 29-34. Through Diodorus his name became known in late Republican Rome and in literary circles thereafter (e.g., Diogenes Laertius 9.69; Plutarch, *Mor.* 354d). Josephus had referred to him in *Ant.* 1.159 (cf. 1.108; 12.38), as the author of a book on Abraham, which would have been a spectacular proof of antiquity had it been proffered here. Josephus now ignores the Abraham book (sensing it was inauthentic?) and refers here only to one on the Judeans, perhaps unaware that this, also, was a Judean pseudepigraph (see Appendix 2).

<sup>613</sup> Hecataeus was known also in *Suda* as a philosopher and here joins the company of other “philosophers” (1.162, 176; the label is always a compliment in this treatise). That he “composed a book” (συγγέγραψε βιβλίον) is sufficient to qualify him for inclusion (the verb echoes συγγράμματα in 1.161), though Josephus also uses the more technical verb ἱστορέω at 1.195. The combination of philosophical intellect with practical activity (illustrated in 1.189, 200) mirrors the compliments to be paid to the Judeans Ezekias (1.187) and Mosollamos (1.201), and anticipates the Judean validation of both word and deed at 2.170-74.

flourished at the same time as Alexander the King and was associated with Ptolemy, son of Lagus,<sup>614</sup> did not refer to us in passing but composed a book on the Judeans themselves,<sup>615</sup> from which I wish to touch on a few passages, in summary form.<sup>616</sup> **184** First I shall determine the date.<sup>617</sup> He makes reference to the battle of Ptolemy against Demetrius near Gaza, and this took place in the eleventh year after the death of Alexander, in the 117th Olympiad,<sup>618</sup> as Castor recounts.<sup>619</sup> **185** For, under the heading of<sup>620</sup> this Olympiad, he says: “In this period Ptolemy son of Lagus defeated

*Fixing the date*

<sup>614</sup> That both L and Latin refer here (and at 1.185) to “Ptolemy Lagus” (corrected by all editors, following ed. pr.) indicates the early corruption of the text. Alexander (d. 323 BCE) and Ptolemy I Soter (satrap, then king of Egypt, 323-283 BCE) feature in the excerpts at 1.184-87, 192, 200. Josephus’ vague connection of author with rulers suggests he knew little more than this, and other sources are equally unhelpful on Hecataeus’ dates and roles (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 7-18). For Josephus it is important to be able to present Hecataeus as an eye-witness of events (cf. 1.47-55); Greek carelessness in recording contemporary history (1.45-46) is now conveniently forgotten.

<sup>615</sup> Despite some textual uncertainties (see Niese and Reinach), the main point is clear (cf. *Ant.* 1.159). Josephus reminds his readers of this fact again at 1.205, 214. If the book had a title it was perhaps *On the Judeans* (περὶ Ἰουδαίων); see Bar-Kochva 1996a: 182-91. Josephus’ delight that a Greek should be so impressed as to write a whole book on the Judeans is mirrored in the space accorded to Hecataeus (over one third of the Greek segment). Although Josephus probably believed it authentic, and a number of scholars have followed him, it is almost certain that the work here cited was written by a Judean (see Appendix 2). It appears to have taken up and corrected many of the observations on the Judeans in the digression on the topic by the real Hecataeus (known to us in the excerpt of Diodorus 40.3). It may have been structured as an ethnography (Jacoby 1943: 66-74; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 187-219), although Josephus’ selections hardly allow us to trace its shape and purpose. Its form (a first-hand account by a figure in the Ptolemaic court), its adulatory tone, and many of its topics (e.g., the magnificence of the temple) parallel *Letter of Aristeas*.

<sup>616</sup> κεφαλαιωδῶς suggests summary in contrast to full detail (2.164; *War* 4.496; *Ant.* 12.245), and gives the impression of picking out all the important points (cf. the adjective in 2.150; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 47 translates “the highlights”). The individual excerpts sometimes appear to be paraphrased (see below), but are otherwise cited in full, rather than summarized. Josephus has the license to select as he will and to arrange his selections in his own order. His eye is caught by passages which illustrate key themes in this treatise

concerning the Judean priestly constitution. The Mosollamos episode (1.200-204) forms the climax, as the cleverest and most vivid affirmation of Judean culture, and an effective counter-weight to Agatharchides’ criticism, which follows immediately (1.205-12). We should not presume that Josephus follows the order, or represents the emphases, of his source.

<sup>617</sup> The purpose here is to fix not the author’s date (already established in 1.183) but the date of the earliest recorded events relevant to the Judean people (see end of 1.185). The real Hecataeus had made reference to Moses and the exodus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3), but Josephus appears to know only this (pseudepigraphical) work which recorded history no earlier than Alexander. This testimony provides weak evidence for Judean antiquity compared to other witnesses in this Greek segment (e.g., Pythagoras and Herodotus), let alone in the non-Greek segments. Josephus’ vague claim at the end of 1.185 and his reference to the occupation of Jerusalem “from the remote past” (1.196) are the best he can do to press this narrative for evidence of a more ancient past.

<sup>618</sup> The exactitude is impressive, and Josephus parades it with detail and cross-reference (contrast the vagueness of 1.166, 172). The eleventh year after Alexander’s death is 312 BCE, the first year in the 117th Olympiad (312-309 BCE). Olympiads were a “universal” (i.e., Greek) framework for chronology, and Josephus’ willingness to adopt this (cf. 2.17; *War* 1.415; on several occasions in *Antiquities* 12-16) indicates his adaptation to a non-Judean historical framework. However, it was useless for very early dates (the scheme starts in 776 BCE) and Josephus’ use is haphazard. As we have noted (1.126, 159-60), the history of the temple provides his chief chronological markers, and it is only occasionally that he brings the two schemes into alignment (e.g., *Ant.* 12.248, 321; 14.66, 487).

<sup>619</sup> Castor of Rhodes composed a 6-book chronology of world history in the 1st century BCE (*FGH* 250); Josephus refers to him later (2.84) as *temporum conscriptor*, and on both occasions assumes he is well-known. The cross-reference indicates agreement among Greek historians (despite 1.15-27).

<sup>620</sup> Reading προθεῖς with Cobet, Naber, Reinach,

*Ptolemy and  
Ezekias*

Demetrius son of Antigonus, called Poliorketes, in a battle at Gaza.”<sup>621</sup> All agree that Alexander died in the 114th Olympiad.<sup>622</sup> It is clear, then, that our nation was flourishing at the time of both Ptolemy and Alexander.<sup>623</sup> **186** Now, Hecataeus further says this,<sup>624</sup> that after the battle at Gaza, Ptolemy became master of the territories of Syria<sup>625</sup> and many of the people, when they heard about Ptolemy’s kindness and benevolence, wanted to go with him to Egypt<sup>626</sup> and to share in the political affairs.<sup>627</sup> **187** One of these, he says, was Ezekias, “a high-priest of the Judeans,<sup>628</sup> a man about

and Münster (rather than προθεΐς in L, Niese): literally, “after putting this Olympiad forward” as a heading.

<sup>621</sup> Demetrius, son of Antigonus I, enjoyed mixed success in the struggle to control Alexander’s vast legacy (336-283 BCE); his epithet (“The Besieger”) derives from famous sieges, such as that of Rhodes in 305 BCE. This battle was part of a series of wars through which Ptolemy I eventually took control of Syria-Palestine (Tcherikover 1959: 50-55). Josephus’ account of this period in *Antiquities* 12 is sketchy; see Diodorus 19.80-110.

<sup>622</sup> The death of Alexander (323 BCE) in the 114th Olympiad (324-321 BCE) was indeed one of the fixed points in Greek historiography; for universal agreement as a sign of truth, see 1.26.

<sup>623</sup> The conclusion (for “it is clear,” cf. 1.162, 166, 174) seems premature, since the Judean nation has not yet been mentioned. When it is (1.187ff.), it appears that Hecataeus referred to a well-established state with a system of government and temple. Josephus’ claim concerning the flourishing of the nation is thus justified but notably vague as an attempt to establish its antiquity. It seems that Ps.-Hecataeus did not share Josephus’ concern to prove the antiquity of the nation. But Josephus does the best he can with this example of “Greek” interest in the Judean nation, selecting passages where his source admired the features that he wanted to highlight.

<sup>624</sup> We strike here a recurrent problem: when is Josephus paraphrasing his source and when is he citing (more or less) verbatim? Texts in accusative and infinitive (e.g., 1.192) are clearly paraphrase, while those with full introduction (e.g., λέγει δ’ οὕτως) and vivid detail are almost certainly verbatim citations (e.g., 1.201-4). In between stand many examples of φησὶν (“he says”) followed by indicative verbs, which could represent either. Editors differ in the application of quotation marks, and I am less certain than most in attributing statements fully to Josephus’ source. The effort to reconstruct Ps.-Hecataeus is crucially determined by such judgments; see especially at 1.191.

<sup>625</sup> In fact, Syria was regained by Demetrius/Antigonus from 311-302 BCE, but then reconquered by Ptolemy in 302 BCE (Diodorus 20.113.1). Josephus (and perhaps Ps.-Hecataeus) omits reference to Pto-

lemy’s capture of Jerusalem, which took place in 312/11 or 302/1 BCE (see note to “city” at 1.210). Even a less hostile account of the event than that given by Agatharchides (1.209-11) might have marred the impression of friendship between the Judeans and the Ptolemaic regime that Josephus (and Ps.-Hecataeus?) wished to evoke.

<sup>626</sup> Cf. the more neutral statement about this migration in 1.194, which stands between this positive portrayal and the brutal picture of enslavement and enforced removal in *Let. Aris.* 12-13. Ps.-Aristeas attempted to salvage the image of Ptolemy I (*Let. Aris.* 14: the enslavement was against his wishes), and in *Ant.* 12.1-11 Josephus vacillated between the image of a cruel conqueror (derived from Agatharchides; cf. *Apion* 1.210) and that of a humane and hospitable king. The focus here only on the latter image may be related, via intermediate sources, to aspects of the mixed portrayal in Diodorus (see Diodorus 19.55.5; 86.2-4; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 72-74), but it is also crucial for Josephus’ larger strategy in this treatise, which will portray, against Apion, notably warm relations between Judeans in Egypt and the Ptolemaic dynasty (2.42-60). This statement on Ptolemy’s “kindness” (ἠπιότης) and “humanity” (φιλανθρωπία; on these as Judean virtues see 2.146, 213) echoes common themes in the eulogies of hellenistic kings (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 74, n.65; Berthelot 2003: 17-57), though the former noun is very rare (hapax in Josephus; cf. LXX Esth 3: 13b).

<sup>627</sup> For this translation of κοινωνεῖν τὰ πράγματα, cf. Xenophon, *Hell.* 2.3.17. On foreigners, including Judeans, in Ptolemaic civic administration see Barclay 1996a: 21-22. Josephus refers to a military role for Judeans in 2.44 but oddly fails to clarify what role, if any, Ezekias had in Ptolemaic government according to Ps.-Hecataeus (1.189).

<sup>628</sup> The level of detail, some irrelevant to Josephus, suggests a citation, though I consider the opening words of the section to be Josephus’ own (thus leaving obscure how, in Ps.-Hecataeus’ account, Ezekias related to the Judean migration to Egypt). The brief and rather cryptic excerpts on Ezekias here and at 1.189 suggest that Josephus’ interest was caught less by this individual (whom he could not harmonize with his other knowledge of the period) than by his dual role as a

sixty-six years old, of high standing among his fellow countrymen and no fool intellectually, and moreover an able speaker, and as experienced as anyone in political affairs.”<sup>629</sup> **188** Indeed, he says,<sup>630</sup> “the total number of the Judeans’ priests who receive a tenth of the produce<sup>631</sup> and who administer public affairs is about 1500.”<sup>632</sup> **189** Referring again to the man mentioned above, he says:<sup>633</sup> “This man, when he

priestly governor of the Judean constitution (cf. 2.185-87, 193-94) and an eminent figure held in honor by Greeks (cf. 1.175; 2.42ff.). The latter was apparently important for Ps.-Hecataeus as well; cf. the high-priest Eleazar in *Let. Aris.* 28-172. Ezekias’ role in the narrative is unclear (given the obscurities of 1.189): was he a source of information on the Judean nation or the leader of the Judean settlement in Egypt (or both)? The fact that Ezekias is absent from the authoritative lists of high-priests preserved elsewhere by Josephus (*Ant.* 10.151-53; 20.224-51; for this period cf. *Ant.* 11.297, 302-3, 347) suggests that Ps.-Hecataeus’ depiction of him as “a high-priest” is unhistorical (only much later can this indefinite designation refer to members of a high-priestly family; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 84-85, *contra* Stern 1.40). However, the discovery of Hezekiah coins, referring to a governor of Judah in the late Persian and early Hellenistic period, has intrigued scholars (see the full description in Bar-Kochva 1996a: 255-70). This does not prove that this narrative is historically accurate (nor help settle its authorship; *pace* Gager 1969: 138-39); indeed it is implausible that the same figure could have been both governor and high-priest (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 85-88). But Ps.-Hecataeus may have used the memory of an important historical figure and transformed his role into that of high-priest.

<sup>629</sup> The text is slightly insecure (some editors suspect a lacuna) but the sense generally clear. Ps.-Hecataeus may have drawn inspiration from the real Hecataeus, who highlighted the virtues of the high-priest (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.4-6). The combination of intellectual and practical skills (cf. 1.183) appears to justify whatever “honor” is alluded to in 1.189. The description emphasizes the bicultural credentials of this paradigmatic figure: highly regarded by the Judean nation, he has the “soul” (τὴν ψυχὴν οὐκ ἀνόητος; cf. 1.180, 201), the rhetorical skills, and the practical abilities to excel in Greek virtues.

<sup>630</sup> At first sight, this section appears to interrupt the description of Ezekias (1.187, 189). However, Josephus’ link (καίτοι—best translated, as here, “indeed”) suggests he saw an integral connection. As high-priest, Ezekias presumably supervised this very large body of people who “administer public affairs”—proof of the final statement of 1.187. Ps.-Hecataeus’ portrayal of a priestly *politeia*, centred on the temple and administered by priests, exactly fits Josephus’ depiction of Judean politics (2.185-88); Josephus excerpts the

scraps of narrative which suit this larger picture.

<sup>631</sup> This statement probably concluded a description of the means of economic support for the priesthood, correcting that offered by the real Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.7), while agreeing with his general point that the priests remain “undistracted” (cf. 1.199). Josephus elsewhere refers to priests receiving tithes (*Ant.* 4.68, 205, 240-43 [along with Levites]; 20.181, 206-7; *Life* 63, 80), and he would not have been perturbed by the technicality that, in the biblical legislation, the tithes went to the Levites (Num 18:20-32; Neh 10:37-39 etc.). At some point the Levite tithe became known as, or transmuted into, a tithe to the priests, but it is unclear when this happened (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 159-60) and it is unsafe to make this point a criterion for judging the authorship of Josephus’ source (Schaller 1963, answered by Gager 1969). Josephus’ Judean readership would find nothing strange here (cf. *Jdt* 11.13; *Jub.* 32.15; *Philo, Virt.* 95), and Roman readers would be unsurprised to find the rulers of a nation extracting a tithe (cf. Diodorus 5.42.1, on the mythical land of Panchaea).

<sup>632</sup> The figure is large, round, and thereby impressive; on Josephus’ alternative reckoning, see note to “priests” at 2.108. While comparisons can be made to biblical calculations, whose totals vary (e.g., *Ezra* 2:36-39; *Neh* 11:10-14; *1 Chr* 9:10-13), the source and meaning of all such figures is obscure. In this case, we cannot tell what Ps.-Hecataeus means by “administering public affairs” and how that relates to service in the temple, and scholarly guesses on numbers of priests in various capacities at various epochs are of limited comparative value; see *Jeremias* 1969: 199-206; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 160.

<sup>633</sup> The following excerpt from Ps.-Hecataeus is so truncated as to be obscure: What honor? Who are “us” within whom he was acquainted? Who are “those in his company”? What is “the difference” (if that is the right translation)? And what does the final clause mean? It appears that Josephus is less interested in the narrative context and in the figure of Ezekias himself than in some element in this citation, and that his eye is drawn in particular by the reference to a “constitution” (πολιτεία), a term of great significance to him in 2.145-286, as in *Antiquities* (see Mason in Feldmann 2000: xxiv-xxix). The impression of a priestly, written constitution exactly fits the image he projects in book 2, and the allusion to this by a “Greek” author is a gift too



*Judean  
suffering for  
the laws*

had acquired this honor and had become our acquaintance,<sup>634</sup> gathered some of those in his company and read to them the complete difference,<sup>635</sup> for he had their settlement and the constitution written.”<sup>636</sup> **190** Then Hecataeus indicates in turn our attitude toward the laws,<sup>637</sup> that we choose to suffer anything rather than transgress them,<sup>638</sup> and consider this to be noble.<sup>639</sup> **191** For this reason, he says,<sup>640</sup> though they

valuable to ignore, even if accompanied by obscurities.

<sup>634</sup> “This honor” is unexplained. If it is not that of high-priest (1.187), it may be some post in the Ptolemaic administration; but, given Josephus’ interest in listing Jewish privileges in Egypt (2.42-64), one might expect him to clarify this further here, or refer back to it later. “Our acquaintance” suggests an authorial voice from the standpoint of a Greek observer, even courtier, as in *Letter of Aristeas*; cf. 1.181 for the theme of admiration by Greeks acquainted with Judeans.

<sup>635</sup> Greek: τὴν τε διαφορὰν ἀνέγνω πάσαν αὐτοῖς. The presence of τε without matching καί suggests there is a lacuna in the text, while διαφορὰν . . . πάσαν is obscure. Taking διαφορὰ in the sense of “difference” (so Latin, Blum, Walter 1980: 155), this could refer to the range of differences distinguishing Judean from Greek ways of life (cf. the explanation of the food-laws in *Let. Aris.* 128-71); with the meaning “advantage” (Thackeray, Bar-Kochva 1996a: 221-25), it could refer to the benefits of emigration to Egypt (see next note). A conjectural emendation (made independently by Lewy 1932 and Cataudella 1933) suggests reading διφθέραν (“scroll”; cf. *Ant.* 12.89) and has Ezekias gathering fellow-Judeans to read the Torah (Lewy 1932: 123; Stern 1.42; Doran 1985: 917, n. f). Both the scene and the purpose of this reading are unclear and the textual problems render the difficulty insoluble.

<sup>636</sup> The Greek is as awkward as this translation. Interpreters divide into two camps. Some understand the “settlement” (κατοίκησις) as that in Judea (as described in the Torah?) and regard the scene as Ezekias’ pronouncement of the Judean way of life, as high-priest to his own people (Lewy 1932; Blum; Jacoby 1943: 67, who takes this as the source of the subsequent description of the temple, the land, and Judean customs in 1.190-99); cf. the pronouncements of the high-priest in the real Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.5-6). Others take the scene to be in Egypt, where Ezekias has led an emigration of Judeans and, honored by Ptolemy I, is describing the constitution of the Egyptian diaspora (Thackeray; Troiani; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 221-31). This may be the image suggested by 1.186-87, but the connections are uncertain, and the following excerpts are about Judea, not Judeans in Egypt (despite Josephus’ interest in the latter, 2.33-64).

<sup>637</sup> Josephus’ mind moves swiftly from “constitu-

tion” (1.189) to “laws.” and he now paraphrases a section of Ps.-Hecataeus on a theme dear to his heart: the Judeans’ utter loyalty to the law. Since he will soon cite Agatharchides’ snide comments on this topic (1.209-12), it is valuable to undercut those in advance with Ps.-Hecataeus’ admiration.

<sup>638</sup> The theme of willing suffering for the law had been introduced in 1.42-43, is illustrated here (1.191-93), and will be a major theme of book 2 (2.219-35; see note to “law” at 2.219). Suffering anything (πάντα πάσχειν, cf. 1.219) will be spelled out further in 1.191 (cf. 1.43; 2.232-33, 272). The concern not to transgress (μὴ παραβῆναι) is a motif Josephus will reiterate frequently (e.g., 2.174, 178, 182-83, 204, 276-77, 293).

<sup>639</sup> Cf. 2.233 on the Judean value system where transgression of the law is the only disgrace, not suffering for it. A possible contrary opinion—that Judean “fanaticism” was naïve, superstitious and reckless (cf. 1.205-12; 2.145-48)—is here countered in advance by labelling it “noble” (καλόν), a judgment supported by the “admiration” of Ps.-Hecataeus (1.193).

<sup>640</sup> Although Josephus again uses φησί and the third-person indicative (as in 1.187-89), there are good reasons to suspect that this section constitutes paraphrase of his source, rather than direct citation. The content of this section goes much further than the examples cited in 1.192-93: the reference here to deaths is not matched by the examples to follow, where the pardons and exemptions seem to portray a more lenient atmosphere. Given his investment in this theme, it seems unlikely that Josephus would choose weak examples from his source; the generalizing comment in this section must represent either Ps.-Hecataeus’ exaggeration or that of Josephus. In this treatise Josephus makes much of Judean willingness to undergo torture and even death (1.42-43; 2.232-34, 272), with vocabulary closely parallel to that employed here (see below), so the exaggeration makes excellent sense as his own. It would not be the only time he claims his sources say more than they do (cf. 1.108, 132, etc.). Further, the unexplained “these” (see below) makes no sense in a citation, but refers to Josephus’ own comment on the laws in 1.190. Thus, against other editors, I decline to use quotation marks in this section and treat it as largely Josephan. It therefore cannot be used to reconstruct the opinion or date of his source.

are verbally abused by their neighbors and by all those who arrive from abroad,<sup>641</sup> as well as being insolently treated on a regular basis by the Persian kings and satraps,<sup>642</sup> they cannot be shifted from their conviction,<sup>643</sup> on the contrary, defenseless<sup>644</sup> they face on behalf of these both tortures and the most terrible of all deaths<sup>645</sup> rather than deny their ancestral ways.<sup>646</sup> **192** He also provides several evidences of this strong-mindedness in relation to the laws.<sup>647</sup> He says that when Alexander was on one occasion in Babylon and had decided to clear the temple of Bel which had collapsed,<sup>648</sup> he ordered all his soldiers alike to transport the soil; only the Judeans did not comply,<sup>649</sup> but endured severe beating and paid heavy fines, until

*Examples of  
Judean  
defiance*

<sup>641</sup> Reading πάντων (with τῶν εἰσαφικνουμένων; so S, Naber, Reinach, and Münster), rather than πάντες (as the subject, “all,” governing the verb “abused”; so L E, Niese et al.). The verbal abuse by neighbors is not exemplified by the following sections, but arises from Josephus’ knowledge of historical relations with Syrians, the Greek coastal cities, and others. “Those who arrive from abroad” anticipates the comment of 1.193 where it seems to refer euphemistically to conquerors, rather than casual visitors.

<sup>642</sup> Taking this as derived from Josephus’ source, scholars have expended much effort in tracing historical evidence regarding this claim, thus affirming, or denying, its Hecataean authorship (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 91-97). Our poor knowledge of the Persian period impedes this inquiry, and Josephus’ stories elsewhere (*Ant.* 11.184-301; 12.45) are of limited help. The comment looks like an exaggeration by Josephus himself based on the reference to satraps in 1.193. In this treatise “Persians” are portrayed negatively (cf. 2.269-70), so frequent persecution from that source is not a matter of shame.

<sup>643</sup> The real Hecataeus apparently claimed that many Judean customs were changed under Persian and Macedonian rule (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.8), and this statement may derive from Ps.-Hecataeus’ attempt to “correct” his alter ego. For the nobility in strength of conviction (διάνοια)—in contrast to claims of folly (1.210: ἄνοια)—compare the affirmation of strong-mindedness in 1.192, 201. Josephus frequently emphasizes the unalterability of Judean convictions (e.g., 2.153, 169, 182-84, 234, 254).

<sup>644</sup> γεγυμνωμένως, an unusual adverb derived from a perfect passive participle, could be taken literally (stripped naked) or metaphorically (defenseless), or in both ways.

<sup>645</sup> “These” are presumably “the laws” of 1.190, but the lack of noun suggests that this is not a verbal citation from Ps.-Hecataeus. The most suffering suggested in the following stories is severe beating and fines, but the exaggeration here mirrors Josephus’ other references to “tortures” (1.43; 2.232) and “terrible” deaths (here θανάτοις δεινωτάτοις; cf. ἐν τοῖς ἑσχάτοις τῶν δεινῶν,

2.228; *War* 2.151; for death in general see 1.42-43; 2.218-19, 234, 272, etc.). The Maccabean theme here has rightly led most scholars to conclude that the sentiment is post-Maccabean (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 91-97; cf. Holladay 1983: 328); but if it is Josephan in origin, that tells us nothing concerning the authenticity of his source.

<sup>646</sup> For the laws as “ancestral customs” cf. 1.269; 2.73, 182; Schröder 1996. Josephus elsewhere insists that Judeans never betray (2.228, 232) but keep their laws (2.156, 184, 254, etc.).

<sup>647</sup> ἰσχυρογνωμοσύνη is resoluteness of mind (cf. 1.191, 201) and certainly has no negative connotations (*pace* Thackeray’s “obstinacy”); cf. Philo, *Somn.* 1.218. The first story here offered is clearly paraphrased (accusative and infinitive); the second (1.193) is probably also condensed and paraphrased. It is not clear that Ps.-Hecataeus related them as “evidences” (τεκμήρια; cf. 1.69) of Josephus’ point. The conclusion in each case is pardon or exemption, vindicating the Judeans’ right to maintain their own customs; loyalty to the law is a necessary ingredient of each story, but hardly its main point.

<sup>648</sup> The story presupposes the presence of Judeans among Alexander’s troops (cf. 1.200; *Ant.* 11.339) and fits alongside other tales that emphasize the cordial, even generous, recognition of Judean rights by the founder of the hellenistic era (see Gruen 1998: 189-202); cf. in this treatise, 2.35-37, 42-43. On Alexander in Babylon and the temple of Bel (or tomb of Belus) cf. Arrian, *Anab.* 7.17.1-2 and Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.1.5 (it took 10,000 men 2 months to do the job; further detail in Labow 2005: 201, n.136). Alexander’s decision is described as ἀνακαθᾶραι the fallen temple: the verb indicates clearing material away, in order to rebuild (Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.1.5 uses the cognate noun in relation to this episode; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 13.67, 70). The Judean soldiers presumably object to the reconstruction.

<sup>649</sup> Translating (with Niese and Münster, following Bekker) προσσχεῖν. Josephus’ paraphrase provides no explanation for this refusal to obey orders. Given his sensitivity to accusations of incivility towards others’

the king pardoned them and granted them an amnesty.<sup>650</sup> **193** Again, he says,<sup>651</sup> when others arrived in their country and built temples and altars, they knocked them all down;<sup>652</sup> in some cases they paid a fine to the satraps, in others they obtained pardon. He adds that it is right to admire them in such matters.<sup>653</sup> **194** He also speaks about how extremely populous our nation has become.<sup>654</sup> For of us he says, “the Persians earlier deported many tens of thousands of them to Babylon,<sup>655</sup> and equally large numbers moved to Egypt and Phoenicia also after the death of Alexander be-

religious practices (2.258), he perhaps did not wish to elaborate. If the tone of 1.200-204 is any guide, Ps.-Hecataeus may have been more forthright.

<sup>650</sup> The punishment of soldiers who disobey orders seems unnaturally light. It appears that Ps.-Hecataeus’ chief interest was in this pardon and exemption (surely further explained).

<sup>651</sup> “Again” translates ἔτι (the text conjectured by Niese, and followed by Münster and others). Although Josephus uses φησί and indicative (rather than the indirect construction of 1.192), there are good reasons to regard this section as his own précis (though perhaps less distorted than 1.191): the story here is summarized, lacks narrative detail, and uses euphemism (“arrived in their country”). Thackeray and Doran 1985 also decline to use quotation marks. The era of the (Persian) satraps was *before* Alexander, and the similar ending of this tale to that just cited (fines, then pardon) suggests that it could have functioned for Ps.-Hecataeus as a precedent for Alexander (perhaps one cited in his hearing in relation to the incident of the temple of Bel). For Josephus it is useful as a second proof, even though the merely monetary punishment here is less congruent with his claim in 1.191 than the previous tale.

<sup>652</sup> If they had the power and desire to build temples and altars, these “arrivals” were presumably the Persian conquerors themselves or settlers encouraged by the Persians. The biblical intolerance of alien altars in the land of Israel (e.g., Exod 34:11-16) was probably not practiced in the Persian period, but became important to the Maccabees and their successors (e.g., 1 Macc 2.25, 45; 5.44, 68; 13.47-48; on Hasmonean policy see Bar-Kochva 1996a: 128-34). Josephus is highly sensitive to the charge of sacrilege levelled against Moses and his followers in Egypt (1.269-70, 311, 318-9) and the general accusation of atheism and hostility to others’ religious practices (2.258); a large section of book 2 will be devoted to the treatment of this theme (2.236-86). It is thus somewhat surprising that he includes this second “evidence,” with its aggressive implications, but the concluding sentence of this section helps to neutralize its potentially negative impact on readers.

<sup>653</sup> The reaction (θαυμάζειν) represents moral admiration, not just amazement. The comment is unlikely to

have emanated from the genuine Hecataeus (rightly Bar-Kochva 1996a: 97-99), and those who defend the authenticity of these fragments are generally forced to posit a Judean editor at this point (e.g., Stern 1.24). Josephus is glad to find the comment in Ps.-Hecataeus since it removes the potential danger from this particular story and further confirms his general thesis about Greek admiration of Judean culture (the same verb is used in 1.175; cf. 1.162, 166).

<sup>654</sup> The authentic Hecataeus had noted the “populousness” of the Judeans (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.8) and, as this was generally regarded as praiseworthy (e.g., Diodorus 1.29.5; 31.6 on Egypt), Ps.-Hecataeus repeats the point and deploys it to soften the information about deportation and emigration. Comments on people, land, temples, and customs were standard features of ethnography, and Ps.-Hecataeus may be following aspects of that template in the material excerpted in 1.194-99. Like Philo (e.g., *Legat.* 214, 226, 281-84; *Flacc.* 45-47), Josephus is proud of the size and spread of the Judean population (*War* 2.398-99; 3.43 [on Galilee]; *Ant.* 4.115-16; 14.114-18) and elsewhere in this treatise highlights Judean commitment to child-rearing (1.60; 2.202).

<sup>655</sup> The Greek of L oddly include both “us” (ἡμῶν) and αὐτῶν (“them”), as if Josephus were undecided whether to record Ps.-Hecataeus indirectly or verbatim. Niese and Reinach omit the first and retain the second; Latin, Thackeray, and Münster do the reverse; Naber, Bar-Kochva (1996a: 48), and Walter (1980: 155) follow L in retaining both. As a result opinions differ as to whether this section (or parts of it) are citation. My translation represents a judgment that the section moves awkwardly from Josephus to Ps.-Hecataean speech (so also Walter). The deportation by Persians may refer to the Babylonian exile, by elision of Babylonians with Persians (cf. 2 Macc 1.19), or a possible later deportation ordered by Artaxerxes III, to which some early Christian texts bear uncertain witness (see Lewy 1932: 126; Stern 1.43; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 143-44; Labow 2005: 202-3, n.140). The point is presumably that the population recovered so well from so huge a loss that it still spilled over during the Syrian Wars.

cause of the conflict in Syria.”<sup>656</sup> **195** The same person has recounted both the size of the country we inhabit and its beauty:<sup>657</sup> “they occupy nearly 3,000,000 arourae of the best and most comprehensively fertile land,” he says.<sup>658</sup> “This is how extensive Judea is.”<sup>659</sup> **196** Indeed, that we inhabit from the remote past the city itself—Hierosolyma, which is both very beautiful and very large<sup>660</sup>—and concerning its abundance of men and the design of the temple, the same author<sup>661</sup> discourses as follows:

*Judea and  
Jerusalem*

**197** For although there are many fortresses and villages of the Judeans around the country, there is one fortified city,<sup>662</sup> with a circumference of roughly 50 stadia;<sup>663</sup> about 120,000

*Hecataeus on  
Jerusalem and  
the temple*

<sup>656</sup> The surplus population moved because of conflict (cf. 1.184), but the migration was voluntary and therefore honorable, not forced. Both this and the previous statement regarding the Persians have been much used in the debate on the authenticity of these fragments, but on both sides and with uncertain results (see Appendix 2). Does the apparent “mistake” regarding the Persians require a non-Judean (genuinely Hecataean) author (Müller 175)? Or does the migration to Phoenicia reflect only Hasmonean (post-Hecataean) realities (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 101-5)? Since each might represent fictionalized accounts of history, both judgments remain uncertain.

<sup>657</sup> In the ethnographic tradition, a description of the people is traditionally matched by depictions of the land, and the fertility of both (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 192-207). Josephus makes a point of emphasizing both size and beauty, although the latter has no basis in his source (cf. 1.196 on Jerusalem). On his continuing identification with the land as homeland see note to “possession” at 1.1.

<sup>658</sup> Cf. *Let. Aris.* 107, 112-16, claiming the land was originally 60,000,000 arourae. An aroura is here rightly understood as a measure of area, not length (contrast 1.86): the figure here represents 825,000 hectares (= 1,500,000 acres; 2,400 square miles; 8,250 square kilometres). Bar-Kochva 1996a: 108 reckons the actual size of Judea at the time of Ps.-Hecataeus (end of 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE) as about one fifth of this, 1,600 square kilometres. Both Judean and Roman readers might be prepared to believe the general fertility of the land (cf. Josephus, *War* 3.35-58 for a survey of its fertility; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.6.1: *uber solum*); the latter had heard mostly of its balsam and palm products from the Jordan valley. For a negative assessment of the rocky Judean hills, see Strabo. *Geogr.* 16.2.36 (cf. Bar-Kochva 1996a: 108-10).

<sup>659</sup> Reading πλῆθος, with L, Niese, and Münster, against the emendation πλάτος (“breadth”) suggested by Hudson and followed by Thackeray, Naber, and Reinach.

<sup>660</sup> After a depiction of the land in general, readers

of ethnographies would expect a description of the principal city, its temples, and their adornment (cf. Diodorus 5.44-46 on the fictional Panchaea). Josephus now quotes at length since this excerpt fully confirms his own portrayal of a temple-centred and priest-governed constitution, distinguished by the absence of cultic images (cf. 2.184-98). At the same time, in this introduction, he can insert two additions: i) that the Jerusalem that “we inhabit” (see 1.195 on the land) has been inhabited “from the remote past” (ἐκ παλαιότητος)—a vague attempt to connect with the theme of antiquity (see note to “date” at 1.184); ii) that Jerusalem is “very beautiful and very large”—thus supplementing and interpreting the mathematical information to be provided in 1.197.

<sup>661</sup> Reading ὁ αὐτός, as reconstructed from Latin in Niese minor, Bekker, and Münster. The following sections are undoubtedly a quotation, though Josephus may have selected the sentences he wanted. A number of terms are *hapax legomena* in the Josephan corpus (e.g., φύτευμα, 1.199; ἀλωδῆς, 1.199; ἀναπόσβεστον, 1.199; ἄτηρητα, 1.197). The closest parallel, from an admiring “Greek,” is the long description of Jerusalem and the temple in *Let. Aris.* 83-106.

<sup>662</sup> Ps.-Hecataeus makes Jerusalem the focal point (cf. Hecataeus *apud* Diodorus 40.3.3) and Josephus does not demur, though in his day and with a different definition of “city” he would have put it otherwise (e.g., on Galilee, *Life* 188, 204). The reference to “many fortresses” (or “strongholds,” ἀχυρώματα) probably fits the post-Maccabean era only (Bar-Kochva 1996a:105-7; 1 Macc 4.61; 9.50-53). The fortification of the city (cf. 1.209) is a matter of national and military pride.

<sup>663</sup> Since a stadion is about 200 yards, or 186.5 metres, this computes as ca. 5.7 miles, or 9.3 kilometres. Josephus puts the figure rather lower at the beginning of the siege (*War* 5.159: 33 stadia) and the figure here is clearly exaggerated. *Let. Aris.* 105 gives 40 stadia (so also Timochares in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.35; cf. 9.36). See Bar-Kochva 1996a: 110-11, with comparative data. Size betokens significance.



people inhabit this city,<sup>664</sup> and they call it Hierosolyma. **198** There, roughly in the middle of the city,<sup>665</sup> is a stone enclosure, about 5 plethra in length and 100 cubits in breadth, with double gates,<sup>666</sup> within which stands a square altar, constructed of uncut stones, heaped up and undressed, 20 cubits long on each side and 10 cubits high.<sup>667</sup> Beside it there is a large building,<sup>668</sup> where there is an altar and a lampstand, both made of gold, two talents in weight;<sup>669</sup> **199** on these is a light that is never extinguished, night or day.<sup>670</sup> There is no statue and no votive offering whatsoever,<sup>671</sup> nor any trace of a plant, whether some kind of

<sup>664</sup> Population figures in ancient texts are regularly inflated; Josephus reckons the population of Jerusalem, swollen by pilgrims, at the outbreak of hostilities as 2,700,000 (*War* 6.423-27). Modern figures are calculated by multiplying the area of the city by plausible population density. Both contain elements of guesswork, but Bar-Kochva 1996a: 112-13 estimates the Hasmonean city contained ca. 40,000 inhabitants, and at the time of the Revolt ca. 100,000. For Ps.-Hecataeus, the size of the population was a sign of its prosperity (1.194).

<sup>665</sup> The following description of the temple is hardly complete, and Josephus may be citing only excerpts from Ps.-Hecataeus. But that he quotes at such length indicates the value of this “Greek” witness to the structure and institution which lies at the centre of his symbolic world, and at the heart of the Judean constitution (2.190-98). The partial descriptions of the temple here and at 2.102-9 provide a visual focus for that constitution, and emphasize its lack of normal cultic accoutrements. “Roughly in the middle” may be a symbolic, rather than a geographical, placement (and can hardly help settle questions of authorship; cf. Lewy 1932: 128-29).

<sup>666</sup> *Let. Aris.* 84-85 also begins with a description of walls and gates, but gives the height of the walls (as one would expect, if they are defensive) and hints at the splendor of the gates. Five *plethra* is about 166 yards, or 150 metres; 100 cubits is about 50 yards, or 45 metres. The dimensions suggest the importance of this sacred space for the identity of the city.

<sup>667</sup> The altar is accorded central significance, but no description is given of the sacrifices conducted on it (contrast *Let. Aris.* 92-95). Ps.-Hecataeus uses βωμός, the normal Greek term for an altar, rather than the special θυσιαστήριον coined by the LXX, but that does not imply he was unaware of the LXX. Although its stones are neither cut to size nor finished by a stonemason, the altar is “constructed,” not a loose pile of rocks (cf. Josephus in *Ant.* 4.200). The unusual design follows the biblical prescription (Exod 20:25; Deut 27:5-6; cf. 1 Macc 4.47; *m. Mid.* 3.4), but is here given no explanation; Philo uses the contrast with the golden altar of incense indoors to suggest the greater value of inner

purity (*Spec.* 1.273-79). The dimensions of the altar given here (equivalent to 9 metres square and 4.5 metres high) curiously match Solomon’s altar of bronze (2 Chr 4:1), but are smaller than those given by Josephus in *War* 5.225.

<sup>668</sup> Oddly this is given no further description and only the plainest of labels (οἴκημα, where one might expect ναός); again the emphasis falls on cultic equipment rather than architectural splendor.

<sup>669</sup> Of the major items regularly mentioned in this connection, one misses reference to the table (for shewbread); cf. 2.106 and the inventories at 1 Kgs 7:48-50; 2 Chr 4:19-22; 1 Macc 1.21-23 (items stolen by Antiochus IV). The golden altar is for the offering of incense (Exod 30:1-5; 37:25-28; *War* 5.218), the gold lampstand/menorah (Exod 25:31-40; 37:17-24; *War* 5.217) a feature of the temple familiar in Rome from its display in Titus’ triumphal procession (*War* 7.148-49) and the sculpture on his Arch. The two talents (one talent is ca. 34 kg) may be the sum of them both (cf. Exod 25:39). Eupolemus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.34.7) has Solomon make 10 lampstands weighing 10 talents each.

<sup>670</sup> The plural “these” should be retained (*pace* Bar-Kochva 1996a: 163), since the day-and-night offering of incense on the table (Exod 30:7-8) seems to parallel the never-extinguished light on the lampstand (Exod 27:20-21; Lev 24:1-4; *Ant.* 3.199; cf. Hayward 1996: 23 with rabbinic references). The perpetual light (ἀναπόσβεστος could mean “unextinguished” or “inextinguishable”) matches the continuous activity of the priests (below) and suggests an unsurpassable piety.

<sup>671</sup> The extraordinary collection of negatives in this sentence emphatically underlines the simplicity (and purity?) of the cult, and stresses its difference from all others (where statues, votives, and sacred groves were all standard). Ps.-Hecataeus builds on comments by the authentic Hecataeus, that the Judeans had no images of the gods whatsoever, and different sacrificial practices (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.4). For Josephus, this testimony from a “Greek” helps prepare for his delicately worded comments on this peculiarity in 2.73-78, 190-92. One might have expected some explanation for this Judean idiosyncrasy (Hecataeus had offered one) but, if this was

grove, or anything else of that sort.<sup>672</sup> The priests spend their time in it night and day,<sup>673</sup> performing certain purification rites; and they drink no wine whatsoever in the temple.<sup>674</sup>

**200** Further, he has testified<sup>675</sup> that they campaigned with Alexander the King and later with his Successors.<sup>676</sup> He says that he himself was present at an incident during the campaign involving a Judean man, which I shall cite.<sup>677</sup> **201** He says as follows:<sup>678</sup>

*Mosollamus the  
Judean archer*

included in his source, Josephus omits it and confines comment to the passages in book 2. On whether the Herodian temple was truly free of “votive offerings” see Bar-Kochva 1996a: 164-66.

<sup>672</sup> Biblical texts associate trees and groves with “idolatry” (Deut 16:21; 2 Kgs 16:4; Jer 3:6, 13, etc.), but neither Josephus nor his source offers any explanation for this ban. The absence of trees, and therefore shade, may connote the austerity and single-mindedness of the Judeans’ piety, parallel to the ban on priestly consumption of alcohol (below; cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.74-75; *Leg.* 1.48-52). Contrast Josephus’ report on Onias’ temple, *Ant.* 13.66.

<sup>673</sup> “It” has no clear antecedent, a possible indication that Josephus has included only excerpts from his source. The continuous devotion of the priests is also emphasized by Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.7) and *Let. Aris.* 92-95; cf. the “perpetual” (i.e., daily) sacrifices of Exod 28:39-42; Num 28:3-8. There is some tension between this statement and Josephus’ image of priests arriving in the morning at 2.105.

<sup>674</sup> The “purification rites” (ἀγνείας τινάς) are presumably the sacrifices, which are otherwise not described. The terminology suits Josephus’ stress on purity as the hallmark of the temple and its activities (cf. 2.104, 198, 203). The abstention from wine (Lev 10:9; Ezek 44:21; *War* 5.229; *Ant.* 3.279 [see Feldman 2000: 316, n.847]; Philo, *Spec.* 1.98-100, 249; 4.191) suggests a sobriety and reverence (cf. *Let. Aris.* 92-95) matching Josephus’ later comments on sacrifices and festivities (2.195, 204). The motif supports Josephus’ later denial of the presence of food or drink in the temple (2.108). Ps.-Hecataeus may have been aware of Egyptian parallels as cited by Hecataeus (*apud* Plutarch, *Mor.* 353a-c).

<sup>675</sup> This is the first use of the μαρτυρ- root in the segment of Greek witnesses (1.161-214); it will be reinforced at the conclusion to the Hecataean material (1.204). Since Josephus has already shown from his source that Judeans are at least as old as Alexander (1.183-86) and that they were part of his army (1.192), the story to follow, cited in full, clearly serves other functions.

<sup>676</sup> L (followed by Münster) reads “we” rather than “they”; I here follow Eusebius, Latin, Niese, and Thackeray. This vague introduction is never given

greater specificity (as to ruler, date, or purpose of the campaign), since, despite this statement, Josephus is interested in the content of the story, not its historical context. On Judeans in Seleucid and Ptolemaic armies, see Stern 1.43 with literature; *CPJ* 1.18-32. It is less certain that they ever served in Alexander’s army.

<sup>677</sup> The eye-witness account gives the episode an apparent authenticity, but is fictional (see Bar-Kochva 1996a: 57-71; *pace* Kasher 1996a). The foregrounding of ethnicity mirrors the stress in the narrative at 1.201, 204, and enables the figure of Mosollamus to stand for all Judeans. Josephus’ inclusion of this tale, the most vivid and most humorous in the treatise, serves his purposes in several respects. It provides a fine climax to the evidence from “Hecataeus” and, in its placement immediately before the citation from Agatharchides, undercuts the latter’s representation of Judeans as laughably “superstitious.” More generally, it hints at the Judeans’ “philosophical” ability to rise above the follies of others’ religious practices, thus paralleling the polemic against mythology to be launched in 2.236-54. This intellectually robust and practical archer is thus a model Judean in the mold in which Josephus here presents his culture. For Roman readers, the story is positioned in the tension in Roman culture between respect for augury and critical doubts about its rationale and mechanics; see further “Reading Options,” above.

<sup>678</sup> The story seems to be cited verbatim and, perhaps, entire, thus forming our best evidence for Ps.-Hecataeus’ style (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 156-59). As a well-shaped *chreia*, it offers a setting, a problem, a striking resolution, and a pithy concluding statement, which sums up the force of the story. Ps.-Hecataeus is particularly skillful in deploying Greek cultural tropes for the benefit of Judean culture. The hero is emphatically a Judean, as is clear from his foreign-sounding name, and is stressed in the first and final clauses of the narrative (1.201, 204). But he is decked in virtues central to the Greek intellectual tradition, notably a strength of “soul” (κατὰ ψυχήν εὐρωστος, 1.201) which equips him to scorn the false opinions of the majority (1.204). Both as archer and as thinker he surpasses the Greeks even as a non-Greek; far from being “misanthropic,” his intervention benefits the whole army. This is the skill of the subaltern in adopting and relocating the virtues of the colonial power, claiming an equal if

Anyway, while I was marching towards the Red Sea,<sup>679</sup> there accompanied us, among the cavalry who were our escort, a Judean man<sup>680</sup> called Mosollamos,<sup>681</sup> a person of considerable intellectual strength<sup>682</sup> and, by common consent, the best archer of all, both Greeks and barbarians.<sup>683</sup> **202** When many people were milling about on the road,<sup>684</sup> and a certain diviner, who was observing a bird for omens,<sup>685</sup> was telling everyone to halt, this fellow asked why they were waiting.<sup>686</sup> **203** The diviner pointed out the bird to him and said that, if it stayed there, it was expedient for everyone to wait; if it flew off and went forwards, to march on; and if it went backwards, to retreat.<sup>687</sup> Mosollamos said nothing but drew his bow, fired, hit the bird, and killed it.<sup>688</sup> **204** When the diviner and some others got angry and cursed him, he replied, “Why are you losing your wits, you poor devils?”<sup>689</sup> Then, taking the bird in his hands, he said, “How could this thing give us any sound information about our jour-

not superior worth to the dominant culture within its terms and without explicit assault on its central convictions. Here, for instance, the Greek (and Roman) tradition of augury is implicitly ridiculed, but the details are kept vague to avoid specific offense (see below), and no attack is made on the divine powers supposed to communicate by this means. What is more, this flattering portrait of Judean rationality is painted by an admiring “Greek,” thus deflecting cultural antagonism. Josephus’ reuse of this story, two centuries after its composition, illustrates the continuing value of this subtle self-insertion into the dominant cultural discourse.

<sup>679</sup> Perhaps Ps.-Hecataeus gave further details, in advance of this story, which did not interest Josephus. The eye-witness pose and the vivid details give an impression of historical precision; cf. the use of “us” in 1.189.

<sup>680</sup> Reading Ἰουδαῖος (conjectured by Niese, followed by Münster), in place of Ἰουδαίων (L E S), which would define the cavalry as Judean.

<sup>681</sup> This is probably to be preferred to the “Mosomamos” found in the texts of Eusebius. This hellenized version of the Hebrew Meshullam (cf. *Ant.* 13.75 for a more hellenized form) represents the cultural hybridity of this figure: alien to Greeks in name and origin, but displaying attributes both familiar and admirable.

<sup>682</sup> Reading the adverb ἰκανῶς with Niese, Reinach, and Münster (against L and Latin). “Intellectual strength” translates κατὰ ψυχὴν εὐρωστος (literally: “strong in relation to his soul”), a phrase that both echoes Greek anthropology (cf. ψυχή in 1.180, 188) and suggests the standard antithesis between “strong” reason and “weak” (or womanish) superstition or error (cf. Cicero, *Div.* 1.7); cf. Josephus’ ἰσχυρογνωμοσύνη in 1.192. This character depiction predisposes the reader to judge Mosollamos’ subsequent intervention favorably.

<sup>683</sup> In the Greek, ἄριστος (“best”) is emphasized by standing last: Greeks are not necessarily the best in every sphere of life, and if not in archery, perhaps also not in their beliefs about birds. His skill as an archer anticipates the narrative to follow, and the combination

of intellectual and practical virtues mirrors the depiction of Ezekias at 1.187. On the translation of βάρβαρος, see note to “Greeks” at 1.58. The context lends its use here a certain irony.

<sup>684</sup> The probable sense of διαβαδίζόντων κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν: the image is of interruption to the march and inconvenience to the whole army caused by a single diviner.

<sup>685</sup> The seer is given neither name nor ethnicity and thus could stand for the whole profession of μαντεία. However, the narrative does not use technical language for bird-augury, never specifies the kind of bird involved (see below), and gives no hint at the theological underpinning of divination. This may be because Ps.-Hecataeus was ignorant of the technicalities and rationale of the practice (Bar-Kochva 1996a: 62-69), but it may also serve to deflect the narrative from a comprehensive confrontation with augury, leaving open the possibility that the diviner was poor at his trade or unaware of the divine dimension of his work.

<sup>686</sup> The question looks innocent, but constitutes a challenge to the power of the diviner and brings Judean and diviner into direct personal confrontation. With the army, the narrative movement comes to a halt to allow the ensuing dialogue.

<sup>687</sup> The bird is not identified, as one would expect in an act of divination. The birds that gave omens by their flight (as opposed to their song) were chiefly eagles, hawks, and ospreys; the appearance of an owl could also be taken as an omen of death (see Bar-Kochba 1996a: 66-69). The bird’s movement was normally observed for its appearance on the right or left (respectively positive or negative), and the oddity of this diviner’s technique may help to soften the otherwise devastating mockery of divination. No rationale is here offered for the expedition’s dependence on the movements of this bird, and there is no reference to the Gods.

<sup>688</sup> That the action comes before the words (1.204) makes the latter more effective and emphasizes the “empirical” tone of the incident.

ney, when it couldn't foresee its own safety?<sup>690</sup> For if it had been able to know the future, it would not have come to this spot for fear that it be shot and killed by Mosollamos the Judean."<sup>691</sup>

**205** That is ample evidence from Hecataeus;<sup>692</sup> those who want to learn more can easily read his book.<sup>693</sup> I shall not hesitate<sup>694</sup> to name also—though he makes reference to us in ridiculing our naïvety, as he regards it<sup>695</sup>—Agatharchides.<sup>696</sup> **206** He is *Agatharchides*

<sup>689</sup> The adjective *κακοδαίμονες* suggests that they are ill-fated losers, and contains both scorn and condescension. The verb *μάνεσθε* suggests a kind of “madness,” connected by some with the word “diviner” (*μάντις*; Plato, *Phaedr.* 244c-d). Where others lose control, the Judean remains rational; since neither side makes explicit reference to the Gods, he cannot be accused of “impiety” or “atheism” (cf. 2.148, 236-70).

<sup>690</sup> Mosollamos could be accused of jeopardizing the safety of the entire army, and his question indicates that the bird was incapable of meeting false expectations (cf. 1.259, of a seer). The adjective *ὑγιές* (“sound,” literally “healthy”) strengthens the contrast between “madness” and well-functioning reason, which is here demonstrated by an argument *a minori ad maius*.

<sup>691</sup> The placement of name and ethnicity at the climax of the story throws the emphasis onto Judean culture in its capacity to stand above “superstition” (contrast 1.205). The statement of the problem—that *the bird* had been unable to know the future—bypasses the function of birds as messengers of the Gods, and thus suggests that the diviner puts his trust in a mere bird, rather than the reasoning capacity of a human mind. The polemic thus suggests the diviner’s inversion of the hierarchy of humanity over the animal realm, a tactic reused in Josephus’ attack in Egyptian religion (1.223-26); cf. Origen’s reply to Celsus with reference to divination (*Cels.* 4.88-97). The humor thus exploits the supposed stupidity of a mere bird, and resonates with the critical objections to divination raised in Cicero, *Div.* 2.80-81.

<sup>692</sup> For the language of “evidence” or “testimony” in this segment, cf. 1.200, 217; it is not made clear at this point what “Hecataeus” testifies to. The claim to sufficiency (here *ἄλλως*, “ample”) mirrors similar formulae for closure (e.g., 1.58, 160, 182; 2.287). In fact, Josephus will refer to Hecataeus later (2.43), but in a different context.

<sup>693</sup> Cf. the similar appeal in 1.182. The availability of the text is indicated by Herennius Philo’s doubts on its authorship (*apud* Origen, *Cels.* 1.15). Josephus’ invitation strengthens his air of confidence and the impression that much more could be added. On the

monograph and its purpose, see Bar-Kochva 1996a, though his hypotheses at several points exceed our limited evidence.

<sup>694</sup> The formula signals a potential problem overcome or bravely met (cf. 2.219; *War* 7.455). In this case, Josephus indicates that the source he is about to cite threatens Judean honor, and thus places himself at a distance from it. Apart from the immediate contextual difficulty, that it contradicts Ps.-Hecataeus’ glowing portrait of Ptolemy I, this source is hardly an example of Greek admiration of Judean customs (cf. 1.162, 165); it also blurs the emphasis on the uniquely *Egyptian* origin of hostility to Judeans (1.223). More dangerously, Agatharchides’ comments echo some contemporary Roman criticisms of sabbath-observance, and current hostile tales about the ease with which Jerusalem may be captured on a sabbath (see note to “day” at 1.209; note to “custom” at 1.210). Since Agatharchides’ evidence adds nothing to the case about the antiquity of Judeans, going back no further than Ptolemy I (cf. already 1.185-89), one may wonder why Josephus bothers to include it at all. Perhaps he simply wanted to accumulate another Greek source (making the total 7), one he already had to hand (cf. *Ant.* 12.5-6). The backhanded compliment on Jerusalem (1.209) is hardly enough to balance out Agatharchides’ critique, but Josephus perhaps reckoned he could do enough to neutralize that criticism and turn it to his advantage as an illustration of fidelity to the law (1.212). Perhaps only sympathetic readers could read this section without being affected by Agatharchides’ tone.

<sup>695</sup> The translation reflects the unusual word-order of the Greek, which foregrounds the problematic stance of the source, and Josephus’ refusal to accept its evaluation (he cannot afford to doubt its historical veracity). Three times Josephus accuses Agatharchides of employing ridicule (cf. 1.208, 212; the vocabulary varies)—a powerful rhetorical weapon he himself will deploy against his critics, but which can backfire if it can be shown that the mocker scorns something honorable (as here, 1.212). Naïvety (*εὐήθεια*) is Josephus’ term: Agatharchides is cited as referring to Jewish “madness” (*ἄνοια*, 1.210) and “fancy” (*ὑπόνοια*, 1.211). Notably



*Superstition of  
Stratonice*

telling the story of Stratonice,<sup>697</sup> how she came to Syria from Macedonia having deserted her husband Demetrius, and when Seleucus did not want to marry her, as she had expected, while he was launching the campaign<sup>698</sup> from Babylon, she staged a revolution in Antioch.<sup>699</sup> **207** Then, when the king returned, and while Antioch was being captured, she fled to Seleucia<sup>700</sup> and, although she could have sailed swiftly away, she paid heed to a dream which stopped her from going, was captured and died.<sup>701</sup> **208** After telling this story and mocking Stratonice for her superstition,<sup>702</sup> Agatharchides uses as an example a story about us,<sup>703</sup> and writes as follows.<sup>704</sup>

lacking here is the term “superstition” (δεισιδαμονία), despite its presence in relation to Judeans both inside and outside the “citation” in *Ant.* 12.5-6; the highly charged word is used here in connection with Stratonice, and only indirectly with Judeans (1.208). On Agatharchides’ ideology, see note to “loss” at 2.211.

<sup>696</sup> Agatharchides is given no further introduction and no reference is made to his works (contrast *Ant.* 12.5); it is not in Josephus’ interests to bolster the authority of this source. As with other cases of overlap in source-reference, Josephus does not indicate that he had earlier cited (a version of) this same fragment (*Ant.* 12.6). Agatharchides of Cnidus was a historian and ethnographer who flourished in Alexandria in the first half of the second century BCE (see *FGH* 86 with commentary; Fraser 1972: 516-17, 539-53; Burstein 1989: 12-21). His hostility to the Ptolemaic regime (evidenced here at 1.210) caused him to flee Alexandria in 145 BCE.

<sup>697</sup> The material cited here may come from either of his two great works, *On Asian Affairs* or *On European Affairs* (see Stern 1.107; Jacoby in *FGH* 2C: 154). This Stratonice was the daughter of Antiochus I and married Demetrius II of Macedon in about 255 BCE. The Stratonice story represents, it appears, the chief storyline for Agatharchides, the Judean incident an anecdotal parallel (1.208, 211). In *Ant.* 12.5-7 Josephus had omitted all reference to the Stratonice context. Here its inclusion softens the critique of Judeans by showing that Agatharchides was scornful of others also.

<sup>698</sup> Reading στρατεία, with Bekker and all subsequent editors (not στρατία, in the textual traditions). The campaign by Seleucus II (her nephew) was perhaps eastwards, into Iran.

<sup>699</sup> The episode is somewhat obscure, with uncertain light shed by Pompeius Trogus (*apud* Justin, *Epitome* 28.1; see Will 1966: 212, 269-70); the date is probably around 235 BCE. Justin suggests that Demetrius took a second wife (Phthia), but Agatharchides (or at least this précis of him) casts the blame on Stratonice for initiating divorce, entertaining false hopes, and instigating a political revolt. She fits the stereotype of the headstrong, disloyal, and vengeful wife, and can then be

ridiculed for her political miscalculation and feminine inclination to “superstition” (1.208).

<sup>700</sup> Seleucia Pieria, the port of Antioch on the mouth of the Orontes.

<sup>701</sup> “Paid heed” (literally “was persuaded,” πεισθεῖσα) indicates her (feminine) intellectual weakness; cf. 1.211. Dreams were considered media of instruction from the Gods, but Agatharchides (or Josephus) omits mention of the divine, so the dream is *only* a dream (cf. Ps.-Hecataeus and augury, 1.203-4). Her fate is important: her “superstition” (1.208) led to her self-destruction, a sure sign that she did not follow “reasonable” religion, since philosophy could not attribute to the Gods other than beneficent intentions. The narrative allows no sympathy for Stratonice at all.

<sup>702</sup> δεισιδαμονία (“superstition”) is an elastic term which, when used negatively, suggests something both excessive and “irrational” (see Martin 2004). The criteria for judgment depend, of course, on cultural constructions of “rationality”; for Agatharchides’ understanding of reason, see note to “loss” at 1.211. That Stratonice was a woman and caused her own death made the label easy to apply in this case. For Roman readers the story could evoke mixed opinions on the validity of dreams as means of telling the future. A stout philosophical defense could be made, on the grounds that the soul in sleep is more receptive to the divine. But hefty criticisms could also be made, and Cicero suggests that many people considered the notion of dream-messages a superstition entertained only by weak minds and old women (*Div.* 2.125, 141, 148; for the defense, see *Div.* 1.39-71; for critique, *Div.* 2.122-47). Josephus can afford to be non-committal in this context, but it would suit him if some Roman readers took exception to Agatharchides’ mocking tone.

<sup>703</sup> Although Josephus gives greater prominence to the Judean material, it appears that it was little more than an aside for Agatharchides, used *exempli gratia*. The conclusion in 1.211 weaves the two stories together.

<sup>704</sup> The citation that follows is much fuller than that in *Ant.* 12.6 and probably closer to the original. But the comparison indicates that even material introduced with “as follows” (οὕτως) cannot be relied upon to be

209 Those called Judeans inhabit the best fortified city of all,<sup>705</sup> which, it happens, the natives call Hierosolyma,<sup>706</sup> and it is their custom to do no work every seventh day<sup>707</sup>—neither to carry weapons on the occasions mentioned, nor to put their hands to any agriculture, nor to attend to any public service<sup>708</sup>—but to pray in the temples until evening, with hands outstretched.<sup>709</sup> 210 When Ptolemy, son of Lagus, entered the city<sup>710</sup> with his army, the people, instead of defending the city, continued in their stupidity;<sup>711</sup> so their homeland acquired a cruel master,<sup>712</sup> and the law was convicted of containing a despicable custom.<sup>713</sup>

*Agatharchides  
on the stupidity  
of Judeans*

accurate: both “citations” use the formula (λέγων οὕτως in *Ant.* 12.6; γέγραπεν οὕτως here), while offering almost no overlap in vocabulary. It is possible that Josephus omits terms here (such as “freedom” and “superstition,” *Ant.* 12.5-6) that he would not wish to mention in this sensitive context.

<sup>705</sup> This large compliment more than confirms Ps.-Hecataeus’ description in 1.197. Agatharchides presumably made this comment in order to emphasize the stupidity of the Judeans: they could easily have defended the city but for their “stupidity” (1.210).

<sup>706</sup> As often, the Greek writer is struck by the oddity of the name “Hierosolyma” (cf. 1.179); the comment suggests the foreignness of Judeans.

<sup>707</sup> To “do no work” (ἀργεῖν) can carry positive connotations of rest (cf. 2.234, 282; *Ant.* 12.274; see note to “work” at 2.234) or a negative nuance of sloth (cf. 2.228, 291). While Agatharchides probably meant it in the negative sense, Josephus may have heard it in the positive (cf. *War* 1.60; 2.392). The seventh-day rest was familiar in Ptolemaic Egypt also under its Hebrew name “sabbath” (cf. *CPJ* 10), and was one of the most widely known features of Judean culture in the Diaspora (Barclay 1996a: 440-42). Josephus’ Roman readers would instantly recognize the phenomenon (cf. Barclay 1996b: 296-98). To hostile Roman observers it signified Judean laziness (e.g., Seneca *apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 6.11; Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.105-6; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.3), an association that Agatharchides’ comments could reinforce.

<sup>708</sup> Of the 3 forbidden activities, only the first is relevant to the story. The others show how comprehensive and damaging the custom was, since it prevented Judeans from earning a livelihood or fulfilling social responsibilities. λειτουργία (“public service”) represents the civic duty of the rich; cf. Philo, *Somn.* 1.123-26 for Roman exasperation with Alexandrian Judeans on this point. The scriptural injunctions against work on the sabbath (e.g. Exod 20:8-11; Num 15:32-36) were difficult to apply in time of war. There is evidence that the issue became contested among Judeans at the time of the Maccabean revolt (Jub. 50.12; 1 Macc 2.32-41; cf. Bar-Kochva 1989: 474-93). Josephus elsewhere uses this point to criticise parties in the Revolt (*War* 2.312-

14, 456, 517) but otherwise shows sympathy with the Mattathias-compromise, that one may bear arms on the sabbath, but only in self-defense under attack (*War* 1.146; *Ant.* 12.277; 14.63; cf. *Ant.* 18.319-23). There is no opportunity here to qualify Agatharchides’ comment. The ban was apparently known to Romans (*Ant.* 14.226; cf. note to “custom” at 1.210).

<sup>709</sup> The gesture of supplication hints at vulnerability and uselessness. Agatharchides imagines a multitude of temples to accommodate the whole population, whose practice of prayer every seventh day, *all day*, suggests their excessive piety.

<sup>710</sup> Reinach suggests emending πόλιν to χώραν (“land”), but without sufficient reason. Ptolemy I entered the region on a number of occasions; his capture of Jerusalem may have taken place in 312/11 or 302/1, more likely the latter (see Tcherikover 1959: 57-58; Stern 1.108; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 76-77).

<sup>711</sup> Agatharchides’ term (ἄνοια) matches his emphasis on “reason” as the necessary antidote to religious excess (see at 1.211). That they *continued* in this, despite its obviously disastrous effects, is further proof of their folly. In *Ant.* 12.4 Josephus suggested that Ptolemy entered the city by trickery, pretending that he wished to sacrifice. That may be Josephus’ own attempt to shift blame from the Judeans, but he cannot here alter the story-line and does not wish further harm to the reputation of Ptolemy I (cf. 1.186; 2.42-44). Bar-Kochva’s reconstruction of the incident (1989: 477-81) posits an independent Judean version lying behind *Ant.* 12.4, and suggests that Judeans did fight, but too late. But Agatharchides’ account suggests total passivity and the historical facts can hardly be recovered from these partial accounts.

<sup>712</sup> Agatharchides’ swipe at the Ptolemaic regime is also a devastating criticism of Judeans for unnecessarily forfeiting their freedom (cf. *Ant.* 12.5; *Apion* 2.125-34). Josephus was unable to reconcile this image of Ptolemy I with that offered by Ps.-Hecataeus in 1.186 (the two are awkwardly juxtaposed in *Ant.* 12.1-9). He needs both citations.

<sup>713</sup> If his purpose had been strictly confined to historical evidence for Judean antiquity, Josephus could have omitted this final clause and the next section (cf.

**211** The event has taught everyone, except them,<sup>714</sup> against running away to dreams<sup>715</sup> and the traditional fancy about the law,<sup>716</sup> on occasions when they are impotent in human reasoning concerning matters in which they are at a loss.<sup>717</sup>

*Josephus’  
response*

**212** To Agatharchides this appears worthy of ridicule, but to those who investigate it without malice<sup>718</sup> it is evidently significant and worthy of much praise<sup>719</sup> if some

*Ant.* 12.6). But it may assist his cause to cite an obviously hostile witness on his side (cf. 1.70), and the challenge gives him the opportunity to rise to the defense of the law (1.212) in terms that foreshadow the encomium in 2.145-286. Agatharchides suggests that reason and experience are enough to convict the Judean law as self-evidently at fault. φαῦλος (“despicable”) here includes both moral and intellectual deficiency (see note to “wisdom” at 1.175), according to a value code to be revealed in the next section. This single case had such enormous consequences as to discredit Judean law/custom (the two seem synonymous) in general. The incident, and this judgment, would resonate with Josephus’ Roman readers, since it became a trope that Jerusalem could be captured on a sabbath when the Judeans would not fight. Despite its capacity to diminish the bravery of Roman troops, the motif was associated with the capture of the city by Pompey (Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.40; Dio 37.16.2-4), Sossius (Dio 49.22.4-5), Vespasian (Frontinus, *Str.* 2.1.17; cf. Dio 66.7.2), and in a non-specific anecdote (Plutarch, *Mor.* 169c). Appian, *Hist. rom.* 11.50 suggests that Ptolemy I’s capture of the city was known as a precedent to that by Pompey.

<sup>714</sup> The phrase suggests that the event was widely-known, but that Judeans had still not learned their lesson: experience is a better teacher than irrational custom.

<sup>715</sup> The Greek is slightly awkward: δεδίδαχε τηνικαῦτα φυγεῖν εἰς ἐνύπνια ... ἤνικα ἄν ... Thackeray and Blum appear to interpret this as “taught them to resort to dreams ... when,” that is, “taught the lesson not to resort to dreams ... until” (Thackeray). But Agatharchides can hardly legitimate a resort to dreams and fancies when at a loss. His point seems to be to ridicule those who take such desperate expedients out of weakness, and his language for this option is consistently derogatory (φυγεῖν = “to run away” or “to flee,” not “to resort”; ὑπόνοια = “fancy” or “speculation,” not “notion”; ἐξασθενέω = “to be weak/impotent”). Thus although the negative is missing after “taught,” it must be implied (Josephus may be paraphrasing poorly): the incident teaches everyone *not* to run away to dreams etc. The inclusion of “dreams” here indicates that Agatharchides paired the stories of Stratonice and the Judeans; he may have cited additional examples of “superstition” as well.

<sup>716</sup> There is no need to emend νόμου here to θείου (“the divine”), *pace* Reinach, following Herwerden. ὑπόνοια (“fancy”) is the opposite of careful thought: it connotes speculation and guesswork, here associated with tradition (παράδομηνη, “handed-down”), which is negatively valued, since it is presumed to be untested by reason. This “fancy about the law” is perhaps its divine origin and authorization. There is a hint of criticism regarding Judean gullibility on this matter in Hecataeus, *apud* Diodorus 40.5-6. Agatharchides may have developed this point in a form Josephus omits.

<sup>717</sup> Agatharchides’ ideology now becomes clear. Human reasoning (λογισμοί) is what gives people the strength to solve conundra and resist folly: where people allow tradition or beliefs to cause themselves harm, they are “impotent” intellectually (ἐξασθενήσωσιν; cf. the ideology of “strength” in 1.192, 201). It is assumed that women (Stratonice) and non-Greeks (Judeans) will be particularly liable to such weakness. Elsewhere Agatharchides recounted that the kings of Ethiopia used to submit to an ancient and irrational custom whereby priests told them when it was the Gods’ will for them to die, ὑπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας τοὺς λογισμοὺς κατισχυόμενοι (“being overpowered in their reason by superstition itself,” *apud* Diodorus 3.6; cf. 3.11). The first king to break free from this “superstition” was Ergames, on the basis of his *Greek* education and ability to philosophize (3.6). Agatharchides thus understood “civilization” on a neat grid: Greekness, masculinity, strength, and rationality were linked in common antithesis to feminine and/or foreign foolishness (see Dihle 1961: 213-29). Within this cultural framework, the Judean ban on sabbath warfare, with its catastrophic results, could only appear a classic case of “irrationality.”

<sup>718</sup> On “malice” (δυσμένεια), cf. 1.2-3. Josephus does not wish to challenge the narrative itself, but the values with which Agatharchides has judged it. He thus hints at an unworthy motivation, an anticipation of the fulsome accusations directed at critics of Judean culture in 1.219-2.144, but not developed here. The phraseology here suggests that *anyone* who really *investigates* this matter dispassionately will see things Josephus’ way: Josephus wants to associate himself with careful historiography and a system of evaluation that is not particular to Judeans but universally reasonable.

<sup>719</sup> “It is evidently” must be the right translation of

people consistently place a higher value on law-observance and piety to God than on their safety and their homeland.<sup>720</sup>

**(1.23) 213** That some writers omitted reference to us<sup>721</sup> not because they did not know about our nation but from envy or for some other unhealthy reasons,<sup>722</sup> I think I can provide proof.<sup>723</sup> Hieronymus, who wrote the history of the Successors,<sup>724</sup> lived at the same time as Hecataeus and, as a friend of the king Antigonus, administered Syria.<sup>725</sup> **214** But whereas Hecataeus actually wrote a book about us,<sup>726</sup> Hieronymus

*Silence of  
Hieronymus*

φαίνεταί, which can contain no hint of uncertainty (cf. note to “way” at 1.168). The reference to “praise-worthiness” (ἄξιον ἐγκωμίων) anticipates the tone of 2.145-286, where an encomiastic tone is disclaimed (2.147, 287), but partially adopted nonetheless. On Josephus’ extremely high valuation of sabbath observance, see Weiss 1998; Doering 1999: 479-507; Schimanowski 2000.

<sup>720</sup> This riposte constitutes one of the clearest examples in this treatise of the clash of cultural values. Agatharchides’ notion of “reason” considered excessive and stupid whatever beliefs or traditions caused harm to oneself or to one’s country, not, probably, in wholesale opposition to “religion,” but on the assumption that the Gods could hardly wish such evils on humankind. For Josephus, on the other hand, the observance of the law and piety towards God overrule considerations of “safety” (cf. 1.42-43, 218-35). Law-observance is a motif already emphasized (cf. 1.60, 190-93) and set to emerge as a central feature of the constitution (2.145-286). Piety, whose association with the law is unspecific but crucial for this argument, is the defining characteristic of that constitution (2.146, 160-67, etc.). The sacrifice of one’s country is perhaps the liminal case (cf. Josephus’ sensitivity on this matter in *Ant.* 14.65-68), and Roman readers would surely be surprised by the notion of a choice between piety and patriotism. But for Josephus it is crucial to rename “superstition” (δεισιδαιμονία) as “piety” (εὐσέβεια), and to suggest that any unbiased observer would sympathise with Judeans in this matter. At the same time, he subtly qualifies his point by claiming only that it is praiseworthy if “some people” (ἄνθρωποι τινες) operate this prioritization: that validates Judean peculiarity without requiring that everyone is required to follow suit. Rather than victims of their own stupidity, Judeans emerge as moral heroes, setting a standard of piety unattainable by most.

<sup>721</sup> This concluding comment (1.213-14) to the Greek segment (1.161-214), like the conclusion to the whole Part (1.215-18), is framed around the implicit question: “Is that all?” Josephus has devoted more space to the Greek segment than any other, and has cited more authors (“so many,” 1.215). But whether there was mention by *Greek* authors is the crux of the

objection to which he is responding (1.2-5), and he may feel that his 7 offerings are not wholly conclusive. Hence the explanation here, that other “writers” (on the general term, see note to “writings” at 1.161) knew about Judeans but deliberately refrained from mentioning them. The explanation also suggests that Josephus is contending throughout with prejudice.

<sup>722</sup> The explanation of ignorance (1.60-68) might work for very ancient times, but could hardly apply to the hellenistic period, when Judeans were certainly in contact with Greeks (e.g., 1.200). The charge of bias is here somewhat vague. “Envy” (attributed elsewhere to Egyptians, 1.224-25; 2.31) tallies with the notion of Greek admiration (1.162) to suggest Judean superiority, but is left unspecific. The other “unhealthy reasons” are even less defined; the pathological metaphor is common in polemics (cf. the Pastoral Epistles in the New Testament), suggesting a neat antithesis between healthy reason and unhealthy “passion” (cf. 1.214: πάθος causes blindness). The assumptions underlying this argument are a) that if the Judeans were known about, they were certainly *worth* mentioning; and b) that it is a mark of honor to be mentioned, and of dishonor to be left unrecorded. These are the assumptions underlying 1.2, and Josephus can explain the failure to mention the unquestionably reference-worthy Judeans only by ignorance (1.60-68) or malice (here).

<sup>723</sup> The “I think” is a signal of confidence rather than uncertainty. Although Hieronymus is the only evidence for this large claim, Josephus thinks it certain.

<sup>724</sup> “The Successors” (*Diadochoi*) is the technical name for the generals who ruled parts of Alexander’s empire after his death (cf. 1.200). Hieronymus of Cardia (in Thrace) lived from the mid 4<sup>th</sup> to the mid 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BCE, and was closely involved in the political and military affairs of Eumenes, Antigonus I, Demetrius Poliorketes and Antigonus Gonatas. He wrote an authoritative history of the Diadochoi (323-272 BCE or beyond); see Hornblower 1981. His history was heavily used by Arrian, Diodorus (for books 18-20), and Plutarch, thus becoming known in Roman literary circles.

<sup>725</sup> Antigonus I (381-301 BCE, known as “One-Eyed”) was the chief contender for Alexander’s empire, until his death at Ipsus. From evidence elsewhere



nowhere referred to us in his history, although he spent time almost on the spot.<sup>727</sup> That is how much the predilections of the men differed.<sup>728</sup> To the one we seemed worthy of significant reference; with the other, some unfavorable emotion utterly blinded him to the truth.<sup>729</sup> **215** Nonetheless, the Egyptian, Chaldean, and Phoenician records are sufficient to prove our antiquity, with the addition of so many Greek writers.<sup>730</sup> **216** Moreover, as well as those cited,<sup>731</sup> Theophilus,<sup>732</sup> Theodotus,<sup>733</sup> Mna-

*Conclusions*

*Other possible sources*

(Diodorus 19.100.1-2; *Paradox. Flor. De Aq. Mir.* 33 = *FGH* 154, frag. 5) we know that he appointed Hieronymus in 312/11 to oversee the revenue from the sale of asphalt derived from the Dead Sea; see Hornblower 1981: 12-13. Josephus may have read this passage and been annoyed to find there only reference to Idumaea and Nabatean Arabs. He has probably exaggerated Hieronymus' role to make the silence about Judeans appear scandalous (so Jacoby in *FGH* 2C: 545).

<sup>726</sup> Referred to in 1.183, 205; the scale of this suggests how much attention Judeans deserved. The argument depends on the earlier citation of "Hecataeus," and the conviction that he was a Greek.

<sup>727</sup> The phrase suggests that Josephus knows more than a general association between Hieronymus and Syria, and has read (or knows about) the passage describing his role at the Dead Sea (see above). Did he (or an assistant) scan the whole of Hieronymus' work, or just focus on this passage (perhaps as cited by others who wrote about the Dead Sea)?

<sup>728</sup> The term "predilections" (προαίρεσεις) suggests moral choices and continues Josephus' habit of regarding tendencies in historiography as a matter of personal moral inclination, rather than social or cultural conditioning. The phrase might suggest that *each* has his own bias, but in fact the explanation to follow is asymmetrical: one has an unbiased commitment to the truth, the other is prejudiced by passion.

<sup>729</sup> Josephus utilizes an old trope that πάθος (here translated "emotion") upsets reason and therefore distorts truth (on blindness, cf. 2.132). He was forced to defend his own historiography against this charge in *War* 1.9-13, recognizing that πάθος is opposed to "the law of history" (1.11). Josephus assumes that Judeans were important enough to be worthy of mention, an indication of his own cultural bias. His complaint thus derives from his Judean particularity: he does not mention other ethnic groups similarly omitted from the record. But this perspective enables him to identify what postcolonial criticism highlights as a persistent failing in "universal" histories: that their "objective" universalism generally operates with hidden assumptions about what is historically and culturally "significant."

<sup>730</sup> Thus begins the conclusion to the whole Part proving Judean antiquity (1.69-218); many of its

key words thus cluster here (ἀρχαϊότης, 1.215, 217; μαρτυρέω, 1.217; ἀναγραφαί, 1.215; ἀλήθεια, 1.217, 218). Josephus names the 4 segments within the Part (not quite in order), emphasizing again the importance of "records" (see 1.28) and deploying again the rhetoric of sufficiency (cf. 1.127, 160, 182, 204). The reference to "so many" (τοσοῦτοι, cf. πολλοί, 1.161) Greek writers highlights the greater number of authors cited in that segment, and prepares for the further indications of plenitude that follow in 1.216-18. For the inclusive term "writers" (συγγραφεῖς), see note to "compositions" at 1.161.

<sup>731</sup> The status of the following authors is ambiguous. Following immediately the reference to "so many Greek writers," they seem at first sight to represent more Greeks; many of them are, indeed, recognizably Greek authors (see below). However, since the list follows the summary in 1.215 of all the segments in this section, they could be taken to represent other nations, or a mixture of the categories just cited. If it is deliberate, the ambiguity may save Josephus from giving more detail about each author, some of whom are actually Judean. The reference to reading books (below) gives the impression that Josephus has drawn these names from his own research in their writings, but he probably learned of them from Alexander Polyhistor's collection of statements about Judeans (known to us via Eusebius; see Wacholder 1974: 3; *Ant.* 1.240) and from Nicolas of Damascus (see below). The list is long, to give the sense that so much more could be said on this topic; the addition of a further 3 names in 1.218 strengthens the impression that one could go on and on. Some of the names may have been as obscure to Josephus' readers as they are to us, but it is the impression of numbers that is most important at this point.

<sup>732</sup> Perhaps the author cited in a fragment of Eupolemus (as quoted by Alexander Polyhistor, *apud* Eusebius *Praep. ev.* 9.34.19) referring to relations between Solomon and Tyre (*FGH* 733; Holladay 1983: 337-42). Josephus probably knew both Eupolemus and Theophilus from Alexander Polyhistor, not recognizing (or at least, not acknowledging) that both were Judean.

<sup>733</sup> It is not clear to which Theodotus Josephus refers. An historian of Phoenicia of this name is known from Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 37 (*FGH* 784; Stern 1.128-29; Troiani 122); like Theophilus, he may have made refer-

seas,<sup>734</sup> Aristophanes,<sup>735</sup> Hermogenes,<sup>736</sup> Euhemerus,<sup>737</sup> Conon,<sup>738</sup> Zopyrion,<sup>739</sup> and perhaps many others—for I have not read every book<sup>740</sup>—have made more than passing reference to us.<sup>741</sup> **217** Most of these men listed strayed a long way from the truth about the earliest events,<sup>742</sup> because they did not read our sacred books;<sup>743</sup> still

ence to the connection between Solomon and Tyre. Alternatively, this may be the Judean (or Samaritan) epic poet cited by Alexander Polyhistor (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22); our fragments refer to Shechem and Jacob, but the poem may have been much more extensive (*FGH* 732; Holladay 1989: 51-204). If Josephus learned this name from Alexander Polyhistor, it is more likely the latter he has in view.

<sup>734</sup> Mnaseas is cited by Josephus in two other places: as an author who refers to the flood, along with “many others,” cited by Nicolas of Damascus, *Ant.* 1.94; and as a narrator cited by Apion, with an account of the golden ass-head in Jerusalem, *Apion* 2.112-14 (see note to “myth” at 2.112). These suggest that Josephus did not know Mnaseas at first hand, and in relation to antiquity Josephus is probably thinking here of Mnaseas’ reference to the flood. Since we know that at least 2 of the following 5 authors also wrote about the flood (see on Hermogenes and Conon below), it is possible that the remaining names in this list come from the catena of “many other” authors cited by Nicolas of Damascus on this topic (*Ant.* 1.93-95). Since Josephus considers all flood stories to be versions of the biblical Noah-saga, it is quite possible that he would consider all these to be references to “us” (see below), but understandable that he would not want to cite them here. All 3 lists of external references to Judean antiquity in *Antiquities* 1 (1.93-95, on the flood; 1.107-08, on ancient longevity; 1.159-60, on Abraham), appear to have been drawn from Nicolas, and it is likely that Josephus has returned to the same source for this list, and that the flood-narratives are their most likely point in common.

<sup>735</sup> The most likely guess is that this figure is Aristophanes of Byzantium, a grammarian and librarian in Alexandria ca. 257-180 BCE (*FGH* 347; Fraser 1972: 459-61). In his scholarship on a wide array of Greek literature, he may well have commented on the Deucalion flood-legend. Otherwise, we have no idea in what connection Josephus considered he made reference to “us.”

<sup>736</sup> Our extremely meager evidence suggests that a Hermogenes wrote (in the hellenistic era?) a history of Phrygia, in which he referred to “Nannakos,” the Phrygian equivalent of Noah (*FGH* 795; Stern 1.452-53). He was probably cited in this connection by Nicolas of Damascus (see above, on Mnaseas).

<sup>737</sup> If this is the Euhemerus who wrote a travel novel about the utopian island of Panchaea (*FGH* 63), this is

the most famous figure in the list, both to Roman readers (via Ennius) and to us. His explanation of the Greek pantheon as ancient rulers worshipped by their grateful populace was used to justify both the ruler-cult and a rationalistic criticism of mythology. The connection in his work with Josephus’ “us” cannot be traced.

<sup>738</sup> Several authors called Conon are known. This might just be the historian of Italy referred to in Servius, *Aen.* 7.738 (so Troiani 122-23), but is far more likely the author of 50 mythical narratives, who lived at the end of the first century BCE (*FGH* 26). Stern (1.352-54) finds a connection with Judeans in narrative 40, with its reference to Joppa. But a far more likely link is his recounting of the tale of Deucalion (narrative 27), which was likely cited by his contemporary Nicolas of Damascus, among the “many others” noted by Josephus at *Ant.* 1.94.

<sup>739</sup> A figure otherwise completely unknown to us (Stern 1.450). The name was probably equally obscure to Josephus’ readers.

<sup>740</sup> The phrase suggests both modesty and erudition; cf. references to the consultation of books in 1.182, 205.

<sup>741</sup> “More than passing” (οὐ παρέργως, cf. 1.183) indicates the significance of the subject. We must allow Josephus a wide latitude in what he considered to refer to Judeans (“us”). If he can take Manetho’s Hyksos as a reference to Judeans (1.73-103) and find reference to Judea in Choerilus’ “Solyman hills” (1.173-74), he could clearly discover allusions to Judeans in implausible places (cf. Berosus’ “reference” to Abraham in *Ant.* 1.159). It was suggested above that many, if not most, of the connections in mind here depend on the assumption that references to a hero-figure in the various flood-legends concern Noah, “the founder of our race,” 1.130. Josephus perhaps knew only the names of these authors, but if he learned more from Nicolas about the contents of their stories, he was wise not to cite them or attempt to argue the identification.

<sup>742</sup> “The earliest events” (τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πράγματα) suggests that Josephus is thinking primarily of very early, primordial stories. The claim of extensive reference by many authors (1.216) requires some such explanation for Josephus’ non-citation; see previous note. The criticism is expressed more mildly than the earlier claims of Greek ignorance and “lies” about ancient history (1.6-27).

<sup>743</sup> This is a crucial and very revealing claim. For

they all agree in bearing witness to our antiquity, which is the topic I set out to address right now.<sup>744</sup> **218** However, Demetrius Phalereus,<sup>745</sup> the elder Philo<sup>746</sup> and Eupolemus<sup>747</sup> did not stray far from the truth;<sup>748</sup> it is proper to forgive them,

Josephus it is non-negotiable that the criterion of truth is set by “our sacred books,” whose sanctity lends them authority (see 1.37-41). On several occasions Josephus has corroborated his external sources by reference to Judean scriptures (e.g., 1.91-92, 127, 128, 154, 160), but the use of those books as a template for judging the historicity of other sources is now made crystal clear. Here the cultural clash between Josephus and his critics is most acute. Where they question the historicity of Judean scriptures unless corroborated by famous Greek historians (1.1-5), Josephus will always assume that those scriptures speak the truth, and other sources can be accepted only to the extent that they agree (or can be made to agree) with them. Josephus and his critics operate with mutually exclusive canons of authority.

<sup>744</sup> On the significance for Josephus of total agreement, see 1.26. The consensus is achieved by his lack of citation and this non-specific claim to “antiquity.” The “witness”-language echoes its frequency in this section, especially the non-Greek segments (see note to “witnesses” at 1.70). The Egyptian authors cited in the next Part also accepted the antiquity of Judeans, but their account of Judean origins in Egypt cannot be given credence, so their voices cannot be heard within this unison.

<sup>745</sup> Josephus refers to this figure later (2.46) in connection with the translation of the scriptures, and knows of him from *Letter of Aristeas* (cf. *Ant.* 12.12-36, 110-14). He was an Attic orator (ca. 345—282 BCE) who served in the court of Ptolemy I and was the first librarian of Alexandria (see note to “time” at 2.46). But it is not clear what Josephus thought this figure would have written about Judeans. Since the next two authors to be named were probably known to Josephus from Alexander Polyhistor (Wacholder 1974: 52-57), who also cites from a Demetrius (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.21, 29), it is usually argued, and probably rightly, that Josephus has confused that otherwise unknown Demetrius with the famous Alexandrian. Demetrius’ attempts to harmonize the chronologies of the Judean scriptures date to the third century BCE (*FGH* 722; Holladay 1983: 51-92; Sterling 1992: 153-67). Since he drew his material from the scriptures, Josephus’ verdict is understandable, but his attribution hides the fact that all 3 authors here in view were Judeans themselves (see further below).

<sup>746</sup> Probably the author of hexameter verses on the patriarchs and the city of Jerusalem, cited by Alexander Polyhistor (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.20, 24, 37; see

*FGH* 729; Holladay 1989: 205-300). “The elder” may be intended to distinguish him from the famous philosopher of Alexandria, referred to by Josephus elsewhere (*Ant.* 18.259-60). This Philo’s dates are unknown, but before Alexander Polyhistor (mid-1st century BCE).

<sup>747</sup> Almost certainly the figure cited by (and known to Josephus through) Alexander Polyhistor (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.17, 26, 30-34, 39). Alexander has him referring to Abraham, David, Solomon (in relation to Tyre), and Jeremiah (the Abraham-fragment now generally considered to be from a different author, “Pseudo-Eupolemus”). He might be identical to the Eupolemus associated with Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc 8.17-20; *FGH* 723; Holladay 1983: 93-188). Josephus elsewhere names him in this connection (*Ant.* 12.415), but either did not make, or did not wish to see made, the identification with the author here listed. In the longest fragment, Eupolemus’ narrative on Solomon and Souron strays some distance from the biblical text, but its similarity to the passages from Menander and Dius authenticated above (1.106-27) may enable Josephus to place him in this “more truthful” category.

<sup>748</sup> The identical phrase is used in *War* 1.17 of certain (nameless) “Greeks” who translated Judean histories. The naming of these 3 authors, surprisingly added after the conclusion of 1.217, is puzzling, since it is not clear either why Josephus added them or who he thought they were. Since they belong in a group separate from those listed in 1.216, and since they are valued more highly, and described rather differently than the others, it is often concluded that Josephus knew they were Judean, especially if he learned of them from Alexander Polyhistor (see Wacholder 1974: 2-3; Gruen 2005: 42-43; Schwartz forthcoming, who also notes that “the elder Philo” implies a contrast with the more famous Judean philosopher). After the listing of all the witness categories in 1.216, these do not have to be read as “Greeks,” and Josephus may feel free to add authors of *any* nationality, whom he considers might bolster his case. But he if did know they were Judeans, he has certainly masked that fact—first by calling Demetrius “Phalereus” (a well-known Greek), and then by declining to declare their identity: as Judeans they could hardly add weight to the gathered testimony for Judean antiquity. It is equally possible that he was uncertain whether they were Judeans or not, but preferred to treat them as non-Judeans, like “Aristeas” (*Ant.* 12.17), “Hecataeus” (*Apion* 1.183-204), Theophilus, and Theodotus (1.216). In this uncertainty, he chooses to label the otherwise obscure Demetrius “Phalereus” to

since they were unable to follow our texts with full accuracy.<sup>749</sup>

*Exodus Stories from Egypt (1.219-320): Reading Options*

Josephus' reply to "libels" against the Judean nation (Part Two) begins with a collection of exodus accounts, as relayed by Manetho, Chaeremon, and Lysimachus. After an introduction explaining the origins of these slanders in Egyptian hatred and envy (1.219-26), Josephus reports an exodus legend from Manetho (1.227-51), to which he offers a lengthy rebuttal (1.252-87). Next, Chaeremon's version is paraphrased and critiqued (1.288-303) before a third version, from Lysimachus, is given equally short shrift (1.304-20). The rhetorical tone of ridicule and outrage rises to a crescendo in this third case, bringing book 1 to a climactic conclusion.

For a *Roman(ized)* audience, many aspects of the tales Josephus relates were apparently familiar. Tacitus reports no less than six versions of the origins of Judeans (*Hist.* 5.2-3), three of which involve expulsion or departure from Egypt. Significantly, the one he reports at length, and which he suggests is supported by *plurimi auctores*, is built on a motif common to all three of Josephus' authors: that the Judeans were afflicted by plague or disease and were expelled in order to purify the land of Egypt. In fact, Tacitus' version of events is remarkably close to that of Lysimachus (see note to "that" at 1.305), so this narrative at least might have won immediate recognition in Josephus' Rome. There is good reason to believe that both Chaeremon and Apion were influential in Rome in the 40s and 50s CE, so we may reckon that versions of the exodus such as those here countered were current in circles known to Josephus. The influence of such stories can be accounted for by their cultural significance and convenience. Where (Stoic) philosophy was inclined to find a purer form of wisdom hidden in ancient cultural traditions, the validity of Judean culture could depend on whether it conveyed an independent antique tradition or was an aberrant offshoot from an older Egyptian source (Boys-Stones 2001). The depiction of Judeans in these tales could establish the impression that they were no more than a renegade or deviant offshoot of the Egyptian population, their religious peculiarities not only uninteresting, but also philosophically groundless. Moreover, in a context where Judean versions of their origins were hardly known and carried little weight, intellectuals were inclined to believe narratives that had the ancient pedigree of Egypt and the powerful backing of such Alexandrian intellectuals as Chaeremon and Apion. Such stories offered explanations of many of the most prominent and puzzling features of Judean culture: their intolerance of other religious practices, their hostility to Egypt, their anti-social behavior, their allegiance to Moses, sabbath observance, fasting, and the lighting of lamps. Neatly combining history with contemporary social observation, such etiologies also reinforced negative stereotypes of Judeans that were current in Rome and would gain credence from those already predisposed against Judean culture.

Josephus thus faced a difficult task in his attempt to dispute such tales. His critique takes four main forms: i) identifying the inconsistencies among the tales; ii) analyzing the implausibilities

---

make him sound Greek, and aligns the other two with him. In *War* 1.17 he thought (or said) that there were Greek authors who retold Judean history on the basis of Judean texts. Here that option may be still in his mind (hence the echo of vocabulary), but his subsequent reading has introduced him to a wealth of literature identifiable as Judean (see Appendix 5), and the awkward placement of this trio may reflect his confusion on the matter. The repetition of "truth" (cf. 1.214, 217) strengthens the presumption that "the truth" is to be found in its purest form in "our texts."

<sup>749</sup> For the rhetoric of "accuracy," see 1.29. The contrast in *War* 1.17 between accurate Judean historiogra-

phy and erroneous Greek translations suggests that the lack of understanding here is linguistic (see Schwartz forthcoming, arguing that γράμματα here, given its literal meaning "letters," alludes to their inability to read Hebrew). If he suspected (or knew) that these were Judean, his criticism might also suggest that he himself was the only reliable Judean guide to Judean history (cf. 1.54; Schwartz forthcoming). The note of forgiveness (or condescension) ends this section with the impression of Josephus as an historian with exacting standards of accuracy, but a reasonable and generous spirit—a good foundation from which to launch the following polemics.



and obscurities inherent in each narrative; iii) highlighting the incompatibility between the stories and known “facts” (in the Bible) about, for instance, Joseph or Moses; iv) tracing the origin of these tales to Egypt, a land of religious depravity. The first two forms of attack are worked through in impressive detail, but might make little impression on a cultural prejudice in favor of these stories. It did not bother Tacitus that there were variant versions of Judean origins (he could choose which he liked) and arguments about “implausibility” depend on precarious assessments about what constitutes “reasonable” behavior. Obscurities might weaken, but would not necessarily discredit any particular story. Moreover, only those who knew or valued Josephus’ external sources would find convincing his insistence that Joseph lived four generations before Moses, and was not his contemporary (1.299). Perhaps Josephus’ single most potent weapon was, therefore, his *ethos*-assault on Egyptians, to which he gives prominence in his introduction (1.223-26) and to which he alludes thereafter. Here he is able to utilize common Roman stereotypes against Egyptians (see Berthelot 2000; Barclay 2004), discrediting the stories by ridiculing their authors. But this rhetorical weapon is still comparatively under-developed in this segment, compared to its hefty deployment against Apion. For the most part he depends on reasoned argumentation, which might be effective only amongst readers already sympathetic to his cause.

For *Judean* readers, a quite different set of cultural presumptions would be operative. Most fundamental would be their disinclination to believe stories that dishonored either Moses or the Judean people and thus their sense of outrage, prompted by Josephus, against the identification of their ancestors with diseased or leprous sections of the Egyptian population. By Josephus’ time, many Judean tales had been told concerning Moses and the exodus, which frequently went beyond the biblical data: Philo’s version of the life of Moses, Josephus’ own tale of Moses’ Ethiopian expedition (*Ant.* 2.238-53), the Artapanus romance, and Ezekiel’s *Exagoge* all testify to a prolific and creative Judean imagination in retelling the story of the exodus. Thus there was nothing in principle problematic about stories that exceeded the biblical parameters. Where Josephus draws on biblical resources (1.279-86, 299), his alternative narrative might win assent from Judean readers, who might also hear echoes of biblical tales in motifs such as forced labor in stone-quarries (1.235; cf. Exod 1:11-14). But congruence with the Bible could hardly be the final criterion for either Josephus or his Judean readers. More important was the fact that these stories were told with an evident polemical bias, and that they depicted Judeans (or their ancestors) as renegade Egyptians, irreligious and anti-social. For Judean readers, Josephus’ replies, logically convincing or not, would presumably have been instantly acceptable as attempts to defend Judean honor.

*Christian* readers of this segment of the treatise appear to have found little of immediate interest or value. Although some Christian authors developed strong anti-Judean sentiments, there is no traceable influence of Josephus’ “Egyptian” authors on Christian polemics (unless Paul’s remark on Judean temple-robbery in Rom 2:22 echoes Lysimachus’ canard in 1.311). For those Christians who wished to defend their Hebrew heritage, this segment was perhaps too specific to be of general use: Josephus’ very pointed replies to specific narratives would only be valuable if precisely those narratives were redeployed by critics of the Judean tradition. Thus, when Origen replies to Celsus’ comment on the Judeans as Egyptian rebels and fugitives, he uses the biblical account of the exodus as his basis for the “proper” account of things, not Josephus’ critique of these three authors (*Cels.* 3.5-8).

By contrast, this segment has been of immense importance in the history of recent *scholarship*. This text provides unique access to another section of Manetho’s work; to a fragment of Chaeremon who is otherwise known from very limited sources; and to a Lysimachus who may be otherwise entirely unknown, or (if the Alexandrian of that name) known only from fragments of a quite different kind. All three display the recycling of old Egyptian mythologies, in historicised form, and thus contribute to the pool of evidence for Egyptian “nationalism,” and its propaganda against foreign threats to Egyptian religion and culture. But the most significant impact of this segment is the impetus it has given to scholarly attempts to collect and analyse the evidence for anti-Jewish (or “anti-Semitic”) sentiments in antiquity. Despite Josephus’ observation that what

he records is only one aspect of a much wider pattern of cultural competition and polemics (1.220-22), the historical and cultural significance of anti-Semitism in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries has made Josephus' collection of anti-Judean material stand out with particular prominence. Although a hefty collection could be made of anti-Egyptian sentiment in antiquity (including Josephus' own recycling of negative stereotypes), it is the history and extent of anti-Judaism in antiquity which has, understandably, drawn by far the greater scholarly attention. Here, Josephus' identification of Egypt as the originating source of anti-Judean feeling (1.223-26) has enticed many scholars into tracing the history of "anti-Semitism" in Egypt, as it can be reconstructed from scattered literary and historical materials (e.g., Yoyotte 1963; Feldman 1993; Modrzejewski 1995). In the ongoing debates about the evolution and significance of this phenomenon (see Schäfer 1997a; Gruen 2002; Appendix 3), Josephus' sources—in our segment, Manetho, Chaeremon, and Lysimachus—have drawn far more scholarly attention than Josephus' own *riposte*.

My own *post-colonial* approach to the text interprets its polemics—both Egyptian and Josephus—in the context of Roman power. The recycling and promotion of old Egyptian stories in first-century Rome (see above) suggest a political attempt to discredit Judeans, an attempt which, to judge from Tacitus, successfully sowed into the minds of the Roman elite derogatory perceptions of Judean origins and Judean national characteristics. Josephus' reply represents a counter-offensive, which defends Judean honor by the defamation and ridicule of his "Egyptian" opposition. In a capital city where currents of Egyptian and Judean culture won both interest and disdain, our segment represents the competition for cultural power by two nations, both subordinate to Roman power. Jockeying for Roman approval, the two cultural traditions trade on the negative stereotypes of the other, and Josephus utilizes Roman disdain of one subservient people to rescue the honor of another (see further Barclay 2004). Josephus has acquired considerable expertise in the literary and rhetorical conventions of his time: he displays knowledge of the classical tradition, both historical and literary (1.220-22); he utilizes a philosophical criterion to place Judeans and Egyptians at opposite ends of the religious spectrum (1.224-25); he deploys logical syllogisms and a varied arsenal of rhetorical tactics to conduct an impressive *refutatio* of his three targets; he even assumes the style of a pagan literary critic, with his expostulation  $\nu\eta$  Δία ("by Zeus," 1.255). All these suggest an absorption of elite culture (whether conscious or unconscious), which equips Josephus for his specifically Judean apologetic. But he also knows enough about Roman amusement concerning Egyptian religion to present his defense in terms that damage the cultural credibility of Egyptians in their Roman context.

What is at stake for Josephus here is not just the correct narration of one item in Judean history, but the power to establish "the truth" about Judean origins, and thus about the nature and identity of Judeans themselves. Josephus is hugely concerned to prove that Judeans were not originally Egyptian lepers (or equivalent), and what is important here is not just that they were not lepers, but also—indeed more significantly—that they were not Egyptian. Josephus' anxiety about "mixing" (1.229) is evident both in his relief that Manetho "admits" that the Jerusalemites were *not* Egyptians (1.253, 278) and in his criticism of the obscurity of Chaeremon and Lysimachus in their use of the label "Judean" (1.298, 302, 313-14). The rhetorical effort expended on this point seems motivated not just by a concern to distinguish peoples sometimes confused in Roman eyes, or by a desire to preserve Judean honor as a foil to Egyptian disgrace (on both points see Barclay 2004). What is important for Josephus is that the Judeans were in origin, and thus remain to his present, a unique and distinct people (cf. 1.1), not an offshoot from Egypt, but a nation with its own special and antique traditions, endowed with its own immense antiquity and entitled to live by its own ancestral customs. Judean culture is not second-hand or derivative, nor a deliberate alteration of previous customs, designed to create an artificial distinction (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.1). The Judean people were shaped not by historical accident through an Egyptian expulsion, but by their own distinct traditions and particular religious "dignity" (1.225). Josephus' battle is not merely to dispel certain "libels" against Judeans current in Rome, but to affirm the integrity of his unique and ancient nation, and thus their right to live by

their own highly distinctive customs (Boys-Stones 2001: 76-95). Thus the topic of this segment is a matter of real political and cultural significance, not just literary debate.

*Introduction to  
Part Two:  
Refutation of  
Slanders*

**(1.24) 219** One topic still remains from those proposed at the start of my argument:<sup>750</sup> to prove false the libels and insults that certain people have aimed at our people,<sup>751</sup> and to invoke their authors as witnesses against themselves.<sup>752</sup> **220** That the same thing has happened to many others, through the malice of some,<sup>753</sup> will be familiar, I think, to those who read more in the way of historical works.<sup>754</sup> For certain people have attempted<sup>755</sup> to besmirch the nobility of nations and of the most renowned cities,<sup>756</sup> and to insult their constitutions,<sup>757</sup> **221**—Theopompus on the Athenians’

<sup>750</sup> “Argument” translates the bland term (λόγος) with which Josephus labels the substance of this work (cf. 2.144); for its genre, see Introduction, § 5. The reference here is to the preface (1.1-5) and the “slanders” there mentioned (cf. 1.59), which Josephus has yet to discuss; several key terms from that preface will recur here (see following notes). That this is the last remaining topic suggests that Josephus understands the *whole* of the rest of *Apion* to fit under this heading; on the place of 2.145-286 within this scheme, see Introduction, § 1.

<sup>751</sup> “Prove false ... the insults” (ἀποδείξαι ψευδεῖς ... λοιδορίας) echoes the aim expressed in the preface to “expose those who insult us as guilty of ... falsehood” (τῶν λοιδορούντων ... ἐλέγξαι ψευδολογίαν, 1.3). “Libels” (διαβολαί) is a less common term in *Apion*, and is normally used with reference to individuals, e.g., in relation to the reputations of Josephus (1.53) and Moses (2.145; cf. 1.70).

<sup>752</sup> The tactic, already mentioned in 1.4 (see note to “themselves”), will be highlighted again in 1.226. In the case of Manetho, this means primarily the demonstration that his stories are internally inconsistent (e.g., 1.230-32, 253-87); thereafter Josephus can compare authors with one another, and show their mutual inconsistency (e.g., 1.293-303; 1.312; 2.15-18). To refer to them here as “witnesses” is ironic. The term has been used repeatedly for the authors in the previous Part, who have borne witness to the antiquity of the Judeans (1.4, 69-70, 93, 104, 129, 160, 205, etc.); now it is used again for a different kind of author, who witness against themselves and against each other. By announcing this argumentative tactic, Josephus signals the heavy investment he will make in the resources of logic and reason (cf. 1.59), through analysis of the internal deficiencies of the narratives he will cite.

<sup>753</sup> “Malice” (δυσμένεια) again recalls the preface (1.2, 3; cf. 1.70, 212; 2.145). Josephus’ first step is to normalize the hostile stories he is about to recount, by placing them in the larger context of ancient polemics.

It is one of the ironies of history that, although Josephus does not regard criticism of Judeans as *sui generis*, the preservation of his apologetic work, unparalleled amongst ancient literature, has encouraged the impression that “anti-Semitism” (or “anti-Judaism”) was different in degree or kind from other forms of ethnic hostility in antiquity. Josephus’ tactic is to place Judeans in illustrious company, as victims of abuse, so that its negative force will rebound on the critics themselves.

<sup>754</sup> For the phenomenon of ancient ethnic polemics and stereotypes, see Isaac 2004. Slurs on nations and cities are found, of course, in many genres, not just in histories; but history is highlighted as the genre of the “Egyptian” narratives about to be recounted. As in 1.16, Josephus constructs his readers as well educated—indeed better educated than himself—but in both contexts he proceeds to display his own erudition. A note of self-deprecation shields an exhibition of learning.

<sup>755</sup> As elsewhere (see note to “histories” at 1.13), ἐπιχειρέω suggests an unsuccessful attempt.

<sup>756</sup> Reference to the “nobility” (εὐγένεια) of nations suggests that any assault—on them, and by extension on Judeans—will be slanderous and unjust. Presumably Josephus would justify his imminent attack on Egyptians as utterly different: simply truth-telling about an ignoble nation (1.225). Cities of the “highest renown” (ἐνδοξότατοι, the adjective is repeated in 1.222) are also, by definition, traduced by criticism. Although Judeans hardly constitute a city, Josephus needs this second category as the only examples he will cite (in 1.221) are criticisms of cities, not nations. It is curious that he does not refer to other “noble” nations being slandered.

<sup>757</sup> The constitution (πολιτεία) is the issue at stake in the examples to follow, but also in relation to Judeans in 2.145-286. The Egyptian exodus-stories discuss Judean origins, in ethnographic mode; but they do relate some features of Moses’ legislation and thus bear on the Judean constitution (1.250).

constitution,<sup>758</sup> Polycrates on the Lacedaemonians,<sup>759</sup> while the author of the *Tripoliticos* (who was certainly not Theopompus, as some think)<sup>760</sup> savaged<sup>761</sup> the Thebans' city as well, and indeed Timaeus in his histories issued many slanders about the above-named and others.<sup>762</sup> 222 They do this especially when they latch onto<sup>763</sup> those of the highest renown,<sup>764</sup> some through envy and malevolence,<sup>765</sup> others thinking they will get noticed by making novel statements.<sup>766</sup> This expectation does not go unfulfilled in an audience of fools, but those whose judgment is healthy condemn their gross depravity.<sup>767</sup>

(1.25) 223 It was Egyptians who initiated the slanders against us,<sup>768</sup> and certain

*Egyptians to blame*

<sup>758</sup> Theopompus of Chios (ca. 370—320 BCE) was an orator and historian with strong sympathies for Sparta and nothing but critical comment on Athens. Book 10 of his 58-book *Philippica* was devoted to a critique of Athenian demagogues (FGH 115, frags. 85-110), and other fragments suggest an extended rhetorical crusade (e.g., frags. 105, 213, 281). He was one of the most widely-read Greek historians in antiquity, and known as a censorious critic (Nepos, *Alc.* 11; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.1); see Shrimpton 1991 and Flower 1994. Josephus elsewhere uses the good reputation of Athens as a platform on which to mount the still higher honor of Judeans (1.21; 2.172, 262-64).

<sup>759</sup> This could be the Polycrates named in Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 139d as the author of a work on Sparta (FGH 588), but is perhaps more likely the 4<sup>th</sup>-century Athenian sophist, who had good reason to respond to Spartan criticisms of Athens (so Jacoby in FGH 597, with commentary and notes). Like Athens, Sparta becomes a useful rhetorical foil for Josephus (2.225-31, 259-61).

<sup>760</sup> The *Tripoliticos* (also known as the *Trikaranos*) launched a simultaneous assault on the cities of Athens, Sparta, and Thebes. It was written in the name and style of Theopompus, in an attempt to make him universally unpopular (Pausanias 6.18.5), but was actually composed by Anaximenes of Lampsacus (FGH 72). Africanus (cited by Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10, 491a) thought it was written by Theopompus; Josephus shows off his erudition by confidently stating its inauthenticity (cf. 1.14).

<sup>761</sup> L, followed by Niese, reads προσέλαβεν (“included”); but the Latin rendition *momordit* (“bit”) suggested to Naber the emendation προσέδρακεν (“bit”, i.e., “savaged”), followed by Reinach, Thackeray, and Münster. The emendation is attractive, although the verb προσδάκνω is otherwise unattested.

<sup>762</sup> For Timaeus as a severe critic of others (Polybius 12.8, 12b-15), see note to “Ephorus” at 1.16. “Slander” (βλασφημῶ) reintroduces the language of 1.4, 59. All Josephus’ examples come from the 4<sup>th</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BCE; their context is the rivalry of Greek city-states, as philosophical debates on the most beneficial political

structures provided resources for mutual denigration. These are only remotely parallel to the Egyptian tales about Judean origins, or to Apion’s first-century slurs on Alexandrian Judeans. But Josephus shows little interest in the social or cultural context of polemics; it is enough for him that Judeans are in good company as targets of abuse.

<sup>763</sup> Greek: προσπλέκω, a rare term, *hapax* in Josephus.

<sup>764</sup> As often, Josephus sandwiches his examples (1.221) between two statements of his key point; thus the language here closely matches 1.220.

<sup>765</sup> Envy (φθόνος) is often advanced by Josephus as the cause of hostility (cf. 1.224, 225; 2.147; cf. 2.31); the term presupposes Judean superiority. Malevolence (κακοήθεια) is used only here in *Apion* (the adjective occurs in 1.148, “evil character”).

<sup>766</sup> The translation follows Dindorf’s emendation of L (καινολογεῖν for κενολογεῖν), now universally adopted. The desire for recognition through difference or novelty was identified as a Greek trait in 1.25-26; but here the general remark can color the Egyptian stories about to be recounted.

<sup>767</sup> Depravity (μοχθηρία) is a rare term in Josephus, reserved for strong polemics (cf. 2.29; *Life* 393). By shifting the focus here from the authors to the recipients of invective, Josephus forces his readers into one of two camps: if they read the following stories sympathetically, they are clearly foolish and sick; if they reject them, they display a healthy judgment (ὕγιαίνοντες τῇ κρίσει). The medical metaphor for the proper operation of reason is a commonplace in intellectual polemics (cf. 1.204, 213; 2.132). For Josephus’ stance as a practitioner of reason see 1.59; here, as in the Greek tradition, reason and moral virtue are intertwined.

<sup>768</sup> For “slander” (βλασφημία), cf. 1.221 and note to “malice” 1.2. Although “Egyptians” had been valuable allies in the historiographical discussion (1.8, 28) and as witnesses to Judean antiquity (1.73-105), they are now blamed as the main and the originating source of hostility to Judeans (cf. 1.70). It suits Josephus’ rhetoric to focus and simplify reality in this way, since he can readily discredit his opponents by drawing on a



people who wanted to gratify them attempted to twist the truth,<sup>769</sup> neither admitting the arrival of our ancestors in Egypt as it actually took place,<sup>770</sup> nor truthfully recounting their exodus.<sup>771</sup> **224** They had many reasons for hate and envy:<sup>772</sup> originally because our ancestors held sway over their land<sup>773</sup> and, when they moved from there to their homeland, again prospered;<sup>774</sup> then, the opposition of these nations<sup>775</sup> has aroused in them a great animosity,<sup>776</sup> since our piety differs from what is customary among them to the same degree that the nature of God stands removed from irrational animals.<sup>777</sup> **225** It is their common ancestral tradition to consider these [ani-

powerful set of stereotypes concerning Egyptians current in the Roman world (see Barclay 2004). Of the five main writers whose “slanders” Josephus will combat (Manetho, Chaeremon, Lysimachus, Apion, Apollonius Molon), Manetho will serve as the original Egyptian slanderer, but much will also be invested in the “Egyptian” character of Apion (2.1-144). For evidence of anti-Judean sentiment in Egypt before Manetho, in the Elephantine papyri, see Modrzejewski 1995: 21-44 and Schäfer 1997a: 121-35. On the sources and canons of ancient hostility to Judeans, see Appendix 3.

<sup>769</sup> “Truth” (the ἀληθ- root occurs twice in this section) is presumed by Josephus to lie in the biblical account, with support from Manetho’s Hyksos-story. The “gratifying” motive (cf. for Greeks, 1.25) is made explicit in the case of Apion (2.142; cf. 2.32), but not relevant to the others. The broad description of these “certain people” enables Josephus to include almost anyone, tarring *any* critics by association with Egypt. Of those that follow, Lysimachus is possibly “Egyptian,” but Apollonius Molon certainly not.

<sup>770</sup> This is not a critique of Manetho’s Hyksos-narrative (1.79-105), which Josephus continues to affirm (1.228, 230-31). His wording here echoes 1.104, with its stress on the claim the Judeans did not *originate* in Egypt: their ancestors came into Egypt from elsewhere (cf. 1.252). The criticism here is thus of those who denied this origin *from elsewhere*, or who reported it in terms that Josephus will not countenance.

<sup>771</sup> Josephus seems content to support Manetho’s account of the “exodus” of the “shepherd-people” in 1.84-90 (echoed in 1.230); he certainly does not advance an alternative version in this treatise. What he cannot accept are the additional tales of the impure or diseased, which feature in the stories he is about to critique. These tales do not challenge the antiquity of Judeans—indeed they support it. But they diminish their honor and challenge the Judeans’ sense of their “own original composition” (1.1).

<sup>772</sup> These twin causes are explained twice each in the course of 1.224-25: hatred because of the ancestors’ political supremacy, and because of the opposing systems of piety; envy because of the Judeans’ success in their own land, and the religious emulation they receive

from others. To attribute the Egyptians’ attitude to Judeans to such negative passions is already to signal their moral inferiority, while in all four cases such passions are elicited by Judean superiority, either political or religious.

<sup>773</sup> In the context of this treatise, Josephus alludes to 1.75-82, where the ancestors are identified with the domineering Hyksos. Their desire to *eradicate* the Egyptian populace (1.81) is no longer mentioned. In the biblical context, only Joseph’s rule could qualify for this description (Gen 42:6; cf. *Ant.* 2.89-90, 174; 3.87, where his power is magnified). Cf. *Ant.* 2.201-2 on Egyptian envy of Israel’s prosperity in Egypt, but only after the (universally appreciated) rule of Joseph. Egyptian resentment of irreligious foreign rulers is reflected as early as reports about the Hyksos, and was heightened in the Persian period (cf. Eddy 1961: 257-323). At what point Judeans were cast in this role is difficult to discern, especially if Manetho’s stories have gone through multiple redactions (see Appendix 1 and Appendix 3).

<sup>774</sup> On Judea as “homeland” (οἰκεῖα χώρα, cf. 2.289), see note to “possess” at 1.1. Josephus uses the adjective to reinforce the point that they were not originally from Egypt (cf. 1.103). On their prosperity there, the cause of envy, see the parallel claim in 1.273, where their economic superiority to Egypt is made more explicit. For obvious reasons Josephus glides over the biblical narrative of Israel’s oppression and slavery in Egypt.

<sup>775</sup> I here translate τῶν ἔθνῶν (with Reinach and Münster). L reads simply τούτων (“of these”). It is possible that some words are missing (so Reinach), or one could emend the text to τῶν ἱερῶν (“cults”; so Spanheim followed by Naber). The topic shifts from politics to religion, where the contrast is so strong as to be classed “opposition” (ὑπεναντιότης; a rare term, *hapax* in Josephus; for the cognate adjective, see 1.269; 2.150, 180, 183).

<sup>776</sup> Greek: ἔχθρα, one of a number of near synonyms for hatred and hostility deployed by Josephus in this connection (1.70, 224, 272, 273, 287, 304; 2.32, 70).

<sup>777</sup> This first reference to Egyptian animal cults introduces a theme that will recur on many occasions

mals] Gods, but they differ from one another in the honors they pay them in their own particular ways.<sup>778</sup> Empty-headed<sup>779</sup> and utterly foolish people,<sup>780</sup> inured from the beginning to depraved opinions about Gods,<sup>781</sup> they did not succeed in imitating the dignity of our religious discourse,<sup>782</sup> but envied us when they saw us emulated by many.<sup>783</sup> **226** Some of their number reached such a level of folly and pettiness<sup>784</sup> that they did not hesitate to contradict even their ancient records,<sup>785</sup> but also did not notice, in the blindness of their passion,<sup>786</sup> that in what they wrote they were contradicting themselves.<sup>787</sup>

**(1.26) 227** The first person on whom I shall dwell in my discussion I employed a *Manetho again*

(1.254; 2.65-66, 86, 128, 139). Josephus uses it here to suggest an honor-scale in which Egyptian theriomorphic religion is not just different, but right at the bottom of a spectrum stretching down from the piety appropriate to the true, elevated “nature of God” (cf. 2.168, 180, 250) to a debased cult offered to “irrational” (ἄλογα) animals (cf. Origen, *Cels.* 6.4). Judeans stand at the top of this (originally Greek) scale of rationality (cf. 2.190-98); Egyptians at the very bottom (2.65-66; cf. Philo, *Contempl.* 8-9; *Decal.* 76-80). Egyptian animal cults elicited mixed but generally bemused reaction from Greeks and Romans; Josephus here echoes the disdain they received from the Roman literary elite (see Smelik & Hemelrijk 1984; Berthelot 2000; Barclay 2004; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.698-700; Juvenal, *Sat.* 15; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.101; Aelian, *Nat. an.* 12.5; Lucian, *Sacr.* 15; *Deor. conc.* 10-11; *Jupp. trag.* 42 etc.).

<sup>778</sup> Josephus can have it both ways. The Egyptians are all equally foolish in their religion, but do not even have the virtue of unanimity (contrast Judeans in 2.179-81): their stupidity has its own particular variants (ἰδίᾳ). Josephus makes no attempt to link these variations to different geographical regions of Egypt (nomes); cf. Herodotus 2.42, 71-74; Diodorus 1.21.6-11; 89.4-5; 90.2; Strabo, *Geogr.* 17.1.38-40; Lucian, *Jupp. trag.* 42. He will later refer to the feuds these differences famously spawned (2.65-66); cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 380a-c and the ferocious critique in Juvenal, *Sat.* 15.

<sup>779</sup> Greek: κοῦφοι (“light-weight”), in contrast to the “dignity” of Judean theology, mentioned below. For use of the same adjective regarding Egyptians in this connection see Plutarch, *Mor.* 380a.

<sup>780</sup> Greek: ἀνόητοι, already used in 1.222, and echoed in the cognate noun at 1.226. Cf. Juvenal’s *demens Aegyptos* (*Sat.* 15.1-2).

<sup>781</sup> The Egyptians’ opinions are not just erroneous but depraved (κακῶς); cf. Cicero’s *pravi errores* (*Tusc.* 5.78). That they are ingrained “from the beginning” suggests that they are ineradicable (cf. 2.239).

<sup>782</sup> The Egyptians’ attempt suggests that even they recognized the honor-contrast Josephus has constructed between the two religious traditions. “Dignity” (σεμνότης) suggests a weight of solemnity and seriousness

equivalent to the Latin *gravitas* (a favorite term in Cicero and Roman moralists); cf. the cognate verb in 2.31 and adjective in 2.221, and Josephus’ use of the noun in relation to himself at *Life* 258 (with comments by Mason 2001 ad loc.). “Religious discourse” (θεολογία) is a noun used by Josephus only in this treatise, but not only of Judeans (cf. its other uses at 1.78, 237). For “correct” discourse about God, cf. 2.236-54, with parallels in Plato.

<sup>783</sup> On envy as a motive for malice cf. 1.213, 222, 224. Emulation (ζηλόω) is a theme Josephus highlights especially in relation to Greeks (1.162, 166) and in his generalizing conclusion (2.280-86); it conveys the superiority of the Judean tradition (see note to “degree” at 2.280). In fact Egyptian customs and religious traditions were admired and adopted in Rome just as much as those of Judeans, not least under Domitian (see Takács 1995: 98-104; Matthews 2001: 10-28). But it suits Josephus’ rhetoric to boost the Judean cause at the expense of the Egyptians.

<sup>784</sup> For “folly,” see note to “people” at 1.225. “Pettiness” (μικροψυχία; a *hapax* in the Josephan corpus) suggests both meanness and intellectual weakness (cf. its opposite, μεγαλοψυχία, a trait of Judeans, in 2.261). From generalities about Egyptians, Josephus begins to talk about Egyptian authors in particular.

<sup>785</sup> The phraseology suggests that the contradiction was both conscious and brazen. The case in view is specifically Manetho, about whom this is a repeated complaint (cf. 1.105, 228-31, 287); the plural suggests the same fault is found among others who depart from the (still honored) Egyptian records.

<sup>786</sup> For the metaphor of error as (mental) illness, see 1.222; on “blindness” in particular, cf. 1.214; 2.132, 142. “Passion” (πάθος) stands as the opposite to reason, thus making self-contradiction explicable.

<sup>787</sup> Cf. the final clause of 1.219, with which this forms an *inclusio*; on the double sense of self-contradiction see note to “themselves” at 1.219. The prominence of this theme in the introduction signals its importance in Josephus’ argument; his most effective ploy is to deconstruct his opponents’ narratives from within.

little earlier also as a witness to our antiquity.<sup>788</sup> **228** That is Manetho, who undertook to translate the history of Egypt from the sacred writings,<sup>789</sup> and says first that our ancestors came against Egypt in very large numbers and ruled the inhabitants,<sup>790</sup> then himself admits that at a later date again they were thrown out,<sup>791</sup> occupied present-day Judea, founded Hiersolyma,<sup>792</sup> and built the sanctuary.<sup>793</sup> Up to this point he followed the records.<sup>794</sup> **229** But then, giving himself license<sup>795</sup> by saying he would record myths and rumors<sup>796</sup> about the Judeans,<sup>797</sup> he inserted implausible

<sup>788</sup> See 1.73-105, with “witness” vocabulary at 1.74, 93, 104. Josephus meets the awkwardness of citing Manetho in both capacities by positing an absolute, but artificial, distinction between the sources that Manetho recycles in each case (see below 1.228-29). Although there is a large textual gap between the two citations of Manetho, Josephus does not want the Hyksos-story forgotten: in fact, its rehearsal here is used to *discredit* the new leper-story, while it continues to anchor Josephus’ insistence that the Judeans did not originate from Egypt. Josephus’ treatment of this new Manetho citation forms his most extended engagement with any single quotation in this treatise. After an introduction that already casts doubt on its historical value (1.227-31), he first paraphrases (1.232-36), then cites (1.237-50), then paraphrases Manetho further (1.251), before offering a lengthy and detailed critique (1.252-87). As the first and most thorough piece of refutation, Josephus displays his arsenal of rhetorical weapons; the subsequent cases can rest on his success here.

<sup>789</sup> See note to “tablets” at 1.73; the Egyptian “writings” are mentioned as Manetho’s source in 1.73, 104, 105 and emphasized here to imply the reliability of the Hyksos-story. Where 1.73 uses μεταφράζω, Josephus here talks of Manetho’s translation using μεθερμηνεύω (as in 1.54 of himself); see note to “writings” at 1.54, and note to “translated” at 1.73.

<sup>790</sup> Josephus’ identification of the “shepherds” in the Hyksos-story as “our ancestors” (1.91, 103) is here assumed, and they will not now be referred to by the shepherd label, only by terms with clear reference to Judeans. The summary of 1.75-82 is supplemented by the reference to “very large numbers” (literally, “many tens of thousands”); 1.89-90 had indicated how many left, not how many had arrived. The more violent features of Manetho’s account are now suppressed, and “ruled” is perhaps vague enough to match the biblical role of Joseph. But the essence of Manetho’s Hyksos-story is maintained, since it clarifies the extraneous origin of the Judeans. Josephus repeats the essential details here because he wishes to represent the leper-story not (as in Manetho) as a sequel, but as a false *alternative* version of the *same events*.

<sup>791</sup> The verb, ἐκπίπτω, was used for the partial expulsion in 1.86. The term “admits” (ὁμολογέω, cf. 1.105,

223, 232, 252) implies that this is a damaging concession; it is so only on Josephus’ assumption that the following story, which also records an arrival and an expulsion, is a literary doublet of the first, not a subsequent event in history.

<sup>792</sup> See 1.90, 94, with note to “Hiersolyma” at 1.90, regarding the possible doctoring of the original Manetho at this point.

<sup>793</sup> This is a detail *not* included in the earlier citations or paraphrases, and perhaps introduced by Josephus himself, who has a vested interest in linking the Hyksos-story as closely as possible to Judean phenomena. Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.3) attributes to Moses and his colonists the construction of the Jerusalem temple, by a simple historical elision; cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3.2. Josephus can endorse this only by jumping over several hundred years of history (cf. 1.127).

<sup>794</sup> “Records” (ἀναγραφαί) was a key term signalling the security of a written source in 1.6-59 (see note to “laws” at 1.7). Josephus emphasizes the point here (in an *inclusio* with the statement in 1.228) to provide the strongest possible contrast with the *oral* sources about to be mentioned.

<sup>795</sup> Greek: ἔξουσία, the vice which led Greek historians to perpetrate lies (1.20), but which Judean culture excluded (1.37).

<sup>796</sup> Greek: τὰ μυθεύόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα. As in 1.105, Josephus draws the sharpest possible contrast between the sources behind the two stories: cf. μυθολογούμενα (1.105), μυθολογία (1.230) and μύθοι (1.287). Since he omits or paraphrases here anything that might look like an official record, the leper-story has the appearance of mere legend, but in style and genre it differs little from the Sethos-narrative in 1.98-102. On the mixture of regional-records and folk-tales *throughout* Manetho’s material, see note to “tablets” at 1.73 (with the remarks by Redford) and note to “authorship” at 1.105.

<sup>797</sup> This phrase “about the Judeans” could go with either the preceding “myths and rumours,” or the following “implausible stories.” In either case it implies, perhaps wrongly, that Manetho called some party in his story “Judeans.” In the following narrative (as reported by Josephus), the former shepherds from Jerusalem are called “Solymitans” (1.248), and the lepers/polluted are given no other label. The term “Judeans” may have

stories,<sup>798</sup> in the desire to mix up with us<sup>799</sup> a crowd of Egyptian lepers and people who for other diseases had been, he says, condemned to exile from Egypt.<sup>800</sup> **230** Having put forward<sup>801</sup> a king Amenophis—a made-up name<sup>802</sup> and hence not daring to fix the duration of his reign (although he accurately appends dates to the other kings),<sup>803</sup>—he connects him with certain myths, no doubt forgetting that he had recorded the exodus of the shepherds to Hierosolyma as taking place 518 years earlier.<sup>804</sup> **231** For Tethmosis was king when they departed<sup>805</sup> and, according to him

been applied to one or other party by Chaeremon (1.292) and Lysimachus (1.305), but Josephus appears to import it into Manetho's story (cf. 1.251). Whether the original Manetho connected his narratives in any way to Judeans/Moses, or whether this connection was added by an editor of Manetho, or by Josephus himself, is a moot point; see commentary on 1.90 and 1.250 and Appendix 1.

<sup>798</sup> "Implausible" (ἀπίθανος) is a term Josephus will use repeatedly in relation to this Manetho story (cf. 1.105, 267, 279, 286, 287; of the 11 occurrences in Josephus, 7 appear in *Apion*). It signals Josephus' strategy to appeal to his audience's sense of what is likely or reasonable, which will naturally stand at some remove from the cultural logic of the Egyptian tale.

<sup>799</sup> "Mixing" (ἀναμίγνυμι) is what Josephus fears or resents most: cf. the strategic position of this term again at 1.252-53 and 1.278. Whether the "mixing" be represented merely by alliance, or by full identification with the Egyptian lepers, Josephus insists on keeping Judean identity distinct; see Barclay 2004.

<sup>800</sup> The "he says" reminds the reader that this is only Manetho's story, not history. Where Manetho had used terms such as "polluted" (1.241, 248), Josephus' paraphrases generally remove the religious dimension and make the problematic condition purely medical (cf. 1.233, 234, 235, 260, 267, 273); see below note to "people" at 1.233. *Pace* Thackeray 256 and Waddell 1940 ad loc., there is no good reason to connect Josephus' comment to Deut 28:27. By highlighting leprosy (cf. 1.233, 235, 256, 257, 267, 278) he can make the story inconsistent with Moses' legislation on the disease (1.281-85).

<sup>801</sup> Translating προθείς, as suggested by Cobet, and followed by Reinach and Münster, in place of προσθείς ("having added," L E S); cf. 1.185. Josephus continues to discredit the story as thoroughly as possible before he recounts it.

<sup>802</sup> There were three kings with this name in 1.95-97, and no good reason why there should not have been a fourth. Amenophis IV (Akhenaten) is in fact a particularly well-attested monarch during the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty (1352-1338 BCE), who appeared in Manetho's narrative after Sethos and Ramesses (1.231) in the Epitome followed by Africanus and Eusebius; see the table at

1.97. Whether there is any history behind Manetho's tale, and if so, whether it is more likely connected to Amenophis III or IV, is highly uncertain; see Meyer 1931: 420-26; Stern 1.84; Reinach 115; Labow 2005: 251-52. For the different names, and other differences between the various versions of the following tale, see Appendix 3.

<sup>803</sup> Josephus' argument initially appears strong (cf. the lists of kings and dates in 1.79-81, 94-97), but dissolves on scrutiny. Where Manetho appended a narrative to a king's reign, he put the reign-dates at the very end (see 1.79, 94). Noting this, Meyer (1904: 77) suggested that Josephus knew only an excerpt from Manetho, which contained the narrative without the closing date, and drew this false conclusion about the original Manetho. We know from Africanus and Eusebius that Manetho did attach a regnal date to this king (variously 20 or 40 years). Meyer's hypothesis is possible, but equally Josephus may have failed to notice the date (in his paraphrase of the end of the narrative, 1.251) and drawn this illegitimate conclusion from his own inattention—or even deliberate suppression of the facts. His Sethos narrative (1.98-101) also concludes without dating, which we can deduce only from his comment in 1.231.

<sup>804</sup> The 518 is the total made up of 393 (1.103), with the addition of the 59 and 66 years of Sethos and Rameses who preceded Amenophis (1.231). For the probable double counting of the 59/60 years in the case of Sethos, see note to "Argos" at 1.103. Manetho certainly did not "forget" the account of the shepherds and their brutal conquest of Egypt: he specifically referred to it in this subsequent narrative (1.237, 240-43, 248). This comment, however, suggests that *Josephus* read this second narrative as a mythological variant on the earlier story, a doublet that repeats the same story under a different guise. This is because for Josephus, following the Bible, there can be only one exodus from Egypt: Manetho's Hyksos-version is tolerable as a version of this true exodus, but this leper-story is an utterly false retelling of the same.

<sup>805</sup> For the variant spellings of this name, cf. 1.88 and 1.94. "Departed" is a euphemism for expulsion (1.94).



*Amenophis’  
desire to see  
the Gods*

[Manetho], there were, after him, 393 years of intervening kings up until the two brothers Sethos and Hermaeos,<sup>806</sup> of whom, he says, Sethos was renamed Aegyptus and Hermaeos, Danaus;<sup>807</sup> Sethos expelled the latter and reigned for 59 years, followed by the elder of his sons, Rampses, for 66 years.<sup>808</sup> **232** Having admitted that our fathers left Egypt so many years before,<sup>809</sup> he then brings in this interpolated king Amenophis,<sup>810</sup> and says that he desired to become an observer of the Gods,<sup>811</sup> like Or, one of his royal predecessors;<sup>812</sup> he reported this desire to his namesake Amenophis, son of Paapios,<sup>813</sup> who was reputed to have a share in the divine nature,

<sup>806</sup> On Josephus’ mysterious calculation of this figure, see note to “Argos” at 1.103.

<sup>807</sup> This reminder of 1.102, otherwise irrelevant to the narrative, suggests the significance for Josephus of translating the Egyptian stories into a narrative that his non-Egyptian audience can recognize. In the earlier version, Hermaeus is called Harmais; but textual variants here make it uncertain what Josephus actually wrote.

<sup>808</sup> Sethos’ expulsion of his brother may be implied in 1.101, 103, but is not actually recounted. These regal dates must be derived from Manetho; see the table, showing minor discrepancies, at 1.97.

<sup>809</sup> On Manetho’s “admitting” a fact, see note to “thrown out” at 1.228. Here again, Josephus leads his readers to consider the earlier exodus the only one relevant to the Judean ancestors; thus, the following story must be fictitious.

<sup>810</sup> See 1.230, with notes; “interpolated” (εμβόλιος) is a rare adjective, found only here in Josephus. From this point to the end of 1.236, Josephus paraphrases Manetho. The compression may well omit or alter many of the details that would make the story more coherent; for Josephus’ response to this part of the story, see 1.254-59. There is reason to suspect that Manetho’s narrative consisted of a combination of two, originally independent, story-lines. One concerned the expulsion/revolt of a polluted segment of the Egyptian population; the other, an invasion of sacriligious foreigners. As we shall see, there are many doublets and awkward seams, which are best explained as Manetho’s rather clumsy stitching of two narrative sequences. But Josephus may also have done his best to exaggerate the inconsistencies he found.

<sup>811</sup> Cf. Josephus in *Ant.* 1.19 on being “an observer” of the *works* of God (cf. Philo, *Mut.* 7, of the divine nature). In the parallel, but later, versions by Chaeremon (1.289) and Lysimachus (1.305-6), the narrative is launched by the anger of the Gods, which justifies the expulsion of the polluted persons. Here the anger of the Gods comes as a response to the king’s action (1.236), not as its cause, while the desire to “observe the Gods” appears arbitrary. It is possible that Josephus’ para-

phrase has omitted something here: perhaps Manetho recounted that the Gods had hidden themselves, out of anger. But it is also possible that Manetho had “rationalized” an earlier, traditional version of the story (preserved by his successors). Since Manetho wants to have the ill-treatment of the polluted people as the cause of the Gods’ anger (and the reason for the invasion of foreigners), he can hardly have the Gods both command the ill-treatment and punish the king for it. Thus the harsh treatment of the polluted Egyptians is attributed to the advice of the seer, in response to an unjustified and purely personal desire of the king. In this version, the king becomes an Egyptian Pentheus, wishing to spy more than he should and ending up (nearly) “fighting against the Gods” (1.246). For the legend that the Gods fled from Typhon and hid themselves in Egypt in animal form (cf. 2.128), see Griffiths 1960b, identifying its roots in a variant of the Horus-Seth myth.

<sup>812</sup> For Or, see 1.96; the different spelling may be a transcriptional error in one place or the other. The king is no doubt named after Horus, but there is no reason to think that Manetho (or Josephus) has confused the king with the God himself (*pace* Reinach 43). Manetho elsewhere (frag. 77 = Plutarch, *Mor.* 354c-d) interprets the name of the Egyptian God “Amoun” as “concealed” or “concealment,” and this may connect to the bowdlerized tale in Herodotus 2.42 that “the Egyptian Heracles” harbored an impertinent desire to see Zeus (=Amoun). Manetho had apparently related more about Oros than 1.96 reveals, but the content and meaning of this “seeing the Gods” motif is now obscure.

<sup>813</sup> This is a historical figure (ca. 1430-1345 BCE), a close adviser to Amenophis III, whose honors steadily grew to the point where he was venerated as a mediator between the Gods and humanity; his inscribed statues and other evidence of his cult (as a healer) in the Ptolemaic era have survived to this day (see Wildung 1977a: 201-302 and 1977b: 83-110). He is known on inscriptions as “Amenhotep, son of Hapu” (see Vandersleyen in Redford 2001: 1.70). Manetho’s story is an amalgam of history and legend, preserved in priestly circles in a tradition constantly reworked.

with regard to his wisdom and knowledge of the future.<sup>814</sup> **233** This namesake, then, told him that he would be able to see the Gods if he cleansed the whole land of lepers and the other polluted people.<sup>815</sup> **234** The king was delighted and gathered from Egypt all the physically disfigured people<sup>816</sup>—there were 80,000 altogether<sup>817</sup>—**235** and threw them into the stone quarries to the east of the Nile,<sup>818</sup> to work there and be isolated from the rest of the Egyptians.<sup>819</sup> There were even, he says, some of the learned priests<sup>820</sup> among them, who were afflicted with leprosy.<sup>821</sup> **236** But this Amenophis, the wise seer, was afraid that the anger of the Gods would come on him and on the king, if they were seen being oppressed,<sup>822</sup> and he added a prediction<sup>823</sup> that some people would ally themselves with the polluted people and

*The treatment  
of the lepers*

<sup>814</sup> The historical Amenhotep was honored for his knowledge of secrets in the writings of the past. The cautious tone of this comment (he “was reputed to have a share in the divine nature”) allows for a gap between the prophet’s advice and the will of the Gods (who become angry when the advice is followed, 1.236). Amenophis here has two roles, as wise adviser to the king and as seer, predicting the future. The second is not relevant here but anticipates 1.236; his double role acts as a thread to stitch the pollution- and the invasion-narratives together.

<sup>815</sup> It is hard to ascertain Manetho’s terminology for these people behind Josephus’ paraphrase. In the following (purported) *citation* from Manetho (1.237-50), there is no mention of leprosy, only of pollution (1.241: οἱ συμμεμιασμένοι [probable text]; 1.248: οἱ μιαιοὶ τῶν Ἀιγυπτίων). This latter term (οἱ μιαιοί) is used by Josephus in his paraphrase at 1.236, 251, 266 and here alongside “lepers”; cf. 1.229, 235 which use “lepers” alone. It is possible that Josephus has added the motif of leprosy to medicalize Manetho’s story, and to create the inconsistency with the legislation of Moses (1.279-85). Alternatively, Manetho may have used the term himself, but only to heighten the emphasis on impurity (e.g., here: “lepers and the *other* polluted people”). A “cleansing” in order to see the Gods suggests that religious defilement is the real issue, and leprosy or skin imperfections had religious connotations in many ancient cultures.

<sup>816</sup> Greek: τοὺς τὰ σώματα λελωβημένους. The same vocabulary is used frequently in Josephus’ comment on this story (1.253, 257, 260, 273; cf. 1.304) and it may be Josephus’ own. The phrase suggests physical disfigurement (being maimed or mutilated), and it is possible that Josephus has thus turned pollution (physical and religious) into physical impairment in order to render the story both incomprehensible (1.256) and impossible (1.278).

<sup>817</sup> The figure is significant for Manetho, in that, when added to that of the invaders (1.243), it nearly matches the king’s army (1.245). Josephus records this otherwise minor detail so he can later parade the incon-

sistency in Chaeremon (1.295).

<sup>818</sup> For other examples of forced labor in quarries (digging stone for the pyramids), cf. Herodotus 2.8, 124-26; Diodorus 1.64.5; cf. Shaw in Redford 2001: 3.99-104. The oppression of the Israelites in Egypt (Exod 1:11-14; Josephus, *Ant.* 2.201-205) might spring to mind for the biblically literate, but Josephus has ruled out any possible accord between this narrative and the biblical account of the exodus.

<sup>819</sup> L’s text (οἱ ἐγκεχωρισμένοι) is variously emended; with most modern editors I follow Holwerda’s suggestion: εἶεν κεχωρισμένοι. The isolation reinforces the pollution motif.

<sup>820</sup> The term ἱερέων is regarded as a gloss by Jacoby and omitted by Münster, but without good cause.

<sup>821</sup> Reading λέπρα συνεσχημένους with Niese minor and Münster; on whether “leprosy” is original to Manetho or introduced by Josephus, see note to “people” at 1.233. This notice prepares the way for the role of Osarsiph (1.238) and other priests (1.241) as leaders of the revolt, all the more shocking since they, as priests, turn against their own religious tradition. On Egyptian priests as “learned” (λόγιος), cf. 1.9, 28; 2.140, and Herodotus 2.3.1 on the Heliopolitans as the most learned (λογιώτατοι) Egyptians (cf. 1.238).

<sup>822</sup> The Greek is very compressed and may be corrupt (so Niese). It seems incongruous that the means chosen to “cleanse the land” (1.233) bring about the anger of the Gods; the notion of “oppression” (cf. the pity mentioned in 1.241) seems suddenly introduced. Josephus’ paraphrase may have obscured the logic here, but it seems likely that Manetho has altered a traditional story in order to join it to an invasion narrative: instead of the Gods’ anger causing the expulsion of the polluted, the expulsion (now oppression) causes their anger, and thus brings down on Egypt the invasion of foreigners who take pity on the oppressed; cf. note to “Gods” at 1.232.

<sup>823</sup> Reading προσθέμενον εἰπεῖν (with L, Niese, Naber, Thackeray, and Münster), though the text may be corrupt and many alternatives have been proposed (cf. Giangrande 1962: 114). The wise royal adviser now

rule Egypt for thirteen years.<sup>824</sup> He did not dare say this to the king in person, but left a document about all this, then killed himself. The king was in despair.<sup>825</sup> 237 Next, to cite verbatim, he writes as follows:<sup>826</sup>

*Grant of Auaris*

When a considerable time had elapsed for those doing hard labor in the quarries,<sup>827</sup> they begged the king that he set apart for them a place for rest and shelter, and he granted them the city of Auaris, by then deserted by the shepherds.<sup>828</sup> This city, according to religious lore, is from the earliest times Typhonian.<sup>829</sup> 238 When they had entered this [city], and having this site [as a base] for revolt,<sup>830</sup> they appointed as their leader one of the Heliopolitan priests

becomes the seer, whose prediction forms the seam between the two narratives (cf. note to “future” at 1.232).

<sup>824</sup> The fear of foreign invasion was a recurrent motif in Egyptian history and folklore, stretching back at least as far as the Hyksos-legends and made vivid in Manetho’s day by the allegedly cruel conduct of the Persians and the recent arrival of Alexander the Great; see note to “Gods” at 2.129. Several motifs in this narrative recall the events of Nectanebo’s unsuccessful stand against Artaxerxes III (Ochus) in 343 BCE (see at 1.245); so this 13-year conquest may reflect the final stage of Persian rule from Artaxerxes’ invasion to the conquest of Egypt by Alexander (332-331 BCE). For the notion of a destined period, cf. Herodotus 2.137-39. The motif of troublesome subjects making an alliance with Egypt’s enemies is echoed in Exod 1:10.

<sup>825</sup> The narrative drama, focused on guilt and personal emotions, creates a “romance” from a traditional Egyptian motif whereby prophecies are written and rediscovered in later eras. On the “apocalyptic” tradition in Egyptian culture, see Griffiths 1983. One of our fullest examples, the *Oracle of the Potter* (see Koenen 1968; 1974), mentions the death of a prophet in the reign of king Amenophis. Here the suicide underlines the personal responsibility of the seer for the king’s treatment of the polluted Egyptians; Josephus uses the epithet “wise” (at the start of this section) with irony; cf. 1.256.

<sup>826</sup> Josephus’ promise to cite κατὰ λέξιν (cf. 1.74, also using λέξις) sets this passage (1.237-50) apart from the preceding paraphrase. When he has finished, he confesses he has omitted much else “for the sake of brevity” (1.251). This extra material could have followed this citation, but it might also be supplementary detail omitted from the citation itself. There are reasons to suspect that Josephus has compressed his source at points (e.g., 1.243-47), so the “citation” may be more paraphrastic than Josephus admits.

<sup>827</sup> The verb, ταλαιπωρέω (“doing hard labor”) evokes pity (cf. the descriptions of their condition as “oppressed” and “humiliated” in 1.236, 241).

<sup>828</sup> There are many peculiarities here: what right have they to beg this of the king? Does the shift in lo-

cation mean they cease to work in the quarries? Why would the king grant them this request? If out of guilt or fear, why did he wait so long? The narrative seems artificially manipulated in order to associate the polluted people with the portentous city of Auaris and thus link this story to that of the shepherd-invaders. The city was strongly (indeed, doubly) associated with the shepherds in Manetho’s Hyksos narrative (1.78, 86), and the presence of the polluted in this city creates a reason for them to invite the shepherds to return (1.242).

<sup>829</sup> This is an important notice which reveals a crucial dimension to this narrative. The echo of 1.78 (both passages use the term θεολογία, translated “religious lore”) strongly suggests that the negative, Typhonian, connotations of the place were suppressed by Josephus in the Hyksos narrative, but can be revealed here, since he treats the former as truthfully recounting Israelite history and the latter as complete fiction. “Typhon” is the Greek name for the Egyptian deity Seth. Whatever his origins (as the God of borderlands, desert places, and foreign nations), by Manetho’s day Seth had long become known as the feared and hated God of chaos and turmoil. The mythological struggle between Horus and Seth has very deep roots (see Griffiths 1960a), and by the Ptolemaic period a set of associations between Seth/Typhon and redness, the desert, chaos, impiety, and the ass had become fixed in Egyptian lore (see Te Velde 1977). Manetho elsewhere associates Typhon with obstruction, violent opposition, and the slaughter of the sacred animals under conditions of drought or disease (*apud* Plutarch, *Mor.* 371b-c, 376b-c, 380c-d); by the time of Plutarch he had become the epitome of evil, violence, and confusion. His association with foreigners (Te Velde 1977: 109-51) made it easy to identify foreign invaders who destroyed Egyptian temples and rites as Typhonian/Sethian forces ranged against all the central values of Egyptian culture. On Auaris as a border city associated with Seth, see note to “Auaris” at 1.78. For the Typhonian echoes throughout our narrative see van Henten and Abusch 1996 and van Henten 1993.

<sup>830</sup> As the Hyksos’ fortified base, and the site of their last stand (1.78, 96), Auaris seems destined to be

called<sup>831</sup> Osarsephos<sup>832</sup> and took an oath that they would be obedient to him in everything.<sup>833</sup> **239** He first laid down for them a law that they should neither worship the Gods<sup>834</sup> nor abstain from any of those animals that are particularly designated by sacred decree in Egypt as holy, but should kill and consume them all;<sup>835</sup> and that they should attach themselves to no one other than their fellow conspirators.<sup>836</sup> **240** Having laid down such laws and very many others that were completely contrary to Egyptian customs, he directed them to repair the walls of the city, with a large body of workers, and to prepare themselves for war against Amenophis the king.<sup>837</sup> **241** He himself, with the assistance of other priests and the fellow-polluted,<sup>838</sup> sent ambassadors to the shepherds who had been driven out by Tethmosis to the city called Hierosolyma;<sup>839</sup> he told them of the conditions in which he and others were together being

*Osarsiph and his constitution*

*Embassy to the shepherds*

the site of a revolt; with its Typhonian associations, it is the perfect locale for the struggle between the king (identified with Horus) and his Sethian opponents. Although the narrative may be determined by these mythical components, it is still not clear why the polluted people should rise in revolt, especially after their request has been granted (see 1.267). If there are echoes here of the reforms of Akhenaten, which dramatically challenged the religious traditions of Egypt (so Meyer 1931: II.1.420-26), they are very remote.

<sup>831</sup> In the Greek sentence λεγόμενον (“called”) is separated rather far from the name. Niese moves it, Reinach omits it, and Münster, following Halbertsma, emends it to λόγιον (“a learned man,” cf. 1.235). The emendation appears to me unnecessary.

<sup>832</sup> The Latin might preserve a more original spelling, Osarsiphos (see 1.250), but either would represent the Greek form of a proper Egyptian name, combining the names of the Gods Osiris and Sepa (a centipede God, worshipped at Heliopolis); see Ranke 1935: 85, n.3; van Henten 1993: 279, n.27. There is no reason to find remote echoes of the name of Joseph (*pace* Reinach 45; Thackeray 261; Troiani 1975: 113-18). For the subsequent identification of this person as Moses, see at 1.250.

<sup>833</sup> The oath seems to match the oath of loyalty to an Egyptian king, suggesting complete contrariety to the Egyptian state. Osarsephos accordingly proceeds to lay down an alternative constitution, utterly opposed to Egyptian tradition.

<sup>834</sup> Neglect of the Gods is the grossest expression of irreligion imaginable, and was ascribed in Egyptian tradition to particularly execrable kings such as Suphis (Manetho, frag. 14), the Hyksos (1.76), and Akhenaten. There is no need to find here an echo of the first commandment (*pace* Reinach 45), though when the story was associated with Moses it is easy to see how this motif could chime with the perceived religious intolerance of Judeans.

<sup>835</sup> This hostility to *all* the animal cults mirrors the depiction of the Hyksos as committed to wiping out the Egyptian nation (1.81). As a central and highly distinc-

tive feature of Egyptian religion, the animal cults represent the heart of Egyptian culture. The barbarity of the Persians was measured by their violent treatment of these cults (see note to “Gods” at 2.129), and one of the most shocking expressions of inter-communal violence within Egypt was the slaughter and consumption of one another’s sacred animals (Diodorus 1.90.2; Plutarch, *Mor.*380a-c with Griffiths 1970: 548-49). Later complaints of the Judeans’ disrespect for Egyptian animal cults (Apion in 2.137-38; cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.2) display the continuation into the Roman era of Egyptian sensitivity on this score.

<sup>836</sup> Social exclusivity matches radical religious difference. As applied to a renegade element in the Egyptian population, the motif suggests no more than political hostility. When used to characterize a nation (the Judeans; see 1.309), it can be linked to ethnic stereotypes of anti-social or misanthropic behavior.

<sup>837</sup> Political revolt is the concomitant of the social and cultural revolution just described, though none of these traits are satisfactorily explained. Manetho’s description of Osarsephos’ constitution amounts to the total discrediting of the king’s foes, akin to political propaganda (see Lloyd 1982 on examples in the Ptolemaic era). The rebuilding of the walls of Avaris (a triplet in Manetho; cf. 1.78, 87) represents hostile intent.

<sup>838</sup> The text is slightly suspect, and the original may have indicated that some of the priests/polluted assistants were sent as ambassadors. It is possible that Josephus has mangled his source somewhat in omitting names. The reference to pollution (Greek: συμμεμισμένων or συμμεμισμένων) suggests that this is the essential characteristic of the quarry-people for Manetho (cf. 1.248); see note to “people” at 1.233.

<sup>839</sup> *Pace* Josephus’ claim in 1.230, Manetho had not forgotten the earlier story, but explicitly builds upon it. As in 1.90, 94, Jerusalem is named in citations from Manetho. If these are not alterations by a later editor (so Jacoby *FGH* 609 ad loc.), they indicate that Manetho connected the Hyksos with Judeans to some degree; see note to “Solyma” at 1.248, Appendix 1, and Appendix 3.



*Invasion of Egypt**Amenophis' reaction*

humiliated, and asked them to unite in a joint expedition against Egypt.<sup>840</sup> **242** He promised to bring them first to Auaris, their ancestral homeland,<sup>841</sup> to provide generously for the needs of their whole company, to fight for them when required, and to bring the country under their control with ease.<sup>842</sup> **243** They were delighted and all eagerly set off together—about 200,000 men—, arriving in Auaris not much later.<sup>843</sup>

Amenophis, the king of the Egyptians, when he heard the news of their arrival, was more than a little troubled, as he remembered the prediction made by Amenophis son of Paapios.<sup>844</sup> **244** Once he had assembled a large crowd of Egyptians and consulted with their leaders,<sup>845</sup> he sent for the sacred animals that were accorded the highest honor in the temples<sup>846</sup> and instructed the priests in each district to hide the images of the Gods in the safest possible way.<sup>847</sup> **245** He sent abroad to his friend<sup>848</sup> his five-year-old son Sethos,<sup>849</sup> also named Ra-

<sup>840</sup> Several features here suggest a seam between the pollution- and the invasion-narratives. There was no previous connection between the two groups (and the ban on alliances in 1.239 would not encourage a new one), and it is not clear how the polluted people, now in Avaris, were still being “humiliated.” The shepherds are thus drawn back to Egypt either by pity for these alien polluted people or by an invitation to reoccupy their previous homeland. Neither seems a strong ground for initiating a war on Egypt; they are narrative devices to tie the two stories together.

<sup>841</sup> See 1.78 and 1.86 (a doublet). Perhaps both the Hyksos and the pollution narratives were associated with this Typhonian city, and Manetho used this common feature to link them. No explanation is given for the shepherds' desire to return to their homeland or to conquer Egypt, or for the connection between these two goals.

<sup>842</sup> Troiani 129 suggests a parallel with Gen 42:2, but there is no hint here that the shepherds suffered famine or had any need to enter Egypt again; Josephus would certainly resist any notion that Egypt was a more attractive land (1.224, 273).

<sup>843</sup> This second invasion of the shepherds constitutes a doublet of the first (the Hyksos). Josephus likes to retain the numbers in his sources, so he can make fun of their discrepancies (1.288-303).

<sup>844</sup> Once again the king's emotions are to the fore (cf. 1.236).

<sup>845</sup> The consultation seems to be a council of war, though the following precautions suggest a real fear of invasion. Either the king is in two minds, whether to fight or flee, or he prepares to fight while fearing the worst. As Braun has argued (1938: 19-25; followed by Eddy 1961: 286-89), several features of the following story about Amenophis seem to reflect the stand of Nectanebo II, the last Pharaoh of Egypt, when facing the invasion of Artaxerxes III in 343 BCE. Two versions

of these events survive, in Diodorus 16.46-51 and in Ps.-Callisthenes' *Alexander Romance* 1.1-3. Though the story is cast in rather different terms (the preparations are military in one, and magical in the other), both recall how the king was initially confident of victory, but lost (see note to “Gods” at 1.246).

<sup>846</sup> L may be slightly corrupt in two places here, but the sense is recoverable. Gathering the sacred animals to himself (both for their safe keeping and for his support) suggests the importance of these animals as symbols of religious and national power. The Sethian opponents can be guaranteed to focus their hostility precisely here (1.239).

<sup>847</sup> The images are also powerful as channels of divine power, and thus vulnerable to enemy attack (1.249). Manetho does all he can to portray this war in religious terms, as foreign invasions of Egypt were traditionally understood.

<sup>848</sup> It seems odd that this friend and his location are unnamed, as if Josephus here abbreviates a larger story; similarly he does not specify where the king crossed the river and prepared to fight the enemy. In his later précis of Manetho, he refers to the son of Amenophis (there called Ramesses) marching to Pelusium with an army of 300,000 (1.274, 300; see notes at loc.). As a further complication, the son is here called Sethos (see next note on the spelling), but is then equated with Ramesses—and is hereafter known only by this latter name (1.251, 300). A near-identical phenomenon is found with a similar pair of names in 1.98 (Sethos, also called Ramesses), also concerning the offspring of a king Amenophis, though there the son is known thereafter as Sethos (1.101, 102, 231). We should probably conclude (with Meyer 1904: 91-93; Helck 1956: 42) that Manetho, or his source, was combining and conflating multiple stories.

<sup>849</sup> L has “Setho,” but most editors prefer “Sethos,” following the Latin (*Sethonem*); cf. the variant versions

messes,<sup>850</sup> after Amenophis' father Rapses.<sup>851</sup> He himself crossed [the river]<sup>852</sup> with the rest of the Egyptians, about 300,000 of the best fighting men,<sup>853</sup> and when he met the enemy, he did not engage them **246** but, thinking that he was about to<sup>854</sup> fight against the Gods,<sup>855</sup> retreated and came to Memphis, and taking Apis and the other sacred animals which he had summoned there,<sup>856</sup> he immediately went up country to Ethiopia with his whole army and a host of Egyptians; for the king of the Ethiopians was under obligation to him out of gratitude.<sup>857</sup> **247** Having welcomed him and supported his whole company with whatever the land offered by way of provisions for human consumption, he also provided cities and villages sufficient for the destined thirteen years of banishment from his kingdom,<sup>858</sup> and he went so far as to deploy an Ethiopian army on the borders with Egypt to guard king Amenophis' people.<sup>859</sup>

*Retreat to  
Ethiopia*

of "Sethos" and "Sethosis" in 1.98.

<sup>850</sup> The reading preferred by most editors, as in 1.98; but cf. the alternative spelling in 1.251.

<sup>851</sup> He is called "Rapses" in 1.231 (see the table of kings at 1.97). There is endless scope for the corruption of Egyptian names in scribal transmission.

<sup>852</sup> The Nile is understood, but one would expect some specification of which branch of the Nile, and where this crossing took place (cf. Pelusium in 1.274); either something has fallen out of the text (which is also missing the preposition σύν), or Josephus is giving us a shortened version, not the full text.

<sup>853</sup> The figure is greater than the combined forces of the enemy (80,000 plus 200,000; 1.234, 243); this and the description of the troops indicate that the resulting withdrawal from battle was caused by factors other than military inferiority. In what follows, Egyptian honor is salvaged by the fact that the troops were never defeated in battle, only withdrawn on the decision of the king.

<sup>854</sup> Greek: μέλλειν, as read by L, followed by Niese and Thackeray. Herwerden (followed by several other modern editors, including Münster) suggests emending to μή δεῖν ("he should not"), as in Josephus' paraphrase (1.263). But in the context sketched below (next note) the Greek as it stands makes good sense.

<sup>855</sup> Greek: θεομαχεῖν (in Josephus only here and at 1.263), a verb particularly prominent in Euripides' *Bacchae*, where it characterizes Pentheus' sin in resisting Dionysus (*Bacch.* 45, 325, etc.); cf. Stern 1.86. In this literary context, the notion may be explained by the king's awareness of his predetermined fate (1.236), but then it is hard to see why he would first offer battle before changing his mind. However, as Braun observed (1938: 19-22) the whole passage makes better sense if it represents a version of the story of Nectanebo II in 343 BCE. According to Diodorus 16.46-51, Nectanebo first offered resistance to the invading Persians at Pelusium, then withdrew to Memphis; after the fall of Pelusium, deserted by both Egyptian and Greek troops, he gathered all his possessions and fled to Ethiopia. In another version of this set of events (Ps.-Callisthenes,

*Alexander Romance* 1.1-3), the king was in the habit of warding off his enemies by use of sympathetic magic (making wax images of his opponents and sinking them in a bowl); but on this occasion, in the course of the magic rites, he saw the Gods of Egypt steering the ships and commanding the armies of his enemies (1.3). The king thus fled (to Pella), but a prophecy predicted that he would return, not as an old man but as a youth, to overcome Egypt's enemies. Manetho's story looks like a combination of these two stories (in both military and religious dimensions) transferred to the life of Amenophis. In this form, it is not well explained how the king was about to fight against the Gods, but it is characteristic of Manetho's narratives to weave together myth and history in such forms, with sometimes puzzling results (cf. 1.81-82).

<sup>856</sup> Memphis, as the religious centre of Egypt, is a fitting location for the gathering of the theriomorphic symbols of her power (cf. 1.244). The most potent symbol was the Apis bull; see Herodotus 3.27-29 on the outrageous disrespect shown by the Persian Cambyses, who even killed the bull.

<sup>857</sup> On the motif of flight to Ethiopia, see Diodorus 16.51. The full-scale military accompaniment anticipates the subsequent re-invasion of Egypt (1.251). The sentence illustrates perfectly the power-relations of favor and gratitude at a political level: being "under obligation" (Greek: ὑποχρεῖται) is sufficient explanation for the lavish welcome which follows. Oddly, again, Manetho omits names and other details of this obligation—unless that represents Josephus' abbreviation of his source.

<sup>858</sup> The main verb is absent from the Greek but is supplied by all editors in one form or another (here, with Reinach and Münster, I read πάρεσχε); the text may be corrupt, or Josephus' abbreviation particularly clumsy. The detail is necessary, perhaps, to explain how the army could be intact for the subsequent return (1.251), which is predicted by the reminder that the exile is limited to 13 years.

*Solymites’  
treatment of  
Egypt*

248 Such [were] the affairs in Ethiopia. But the Solymites,<sup>860</sup> having descended, together with the polluted Egyptians treated the population in such a sacrilegious and [cruel] fashion<sup>861</sup> that the rule of [the shepherds]<sup>862</sup> mentioned above seemed golden<sup>863</sup> to those who now watched the impious behavior of these people.<sup>864</sup> 249 For they not only burned cities and villages, nor were content with pillaging temples and mutilating images of the Gods,<sup>865</sup> but also continually used the sanctuaries<sup>866</sup> as kitchens for the revered sacred animals;<sup>867</sup> they forced the priests and prophets to sacrifice and slaughter these, and threw them out naked.<sup>868</sup> 250 It is said that the one who<sup>869</sup> laid down their constitution and laws, a priest and Heliopolitan by descent called Osarsiph (from Osiris, the God in Heliopolis), when he transferred to this people,<sup>870</sup> changed his name and was called Moyses.<sup>871</sup>

*Osarsiph  
becomes  
“Moses”*

<sup>859</sup> The detail explains why the shepherd-invaders could not pursue Amenophis but left him preparing to fight another day.

<sup>860</sup> This intriguing title might indicate *either* that Manetho regularly used “Solyma” as the name of the shepherds’ city, and that Josephus (or an intermediary source) has altered this in 1.90, 94, 241 to “Hierosolyma”; *or* that Manetho used “Hierosolyma” as the name of the city, but removed the prefix (“Hieros,” understood as “sacred”) when referring to its inhabitants. Either option is plausible. On “Solyma” as a name for Jerusalem (in both Josephus and pagan sources) see note to “them” at 1.174.

<sup>861</sup> The Greek (containing an additional καί) makes many editors suspect a lacuna, with another adverb (ὠμῶς, “cruelly”?) missing (so Niese minor, Waddell, Reinach, and Münster); others suggest the removal of the καί.

<sup>862</sup> “Shepherds” is certainly understood in the context; Reinach, followed by Münster, added ποιμένων to the text.

<sup>863</sup> Literally: “gold” (for parallels see Stern 1.86; Labow 2005: 266, n.79). “Those mentioned above” are the shepherds; far from forgetting the earlier account (1.230; cf. 1.241), Manetho explicitly refers to the Hyksos and alludes to their extreme cruelty, depicted in 1.75-76.

<sup>864</sup> Once again, religion is the touchstone of others’ stance towards Egypt. The combination of foreigners and polluted Egyptians, both domiciled in Typhonian Avaris, spells disaster for Egypt’s religious structures.

<sup>865</sup> Beginning with phrases parallel to 1.76, the list of outrages builds in a crescendo of impiety that will climax with the slaughter of the animals (cf. 1.239). The pillaging of temples (Greek: ἱεροσυλέω) is a motif shared with Lysimachus, but transferred by him to a different context (1.311). On the images of the Gods as requiring protection, see 1.244.

<sup>866</sup> Reading ἁδύτοις (“sanctuaries”), with all modern editors, in place of L’s αὐτοῖς.

<sup>867</sup> I.e., as places to roast them. For similar accusa-

tions against Artaxerxes III (Ochus), see note to “Gods” at 2.129.

<sup>868</sup> Stripping the priests of their sacred robes is the final indignity after the humiliation of destroying their own most sacred symbols; the highest officials in Egyptian culture are forced to perform the sacrilege planned by the polluted (1.239).

<sup>869</sup> Cobet and Niese conjectured the inclusion of ὁ at this point (followed tentatively by many editors, including Münster), which allows the above translation. This eases, but does not resolve, the unacknowledged overlap with 1.238, and remains conjectural; Niese himself did not follow it in his *editio minor*. Without this supplement, the sentence would read: “It is said that a priest and Heliopolitan by descent called Osarsiph ... , having laid down their constitution and laws, when he transferred to this people, changed his name ...”

<sup>870</sup> Greek: γένος, meaning “descent-group” or “people” (see note to “people” at 1.1); above Osarsiph is described as Heliopolitan “by descent” (τὸ γένος; for the expression, cf. 1.73, 129, 179, etc.).

<sup>871</sup> “It is said” (λέγεται) introduces this additional remark, but it is uncertain who is responsible for adding it: Manetho? An editor of Manetho? Or Josephus himself? The last option is unlikely. Although he does use this phrase when reporting additional comments (1.165), he has characterized the whole passage as based on “legend” (1.229), and one might thus expect “it is also said,” or “others say” (cf. 1.251). One would also expect some cross-reference back to Manetho’s reported statement in 1.238. Since Meyer (1904: 76-77), most interpreters have attributed this comment to an editor of Manetho, or an interpolator, who was eager to make an explicit connection between this story and the Judeans. This is usually understood as a sign of incipient hostility to Judeans, transforming Manetho’s text into an anti-Judean saga (see, e.g., Laqueur 1928: 1071-72; Weill 1918: 101; Gager 1972: 117; Labow 2005: 266-67, n.83); Gruen’s striking suggestion, that it might have been Judeans themselves who effected this identification (1998: 63-65), could only apply to a

(1.27) 251 These are the tales that the Egyptians tell about the Judeans,<sup>872</sup> and many others, which I omit for the sake of brevity.<sup>873</sup> Manetho goes on to say that Amenophis later advanced from Ethiopia with a large army, as also his son Rampses, who had an army of his own.<sup>874</sup> Together the two attacked the shepherds and the polluted people, defeated them, and after slaughtering many, pursued the rest as far as the borders of Syria.<sup>875</sup> 252 These, and others like them, are the things Manetho

*The rest of the story*

layer of editing beneath the present one, where the invaders' behavior is explicitly condemned as "impious" (1.248). The strongest reason to suspect a supplementary layer of editing here is the repetition of details from 1.238 (priest, Heliopolis, near-identical name), without back reference; as Gruen remarks, the comment seems "mere repetition, unnecessary, and out of place" (1998: 59). The fact that the name is spelled differently (Osarsephos, 1.238; Osarsiph here) may add to the suspicion of another hand at work, though textual corruption in one or other place is also possible (cf. 1.265, 286). Finally, some would point to the final clause of 1.82 as a parallel example of an additional remark ("some say") added to Manetho's text. On the development of theories on this line, see further Appendix 1.

A case might still be made for the thesis that Manetho himself added this remark. Since he is citing various legends (1.229), he could well add another version himself, as he probably did in 1.82 (see note to "Arabs" ad loc.) and apparently also in fragment 15 (Waddell 1940). As his predecessor Hecataeus shows, some versions of this story made reference to Moses (*apud* Diodorus 40.3), and it would be typical of Manetho to attempt to connect parallel versions of a story, attributed to differently named individuals, by suggesting that the two names referred to the same person (cf. 1.98, 245 and especially 1.102, in a concluding comment parallel to ours). Still, the failure to refer to the earlier version in 1.238 is striking. But we have found evidence elsewhere for a strange inability by Manetho to edit his various narratives into a smooth or consistent whole (e.g., on Avaris, 1.78, 86).

Thus, while the detection of an editorial hand may well be correct, it is not absolutely certain, and the implications remain unclear. If the original Manetho associated the Hyksos with Jerusalem (see on 1.90, 94, 241, 248), what is said now bears more explicit but not substantially more hostile implications for Judeans. As Hecataeus shows, there is early evidence for the association of Moses with the expulsion of a plagued population from Egypt, and the processes by which the various stories were conflated and expanded (before Manetho, by Manetho, and after him) are a matter of speculative reconstruction. There is certainly insufficient evidence to trace an evolution in anti-Judean sen-

timent, as has been the trend in scholarship.

<sup>872</sup> This sentence might lead one to expect that Josephus has finished using Manetho, but in fact he has further material to paraphrase (1.251) and another conclusion (1.252). The present statement thus provides a transition from (purported) citation (1.237-50) to paraphrase (1.251), while emphasizing the legendary character of Manetho's sources (see note to "rumors" at 1.229); cf. the immediately preceding "it is said" (1.250). Identifying the "Egyptian" origin of the tale has especial relevance to the claim about Moses (cf. 1.279), but also evokes the dismissive tone of 1.223-26, while the present tense leads Josephus' readers to attribute what echoes of this story they presently hear (see Reading Options, above) to the continuing malice of Egypt. As in 1.229 (see note at "Judeans"), it is Josephus, not Manetho, who explicitly associates this story with "Judeans." Josephus will insist that if anyone in this story is Judean it is the shepherd people, and *not* the Egyptian lepers (1.252-53).

<sup>873</sup> Cf. the parallel statement ("these and others like them") in 1.252. We can only guess what Josephus has omitted: certainly material from the highly abbreviated conclusion (1.251) and the earlier paraphrase (1.232-36), but perhaps also from the spaces between the citation and the paraphrases, and even within the citation-passage (1.237-50). At least some of the obscurities and inconsistencies in Manetho's tale may be due to Josephus' own selection and abbreviation.

<sup>874</sup> This final episode, the recapture of Egypt by its rightful king, interests Josephus much less, though it provided a fitting climax to Manetho's nationalist saga. In Chaeremon's version (1.292), the main protagonist is Ramesses, and here it is notable that both father and son have an army of their own. This again suggests that Manetho is stitching two versions of the story together, one with Amenophis, the other with Ramesses as hero of this hour (cf. 1.245 and the two versions of the son's name). The different spellings of the son's name (Ramesses in 1.245; Rampses here) may be a further sign of source-diversity; but Josephus' inconsistency or transcriptional error are also possible causes.

<sup>875</sup> The rout is reminiscent of the expulsion of 1.89, though more violent; Josephus will later insist, for his own purposes, that the lepers would not have survived



Josephus' reaction

wrote up.<sup>876</sup> I shall demonstrate that he is quite clearly<sup>877</sup> talking nonsense<sup>878</sup> and telling lies,<sup>879</sup> after I first establish this point, for the sake of my responses to others later on:<sup>880</sup> this man grants us, and admits,<sup>881</sup> that [we] were not in origin Egyptians by descent,<sup>882</sup> but, having invaded from outside, ruled Egypt and again departed from it.<sup>883</sup> **253** That the physically disfigured<sup>884</sup> among the Egyptians were not subsequently mixed up with us,<sup>885</sup> and that Moses, who led the people, was not one of

this debacle (1.278). It is possible that, like his predecessor Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3), Manetho went on to attribute aspects of the Judean way of life to elements in this saga and the mingling of the shepherds with the polluted Egyptians (cf. Lysimachus in 1.311 and Apion in 2.20-27). But etiology is not characteristic of the Egyptian logic that governs Manetho's tale (see Appendix 3).

<sup>876</sup> For Josephus' advantage in his ability to select, see notes to the previous section. He now focuses on Manetho as author, so the following charges can be pointedly *ad hominem*.

<sup>877</sup> Greek: περιφανῶς; the adjective is used in 2.12. From the outset, Josephus' critical stance is confident; he will use δῆλον ("clearly") on many occasions in his response (1.268, 277, 281, 287).

<sup>878</sup> Greek: ληρέω, used only here in Josephus; cf. the noun at *War* 3.405. Josephus' special delight in the response to follow (1.254-87) is to pour scorn on Manetho's "stupidity" (1.254, 259, 260, 267, 271, with a range of vocabulary), placing his readers with himself in a position of intellectual superiority.

<sup>879</sup> A common term in this treatise (ψεύδομαι), whose root is deployed against Manetho often (cf. 1.105, 230, 267, 293); cf. πλάσμα ("fiction") in 1.254, and the concurrence of both roots in 1.293. In his critique of Manetho's story, Josephus uses three main types of charge: i) that it is inconsistent with the "truth" (usually drawn from some external standard of reality); ii) that it portrays something simply impossible; and iii) that it is inherently implausible, either a) because the human motivation is incomprehensible, or b) because any reasonable person in that role would have done otherwise. The majority of Josephus' criticisms lie within this third category, as Josephus exploits the brevity of his story (truncated in part by himself!) and the gap between his readers' logic and the cultural logic of this Egyptian tale. Josephus has no independent knowledge of Egyptian history with which to critique this story. Rather than simply contrast it with the biblical account of the exodus (which would clash with the Hyksos narrative he has endorsed), Josephus subtly inserts select elements of the biblical material (esp. in 1.280-86) into an internal critique of Manetho's tale. His arguments display some skill in the art of *refutatio*, but there is no need to attribute this to the plagia-

rization of a previous Hellenist critique of Manetho (despite the exclamation in 1.255), *pace* Laqueur 1928: 1072-73; Momigliano 1975b: 777-78. Josephus shows similar rhetorical skills elsewhere, on a smaller scale (e.g., 2.20-27, 125-34); he has had nearly 30 years in Rome to learn law-court technique.

<sup>880</sup> Chaeremon, Lysimachus, and Apion all identify the "polluted" Egyptians with the origin of the Judean people. From Josephus' perspective, the one great virtue of Manetho's version is that it draws a distinction between outsiders (shepherds) and insiders (polluted Egyptians). Josephus insists on this point when he first introduces this tale (1.228-29), now in beginning his critique (1.252-53), and towards his conclusion (1.278). That shows its significance for him, and partially explains why he is content to devote so much space to this single story from Manetho.

<sup>881</sup> The use of two verbs drives home the point; cf. "admits" in 1.105, 228, 232. Josephus takes as a concession what he can use for his side of the argument.

<sup>882</sup> "We" is not in the Greek, but is needed for the sense; the Latin adds "our forefathers" at the end of the sentence, whose Greek original may have dropped out in transmission. For the phrase τὸ γένος Αἰγύπτιοι ("Egyptian by descent" or "Egyptian by ancestry," cf. 1.73, 225, 298, 317; 2.28; for other expressions of descent-group, cf. 1.129, 164, 179). The pristine Judean character of his people was signalled as a matter of concern for Josephus from 1.1.

<sup>883</sup> Cf. 1.228, also building on the narrative of 1.75-90 concerning the Hyksos. The pattern of external origin, conquest, and subsequent departure fits both the original Hyksos invasion and this second narrative in Manetho. The homology prompts Josephus to suggest that Manetho is recounting the same story twice (1.230), or at least supports his broader concern to distinguish the origins of his people from the land of Egypt.

<sup>884</sup> For the phrase and its use by Josephus, see note to "people" at 1.234.

<sup>885</sup> On the theme of "mixing" (ἀναμίγνυμι), see note to "us" at 1.229; its repetition here and at 1.278 shows the significance for Josephus of Judean ethnic integrity. The "subsequently" might mean after the Hyksos story, or after this second tale (cf. 1.278).

these, but lived many generations earlier<sup>886</sup>—these facts I shall try to prove by means of his own statements.<sup>887</sup>

**(1.28) 254** In the first place, the initial cause on which he constructs the fable is ridiculous:<sup>888</sup> the king Amenophis, he says, desired to see the Gods.<sup>889</sup> Which Gods?<sup>890</sup> If he means the Gods that are established by their laws—the bull, the goat, crocodiles, and dog-faced creatures—he saw them regularly.<sup>891</sup> **255** As for the heavenly ones, how could he see them?<sup>892</sup> And why did he have this desire? Because, by Zeus,<sup>893</sup> another king, a predecessor, had seen them!<sup>894</sup> Thus he had learned from him what they were like and how he had seen them—so he did not need a new method.<sup>895</sup> **256** At least the seer was wise, with whose aid the king thought that this

*Criticism of  
Manetho's  
story*

<sup>886</sup> Setting out his agenda, Josephus anticipates the argument of 1.279-86.

<sup>887</sup> On Josephus' favorite technique—displaying his authors' inconsistencies—see 1.219, 226. (The “his own” here presumably refers to Manetho, not Moses; but the phrase will be echoed, in relation to Moses, in 1.281.) If the first point, regarding non-mixing, relates to this second tale, it will be established only by speculative inference in 1.278. The second, on the identity and date of Moses, actually requires *external* testimony to prove its falsehood—biblical evidence about Moses' laws on leprosy (1.281-85) and the biblical association of Moses with the exodus from Egypt (1.280). It is Josephus who reads Moses back into the Hyksos story, 518 years before this second episode (1.280), so the “problem” in Manetho's tale is present only from a Judean perspective.

<sup>888</sup> Josephus will work his way through the whole story, or such of it as he has related, from start to finish, commenting on almost every detail. If the motif which puts the narrative in motion (its initial αἰτία) is suspect, the rest falls with it. Josephus already labels the story a “fable” (πλάσμα, cf. 1.304; 2.122, and the cognate verb in 1.293, 298), and invites his audience to laugh at its naïvety.

<sup>889</sup> Cf. 1.232, with notes. Josephus exploits here an obscurity in Manetho's narrative, caused either by Manetho or by Josephus' own abbreviation of his tale.

<sup>890</sup> The first of 11 rhetorical questions in this opening critique (1.254-59), inviting both analysis and laughter. The two options which Josephus will allow to be considered—animal or heavenly—would hardly be distinguished by a native Egyptian.

<sup>891</sup> The rhetoric is finely measured: in the list of animals, the terms are of increasing length in Greek (τὸν βόυν καὶ τράγον καὶ κροκοδείλους καὶ κυνοκεφάλους), and the sentence finishes with a devastating riposte, a single word (ἑώρα) whose imperfect tense indicates repeated action. Josephus thus takes another opportunity to ridicule Egyptian theriomorphic religion (cf. 1.224-25), the list beginning with the famous Apis bull (cf. 1.246; Herodotus 2.38-41). The goat is at least recognizable to

Greeks as an equivalent to Pan; cf. Herodotus 2.46, associating the sacred goat with the district of Mendes, to which indeed this veneration may have been confined. Egyptian veneration (or hatred) of crocodiles (associated especially with Suchos/Sebek) was famous, inviting extended comment by Herodotus (2.68-70; cf. 2.90; Diodorus 1.35.6) and general scorn (cf. Josephus at 2.139; see note to “care” at 2.66). The last item in the list (κυνοκέφαλοι) represents not “dog-faced baboons” (*pace* Thackeray et al.), but the dog-faced deity, Anubis (cf. the use of the adjective in Lucian, *Tox.* 28; *Jupp. trag.* 42).

<sup>892</sup> For the sake of the argument, Josephus adopts a Greek polytheist perspective, and speaks here of the Olympian Gods (cf. 2.240-41; not the “heavenly bodies,” which were often considered divine, but were visible). But he combines this with a Platonist and/or Judean conviction that a true deity must be immaterial and invisible (cf. 2.190-91), against the popular conception that the Gods might well make themselves visible in dreams or visions (Lane Fox 1986: 102-67). By his rhetorical question Josephus presumes his audience will share his philosophical conviction on this point.

<sup>893</sup> The Greek phrase—ὣν Δία—is probably not repeated in 2.263 (*pace* Niese's reconstruction of the text; see note to “say” ad loc.); it has caused surprise to commentators, some of whom find here evidence for use of a pagan source (see note to “lies” at 1.254). But, though Josephus does not use the expression elsewhere, it is easy to imagine him doing so here in sarcasm or irony, especially after referring to the “heavenly Gods” and while adopting the style and stance of a literary critic.

<sup>894</sup> See 1.232, referring to Or.

<sup>895</sup> Josephus either does not know or does not wish his audience to imagine a more plausible scenario whereby national safety might be threatened by a disappearance of the Gods (though this is hinted at in 1.233, 256). Amenophis' motivation is reduced to personal curiosity, and the effort to render the Gods again visible becomes a matter of mere technique.

would succeed.<sup>896</sup> So, how was it that he did not foresee the impossibility of his [the king's] desire? For it was not fulfilled.<sup>897</sup> And what sense did it make that the Gods should be invisible because of mutilated or leprous people?<sup>898</sup> They get angry at impieties, not at physical defects.<sup>899</sup> **257** And for 80,000 lepers and invalids how was it possible to be gathered together in practically a single day?<sup>900</sup> And how was it that the king paid no heed to the seer? For the seer ordered him to banish the disfigured people from Egypt, but the king threw them into the stone-quarries, as if he was in need of workers rather than intending to cleanse the land.<sup>901</sup> **258** He says that the seer killed himself as he foresaw the anger of the Gods and what would happen to Egypt, leaving his prediction in writing for the king.<sup>902</sup> Then how did the seer not know in advance, from the outset, about his own death?<sup>903</sup> **259** Why did he not immediately oppose the king in his wish to see the Gods?<sup>904</sup> How was it reasonable

<sup>896</sup> Josephus exploits the description of the seer (1.232, 236) to indulge in sarcasm; having rubbished the narrative portrayal of the king, he moves on to the next character in the story.

<sup>897</sup> At least not in the version of the story Josephus relates, and this was perhaps a lacuna in Manetho as well. On the oddities in Manetho's narrative logic, see note to "Gods" at 1.232.

<sup>898</sup> Although the story was clearly about the removal of pollution (see 1.233, echoed in 1.257, 260), Josephus again avoids describing the victims in these terms, for rhetorical purposes. Alongside the term "lepers," he now uses "mutilated" (ἡκρωτηριασμένοι), and refers to physical "defects" (ἐλαττώματα). On the absence of "sense" (λόγος), cf. 1.259 (πῶς εὐλογος) and 1.271 (ἄλογος).

<sup>899</sup> In Manetho (as paraphrased by Josephus), the anger of the Gods occurs after this point (1.236) and is not the cause of the expulsion, as it is in Chaeremon and Lysimachus (1.289, 306). Manetho may have suppressed the notion of the Gods' anger at pollution (cf. note to "Gods" at 1.232); if so, Josephus misrepresents him here, in order to ridicule. Continuing his pose as an intellectual polytheist, Josephus insists that the Gods are concerned with morality, not physical defect; from a more radical philosophical stance others might deny that the Gods get angry at all (a passion unworthy of the divine). It is ironic that, for a different part of his argument, Josephus will shortly draw on the very same ideology he here disdains: in 1.281-84 he will describe the Mosaic laws concerning "leprosy" and the physical integrity of the high priest, whose logic depends on the exclusion from the holy (city or altar) of what is less than physically perfect. Thus, in the Judean tradition, also, religion is not just about the moral or "spiritual" condition of the worshipper, though it could be interpreted in this rarified sense (e.g., Philo, *Spec.* 1.80-81).

<sup>900</sup> The précis at 1.234 contained this number, but not this indication of speed. It appears that Josephus

has inserted the notice "in practically a single day" to aid his argument. Once again, his rhetoric works partly through distortion of his sources. To describe the people gathered as "invalids" (κακῶς διακειμένοι; lit.: "those in a wretched condition") helps his case, as it suggests severe limits to their mobility.

<sup>901</sup> Again Josephus misconstrues Manetho, in order to render his narrative senseless. Even from Josephus' paraphrase (1.233-35) we can see that the "purging" of the land is about removal from normal society, while the stone-quarries are explicitly described as "east of the Nile" (thus outside sacred territory), their location ensuring "isolation" (1.235). Whether this deportation constitutes "banishment" is beside the point, as the seer never demanded precisely this.

<sup>902</sup> Josephus provides a further condensation of the précis in 1.236. Perhaps the length of the citation from Manetho (1.237-50) requires him to remind readers of the earlier contents, while the repetition enables him to highlight those elements that he wishes to attack. He here omits the reason for the Gods' anger and the contents of the prediction of woe.

<sup>903</sup> The first of four rhetorical questions relating to the passage just condensed, the first three of which begin with πῶς ("how?"). The questions are left unanswered, to give the impression that their logic is self-evident and Manetho's story clearly absurd. They are not all of equal strength. The first requires the twin assumptions that the seer would have known *all* aspects of the future, and that, if he had known about his death, he would have acted otherwise. Neither assumption is secure, and the argument only scratches the surface of the narrative. Cf. the critique of the supposedly pre-scient bird in 1.204.

<sup>904</sup> The question at least touches the central problem in Manetho's tale—that the solution to the invisibility of the Gods becomes itself the cause of the Gods' anger (see note to "oppressed" at 1.236). Even so, Josephus does not address this as clearly or as fully as

to fear disasters that would not happen in his lifetime?<sup>905</sup> What worse fate could he have undergone than what he hastened to do to himself?<sup>906</sup>

**260** But let us examine the most stupid feature of them all.<sup>907</sup> Although he had been informed about these matters and was afraid of the future, even then he did not expel from the country those disfigured people, of whom he had been warned that he should purge Egypt.<sup>908</sup> Rather, he gave them a city, at their request—as he [Manetho] says, the one called Auaris, which had once been inhabited by the shepherds.<sup>909</sup> **261** When they had assembled there he says they chose a leader from among the former priests of Heliopolis, and this man instructed them neither to worship the Gods nor to abstain from the animals that receive worship in Egypt, but to sacrifice and eat them all, and not to ally themselves with anyone other than their fellow conspirators.<sup>910</sup> He also bound the whole company with oaths that they would remain utterly faithful to these laws, and, when he had fortified Auaris, he went to war with the king.<sup>911</sup> **262** He [Manetho] adds that he sent to Hiersolyma, inviting the people there to form an alliance and promising to give them Auaris (for this was

*Summary of  
story*

he might: the question is not so much why the seer did not oppose the king's wish as why he did not suggest a less hazardous means of fulfilment.

<sup>905</sup> Another poor question, which operates on a very limited sense of what constitutes “reasonable” behavior. The seer could certainly fear national disasters bigger than, and subsequent to, his own life; and the disasters took place after his lifetime only because he took his own life prematurely.

<sup>906</sup> The text of the sentence is corrupt. Niese suggests something is missing, but offers no supplement. I follow here the emendation of Herwerden (οὐ δρᾶν in place of L's οὐδ' ἄν), also adopted by Thackeray, Münster, and all modern editors. Is suicide the worst imaginable fate? The Egyptian seer might reckon national disasters of greater importance. For Josephus' contradictory statements on the morality and meaning of suicide see *War* 3.361-82 and *War* 7.320-88.

<sup>907</sup> For the theme of stupidity (here εὐηθέστατον, cf. 1.303), see note to “nonsense” at 1.252. The singular suggests Josephus will identify one climactic example (perhaps the turn in the narrative recounted in 1.260), but in fact he proceeds to recapitulate the whole of the rest of Manetho's narrative (1.237-51) in 1.260-66. We have already seen him do this with an element of the story in 1.258, and the same reasons noted there might apply: i) he wishes to remind his readers of the contents of the story, now somewhat distant; and ii) he can select from the long quotation the points he wants to isolate for his attack. To this we might add iii) that the restatement of the narrative provides an interlude between two passages of rhetorical assault (1.254-59, 266-77). Even so, it seems a lot of space to devote to the rehearsal of a story only quite recently told; but it appears that once he had started an element of the rehearsal (1.260), Josephus decided to cover all the rest

in one unit, rather than dart back and forth between recapitulation and response. There is certainly no need to follow Waddell's suggestion (1940: 135, n.1) that Josephus is here drawing from another source, or Reinach's tentative proposal that Josephus first wrote this résumé (1.260-66), then decided to give the full quotation (1.235-50), then inadvertently left both in his text (Reinach 50, n.1).

<sup>908</sup> Reading καθαρίσαι (Cobet's emendation, followed by Münster; cf. Latin *purgare*); L has καθαρεῦσαι (“that Egypt should be clean”; followed by Niese and Thackeray). The difference is small.

<sup>909</sup> In abbreviating 1.237, Josephus omits the reference to hard labor, which justified the request for a place of rest (though cf. 1.278), together with the notice about the city being Typhonian. Josephus may not have understood what the latter meant; if he did understand it, he certainly did not like it. The king's action here is, indeed, a huge anomaly in Manetho's narrative. Having just remarked that this is “the most stupid feature” (1.259), Josephus makes no more of it: when he returns to this point in the narrative at 1.267 he focuses on the reaction of the shepherds, not on this illogical concession by the king. He thus passes up one of his strongest opportunities for attack.

<sup>910</sup> A précis of 1.238-39, using much of the same vocabulary, in the same sequence. By omitting the name of the priest, Josephus cuts out the duplication between 1.238 and 1.250 (see 1.265 below). It is important for Josephus to emphasize that this priest urges these Egyptians to turn against their own culture (cf. 1.269-70).

<sup>911</sup> A version of 1.238 and 1.240, modifying the original notice of a personal oath of allegiance, and placing emphasis on the Egyptians' initiative in starting the revolt, even before the arrival of the shepherds.



ancestral property for those who would come from Hiersolyma), from where they would launch an attack and gain possession of all Egypt.<sup>912</sup> **263** Then, he says, they advanced with an army of 200,000, and Amenophis, king of the Egyptians, thinking he should not fight against the Gods, fled at once to Ethiopia, having entrusted Apis and some of the other sacred animals to the priests, ordering them to guard them well.<sup>913</sup> **264** Then, when the Hierosolymites invaded, they depopulated the cities, burned down the temples and slit the throats of the priests<sup>914</sup>—in short, they did not hold back from any form of criminality or cruelty.<sup>915</sup> **265** The priest who laid down their constitution and laws, he says, was a Heliopolitan by descent called Osarseph (from Osiris, the God in Heliopolis), but he changed and called himself Moyses.<sup>916</sup> **266** He says that Amenophis in the thirteenth year—for that was the period destined for his banishment—advanced from Ethiopia with a large army, attacked the shepherds and the defiled people, defeated them in a battle, and slaughtered many of them after pursuing them up to the borders of Syria.<sup>917</sup>

*Implausible  
features of the  
story*

**(1.29) 267** Here again, he does not comprehend how implausibly he tells lies.<sup>918</sup> For the lepers and the whole company with them, if they had earlier been angry with the king and with those who had treated them like this in accordance with the seer's prophecy, still when they left the stone-quarries and were granted by him a city and

<sup>912</sup> Summarizing 1.241-42, though mostly in different words. The role of other priests is omitted (but cf. 1.270), together with the reference to Tethmosis. More significantly, the humiliation of the quarry-workers is passed over, and their promise that the "Solymitae" would overrun Egypt *easily*. Together with the prospect of a return to their homeland, Avaris, these other motifs provided some motivation for the shepherds' invasion in Manetho's tale. By omitting them, Josephus makes his ridicule easier in 1.271-73.

<sup>913</sup> This constitutes a drastic shortening of the whole of 1.243-47, omitting the king's consultations and vacillations, the dispatch of his son, and the circumstances of his Ethiopian sojourn. On "fighting against the Gods" (θεομαχέω), see note to "Gods" at 1.246. Josephus is much less interested than Manetho in the fortunes of the king, though he missed here a golden opportunity to question the logic and consistency of Manetho's tale (see notes at 1.245). 1.246 suggested that Apis and the sacred animals were taken to Ethiopia for sake keeping (what fun Josephus might have made of that!). For reasons that are not entirely clear (except perhaps carelessness), Josephus has the king here hand the sacred animals to the priests (cf. 1.244 on the *images* of the Gods).

<sup>914</sup> Niese, following L and Latin, reads ἵππέας (horsemen), but, with most other editors, I follow Bekker's emendation to ἱερέας (priests). This does not entirely match 1.249 (where the priests are thrown out naked); either Josephus' paraphrasing is clumsy, or the text is more seriously corrupt.

<sup>915</sup> A very brief summary of 1.248-49, taking the focus away from specifically religious crimes to general

criminality (παράνομία = breaking the law). The "cruelty" here is reminiscent of that of the Hyksos (1.76), but such faults will be attributed explicitly to the Egyptians in 1.270.

<sup>916</sup> This is nearly a verbatim repetition of 1.250; Josephus' paraphrases vary greatly in their closeness to the original text. On the spelling of Osarseph, see note to "Moses" at 1.250. A slight but perhaps significant alteration takes place at the end of this section. 1.250 reads: ὡς μετέβη εἰς τοῦτο τὸ γένος, μετετέθη τὸ ὄνομα καὶ προσηγορεύθη Μωυσῆς ("when he transferred to this people, he changed his name and was called Moyses"), but the event is now described as "having changed (μεταθέμενος) he called himself Moyses". Josephus may have wanted to omit any suggestion of a change of ethnicity (transferral to a different γένος), in order to keep the two figures, Osarseph and Moses, distinct in identity; cf. his horror at "mixing" in 1.228-29, 252-53, 278.

<sup>917</sup> The paraphrase draws from 1.247 and 1.251 (the latter already a paraphrase) and will be important for the claims of 1.277-78. The major omission here is the role of the son (cf. 1.251), who is entirely absent here, as in 1.277, but appears in a different role in 1.274. See note to "own" at 1.251 and to "300,000" at 1.274.

<sup>918</sup> This judgment appears to cover all of 1.260-66, and picks up the twin charges of 1.252. On implausibility (here ἀπιθανῶς), see note to "stories" at 1.229; on lying, see note to "lies" at 1.252. Josephus changes the style of rhetorical attack: instead of rhetorical questions (1.254-59, 271-74), he proceeds in 1.270-74 by a series of hypotheses to test the logic in Manetho's narrative.

a territory,<sup>919</sup> would in any case<sup>920</sup> have softened in their attitude towards him.<sup>921</sup> **268** And even if they really did continue to hate him, they would have plotted against him personally and not waged war against everyone, for it is obvious that they would have had very many relatives, being such a large company.<sup>922</sup> **269** Nevertheless, having decided to make war on fellow humans, they would not have dared to make war on their Gods, nor would they have laid down laws utterly contrary to the ancestral customs in which they were reared.<sup>923</sup> **270** But we should be grateful to Manetho since he says that the originators of this criminal behavior were not those who came from Hiersolyma but those who were themselves Egyptians,<sup>924</sup> and of these it was especially the priests who both planned these things and swore in the whole company.<sup>925</sup>

**271** However, is this not senseless, that none of their own people or friends would join them in the revolt or share in the dangers of war, but that the defiled people sent to Hierosolyma and effected an alliance with them?<sup>926</sup> **272** What kind of friendship or what relationship previously existed between them? On the contrary, these people were hostile and differed hugely in their customs.<sup>927</sup> But, he says, they im-

*Further  
implausible  
features*

<sup>919</sup> Manetho in 1.237-38 had not said explicitly that they had *left* the quarries, only that they had acquired a place for “rest and shelter”; their continued work might be implied. Josephus draws more from the story than is justified, and adds a reference to “territory” to make their condition even more satisfactory.

<sup>920</sup> Reading πάντως (instead of L’s πάντες) with ed. pr. and all subsequent editors.

<sup>921</sup> Josephus has moved on now from the motivation of the king (1.260) to that of the lepers and company: why should they stage a revolt (1.238)? The question picks at the seam where Manetho joined an expulsion to an invasion story (cf. note to “shepherds” at 1.237 and note to “revolt” at 1.238).

<sup>922</sup> The question seems rather lame, given that a revolt against a king constitutes a war against the nation he represents; and if they had been in the quarries for “a considerable time” (1.237), their social contacts with other Egyptians would have weakened. But Manetho’s story (as reported by Josephus) never did explain the causes of this political (and cultural) revolution, which seems to be a literary device to get the shepherds back on the scene.

<sup>923</sup> Cf. 1.239-40, 261. The religious and cultural revolt was perhaps poorly explained by Manetho, but Josephus has ignored, or failed to understand, the one clue that Manetho dropped: that the city, Avaris, was “Typhonian” (1.237). Even if Manetho had not spelled out the significance of this notice, it placed the story in a framework of mythological conflict, which made perfect sense in Egypt (see note to “Typhonian” at 1.237).

<sup>924</sup> As in 1.252, Josephus pauses to give somewhat ironic praise to Manetho; again this is related to the fact that Manetho’s story preserves a clear distinction between native Egyptians and outsiders from Jerusalem.

Here, the fact that the anti-Egyptian behavior was initiated internally deflects any moral blame which might otherwise attach to Jerusalem (cf. 1.275). The Hyksos could not have been cleared in this way (1.75-76), but in their case Josephus had simply refrained from comment.

<sup>925</sup> The role of the priests in 1.235 and 1.241 is un-specific, and not attached to the oaths of 1.238. Generalizing from the one priest, Osarseph, Josephus heightens the sense that Egypt turned against herself. The priests have previously been hailed as the guardians of Egyptian culture (1.28), but here lead a religious apostasy.

<sup>926</sup> Josephus reverts to rhetorical questions and, as in 1.257-59, leads this one with another πῶς. As in the opening statements of paragraphs at 1.254, 260, 267, this question sets the tone for the whole following passage (1.271-77). For “senseless” (ἄλογος), see note to “nonsense” at 1.252. The absence of support from Egypt is hardly surprising, given the stated hostility to Egyptian customs, but Josephus again rightly pursues the question of the connection to Jerusalem, which Manetho had left insufficiently explained.

<sup>927</sup> Again Josephus underlines the distinction between Jerusalemites and Egyptians. His claims concerning hostility and cultural difference are not here supported, but presumably depend on the depiction of the Hyksos (1.76-90) and the summary statements in 1.224-25. However, the Egyptians who invite Jerusalem to invade are themselves renegades, and share with Jerusalem a common hostility to Egyptian religion (1.239-40), so the cultural difference in this case is greatly reduced. If Josephus has other differences of custom in mind, he does not spell them out, and he may be depending on a Roman perception that the Judeans

mediately paid heed to those who promised that they would occupy Egypt, as if they were not extremely well acquainted with the land from which they had been expelled by force.<sup>928</sup> **273** Now if they had been in dire straits or poor conditions, they might perhaps have exposed themselves to such danger, but since they inhabited a prosperous city and enjoyed the fruits of an extensive territory that was better than Egypt,<sup>929</sup> why on earth would they have run the risk of going to the aid of people who were their former enemies and physically disfigured, and whom none even of their own people could endure?<sup>930</sup> For they certainly did not know in advance that the king would flee.<sup>931</sup> **274** On the contrary, he himself said that the son of Amenophis went out to meet them, heading for Pelusium with an army of 300,000.<sup>932</sup> Those who were there certainly knew about that; how could they possibly have guessed that he would change his mind and take flight?<sup>933</sup> **275** Then he says that the invad-

and Egyptians were divided by mutual antagonism at the level of religious customs (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.1; 5.5.4); cf. 1.224-25.

<sup>928</sup> Cf. 1.86-89, though the departure there was under pact, not force. The logic appears to be that the shepherds would be disinclined, even fearful, to return after their previous experience; but that might also be taken to motivate revenge. The implausibility in motivation is increased by adding to Manetho's account that their reaction to the invitation took place "immediately," and by omitting the promise that they would reconquer Egypt "easily" (1.242, also omitted in 1.262).

<sup>929</sup> Josephus entertains a possible motivation only to dismiss it. No mention could be made here of the famine which induced Jacob's sons to visit and settle in Egypt (Genesis 42-49; *Ant.* 2.95). The argument for implausibility is advanced by introducing a "fact" external to the story—though in this case a highly dubious one. Josephus had mentioned earlier both the size of Jerusalem (1.90, 196-97; but not exactly its prosperity) and the quality of the land (1.60, 195—see note there to "says"). But the claim that it surpassed Egypt, even if vague, was surely surprising to all but Josephus' most sympathetic readers: Egypt was famed for its fertility (Diodorus 1.36.1-6; cf. 1.69.6, "the most prosperous land in the world") and appreciated in Rome as a major source of grain. A critic might well retort with a comment like that of Celsus, on the poor value of Judean land (Origen, *Cels.* 5.41).

<sup>930</sup> On the motif of hostility, and its inappropriateness in this context, see note in previous section on "customs." By turning Manetho's motif of religious "pollution" into physical disfigurement (Josephus again uses τὰ σώματα λελωβημένοι, see note to "people" at 1.234), Josephus can turn a repulsiveness that made good sense on Egyptian terms into a general repulsiveness, which reduces the plausibility of outside assistance. Josephus' argument *a minori* would not work on Manetho's understanding of their condition.

<sup>931</sup> But in 1.242 they were promised a pushover; Josephus has conveniently forgotten the adverb "easily" (cf. 1.262).

<sup>932</sup> Pelusium, on the eastern edge of the Delta, was the gateway to Egypt for any army approaching from the direction of Syria. In 1.245 Josephus reported Manetho as saying that the king was in command of the 300,000 troops at this point, as his son, only 5 years old, was dispatched abroad; the son has a role only after the 13-year exile in Ethiopia (1.251). But he reiterates this pre-exilic military role for Ramesses in 1.300, in order to show up a contradiction with Chaeremon (cf. 1.292). (This present notice is also the only place where Pelusium is named as the site of the impending battle; though Chaeremon's story might imply the same [1.291].) How are we to explain this discrepancy in Josephus' report on Manetho? There are (at least) four options: i) This may be a simple slip by Josephus, transferring the role of the son from a post-exilic to a pre-exilic moment; ii) Josephus may have deliberately altered Manetho's story in order to create a discrepancy with Chaeremon—though that would make more sense in 1.300 than here; iii) Manetho himself may have recounted variant versions of this story (cf. 1.252), in which the son appears in different roles; this might even be related to the two versions of the son's name in 1.245; knowing both, Josephus chooses one in one place, the other elsewhere, for rhetorical reasons; iv) Josephus may be drawing here and in 1.300 on a different version of the tale, other than what he learned from Manetho. It is hard to choose among these options, though the last is perhaps the least likely. In any case, there is some clumsiness on Josephus' part in contradicting the version of the tale he has cited from Manetho while simultaneously trying to refute it.

<sup>933</sup> Josephus exploits the tale of the contradictory actions of the king (1.245), though he had glossed over this in 1.263. The question has already been answered at the end of the previous section.

ing army from Hiersolyma, when they had conquered Egypt, did many terrible things, and he reproaches them for this as if he had not brought them into the story as enemies,<sup>934</sup> or as if one ought to put the blame on people who had been invited in from abroad, when Egyptians by descent, before their arrival, had been practicing these things and had sworn an oath to continue doing so.<sup>935</sup> **276** However, at a later point in time Amenophis advanced and won a battle, and slaughtering his enemies drove them as far as Syria.<sup>936</sup> So perfectly easy a prey is Egypt to invaders from any direction whatever!<sup>937</sup> **277** Yet<sup>938</sup> those who at that time conquered it in war, although they knew that Amenophis was alive, did not fortify the passes from Ethiopia (though they had considerable resources for such a task), nor did they put the rest of their army on alert.<sup>939</sup> Amenophis, he says, massacred them even as far as Syria while he pursued them across the waterless desert—which obviously it is not easy for an army to cross, even without fighting.<sup>940</sup>

**(1.30) 278** So, according to Manetho, our people is not from Egypt, nor were any of the people from there mixed up with us:<sup>941</sup> for it is likely that many of the lepers and the sick<sup>942</sup> died in the stone-quarries, since they were there a long time and were

*Conclusion:  
Judeans not  
mixed with  
Egyptians*

<sup>934</sup> Following Reinach, Schreckenberg (1977: 162-63) emends αὐτοῖς (“to them”) to αὐτούς (“them”); he also suggests emending ἐπαγαγών to εἰσαγαγών, rendering the sense “brought into the story” (not brought into Egypt). I adopt here these minor alterations. To add variety, Josephus ceases rhetorical questions and challenges the moral judgment implied in Manetho’s narrative (e.g., “impious” in 1.248).

<sup>935</sup> Again, Josephus insists on a clear demarcation between native Egyptians and “outsiders” (οἱ ἕξωθεν); in this, and in clarifying the burden of blame, he reinforces the point already made in 1.270. In the story, although the Jerusalemites and Egyptians shared a common disregard for Egyptian religion, especially animal cults, the level of damage and violence wreaked by the invaders in 1.248-49 goes further than anything practiced or promised by the Egyptian renegades. Josephus’ point can only stand because it is expressed in such general terms.

<sup>936</sup> The pursuit and slaughter is now recounted for the third time (cf. 1.251, 266); it will prove important for the point made in 1.278. The part played by the king’s son (1.251) is omitted, as it has been transferred earlier (1.274).

<sup>937</sup> This could be either sarcasm (Egypt is surely not that easy to invade—the story is again implausible) or *Schadenfreude* (what a vulnerable nation Egypt has proved to be; cf. 2.128, 133). The former may be more likely in this rhetorical context.

<sup>938</sup> L (adopted by Münster) reads just καί, but perhaps with this concessive sense; Thackeray (followed by Waddell) emended to καίτοι.

<sup>939</sup> Josephus had given a highly abbreviated account of the end of Manetho’s story (1.251), but the reference to the defenses on the Ethiopian side (1.247)

perhaps made him ask what defenses were in place in Egypt. He takes the silence in Manetho (at least as he reports him) as evidence of non-occurrence, and then interprets this to be so stupid as to be implausible. It is standard rhetorical practice to exploit the gaps in one’s opponent’s narrative in this way. In fact, there is no logical reason why Amenophis could not have overwhelmed fully guarded passes; cf. the Ethiopian invasion recorded by Josephus in *Ant.* 2.239-40.

<sup>940</sup> The fighting and pursuit have been told and retold in 1.251, 266 and 276, with slight variations on the relationship between the two elements. To make the scenario less plausible, Josephus adds reference to the terrain as desert, reinforces its inhospitality by the adjective “waterless” (cf. 2.23, 157), and thus suggests that this is a difficult environment in which to travel, let alone fight. It seems slightly lame to finish with a claim no stronger than that this would not be “easy”; but he can hardly assert that this scenario is impossible, since the biblical exodus involved crossing and fighting in the very same desert.

<sup>941</sup> As elsewhere (cf. 1.228-29), Josephus takes Manetho’s invaders from Jerusalem to be Judeans; on “our people” and its integrity cf. 1.1, 104. This summary statement matches the introduction to Josephus’ response at 1.252-53, with the same anxiety about “mixing” (see note to “us” at 1.229). We have seen him stress that the two parties in the story are wholly distinct, and even incompatible (1.270, 272-73, 275). For this preliminary conclusion, rather than dismiss the whole narrative as complete fiction, he gives it enough credence to argue that, on its own terms, the two groups could not have merged even at its denouement.

<sup>942</sup> This is the first time Josephus has applied this word (νοσοῦντες) to the Egyptian renegades, a general



badly treated,<sup>943</sup> while many others died in the subsequent battles, and the majority in the final [battle] and the rout.<sup>944</sup>

*False  
representation  
of Moses*

(1.31) 279 It remains for me to reply to him regarding Moyses.<sup>945</sup> Although the Egyptians consider this man marvellous and divine,<sup>946</sup> they want to make him one of their own with an implausible slander,<sup>947</sup> asserting that he was a Heliopolitan, one of the priests from there driven out with the others on account of leprosy.<sup>948</sup> 280 But it is shown in the records that he lived 518 years earlier<sup>949</sup> and led our forefathers

term for physical sickness; cf. “invalids” (κακῶς διακειμένοι) in 1.257. In both places, the vocabulary serves a rhetorical purpose, here to suggest that those so physically weak would hardly survive hard labor in the quarries.

<sup>943</sup> The “considerable time” (χρόνος ἰκανός) of 1.237 has become here a “long time” (πολὺς χρόνος), while the references to oppression and hard labor (1.236, 237, cf. 1.241) are translated as being “badly treated” (or “suffering,” κακοπαθοῦντες). This aspect had been left out of the précis in 1.260-66 (so there was less reason for the shepherds to come to their aid), but it now serves an important purpose in suggesting a diminution of numbers. According to Manetho, however, there were still quite enough to rebuild Avaris (1.240, “with a large body of workers”), and to stage a revolt.

<sup>944</sup> Josephus is clearly anxious to have as many as possible of the leper people die before they reach Syria so that little or no racial mixing can take place in the aftermath of this story. Manetho had had the polluted pursued as far as Syria (1.251), but he presumably took them to survive the ordeal and to influence the future of the Jerusalemite nation. Josephus’ repeated references to the final battles and flight (see note to “fighting” at 1.277) now make sense: he wants to increase the likelihood that most of the “sick” perished. Manetho had specified, it seems, only one battle, in which “many” died (πολλοί, 1.251), but not, as here, “the majority” (πλείστοι).

<sup>945</sup> Josephus picks up the second topic announced in 1.253. The fact that he devotes a whole paragraph to this (1.279-86) is a measure of his concern for the reputation of Moses (cf. 2.145, 290), and of his confidence in his ability to disprove Manetho’s tale.

<sup>946</sup> Cf. Josephus’ claim on Moses’ international reputation in *Ant.* 2.216. Josephus correctly recognizes Moses’ ambivalent reputation in Egypt, where his name was both honored and denigrated. The same duality is present in the biblical story, where he is both the Egyptian prince and the dishonored exile. Egyptian admiration may be evidenced in aspects of Apion’s version of the exodus (see at 2.10-11) and in the Egyptian legends that apparently lie behind the tales recounted by Artapanus and Josephus (*Ant.* 2.238-53). The presence

of Moses’ name in Egyptian magical formulae (see Gager 1972) is witness to popular awe. The admiration for Moses in the narratives of Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3) and Strabo (*Geogr.* 16.2.35-36) may also have Egyptian, as well as Greek, roots. On his characterization as “divine” (θεῖος), cf. the Egyptian attribution to Moses of “honor equal to a God” (ἰσοθέου τιμῆς) in Artapanus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.27.6) and Philo’s suggestion that they wondered whether his mind was human or divine (*Mos.* 1.27). The Exodus narrative has Moses “as a god to Pharaoh” (Exod 4:16; 7:1), a description which may lie behind Josephus’ depiction of Moses as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ (*Ant.* 3.180; see Feldman 2000 ad loc.; Du Toit 1999).

<sup>947</sup> The claim that Moses was Egyptian would arise naturally from the Egyptian origin of his name (see at 1.286); the legend in Exodus 2 about his discovery in a basket seems an elaborate attempt to prove that this Egyptian prince was really, in origin, an Israelite. It is not clear whether Josephus regards it as slanderous that Moses be considered an Egyptian at all (cf. 2.31), or only that these particular tales be told about him. “Slander” (βλασφημία) is used here for the first time since 1.223, and is attributed not to Manetho personally but to his Egyptian sources (cf. the same deflection of blame in 1.251, 287).

<sup>948</sup> On Moses as Heliopolitan priest, see also Apion in 2.10-11. On his leprosy, cf. Lysimachus in 1.305-11 and the strange tradition that associates Moses with the letter Alpha and ἀλφός (leprosy) in Nicharchus, Ptolemy Chennus, and Helladius (*Stern nos.* 248, 331, 472). Josephus emphasizes here the aspect of leprosy (rather than general sickness or disfigurement) as he has evidence against this allegation specifically in Moses’ leprosy laws (1.281-83).

<sup>949</sup> Josephus claims to start with a fact drawn from the records. He uses this term (ἀναγραφαί) elsewhere for Egyptian records (1.8-9, 228, 287), and the echo here of the 518-year interval in 1.230 (see note to “earlier” ad loc.) indicates that Josephus thinks he can catch Manetho in a glaring self-contradiction (cf. the tactic announced in 1.253). But in the Egyptian Hyksos story to which Josephus refers, there is no mention of a “Moses,” or any obviously equivalent figure; it is only from the *biblical* account that Josephus can assert

out of Egypt into the land that is now inhabited by us.<sup>950</sup> **281** And it is clear from his own statements that he did not suffer any physical misfortune of this sort,<sup>951</sup> for he prohibited lepers from staying in a city or living in a village,<sup>952</sup> requiring that they travel about alone,<sup>953</sup> with their clothes torn;<sup>954</sup> and he regards as unclean anyone who touches them or lives under the same roof.<sup>955</sup> **282** Moreover, even if the disease is cured and the leper regains his proper condition, he [Moyses] has prescribed certain rites and purifications by washing in spring water and the shaving off of all hair<sup>956</sup>—and gives instructions that it is only after offering many different kinds of sacrifice that he may enter the holy city.<sup>957</sup> **283** Yet, on the contrary, it is likely that someone who had had this affliction would have shown some consideration and benevolence to those whose misfortune was like his own.<sup>958</sup> **284** And it was not only in relation to lepers that he laid down such laws: he did not allow those whose bodies were mutilated even to the slightest degree to serve as priests,<sup>959</sup> but, even if

*Moses on  
leprosy*

*Moses on  
priests'  
perfection*

Moses' activity in that earlier account of the exodus. Josephus' argument is thus disingenuous, and it is possible that "the records" are left deliberately unspecified to allow this merging of Egyptian and Judean tradition.

<sup>950</sup> As in his comment on the Hyksos story (e.g., 1.91), Josephus takes the "shepherds" to be Judeans, "our forefathers." The renewed emphasis on Judea as "the land now inhabited by us" is striking, given Josephus' Diaspora location; see note to "possess" at 1.1.

<sup>951</sup> The reference to "his own statements" echoes 1.253, though the "he" Josephus now exploits is not Manetho, but Moses. Josephus now reuses, though without acknowledgement, an argument he had deployed in *Ant.* 3.265-68, where he had digressed from his summary of the leprosy laws to refute the legend of Moses as a leper. In this shorter version, as in the earlier one, the logic depends on accepting Moses' authorship of these laws, and leaving out of account the possibility that Moses might have recovered and later legislated against his former condition (cf. *Exod* 4:6-7; *Num* 12:9-15).

<sup>952</sup> Following the LXX, Josephus takes the laws against minor skin diseases in Leviticus 13-14 as referring to "leprosy"; on the range of meaning of this term, see Feldman 2000: 309, n.788; Labow 2005: 255, n.28. The instruction to banish the polluted person from the camp or the tabernacle (*Lev* 13:46; 15:31; *Num* 5:2) is taken in *Ant.* 13.261, 264 to refer to "the city" (= Jerusalem; cf. *Apion* 1.282; *War* 5.227). Josephus here widens the application to any city or village to stress the rigor of the exclusion order.

<sup>953</sup> See *Lev* 13:45-46 with the instruction that they "dwell alone outside the camp"; *Ant.* 3.264 speaks of them "associating with no-one."

<sup>954</sup> See *Lev* 13:45.

<sup>955</sup> The laws about touch in fact appear only in the parallel purity rules concerning bodily emissions from male or female (*Lev* 15:1-15, 19-24). The ban against

living under the same roof is a development well beyond the biblical laws, though the notion of the infection of a house is present in *Lev* 14:33-53. On the infection of clothes, see *m. Neg.* 11; of houses and those who enter them, *m. Neg.* 12-13. Josephus has an interest in stressing the social isolation required by the laws, to underline the mismatch with Manetho's story.

<sup>956</sup> See *Lev* 14:8-9, where the washing of clothes and body in water is specified, but not that this be in spring (=fresh) water (see *m. Neg.* 14.1); the shaving of hair in the biblical law includes beard and eyebrows.

<sup>957</sup> The holy city is clearly Jerusalem, but, like Deuteronomy, Josephus may be reluctant to name it, for fear of appearing anachronistic. Leviticus 14 specifies bird-sacrifices (14:4-7), and options for wealthier and poorer Israelites in offering further sacrifices (14:10-32). Where Josephus had alluded to these in *Ant.* 3.264, he had promised further discussion of these matters, but neither this passage nor the general reference to purity rites in 2.198 fulfils that promise (see Introduction, § 2). The clash here with the more "philosophical" tone adopted in 1.256 is striking (see note there to "defects").

<sup>958</sup> The argument from likelihood (εἰκός; also used in 1.278, 285) has been the main rhetorical tactic since 1.252, and the line of reasoning similar to, though less explicit than that of *Ant.* 3.266-67. The stress here on the harshness of these laws is rhetorically necessary in this context, but later Josephus will insist that the "benevolence" (φιλανθρωπία) he here denies to the leprosy law is one of the chief characteristics of the law as a whole (2.146, 213).

<sup>959</sup> The argument is dependent on Josephus' earlier alteration of Manetho's pollution-language to terms denoting either leprosy or physical disfigurement. Here Josephus picks up the term "mutilated" (ἡκρωτηριασμένοι) which he had used in 1.256, to fit his present point. As far as we can see from the relevant places in Josephus' paraphrase (1.235) and quotation (1.241),

## Conclusions

someone suffered a misfortune of this sort while in the course of his priestly service, he deprived him of his office.<sup>960</sup> **285** How then is it likely that he would lay down such rules,<sup>961</sup> or that those who had been brought together by such misfortunes would accept<sup>962</sup> laws composed against themselves, bringing them disgrace and harm?<sup>963</sup> **286** Moreover, he changed his name in an extremely implausible fashion.<sup>964</sup> He says he used to be called Osarseph. This does not match up with the change,<sup>965</sup> as his real name means “saved out of the water”; for the Egyptians call water “*mōy*.”<sup>966</sup> **287** Thus I think it has become sufficiently obvious<sup>967</sup> that, as long as Manetho followed the ancient records, he did not deviate much from the truth,<sup>968</sup> but when he resorted to anonymous myths<sup>969</sup> he either stitched them together implausibly<sup>970</sup> or gave credence to some of those who have spoken with hostile intent.<sup>971</sup>

Manetho had not spoken of the priests in the narrative being mutilated. Josephus is drawing on Lev 21:16-23, which lists physical blemishes that debar priests from approaching the veil and the altar; cf. *Ant.* 3.278; *War* 5.228; Philo, *Decal.* 71; *Spec.* 1.80 and *m. Zebah.* 12.1.

<sup>960</sup> He has in mind the famous case of Hyrcanus (*War* 1.270; *Ant.* 14.366-67), whose ears were lacerated specifically to debar him from the high-priesthood. For Roman taboos concerning the physical perfection of priests, see Plutarch *Mor.* 281c.

<sup>961</sup> The summary statement covers all of 1.281-84. L reads ἀνοήτως (“foolishly,” supported by the Latin); Niese suggests either adding ἢ τοὺς to aid the syntax of the sentence, or reading the latter in place of the adverb (so Naber and Niese minor). The adverb is hardly necessary and may be best substituted, as Niese suggests, together with a slight alteration to an earlier word (ἦ κείνον in place of ἐκείνον, “he”); so also Münster ad loc.

<sup>962</sup> Reading προσέσθαι, with Niese minor, Münster, and most modern editors.

<sup>963</sup> Cf. the similar argument against Lysimachus, 1.319.

<sup>964</sup> The subject of the sentence might be Moses/Osarseph (cf. 1.265), but in context appears to be Manetho. Josephus rightly exposes the artificiality with which the Egyptian tale had been connected to Moses, though who was responsible for this connection is less clear (see note to “Moyses” at 1.250).

<sup>965</sup> It is not clear what sort of match Josephus is looking for; for other name alterations or alternatives see 1.102, 245. In 1.150, 265 it was noted that “Osarseph” derives from the divine name, Osiris, and the etymological note in this section suggests that Josephus is pressing the difference in the etymology of the two names. But there is no reason in theory why a historical figure could not change his name to another with a different root and meaning.

<sup>966</sup> Greek: μῶυ. Cf. Josephus’ deployment of Egyptian etymology in 1.82; 2.27. In the Hebrew text of

Exod 2.10, Moses’ name (מֹשֶׁה) is derived from the Hebrew root מָשַׁח meaning “to draw out”). Since it was implausible that an Egyptian princess would name the founding by use of Hebrew etymology, and since the name had Egyptian parallels, a tradition developed providing it with an Egyptian etymology. In *Ant.* 2.228 Josephus explains both parts of the Greek name Μωυση̅ς by reference to Egyptian words (μῶυ meaning “water” and εση̅ς “saved”; the LXX of Exod 2:10 invites some such explanation). Here, he mentions only the first part of that explanation, like Philo in *Mos.* 1.17; they are thinking of the Egyptian word *mw*, which means “water.” But this etymology fits only the Greek version of the name. The original Hebrew מֹשֶׁה almost certainly derives from Egyptian *mose*, the old perfective of *ms* (“is born”); it is found frequently in theophoric forms (e.g., Ptah-mose, Tuth-mose). For a strong defense of this consensus view see Griffiths 1953.

<sup>967</sup> A minor textual difficulty is best resolved by following Bekker and reading κατάδηλον (“obvious”). Josephus finishes on a confident note, as he had begun (see note to “clearly” at 1.252).

<sup>968</sup> This concession (οὐ πολὺ τῆς ἀληθείας διημάταεν; for the wording, cf. 1.218; *War* 1.17) is necessary because of the earlier use of Manetho as a positive witness; the same double verdict, with very similar language, is found at 1.105, 229. The “ancient records” are Egyptian documents (cf. 1.8-9, 73, 104-5, 228, 280). The slight qualification “not ... much” implies that Josephus has some leeway to disagree in part even with the Hyksos story, but for rhetorical reasons he never does so explicitly.

<sup>969</sup> Greek: ἀδεσπότους μύθους, echoing the ἀδεσπότης μυθολογουμένων of 1.105. The adjective straddles the senses “anonymous” and “unauthorized,” with perhaps the additional nuance of “inauthentic.”

<sup>970</sup> The root “implausible” (ἀπίθαν-) is used one last time in relation to Manetho (cf. 1.105, 229, 267, 279, 286). The verb συνέθηκεν here probably has the sense “stitched together” (Josephus rightly detects the artifi-

(1.32) 288 After him I wish to scrutinize<sup>972</sup> Chaeremon.<sup>973</sup> For indeed this man, claiming to be writing Egyptian history<sup>974</sup> and putting forward the same name as Manetho for the king, Amenophis, and his son Ramesses,<sup>975</sup> 289 says that<sup>976</sup> Isis appeared to Amenophis in his sleep, blaming him for the fact that her temple had been destroyed in the war.<sup>977</sup> The sacred scribe Phritobautes<sup>978</sup> said that if he purged

*Chaeremon's  
story*

cial combination of varied tales); elsewhere (1.46, 112, 293, 294, 304 etc.) words from the same root mean more generally to “concoct” or “invent.”

<sup>971</sup> The blame for the prejudice is shifted from Manetho to his sources, since Manetho is too valuable a witness to have his reputation wholly or directly sullied. For hatred as a motive for stories Josephus finds unwelcome, see 1.220, 224; 2.32, 70; the accusation is levelled directly at Lysimachus in 1.304.

<sup>972</sup> “Scrutinize” (ἐξετάζω) can be used in both non-legal (e.g., 1.31, 212) and legal (e.g., 2.276) contexts. If the legal atmosphere of this work was felt to be still active (cf. 1.277, 312 regarding Manetho and Lysimachus), it might be translated “cross-examine” (with Chaeremon as a hostile witness; so Thackeray; cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 870a). In either case, Josephus places himself in a superior position, with the authority to examine his opponent.

<sup>973</sup> Josephus does not introduce his opponent with any indication of nationality or context; his tactic is to focus not on Chaeremon’s *ethos* but on the errors in his narrative. From a variety of references and fragments (newly collated by van der Horst 1984; cf. Schwyzer 1932; *FGH* 618), we know that Chaeremon was a leading Alexandrian intellectual in the first century CE (ca. 10–80 CE). He was probably the “Chaeremon son of Leonidas” who is listed third among the Alexandrian delegates to Rome in 41 CE, congratulating Claudius on his accession and complaining about the claims of Alexandrian Judeans and the associated disturbances in Alexandria in the preceding years (*CPJ* 153, line 17; so Frede 1989: 2077-78, unnecessarily doubted by Labow 2005: 291-92). An early tutor of Nero, he must have exercised considerable influence at the heart of Roman power, disseminating Egyptian opinions about Judeans. He gained immense respect in Rome as a “sacred scribe” from Egypt (van der Horst 1984: test. 6 and frag. 4; for the label see note to “Phritobautes” at 1.289), whose works on Egyptian history and on hieroglyphics interpreted Egyptian culture to a Roman audience (Frede 1989; Labow 2005: 288-94, with bibliography). As a Stoic philosopher he provided allegorical explanations of Egyptian religion, and was sufficiently famous to be pilloried by Martial (11.56). Thus, although his is the briefest of the “Egyptian” narratives related by Josephus, it may have been among the most influential in Rome (see Appendix 3). His (and Apion’s) depiction of Judean theology as framed by aberrant Egyptian

scribes or priests (1.290; 2.10-12) was of major significance to the philosophical evaluation of Judean culture: if it was a dependent, derivative, and corrupt version of Egyptian culture, it could make no claim to represent an ancient philosophical wisdom. As both Frede (1989) and Boys-Stones (2001: 44-75) have shown, 1<sup>st</sup>-century Stoic philosophy, of which Chaeremon was a leading figure in both Alexandria and Rome, was inclined to scrutinize truly ancient traditions for signs (embedded in allegory) of an original, pure human wisdom. If Judean tradition was neither ancient nor pure (compared to that of Egypt), its peculiar customs could gain no philosophical justification at all.

<sup>974</sup> Josephus’ language (cf. 1.228) evokes his earlier canons of historiography, which he will evoke in 1.293 (cf. 1.26). It is unclear whether Chaeremon composed a complete history or narrated only those aspects relevant to his elucidation of Egyptian culture; frag. 2, from Psellus, also refers to a ἱστορία.

<sup>975</sup> On the spelling of the name see notes at 1.245, 251. The agreement on both names shows that the two authors are talking about the *same* kings, and thus underscores the significance of the narrative *differences* that Josephus will proceed to highlight. In the extremely short précis that follows (1.289-92), Josephus picks out details that can be shown to contradict Manetho; unlike his citation from Manetho, there are almost no facets of this account that Josephus will not assess in his critique (1.293-303). Josephus thus appears fully in command of his material, and there is no reason to think that he is following an earlier or fragmentary abbreviation of Chaeremon (*pace* Stern 1.421). As a result we know extremely little about the character and force of Chaeremon’s tale; even those gaps that Josephus criticises (e.g., 1.302) may be ones he has manufactured himself.

<sup>976</sup> Introduced in this way (φησὶν ὅτι + indicative), this opening sentence could be taken as verbatim quotation. But since the rest of the passage (1.289-92) is in indirect speech (accusative and infinitive), it is more likely that Josephus summarizes Chaeremon’s story from the outset.

<sup>977</sup> Although the details here are unexplained (what war? and which temple?), Josephus cites them for the contrast they make with Manetho’s opening scene (see 1.294). The goddess Isis was well known in Rome and revered by more than just the Egyptian population of the city (see Solmsen 1979; Takács 1995). Indeed, in



Egypt of those who had impurities, he would find relief from his terror.<sup>979</sup> **290** And when he had collected 250,000 of the noxious people,<sup>980</sup> he expelled them; they were led by scribes, Moyses and Iosepos—he too was a sacred scribe!<sup>981</sup>—their Egyptian names being (for Moyses) Tisithen<sup>982</sup> and (for Iosepos) Peteseph.<sup>983</sup> **291** These went

Josephus' day, Domitian had shown special respect for the Isis-cult, including the restoration of the Isis-temple on the Campus Martius, after it was destroyed by fire; the event was marked by the erection of an obelisk which records Domitian as a "lover of Isis" (Malaise 1972). Romans would understand well the wrath of deities when their temples were damaged or destroyed (see Varro on the anger of Apollo, *apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 18.12). But the roots of this story lie deep in Egyptian soil. An assault on Isis suggests the work of Seth/Typhon, the arch-enemy and murderer of Isis' consort, Osiris; see the echoes of this mythology in 1.292. Her revenge thus casts the "impure" as a threat to the nation, who must be banished to the alien, Sethian exterior. A fragmentary papyrus from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE appears to refer to the "wrath of Isis" against "Judeans" who are described as "impious" and charged with despoiling the temples of Egypt (*CPJ* 520, with commentary by Stern). The origin of this charge is now untraceable (Frankfurter 1992 relates it to the Diaspora Revolt, 116-117 CE, Bohak 1995 to the Leontopolis temple), but it demonstrates the recurrence and adaptability of a mythological motif that is here also connected to Judeans (1.292; cf. van der Horst 1984: 49-50; Appendix 3). On Isis' appearance in dreams, see Diodorus 1.25.3 and Apuleius, *Metam.* 11.3-6, with Griffiths 1970: 139.

<sup>978</sup> The name is spelled "Phritibautes" in L (followed by Niese), but in 1.295 the same MS reads "Phritobautes" (which is read here in Latin and adopted by Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster); ed. pr. reads "Phritiphantes" in both places. On the possible meanings of the name, see van der Horst 1984: 50. For the role of "sacred scribes" (cf. *Ant.* 2.205, 234) as priests and interpreters of the sacred records, see *LÄ* 2.1199-201. Josephus includes this detail because it clashes with Manetho's story of Amenophis (see 1.295).

<sup>979</sup> As in Manetho (cf. 1.233), the nation's ills can be cured only by the expulsion of "the impure" (here οἱ τοὺς μολυσμοὺς ἔχοντες). The physical integrity of the nation is bound up with its cultic purity, in a nexus widely evidenced in cultures of the ancient Near East.

<sup>980</sup> The Greek adjective ἐπισινης is rare, and is not used elsewhere by Josephus; it is probably taken from Chaeremon. In this context it reflects the active sense of the verb (ἐπι)σίνομαι ("to harm"): the presence of the impure damages the nation and they are positively harmful (cf. Blum, "nuisables"). The passive sense (Thackeray: "afflicted"; van der Horst: "diseased") is

possible but, in context, less likely. Josephus records the number (the first of three numerical details in this précis) for its value in his subsequent riposte.

<sup>981</sup> This additional remark appears to be an exclamation of mock surprise by Josephus, though the wording is slightly clumsy and it is not entirely clear whether Joseph is here twinned as "sacred scribe" with Moses or with Phritobautes; Reinach emends the text to have both Moses and Joseph "sacred scribes," like Phritobautes. The association of Moses with a version of this legend is attested in Josephus' citation of Manetho (1.250); the link would be natural for anyone, Judean or not, who connected this story with the origin of the Judean people. The inclusion of Joseph suggests some knowledge of Judean traditions, however filtered and adapted. On the basis of the Genesis story (Genesis 37, 39-50), there developed many Judean legends of Joseph's rule in Egypt, for instance, those now found in Artapanus and in *Joseph and Aseneth* (see Gruen 1998: 73-109 and the full survey by Niehoff 1992). The name of Joseph thus became known to some non-Judeans. In Apollonius Molon he is the twelfth son of Abraham and the grandfather of Moses (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.19.3), in Pompeius Trogus, who accords him enormous respect, the benefactor of Egypt and father of Moses (*apud* Justin, *Epit.* 36.2.6-10). Here, the presence of alternative Egyptian names for both Moses and Joseph suggests that these "sacred scribes" were once purely Egyptian characters (so Schwyzer 1932: 57); at a point we cannot now trace, they were identified with Judean figures (cf. Osarseph and Moses in 1.250). One can imagine Judean motivation to discover Joseph in Egyptian legends (cf. Josephus himself in 1.92), but Egyptian hostility could cast him in a different light, as here. To portray these iconic figures as representatives of the Egyptian religious and intellectual tradition was to prove that Judean culture (and perhaps also the Judean nation, 1.292) was *derived* from Egypt, and thus of no independent value as a source of ancient philosophical truth (see Frede 1989: 2072-74; Boys-Stones 2001: 68-69, 73-75).

<sup>982</sup> According to van der Horst 1984: 50, this is a feminine form; he suggests the name was originally "Petisithen" (given by Isis). Surprisingly, Josephus does not comment on the glaring inconsistency with Manetho (1.250).

<sup>983</sup> Troiani (134) following Hopfner, suggests that the name was originally "Peteseth" (given by Seth) and connected to the Typhonian legend. But the present

to Pelusium<sup>984</sup> and there met 380,000 people who had been left by Amenophis, whom he had not wanted to bring over into Egypt;<sup>985</sup> they made an alliance with these people and marched against Egypt.<sup>986</sup> **292** Amenophis did not wait for their attack but fled to Ethiopia,<sup>987</sup> leaving behind his pregnant wife, who hid in some caves and gave birth to a child named Ramesses.<sup>988</sup> He, when he had grown up, drove the Judeans,<sup>989</sup> numbering about 200,000, into Syria,<sup>990</sup> and brought his father Amenophis back from Ethiopia.<sup>991</sup>

**(1.33) 293** Thus Chaeremon.<sup>992</sup> From these statements the falsehood in the ac-

*Response to  
Chaeremon*

form is comprehensible as it stands, meaning “given by Sepa” (the God worshipped in the form of a centipede); see Ranke 1935: 243; Mussies 1979: 209-12; van der Horst 1984: 50; cf. “Osarsephos” in 1.238.

<sup>984</sup> On Pelusium as the border of Egypt see note to “300,000” at 1.274. It appears that Chaeremon’s version lacked Manetho’s stone-quarries and the settlement in Avaris, though we cannot say what Josephus may have omitted.

<sup>985</sup> From this description, it appears that these were foreigners, but their origin and the circumstances of their exclusion are not related in this abbreviated version; Josephus’ charge of obscurity on this point (1.301) may be less than fair to the fuller original. The resulting combination of polluted natives and foreign invaders is structurally identical to Manetho, though without the linking apparatus (Avaris etc.) employed by the earlier author. This might suggest that Chaeremon is adapting a specifically Manethonian version of the legend, though something similar could have circulated in many variations.

<sup>986</sup> Manetho’s version had provided some grounds for their alliance, in their common association with Avaris and shared hatred of Egyptian culture (both with Typhonian overtones). We cannot detect whether Chaeremon linked the two groups in similar fashion or simply left the alliance unexplained. The Typhonian echo will, however, appear at the next stage of the saga.

<sup>987</sup> The story follows the same structure as that of Manetho, but omits the prevarication of 1.244-46.

<sup>988</sup> In Manetho’s version (1.245), the son was already 5 years old, and was dispatched abroad for safe keeping; perhaps, with the 13-year period of exile fixed in tradition (1.236, 247), he needed to be this age at the outset in order to be old enough to lead an army at the end (1.251). Chaeremon’s version appears in some respects more natural, and clearly evokes the Osiris-myth, with king Amenophis cast in the role of Osiris, his pregnant wife as Isis, and their son as Horus: as in the myth, after a childhood hidden and protected from the enemy, the son grows up to avenge his father. The myth is attested in numerous coffin-spells, in the Hymn of Amen-Mose, on the Metternich stela and in various literary texts (e.g., Herodotus 2.156; Diodorus

1.21.3; 88.6; Plutarch, *Mor.* 357f, 358b-c, 366a); see Griffiths 1960a: 52-53, 93-96; A.Y. Collins 1976: 62-63; Redford 2001: 1.199-201; van Henten and Abusch 1996: 280, n. 31. Since the myth is both cosmic and historical in scope, it can easily be used to shape Egypt’s historical legends. The allies’ attack is thus implicitly Typhonian.

<sup>989</sup> This label is suddenly introduced and, due to Josephus’ abridgement of his source, we cannot tell to whom it was applied by Chaeremon or how (as Josephus complains in 1.302). Since in the first century CE Ἰουδαῖοι normally retained geographic connotations (relating to Judea as place of residence or origin), it is possible that this label was used for the 380,000 found in Pelusium, as originating from Judea; though Josephus would perhaps have noted this to distinguish them from the “impure.” It is more likely that Chaeremon used the label for those expelled by Ramesses, after they had settled in Judea. In this case, Josephus slightly anticipates the use of the term by Chaeremon, for rhetorical purposes: claiming that the application of the label is unclear (1.302), he can deny its suitability altogether. A third explanation, that Josephus did not have direct access to Chaeremon and thus did not know how he used the term, remains possible.

<sup>990</sup> Again, the story mirrors Manetho (1.251). The figure (cf. the same number brought *into* Egypt in 1.243) is important for Josephus’ calculations in 1.300-01. Cf. the alternative figure in Lysimachus and Apion (2.20).

<sup>991</sup> Here the son takes the main initiative; cf. the variant Manethonian versions in 1.251, 276, and the comment on associated discrepancies regarding this son in note to “300,000” at 1.274. Oddly, Josephus’ subsequent comment on Chaeremon has the father already dead before the son’s birth (1.300), as in the Osiris myth; it is impossible to tell which of these is the correct representation of Chaeremon’s tale.

<sup>992</sup> Josephus’ response (1.293-303) is considerably longer than the précis, and takes up almost every detail within it. Whereas with Manetho his main angle of attack was the *implausibility* of the tale, here the juxtaposition with Manetho enables a change of tactic, focusing mainly on the *inconsistencies* between the

count of both authors is, I think, self-evident.<sup>993</sup> For if there were any underlying truth, it would not have been possible to disagree to such an extent;<sup>994</sup> but those who concoct lies do not write what agrees with others but fabricate what they like.<sup>995</sup> **294** So one [Manetho] says that it was the king's desire to see the Gods that caused the expulsion of the polluted people,<sup>996</sup> whereas Chaeremon concocted his own dream as of Isis.<sup>997</sup> **295** One says that it was Amenophis who warned the king to effect the purging, the other Phritobautes;<sup>998</sup> and the number of people is also of course extremely close—one talks of 80,000, the other 250,000!<sup>999</sup> **296** Further, Manetho first expels the polluted people to the stone-quarries, then gives them Auaris in which to settle and incites them to war against the rest of the Egyptians, and then says that they appealed for aid from the Hierosolymites;<sup>1000</sup> **297** whereas Chaeremon [says

two stories (5 discrepancies are highlighted); there are also 4 points of obscurity to which Josephus draws attention. The value of placing Chaeremon immediately after Manetho is evident: their story-lines are close enough to be comparable, but different enough to afford the new tactic plenty of scope.

<sup>993</sup> “Self-evident falsehood” (αὐτόθεν φανερά ... ψευδολογία) displays the confidence of a rhetor, matched by the remark which closes this section (1.303; cf. the start of the response to Manetho, 1.252: ψεύδεται περιφανῶς). Josephus' aim is not simply to convict Chaeremon of falsity on the basis of his difference from Manetho—that would imply that Manetho's version was correct—but to convict them *both* on the basis of their major disagreements.

<sup>994</sup> The vague “to such an extent” seems designed to support a questionable logic, according to which gross difference implies that *both* accounts are untrue. The logic is similar to, or based upon, the inverse principle enunciated in 1.26, that truthful history is found where all the witnesses agree (see note to “writing” at 1.26). The scale of disagreement could show that both accounts cannot be right, but it hardly disproves the possibility that one account might be right and the other largely wrong. Josephus' language of “disagreement” (διαφωνεῖν) echoes that used in 1.15-27 and, as there, his argument only works for those who are already skeptical of the veracity of all the sources cited. It would be interesting to know how he would have reacted when confronted with the disagreements between his work and the Judean scriptures, or the sometimes gross contradictions between the accounts of events in his *War* and his *Antiquities/Life*.

<sup>995</sup> As in 1.15-27, the only explanation Josephus offers for difference is irresponsible and arbitrary invention (rather than, for instance, following a better source). “Concoct” (συντίθημι) is used again in 1.294 and elsewhere in 1.46, 112, 287, 304, 312; 2.3, 124; “fabricate” (πλάττω) appears in this or cognate forms in 1.254, 293, 298, 304; 2.12, 122. For the Judean

scriptures as the polar opposite, free of any arbitrariness or difference, see 1.37.

<sup>996</sup> See 1.232, commented on in 1.254-55. By preserving Manetho's language of “pollution” (cf. 1.241, 248), Josephus keeps the two stories close enough on this point to exploit their difference on others.

<sup>997</sup> This, with 1.289, 298 is Josephus' only reference to Isis in this work (cf. elsewhere *War*. 7.123; *Ant*. 18.65-80). While he everywhere ridicules animal cults, he offers no critique of Isis, only of the storyteller. He may have wished to avoid direct confrontation with those in Rome who respected the goddess (see note to “war” at 1.289). The translation here follows L (with Niese maior, Naber, Thackeray, Reinach [with doubts], and Münster): ὁ δὲ Χαίρημων ἴδιον ὡς τῆς Ἴσιδος ἐνύπνιον συντέθεικε (Thackeray's translation differs). This awkward expression appears to compress two ideas: that Chaeremon invented the story of an Isis dream, and that the result is like a “dream” of his own. Various textual emendations have been proposed, including: i) a change of ἴδιον to αἴτιον (Schreckenberg 1977: 163: “Charemon invented a dream of Isis as the cause,” cf. 1.254); and ii) Niese's conjecture (adopted in Niese minor), emending ἴδιον ὡς τὸ ἠδίων, ὅς (“Chaeremon was sweeter, who concocted a dream of Isis”).

<sup>998</sup> For Manetho, see 1.232; for Chaeremon, see 1.289 (where the note describes the variant spellings of the name). As well as a different name, the two figures have different roles, Amenophis as “seer,” Phritobautes as “sacred scribe”; Josephus comments only on the first difference as the most obvious.

<sup>999</sup> Josephus' tactic changes to sarcasm (marked by δῆ); for the figures see 1.234, 290. The attack on the plausibility of Manetho's tale, regarding the sudden gathering of 80,000 (1.257), could have been extended here to the far larger figure, but Josephus' critique is now focused on discrepancy, not implausibility.

<sup>1000</sup> This summary of Manetho's story (1.235, 237-42; cf. 1.260-62) emphasizes the sequence of events

that] when they left Egypt they found at Pelusium 380,000 people who had been left by Amenophis, and with these they returned to invade Egypt, while Amenophis fled to Ethiopia.<sup>1001</sup> **298** But the absolute gem is this:<sup>1002</sup> he has not said who these large numbers of soldiers were and where they were from, whether they were Egyptians by descent or had come from outside;<sup>1003</sup> and he has not even clarified the reason why the king did not want them to enter Egypt<sup>1004</sup>—this from a man who, in connection with the lepers,<sup>1005</sup> fabricated the Isis-dream!<sup>1006</sup> **299** With Moyses Chaeremon has connected Iosepos, as if they were driven out together in the same period, although Iosepos predates Moyses, having died four generations, that is about 170 years, earlier.<sup>1007</sup> **300** Indeed, Ramesses, the son of Amenophis, according to Manetho fought as a young man alongside his father, and was banished with him, fleeing to Ethiopia;<sup>1008</sup> but Chaeremon has him born in a cave after his father's

("first ... then ... then"). One point of contrast in Chaeremon (1.297) will be the order in which the polluted people go to war and call in outside aid. "Hierosolymites" is Josephus' label (cf. 1.264); Manetho had called them "Solymites" (Σολυμίται, 1.248).

<sup>1001</sup> This summary of 1.291-92 is given no further comment, but the juxtaposition with 1.296 shows up the difference in almost every detail—in circumstance, sequence, and location. Only the ending of the story is the same (cf. 1.246, 292), though Josephus did not cite that section of Manetho's narrative in 1.296.

<sup>1002</sup> Josephus breaks off the display of inconsistencies (to which he will return at 1.300), to highlight two related obscurities in Chaeremon's story. The sarcasm of 1.295 returns, again marked by δῆ. "Absolute gem" translates γενναϊότατον: the adjective indicates something "noble" or "splendid," and is used sarcastically of Josephus' opponents in 1.319; 2.32.

<sup>1003</sup> The obscurity, in 1.291, may be as much the result of Josephus' compression of his source as of Chaeremon's own making; even so, a more natural reading of 1.291 would take the Pelusium crowd as outsiders, since it refers to Amenophis not wanting to "bring them over" (διακομίζειν) into Egypt. But Josephus presses this point because he wants to clarify how, if at all, this story is connected to "Judeans" (cf. 1.302): thus the language here used, and the alternatives offered (native Egyptians or outsiders), echo the anxieties already expressed in 1.229, 252, 278 concerning the "mixing" of Judeans with Egyptians.

<sup>1004</sup> This second obscurity is closely related to the first: the king's action would have made more sense if the identity of those he excluded was apparent.

<sup>1005</sup> "Lepers" is Josephus' term (again in 1.302), not Chaeremon's (cf. 1.289, 290). On a similar alteration of Manetho, see note to "people" at 1.233.

<sup>1006</sup> The implication is: if he can "fabricate" (σμπλάσσω; cf. note to "like" at 1.293) an Isis-dream, why did he not invent other "facts" to make the story

coherent? Chaeremon is as incompetent as he is untruthful.

<sup>1007</sup> Josephus does not here comment on the name-changes of Moses and Joseph (cf. 1.286), but seizes on what he considers a factual error, the only example of this tactic against Chaeremon. Typically, he does not reveal his alternative source of knowledge (the biblical tradition); only Judean or sympathetic readers, who acknowledged his access to better sources, would be willing to take this chronological statement on trust. In fact, the biblical time references on this period are vague or inconsistent. Gen 15:13 speaks of the descendants of Abraham being slaves in a land not their own for 400 years, while Gen 15:16 promises they will return to Canaan "in the fourth generation." Exodus 1 has no clear indications of the passage of time. Exod 6:16-20 traces three generations between Levi (half-brother of Joseph) and Moses, while Exod 12:40 says the people of Israel were in Egypt (LXX: in Egypt and Canaan) for 430 years. Elsewhere (*Ant.* 2.204) Josephus speaks of enduring hardship in Egypt for 400 years (following Gen 15:13), while in *Ant.* 2.318 he gives the figure of 430 years from Abraham to the exodus, or 215 from the arrival of Jacob in Egypt (see Nodet 1992: 139, n. 6; Feldman 2000: 224). Here he gives the interval between Joseph and Moses more definitely as "four generations" than in precise years ("about 170 years"). Reinach (55, n. 2) and Troiani (134) consider that Josephus is dependent on Exod 6:16-20 (cf. Philo, *Mos.* 1.7). But neither "four generations" nor "170 years" is easily deduced from that passage, and it is more likely that he is following "the fourth generation" of Gen 15:16; the figure of 170 years is then calculated from a rough estimate of 40-45 years per generation.

<sup>1008</sup> Josephus returns to another point of difference between the two stories. He cites here the version of Manetho's story he had used in 1.274, not the story of the 5-year-old sent abroad for safe keeping in 1.245 (on the difference between these two, see note to "300,000"



death,<sup>1009</sup> and subsequently victorious in battle, driving the Judeans, numbering about 200,000, to Syria.<sup>1010</sup> **301** What irresponsibility!<sup>1011</sup> Earlier he did not say who the 380,000 were, and neither does he indicate how the 430,000<sup>1012</sup> perished—whether they fell in battle or went over to Ramesses’ side.<sup>1013</sup> **302** And the most amazing thing<sup>1014</sup> is that one cannot learn from him whom he calls “Judeans,” or to which group he applies this designation, the 250,000 lepers or the 380,000 at Pelusium.<sup>1015</sup> **303** But it would, perhaps, be stupid to use more examples to refute those who are refuted by themselves;<sup>1016</sup> it would have been more tolerable for them to have been refuted by others.<sup>1017</sup>

*Obscurity on identity of “Judeans”*

*Lysimachus’ story*

**(1.34) 304** In addition to these I shall bring on Lysimachus,<sup>1018</sup> who has taken the

at 1.274). This maximizes the distance from Chaeremon’s version, though the other Manetho account was still strikingly different.

<sup>1009</sup> In 1.292 the father leaves his pregnant wife behind, but survives in exile and is brought back to Egypt by his grown-up son. There are several possible explanations for this discrepancy: i) Josephus is simply clumsy, not noticing that he here alters the story he has just summarized (so Thackeray and Reinach); ii) Josephus subtly changes the original version to increase the divergence from Manetho’s account; iii) Josephus here cites what Chaeremon actually said; this version is more accurate than that in 1.292; iv) Josephus knows and cites more than one version of Chaeremon’s story. All of these are possible, but there are some reasons to support iii), as fitting better the Horus-pattern (see note to “Ramesses” at 1.292; van Henten and Abusch 1996: 281-82).

<sup>1010</sup> This last stage in the saga is not, in fact, a point of difference with Manetho, but is mentioned here, repeating material from 1.292, to set up the objections in 1.301-2.

<sup>1011</sup> The expostulation (ὡ τῆς εὐχερείας) adds rhetorical variety and sums up in a single word (elsewhere used only in 1.57) Josephus’ damning verdict on Chaeremon’s historiography.

<sup>1012</sup> L, followed by Niese, reads “230,000,” but Josephus’ sums require a different figure. If there were 250,000 polluted people (1.290, 295, 302) and a further 380,000 added from Pelusium (1.291, 297, 302), the combined total was 630,000. And if 200,000 got back to Syria (1.292, 300), that leaves 430,000 who must have perished in between. This is the figure found here in ed. pr. and adopted by all modern editors apart from Niese.

<sup>1013</sup> The lacuna bothers Josephus, not just because it is an obvious point of weakness in Chaeremon’s narrative, but because, as with the identity of the 380,000, he desires complete clarity on who is, or is not, to be considered “Judean” (cf. 1.302). The alternatives he allows here exclude the possibility that these 430,000 could be considered Judean in any way (cf. 1.278).

<sup>1014</sup> A third use of δὴ signals another piece of sarcasm (cf. 1.295, 298); the same expression is used in 2.284, but without sarcasm.

<sup>1015</sup> For Chaeremon’s use of this label, see note to “Judeans” at 1.292. It is likely that he meant neither of the two options canvassed by Josephus, but employed the term to refer to the survivors who got to Syria, and settled in Judea. Thus Chaeremon probably meant this story to describe the origin of the Judean people, but it suits Josephus’ purpose to claim he was obscure or confused, and thus to nullify the potential damage to the reputation of Judeans. Manetho’s story lent itself to a clear distinction between two parties, and thus to a strong denial by Josephus that the Judeans were originally native Egyptians; Chaeremon’s can be ridiculed as simply obscure.

<sup>1016</sup> As in 1.287, Josephus ends by asserting the sufficiency of what he has done, aware, perhaps, that this section seems short, relative to the response he made to Manetho. The self-refutation here referred to is most likely the mutual refutation of Manetho and Chaeremon: that was the main point announced in 1.293 and copiously illustrated thereafter. For the tactic, cf. 1.219, 226.

<sup>1017</sup> The sense here depends on the nuance given to the term μετριώτερον, here translated “more tolerable” (μέτριος means not too much). The previous comment asserted that both authors collapse immediately, and far too easily, when confronted by each other. Josephus now suggests that a less devastating result might have ensued had each been opposed—though still refuted—by others. But if this is an apology, it is meant ironically: it serves to reinforce how weak each author looks when juxtaposed with the other.

<sup>1018</sup> Josephus introduces Lysimachus (“bring on”—ἐπιισάγω—evokes the theater more than the law-court) without reference to his nationality, his historical context, or his literary purpose. His placement in the sequence of citations may have nothing to do with chronology. Chaeremon was juxtaposed with Manetho for rhetorical purposes, and Lysimachus may have written at any time between Manetho and Apion; 2.20

same foundation<sup>1019</sup> as the basis for his lying<sup>1020</sup> about the lepers and the disfigured<sup>1021</sup> as the authors mentioned above, but surpasses them in the implausibility of his fabrications,<sup>1022</sup> which have clearly been concocted out of profound enmity.<sup>1023</sup>  
**305** He says that<sup>1024</sup> when Bocchoris was king of the Egyptians,<sup>1025</sup> the Judean

might suggest that Apion referred to him. We know of an Alexandrian Lysimachus, who wrote on Theban “paradoxes” and the Greek legends of “returns” (“Nostoi”; *FGH* 382); his dates are after Mnaseas (Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 158d) and thus after the second century BCE. Tempted by the Egyptian link, many scholars identify our Lysimachus (a common name) with this Alexandrian scholar (Gudeman in *PW* 14.32-39; Fraser 1972: 2.1092-93, n. 475; Reinach; Thackeray; Bar-Kochva 1999-2000b: 477-83; 2001: 18-20; see further, Labow 2005: 311-14). But there is good reason to doubt this identification (see Jacoby in *FGH* 621 and 3b: 166; Troiani; Schürer revised 3.600-1). Although the setting of his story is clearly Egyptian, with traditional motifs of divine anger and the purging of the land, in several respects the saga (as we know it from Josephus’ paraphrase) has been developed *away from* a specifically Egyptian ambience: Moses is not here introduced as an Egyptian or with an Egyptian name; he and his people are hostile not to Egyptian religion but to the religion of everyone they encounter, especially in the new land they conquer; and there is no final vindication of Egypt culturally or militarily. Elsewhere, Josephus twins Lysimachus with the non-Egyptian Apollonius Molon (2.145, 236) as critics of Moses and his laws, while Tacitus recounts a version of the exodus very similar to that of Lysimachus (*Hist.* 5.3-4; see note to “says” at 1.305). Thus it is easy to imagine Lysimachus as a Greek intellectual, adapting an old Egyptian saga to provide a more pointedly pejorative account of Judean origins, full of etiological motifs designed to “explain” Judean practices (see below). In any case, Josephus makes no attempt to characterize Lysimachus as Egyptian, beyond placing him in the company of others who explicitly are so.

<sup>1019</sup> Josephus first emphasizes their basic similarity, in order to explain all difference as the product of pure invention (cf. 1.293). There are many themes in common with Manetho and Chaeremon (impurity, divine wrath, purging of the land, the leadership of Moses, an irreligious constitution, travel across the desert and settlement in Judea), but also striking differences: the story is set in the reign of a different king, there is no role for foreigners, no invasion of Egypt, no assault on Egyptian religion and no clear Typhonian echo. As we know from other sources (see Appendix 3), there were multiple and only partly overlapping versions of this saga, and there is no reason to think that Lysimachus

was directly dependent on either Manetho or Chaeremon.

<sup>1020</sup> “Lying” (ψεῦσμα) is a charge against Lysimachus repeated in 1.318, 320; cf. 1.252 (Manetho) and 1.293 (Chaeremon).

<sup>1021</sup> “Disfigured” (λελωβημένοι) had been used by Josephus in his paraphrase of, and commentary upon, Manetho (1.234, 256, etc.); it may be his own terminology. When he comes to paraphrase Lysimachus, he uses terms of impurity (1.306, 307), leprosy, or scabies (1.305, 308).

<sup>1022</sup> Josephus loads his polemic in advance of the paraphrase: implausibility (ἄπιθανότης) is his chief weapon in 1.314-19 (cf. on Manetho at 1.105 and note to “implausibly” at 1.287). For “fiction” (πλάσματα), cf. note to “like” at 1.293.

<sup>1023</sup> As usual, “clearly” signals supreme confidence in Josephus’ advance judgment (cf. 1.252, 293). For “concoct” (συντίθημι), see note to “like” at 1.293. Josephus intuits Lysimachus’ motive as “profound enmity” (πολλὴ ἀπέχθεια), echoing his complaint about Egyptians in general (1.224) and Manetho’s sources in particular (1.287), but without reference here to Egypt. The polemical crescendo may reflect genuine outrage at Lysimachus’ explicit identification of Judeans with lepers and scabies-sufferers; but it also brings this first book to a close on a rhetorical climax (cf. 1.318-20).

<sup>1024</sup> All the material from Lysimachus is paraphrased (Thackeray indents, as if it were a quotation). It is impossible to tell how much of his source Josephus knew and how much he has shortened, but we should note: i) he later cites a detail (2.16, on the number of those who accompanied Moses) not given here, suggesting that this passage is a précis; ii) in contrast to the Chaeremon précis, Josephus here includes many details from Lysimachus on which he does not later offer comment; iii) many items of vocabulary are unique to this passage (e.g., ψωρός, 1.305, 306 etc.; ἐπιλογή, 1.307; ἐπιβωμίται, 1.307). These last two observations may indicate that Josephus stays quite close to his source. Many of the details in this account reappear in Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3-4: the king Bocchoris, the oracle from Ammon, the plague/disease (also identified as scabies), the expulsion into the desert, Moses’ rallying of the helpless crowd, hostility to others and their Gods, travel through the desert, and expulsion of the inhabitants of the new land. Thus we know that something close to Lysimachus’ account was familiar in Rome in Josephus’

people<sup>1026</sup> suffered leprosy, scabies, and certain other diseases,<sup>1027</sup> and took refuge in the temples to beg for food.<sup>1028</sup> When very many people contracted disease, there was a crop-failure in Egypt.<sup>1029</sup> 306 Bocchoris, the king of the Egyptians, sent people to consult the oracle of Ammon<sup>1030</sup> about the crop-failure and the God told him to purge the temples of unholy and ungodly people:<sup>1031</sup> he should throw them out of the temples into desert locations and drown those with scabies and leprosy,<sup>1032</sup>

day, and this might explain why he both cites it in this tractate (though it may have only remote connections to Egypt) and dismisses it with such vitriol. See further Appendix 3.

<sup>1025</sup> Bocchoris (his Egyptian name is Bakenrenef) was the second king in the 24<sup>th</sup> Dynasty (Manetho fragments 64-65 in Waddell 1940); his dates are thus ca. 720-715 BCE (cf. Apion's dating at 2.17). It is not clear why Josephus considers him to have lived much earlier (2.16: 1700 years ago), but that may represent a misunderstanding of his source, manufacturing an inconsistency with others (*pace* Reinach 56-57 n. 2, drawing a wrong inference from Diodorus 1.65). Bakenrenef was not much celebrated in Egyptian texts (see Redford 2001: 1.162), beyond his association with an oracle from a lamb that prophesied Egyptian humiliation at the hand of foreigners, to be followed by recovery. But in Greek sources, as "Bocchoris the wise," he is known as a great legislator, the inspiration for Solon (Diodorus 1.45, 65, 79, 94; Plutarch, *Demetr.* 27.5-6). Lysimachus' version of the story may have arisen out of the association of this king with the oracle of the lamb, but it has lost its link with foreign invaders (cf. Labow 2005: 316-17).

<sup>1026</sup> If we may trust Josephus, Lysimachus explicitly identified "Judeans" with the diseased from the outset of the story; Josephus will question what this identification means (1.313-14) and does not allow us here to see its rationale.

<sup>1027</sup> The explication of "impurity" as disease may have been implicit in Manetho's version of this story (see note to "Egypt" at 1.229 and note to "people" at 1.233). Here, the characterization of the problematic people as diseased is simply juxtaposed with their labelling as "unholy and godless" (1.306), perhaps a sign of a story with two layers, the medical superimposed on the religious. Both Pompeius Trogus (Justin, *Epit.* 36.2.12) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.4.2) agree with Lysimachus in specifying scabies; cf. Apion's groin-tumors (2.20-27). It appears that legends of "plague" were amenable to a variety of interpretations, giving rein to historical imagination and polemical animus.

<sup>1028</sup> Did the diseased go to the temples for protection or for alms, or both? And how did they gain entry? As Stern suggests (1.385), this puzzle may indicate a story with more than one layer. In the substratum, sources of impurity are ejected from Egyptian temples

(1.306-7); in a later layer, Judeans are represented as diseased people who enter the temples (under obscure circumstances), in order to be ejected from there. Lysimachus' reference to begging would resonate with a certain stereotype current in Rome of the Judean beggar; see Martial 12.57.13; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.542-47.

<sup>1029</sup> Again, this is puzzling, and may have been clearer in the fuller version Josephus paraphrases. Crop-failure (ἀκαρπία) suggests a collapse in the fertility of the land (cf. 1.306), explicable if Egypt is polluted by unholy elements in the population; on crop-failure under the curse of Typhonian impiety, see *Oracle of the Potter* (P. Rainer I.1.7; Koenen 1968: 200). But here the story-line seems to indicate a transmission of disease via the temples, causing perhaps a shortage of farmers (Stern 1.385), or an "infection" of the land passed on via temple-visitors. Lysimachus' version may superimpose a more "rational" explanatory scheme on an old Egyptian narrative. On the double version of events, see Bar-Kochva 2001: 16-23, suggesting that Josephus has conflated two different accounts that he found in Lysimachus; I find it more likely that the conflation occurred in Lysimachus himself.

<sup>1030</sup> Ammon (or Amun), the ram-headed deity, is especially associated with the city of Thebes, and the sun-God, Re; hence the reference to the sun later in this section. His oracle was located in the Libyan desert, at the oasis of Siwa (see Frankfurter 1998: 157), and was the recipient of notable visits, by Croesus, Hannibal, Cambyses, and, most famously, Alexander the Great. Romans certainly knew about this God (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3.1; 4.2) and about the oracle, which acclaimed Vespaian as Amun's son, like Alexander (Suetonius, *Vesp.* 7).

<sup>1031</sup> This purification motif, paralleled in Manetho (1.233) and Chaeremon (1.289), looks like an original Egyptian theme; the "unholy" (ἄναγνοι) and "ungodly" (δυσσεβείς) are a threat to the purity of the land, and particularly the temples, its most sensitive locations. On the relationship to the disease-labels, see notes to 1.305.

<sup>1032</sup> Here the two layers of the story (concerning the unholy and the diseased) are awkwardly combined, with two parallel but different fates. The expulsion into the desert, the location of Seth, may reflect a buried Typhonian motif.

as the sun was angry at their existence; he should purify the temples and in this way the land would be fruitful.<sup>1033</sup> **307** When Bocchoris received these oracles he summoned the priests and assistants at the altars and instructed them to make a selection of the impure people and hand these over to soldiers who would take them out into the desert, and to wrap up the lepers in lead sheets in order to sink them in the sea.<sup>1034</sup> **308** When the lepers and scabies-sufferers had been drowned, the rest were assembled and taken out to desert locations to die; but they gathered together to plan what to do about themselves,<sup>1035</sup> and, when night came, lit a fire and lamps and kept guard,<sup>1036</sup> and on the next night fasted and made atonement offerings to the Gods for their rescue.<sup>1037</sup> **309** On the next day a certain Moyses advised them to risk taking a straight course until they reached inhabited territory,<sup>1038</sup> and he instructed them to show goodwill to no-one, nor to give the best but the worst advice,<sup>1039</sup> and to reduce

<sup>1033</sup> The wrath of Amun-Re, the sun-God (see Quirke 1992: 21-51), represents a clear religious logic, parallel to the anger of Isis (1.289): the Egyptian Gods jealously guard the purity of the land and punish impurity with natural disasters. For a Persian parallel see Herodotus 1.138. If Lysimachus wrote as represented here, his account may carry an implicit critique of Egyptian “superstition”: to speak of “the sun” as angry might suggest to a Greek mind a crude personification of nature. For Essene personification of the sun, cf. *War* 2.128, 148.

<sup>1034</sup> It is not clear if the two categories of victims are distinct. If so, and if the Judeans were the diseased rather than the impure (1.305), none would have survived the treatment ordered here, and carried out in 1.308. Josephus does not comment on this internal inconsistency, which perhaps arose from the conflation of an Egyptian substratum and Lysimachan overlay. Pompeius Trogus’ version is neater: “The Egyptians, being troubled with scabies and leprosy and warned by an oracle, expelled [Moses], with those who had the disease, out of Egypt, that the distemper might not spread among a greater number” (Justin, *Epit.* 36.2.12). The reference to lead sheets might contain a distant echo of the Osiris-myth, in which Typhon tricked Osiris into lying in a coffin, sealed it with nails and lead, and launched it into the sea (Plutarch, *Mor.* 356c); but if so the motif has been transferred and is barely recognizable. On uses of lead in antiquity, see Labow 2005: 322-23, n. 53.

<sup>1035</sup> According to 2.20, Lysimachus said there were 110,000 of these people; in the present context numbers are of no concern to Josephus (unlike the case of Chaeremon).

<sup>1036</sup> Etiological elements begin to emerge here, as in Tacitus’ account (see Appendix 3). For an encampment to light a fire and keep guard makes good sense, but the reference to “lamps” (λύχνοι) looks superfluous, except for its etiological value (the Egyptian custom in

Sais, recorded in Herodotus 2.62, is a remote parallel). Josephus uses the same language of the Judean custom of lighting lamps (2.118, 282), and this was a custom certainly known in Rome and associated with the sabbath (Seneca, *Ep.* 95.47) or “Herod’s day” (Persius, *Sat.* 5.180-81).

<sup>1037</sup> Fasting was well known in Rome as a Judean sabbath custom: Pompeius Trogus (in Justin, *Epit.* 36.2.14); Petronius, frag. 37; Suetonius, *Aug.* 76.2; Martial 4.4; cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.3. See Williams 2004 for a strong argument that this was an accurate perception of Judean practice in Rome. The atonement offerings are here polytheistic, perhaps to render the later hostility to altars of the Gods (1.309) all the more reprehensible, and attributable to Moses’ malign influence.

<sup>1038</sup> Although it is implied that Moses is one of the Egyptian expellees, he is given here no Egyptian pedigree (in contrast to the versions of Manetho, Chaeremon, and Apion; for the latter two this point was of crucial significance in downgrading Judean culture). But his initiative is here highlighted; 2.145 suggests Lysimachus expressed special venom against Moses, as well as against his laws. The crossing of the desert, which was of little interest to Manetho and Chaeremon, became the source of etiological speculation in many other versions (e.g., Apion, Pompeius Trogus, and Tacitus). Here, the risk and difficulty of the journey (1.310) suggest the formation of a daring but brutalized nation.

<sup>1039</sup> Hostility specifically directed against Egyptians in Manetho’s version (1.239) is here generalized into a universal anti-social temperament. Giving good advice was considered in antiquity one of the basic rules of humanity (sometimes attributed to Bouzyges); cf. Cicero, *Off.* 1.52: *consilium fidele deliberanti dare* (“to give faithful advice to one who is deliberating,” parallel to offering water and fire; see note to “them” at 2.211; Berthelot 2003: 54-55, 108-9). The expulsion from Egypt had been linked to Judean “misanthropy”



to ruins whatever sanctuaries or altars of the Gods they encountered.<sup>1040</sup> **310** The others agreed<sup>1041</sup> and when they had put these decisions into practice, they crossed the desert; despite considerable difficulties, they arrived in an inhabited country, where they maltreated the people and plundered and burned the temples,<sup>1042</sup> and came to the territory now called Judea, where they founded a city and settled in it.<sup>1043</sup> **311** This city was called “Hierosyla” [temple plunder] because of their disposition,<sup>1044</sup> but later, when they had become powerful, they changed the name in time in order to avoid opprobrium,<sup>1045</sup> and called the city “Hierosolyma” and themselves “Hierosolymites.”<sup>1046</sup>

Response to  
Lysimachus

**(1.35) 312** This author<sup>1047</sup> did not even discover enough to refer to the same king as the others, but has concocted a more novel name<sup>1048</sup> and, passing over the dream

already by Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.4), and allegations along such lines were regularly directed against Judeans (see note to “Greeks” at 2.121 and full survey in Berthelot 2003: 79-184; there is a particularly close parallel to Lysimachus’ complaint in Diodorus 34/35.1.2-3). For the Judean reputation in Rome see Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.103-4. Tacitus recounts a defiant and self-reliant Judean attitude spawned by the exodus (*Hist.* 5.3.1) and recycles a generalized complaint: *adversus omnes alios hostile odium* (“an aggressive hatred against all others,” 5.5.1).

<sup>1040</sup> The destruction of Egyptian temples, deplored by Manetho (1.239; cf. 1.76) is here also generalized, and practiced after leaving Egypt. On the Judean reputation as “atheists,” see 2.148 with note *ad loc.* The razing of altars is praised by pseudo-Hecataeus (1.193, in very similar language) where it may reflect Hasmonean expansion into Gentile cities (see note to “down” at 1.193); for a more recent example, alleged to have inflamed Gaius, see Philo, *Legat.* 199-202. Tacitus notes Judean hostility specifically to Egyptian Gods (*Hist.* 5.4.2) but also expands this into a general religious contrariety (5.4.1).

<sup>1041</sup> The agreement signals collective responsibility; it is described as an “oath” in 1.318, which may have been a term used by Lysimachus or may be Josephus’ borrowing from Manetho (1.238).

<sup>1042</sup> The Hyksos-type behavior (1.76; cf. 1.249) is directed now against non-Egyptians, the land being inhabited (contrast Hecataeus, *apud* Diodorus 40.3.2) to provide victims for such attacks. The “plundering” of temples (τὰ ἱερὰ σὺλῶντες; cf. 1.249) will be important for the inventive etiology to follow. Pompeius Trogus (in Justin, *Epit.* 36.2.12) knew of the tradition of the “spoiling of the Egyptians” (Exod 3:21-22; cf. Artapanus in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.27.34-35), but if an echo of that story is here present, it is again universalized. Berthelot (2003: 109) suggests a possible reflection of complaint at the Hasmonean treatment of non-Judeans.

<sup>1043</sup> Since Lysimachus named the Judean people

before this point (1.305), he may have thought that the land took its name from the people, rather than vice versa.

<sup>1044</sup> This clever jibe plays on the way ethnographic treatises associate a people’s “disposition” (διάθεσις) with aspects of their history or geographical location. “Hierosyla” is a made-up word, but it obviously derives from the verb ἱεροσυλέω, whose components had been used in the previous sentence. Paul’s strange charge against his fellow-Judeans in Rom 2:22 might have remote roots in this story.

<sup>1045</sup> Lysimachus’ Greek πρὸς τὸ ὀνειδίζεσθαι would more naturally mean “in order to receive opprobrium”; Josephus is either using the prepositional phrase in an unusual sense or a negative is missing (so Hudson, followed by Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster).

<sup>1046</sup> Lysimachus’ joke (it is hardly a serious etymology) trades on the fact that the name of the Judeans’ chief city, once transliterated into Greek or Latin, was regarded as odd (cf. 1.179) and open to several explanations. Tacitus records a story with an eponymous hero, Hierosolymos (*Hist.* 5.2.2), but it was more common to read “Hierusalem” (or equivalents) as made up of a prefix “holy” (“hieros”) and some variant of “Solyma.” Cf. Manetho’s “Solymites” (1.248), Choeirilus’ “Solyman hills” (as interpreted by Josephus, 1.173; see note to “them” at 1.174), and Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2.3. Lysimachus’ suggestion of a change of name encourages his readers to suspect that a malign character lurks under the surface of Judean oddity.

<sup>1047</sup> Josephus does not name Lysimachus in this reply: the use of “this man” (οὗτος) and “this fine man” (ὁ γενναῖος, 1.319), and the direct address to “you” (1.314), make the interaction both scornful and dramatic (cf. 1.304). In his response (1.312-20), Josephus accuses Lysimachus of arbitrary inventiveness (1.312), obscurity (1.313-14, 316), implausibility (1.314-19), and ignorant slander (1.319-20). This variety mixes the rhetorical gestures deployed in the earlier critiques of Manetho and Chaeremon.

<sup>1048</sup> For “concoct” (used four times in a short span

and the Egyptian prophet, has gone off to Ammon's shrine to fetch an oracle about those with scabies and leprosy.<sup>1049</sup> **313** He says that a mass of Judeans gathered in the temples:<sup>1050</sup> does he apply this name to the lepers or was it only Judeans who succumbed to these illnesses?<sup>1051</sup> For he says: "the Judean people."<sup>1052</sup> **314** What kind of people were these? Were they foreign or native by descent? So why, if they were Egyptians, do you call them Judeans? And if they were foreigners, why do you not say where they were from?<sup>1053</sup> If the king drowned many of them in the sea, and drove the rest out into desert locations, how is it that a mass of them survived?<sup>1054</sup> **315** Or how did they cross the desert,<sup>1055</sup> conquer the territory that we now in-

*Obscurity on  
identity of  
"Judeans"*

of text, 1.287, 293, 304, 312), see note to "like" at 1.293. Josephus implies that Lysimachus' research is so poor that he cannot even identify the king properly, assuming that he is otherwise following the same story as the others (cf. note to "foundation" at 1.304). The accusation of pure invention (cf. Manetho and Amenophis in 1.230) is entirely unfair, as Bocchoris is a known historical figure; indeed Josephus himself implies that by his dating in 2.16.

<sup>1049</sup> "Passing over" suggests Lysimachus deliberately discarded the other versions of this story in favor of his own, whereas he seems to have followed a quite different variant with few common features. The dream is a reference to Chaeremon's account (1.289), the prophet to Manetho's (1.232-33, the seer Amenophis). Josephus could certainly have gone on to list a large number of additional differences between Lysimachus' narrative and the previous stories, but that would have become tedious; a few examples are sufficient to make the point. In his comments on Lysimachus, Josephus ignores the category of people called the "unholy and ungodly" (1.306-7) and collapses the material into a single group, with medical labels. An analysis of Lysimachus' use of these categories, at least as reported in 1.305-8, might have exposed multiple inconsistencies (cf. Stern 1.385-86; Bar-Kochva 2001: 16-18). But Josephus' eye is caught by a more urgent issue, the identity of the "Judeans."

<sup>1050</sup> As with Chaeremon (1.302), Josephus is most perturbed by the use of the term "Judeans" in Lysimachus' account (1.305); to neutralize the potential damage, he insists the use is obscure. Since we only have Josephus' paraphrase, we cannot guess the answers to Josephus' questions, but it is unlikely that Lysimachus was as confused or opaque as Josephus makes out.

<sup>1051</sup> The sense of the second question depends on a textual decision. I here follow L and Niese maior, followed by Naber and Thackeray: ἡ μόνον τῶν Ἰουδαίων τοῖς νοσήμασι περιπεσόντων; (the sense would be clearer reading μόνων, as in ed. pr.). On this reading the second question is not about reference so much as plausibility: if the label "Judean" is used to refer to the lepers, was it really only "Judeans" who succumbed? The

following statement, a quote of the précis, would confirm that it looks like this unlikely claim is being made. An alternative reading is possible with slight emendation of the text (in Niese minor, followed by Reinach and Münster): ἡ μόνον τῶν Ἰουδαίων τοῖς νοσήμασι περιπεσοῦσι; ("or only to those of the Judeans who succumbed to these illnesses?"). Josephus' phrase "the mass of the Judeans" (πλήθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων) might indeed be ambiguous (is it a partitive genitive?). But Lysimachus' "the Judean people" (λαὸς τῶν Ἰουδαίων) is not so, and since Josephus immediately quotes this, with the connective "for" (γάρ), it makes less sense for him to raise this possibility; thus, this alternative reading is less likely, as well as being textually insecure.

<sup>1052</sup> Josephus quotes his paraphrase (1.305) and perhaps Lysimachus himself; in contrast to Chaeremon's version (1.292), the label is used from the beginning of the narrative, not just at its end.

<sup>1053</sup> The rhetorical questions (cf. 1.256-59, 271-72) and the direct apostrophe suggest an interrogation of his opponent, not just of his text. Josephus presses the same alternatives as he had in response to Chaeremon (1.298, 302; cf. 1.317 below) and notes the oddity that Egyptians are called "Judeans"; cf. his delight that Manetho makes this distinction quite clear (1.252-53, 278). Lysimachus probably had good answers to these questions, but because Josephus does not indicate fully the context of the phrase "the Judean people" we cannot grasp how he used it.

<sup>1054</sup> The two types of victim in 1.307 now become, more simply, "many" and "the rest." The issue is now the plausibility of the narrative (cf. the multiple πῶς questions in 1.255-59). Josephus' logic is weakened by allowing that some survived the drowning (which is not clear in 1.308) and by not declaring *how many* Lysimachus claimed to have survived; 2.20 shows that Josephus knew this detail, but has omitted it here. It might have been better to press the fact that (it seems) Lysimachus identified the lepers and scabies-sufferers as "Judeans," but then said that this category of unwelcome people were drowned (cf. Reinach 58, n. 1). On that basis, there should be no Judeans left at all.

<sup>1055</sup> Lysimachus had admitted that this was "with

*Implausible  
features of the  
story*

habit,<sup>1056</sup> and both found a city and construct a universally famous sanctuary?<sup>1057</sup> **316** He should not only have related the legislator's name but indicated who he was by descent, and of what parents.<sup>1058</sup> And why would he have attempted to draw up for them such laws about the Gods and such crimes against humanity during their voyage?<sup>1059</sup> **317** If they were Egyptians by descent, they would not have changed from their ancestral customs so easily, and if they were from elsewhere, they would at any rate have had some laws that had been preserved through long habituation.<sup>1060</sup> **318** If they took an oath never to show goodwill to those who had driven them out, that would have been reasonable,<sup>1061</sup> but for these people to wage an implacable war against all humanity, if, as he himself says, they were in dire straits and needing help from all sides, demonstrates the height of folly,<sup>1062</sup> not on their part, but on the part of the one who tells these lies,<sup>1063</sup> who indeed dared to say that they gave their city a name based on temple-plunder and changed it later.<sup>1064</sup> **319** Obviously, the name

considerable difficulties" (1.310) and there is no good reason for Josephus to imply that this was impossible. Since Lysimachus related no fighting in the desert (unlike Manetho), Josephus cannot press this point as well as against Manetho (1.277-78). As with the other points in this section, he trades on a general sense of the practical difficulties inherent in the story Lysimachus tells.

<sup>1056</sup> On Judea as (again) the territory which "we" presently "inhabit," see note to "possess" at 1.1.

<sup>1057</sup> As far as we can tell from 1.310-11, Lysimachus had not stated anything about a temple; cf. the identical addition to Manetho's narrative in 1.228. But this gives Josephus an opportunity to insert a comment in praise of the Judean people; cf. note to "sanctity" at 2.79; Ps.-Hecataeus in 1.196-99; Philo, *Spec.* 1.73 on the impact of the temple on visitors. The Jerusalem temple was extremely well known in Rome, both from the Gaius episode and from its destruction in 70 CE, with the parade of its treasures in the triumphal procession. Tacitus bears witness to its lingering reputation (*Hist.* 5.8.1; 12.1) and may have described it as *aedem sacratam ultra omnia mortalia illustrem* ("a sanctified building famous beyond all mortal objects," *apud* Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2.30.6).

<sup>1058</sup> In Manetho (1.235, 250) and in Chaeremon (1.290), as in Apion (2.10), it is clear that "Moyses" was a native Egyptian. According to Josephus, this is not explicit in Lysimachus, and it invokes in him the same anxiety as the lack of clarity on the identity of "the Judeans." In both cases, Lysimachus is found not to support the claim Josephus most fears—that Judean culture is a distorted version of a more ancient Egyptian original.

<sup>1059</sup> The question leads into the further arguments of 1.317-18, concerning Moses' responsibility for such irreligious and antisocial laws; we can guess from 2.145 that this represents the real force of Lysimachus' narration of this story. The specifics of 1.309 are generalized as "crimes against humanity" (ἡ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἀδι-

κία) to render Lysimachus' charge less plausible (cf. 1.318).

<sup>1060</sup> Josephus offers the same alternatives as in 1.314, with the same anxiety to clarify the identity of the participants in the story. A dramatic change of native Egyptian custom (cf. 1.269) is actually quite understandable given their experience of rejection; Josephus half admits as much in the next section. Lysimachus' narrative indeed implies that Judean contrariness had precisely this cause, and here again Tacitus is the closest parallel (*Hist.* 5.3.1; cf. 5.4.1-2). Josephus' alternative scenario, if the Judeans were outsiders, makes less logical sense, unless it detects an inconsistency between propitiating the Gods (1.308) and vowing to destroy all sanctuaries (1.309).

<sup>1061</sup> Cf. 2.121-22. Josephus' concern with what is "reasonable" (λόγον εἶχεν εἰκότα) mirrors his concern with Manetho's lack of reason (1.256, 259, 271, etc.).

<sup>1062</sup> "Implacable war" translates ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος, which can mean either "undeclared/unheralded war" or "unrelenting/truceless war"; cf. *War* 1.269; 2.30; *Ant.* 15.139 (with Mason *BJP* 1a, note to "heralds" at *War* 2.30; Labow 2005: 329, n. 80). Lysimachus perhaps portrayed the Judeans as brutalized by their experience; their attitude may have been dangerous, but according to the story they did survive. Josephus omits comment on the *religious* intolerance described by Lysimachus; that will be the subject of a much fuller and more delicate discussion in 2.236-86.

<sup>1063</sup> The rhetorical switch from the actors in the narrative to the narrator himself draws attention to the fictionality of the story. Lysimachus' folly (ἄνοια) echoes the general charge against Egyptian historiography in 1.226 (cf. 1.59); his lying (the charge is repeated in 1.319) was made explicit at the outset (1.304).

<sup>1064</sup> As elsewhere (1.59; 2.22; cf. other uses of *τολμᾶω* in 1.45; 2.37), Josephus charges his opponents with audacious behavior when he wishes to raise the rhetorical pitch.

brought shame and hatred on those of later generations, but those who founded the city thought they would adorn themselves by so naming it!<sup>1065</sup> This fine man<sup>1066</sup> got so carried away in his insults<sup>1067</sup> that he did not realize that we Judeans do not use the same term for temple plundering as do Greeks.<sup>1068</sup> **320** What more is there to say to a man who lies so shamelessly?<sup>1069</sup>

But since this book has already reached an appropriate size, when I have made another beginning I shall try to complete the rest of the material relevant to my subject.<sup>1070</sup>

*Close of  
Book 1*

<sup>1065</sup> What is “obvious” (δηλον) is usually Josephus’ point; here the term serves to sharpen his sarcasm. Lysimachus had not claimed a positive purpose for the original name, but Josephus is entitled to expose the absurdity in Lysimachus’ etymological joke.

<sup>1066</sup> Greek: ὁ γενναῖος, with a suggestion of moral nobility. The adjective is used later of Apion (2.32, 42), with the same sarcasm (cf. 1.298 of a narrative feature).

<sup>1067</sup> “Insult” (τὸ λοιδορεῖν) was a prominent term at the opening of this segment (1.219-20), but is used only here of the three authors Josephus has discussed. Being “carried away” (πολλὴ ἀκρασία, lit.: “much weakness of will”) suggests a moral and not just an intellectual fault; cf. its use in 2.244.

<sup>1068</sup> The first person plural reinforces Josephus’ identification with the people under attack; cf. 1.1 “our nation.” Lysimachus’ false etymology works only in Greek, and Josephus’ comment on the Judeans’ language, in the present tense, underlines his sense that Greek is only a second language for Judeans, even when it has been almost perfectly ac-

quired; cf. *Ant.* 20.263-64.

<sup>1069</sup> Josephus’ usual final statement of sufficiency (cf. 1.287, 303) is here made a rhetorical question. Reference to Lysimachus’ shameless lies (ἀναισχύτως ψευδόμενος; cf. 2.32) completes the tone of moral outrage begun in 1.319.

<sup>1070</sup> The completion of the first book may or may not coincide with the completion of a papyrus roll, depending on the size of writing and length of columns; the two books of *Apion* are together shorter than Book 1 of *War*. In any case, it provides a convenient break in the argument. Although the reply to detractors of Judaism still has some way to run (for the agenda, see 1.3-5, 58-59, 219), Josephus has largely finished with stories of the exodus, and will focus on different matters in his far longer response to Apion (2.1-144) and his generalized defense of the Mosaic laws (2.145-286). The strength of his counter-invective against Lysimachus has brought the first book to a fitting climax, and set the mood for the still stronger polemic against Apion.





## BOOK TWO

### *Response to Apion (2.1-144): Reading Options*

Continuing his program of refutation, Josephus devotes the first half of Book 2 to the Alexandrian scholar, Apion, offering his longest and most detailed response to an individual opponent. Apion's material is divided into three sections: "additions" on the topic of the exodus (2.8-27), charges against Judean residents of Alexandria (2.33-78), and accusations against the temple-cult and other Judean practices (2.79-144). Apion is attacked throughout as an ignorant and bombastic "scholar." But Josephus' arguments also turn on his "Egyptian" identity, with many of Apion's criticisms reversed in Josephus' polemics against his Egyptian character or religion. This segment thus contains the most sustained personal invective in the treatise, and the most developed forms of ethnic vituperation.

This material would have been of particular interest to a *Romanized* audience. Apion had once wielded considerable influence in Rome, both as an orator and as a leader of the Alexandrian delegation in dispute with Judeans before Gaius (see note to "scholar" at 2.2). Indeed, of all the authors Josephus counters in this treatise, Apion had left, perhaps, the most insidious legacy in Rome through his portrayal of the cultural and political deficiencies of the Judean people. Josephus' response is also the most overtly political of any segment in the treatise: here Romans and Roman imperial policy are cited on several occasions, in relation to Alexandrian politics (2.37-64), citizenship (2.39-41), imperial statues (2.73-78), and eastern politics (2.125-34).

In fact, almost every issue here addressed would have resonated with central Roman concerns. Josephus does not dwell long on Apion's account of the exodus, but, judging from Tacitus' survey of the dominant views in Rome (*Hist.* 5.2-3), Apion's version was readily recognizable (see Appendix 3). By dating the exodus to the year of the founding of both Carthage and Rome (2.17), Apion had probably implied a fated history of hostility between Judeans and Romans, and in his version of Egyptian history he had portrayed Judeans as instigators of political unrest, an unreliable and dangerous element in the Alexandrian population (2.50, 64, 68, 73). Despite Claudius' attempt at resolving the Alexandrian disturbances (41 CE), renewed violence in Alexandria in 66 and 71 CE continued to remind Romans of the volatility of ethnic relations in that city, while the Judean Revolt (66-70 CE) had provided the greatest possible demonstration of Apion's claim that Judeans were an insubordinate and unruly people. If the "Acts of the Pagan Martyrs" (Musurillo 1954) reflect more than Alexandrian imagination, they also demonstrate that the Judeans' status and rights in Alexandria continued to feature on the political agenda in Rome up to the time of Hadrian. Several of Apion's other charges would have borne particular significance for Roman hearers/readers. To judge from Plutarch and Tacitus, the notion of an ass-cult (2.79-88, 112-20) retained some currency in Rome (see Appendix 4). Apion's claim that the Judeans' ignominious history proved their cultural and religious inferiority (2.125) must have been massively reinforced by the defeat of the Judean Revolt—an event heavily emphasized and vividly portrayed in Rome, legitimizing the Flavian dynasty (Millar 2005). Even Apion's bizarre story of the annual murder of a Greek (2.89-96) would have resonated with cultural prejudices in Rome. Roman horror at the practice of human sacrifice by Gauls/Druids helped fuel her self-understanding as a "civilizing" empire (see note to "story" at 2.90). Although we hear no echo of this particular tale in Roman authors' comments on Judeans, it would certainly have reinforced a Roman perception that Judeans were among the most anti-social people in the world, driven by an "aggressive hatred against all others" (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1: *adversus omnes alios hostile odium*).

Thus, although Apion had been dead for some 50 years, Josephus knew that the prejudices he had sown were still current in Rome and, if anything, magnified by subsequent history. His response is aided by the fact that Apion's reputation was mixed: his scholarly brilliance was famously eccentric, and his self-opinion somewhat irksome (see note to "scholar" at 2.2). Josephus was also able to fix on a detail in Apion's argument to launch an extended tirade against

Cleopatra; exploiting Augustan propaganda he presents her as an enemy both of Judeans and of Rome (2.56-60). On a wider scale, the repeated assaults on Apion's "Egyptian" character and opinions are based upon a tradition of negative ethnic stereotypes, already established in the Hellenistic world but developed and refined in Rome. In Josephus' context, a certain "Egyptomania" had gripped some segments of the population, including a fascination with ancient Egyptian culture and the current cult of Isis (*War* 7.123; Malaise 1972; Takács 1995; Jones 1992: 100-101). But as often in such "orientalizing" phenomena, the exotic was both intriguing and appalling, its priests regarded with awe, its common people considered fickle, superstitious, and madly addicted to the animal cults (Frankfurter 1998: 217-21). Josephus is able to exploit such prejudices on numerous occasions in this segment (e.g., 2.28-32, 41, 66-67, 69, 72, 86, 125-34, 137-44), using Roman incomprehension of Egypt to dissolve and discredit Apion's assaults. At the same time, Josephus embeds in his reply a number of comments which mirror Rome's good opinion of herself and align Judeans with her political interests. Her "benevolence" in granting citizenship (2.40) and her "magnanimity" and "moderation" in allowing her subjects to maintain their religious scruples (2.73-78) are the highlighted characteristics of those "who are now rulers of the world" (2.41). In this, and in the careful presentation of Judeans as her "friends and allies" (2.125-34), the Roman desire to hear from her subjects both good will and political compliance is amply satisfied.

For *Judean readers/hearers* the chief significance of this segment would have lain in its resolute rebuttal of every charge directed against the Judean people. Josephus' clear labelling of all such accusations as "lies," "slanders," and "insults" retrieves the honor of Judeans, deflecting abuse onto an Egyptian race long insulted in the Judean tradition (most recently, by Philo and in *The Wisdom of Solomon*). Although the Alexandrian issues were of local origin, they were echoed in certain respects in many cities throughout the empire: it was crucial for all Judeans everywhere to be able to recount positive narratives of trust, loyalty, and honorific status in the eyes of kings and emperors (2.33-64; cf. *Ant.* 14.185-323; 16.160-78). Josephus certainly had Judean precursors. Here, as elsewhere, he draws from the highly positive portrayal of relations with Ptolemy Philadelphus in *The Letter of Aristeeas*, and he shares some legends with the author of *3 Maccabees*. His account of Alexandrian issues is also close to Philo's historical treatises (*In Flaccum; Legatio ad Gaium*), at least in rhetorical tactic. Although, for much of this segment, his rhetoric is conducted from the back foot, parrying one assault after another, he luxuriates in an opportunity to portray a Judean ideal, of widespread appeal in the Judean Diaspora: a royal pagan patron was "eager to learn about our laws and ancestral philosophy" from their central expression (the scriptures) and on the Judeans' own terms (2.47).

*Christian readers* appear to have shown no special interest in this segment, although the name of Apion was not unfamiliar to some. Tatian cites from the 4<sup>th</sup> book of Apion's *Aegyptiaca*, concerning the antiquity of Moses, but shows no awareness of this riposte by Josephus (*Ad Gr.* 28). In the Ps.-Clementine *Homilies* 4-6, Apion features as a pagan disputant on the topic of Greek mythology: he is known as a "scholar" (grammarian) from Alexandria, and visitor to Rome, and his hatred of the Judeans is noted several times (4.13; 5.2, 29). But this Christian response shows no knowledge of Josephus' work, portraying Apion not as an Egyptian, but as a representative Greek, who discusses not Alexandrian politics but the allegorical sense of Greek myth. Since Christians had their own defense to make on charges of ass-worship, ritual murder, and political insubordination, perhaps Josephus' specifically Judean response on such matters was of limited apologetic value.

*Scholarly interest* in this segment has been immense, for a variety of reasons. Apion himself is a figure of some historical interest, and, despite its evident bias, Josephus' reply offers some of our best historical information about his life and scholarship. In glimpsing aspects of Apion's exodus narrative we gain another witness to the tradition of derogatory accounts as they continued into the Roman era. We also gain, at fuller length, Apion's perspective on Alexandrian issues. Since he was a major participant in these disputes, this is a hugely valuable source for understanding the Alexandrian perspective, to add to our complex portfolio of contemporary materials (for recent treatments see Kasher 1985; Barclay 1996a; Gruen 2002; Gambetti 2003). But this segment also gives us unique access to two infamous libels directed against Judeans in antiquity: the cult of the ass, and the ritual slaughter of a Greek (2.79-120). These are two of the

most frequently discussed features in constructions of ancient “anti-Semitism”; ironically, Josephus supplies our best evidence for the libels he attempted to dispel. As usual, Josephus’ own response to these stories has been of comparatively little interest, though his descriptions of the temple (2. 102-9, 119) have occasionally attracted scholarly interest (e.g., Bauckham 1996).

A *post-colonial* reading of this segment is attracted to its political, or implicitly political, strategies. In the first place, Josephus here develops and deepens the anti-Egyptian rhetoric he had already begun in the preceding segment. In a range of personal comments on Apion, his motives and his life, and through broad invective against the Egyptians’ animal cults and political standing, Josephus uses the ethnic stereotypes and biases of his readers/hearers for his own rhetorical advantage. This is no innocent trading of insults. If the reputation of Judeans had been damaged by Apion, and by events in Alexandria, their honor could only be restored by a wholesale re-description of the parties involved. To label his opponents “Egyptian” while highlighting the honors received from Rome was to restore Judean pride on the back of Egyptian disgrace, a bid to reverse one set of ethnic stereotypes by trading on another (see Barclay 2004). As 2.125-34 suggests, both nations could define their place in the world only with reference to the ultimate dispenser of truth, the imperial power of Rome.

Secondly, Josephus’ rhetorical maneuvers in relation to Rome are particularly intriguing. As Tacitus makes clear (with his own ironic twist), what the Roman elite expected of her subjects was the commitment to serve Rome’s military and political interests, and loyalty to “friendships” established on Roman terms (e.g., *Ann.* 3.60-63). Any signs of “arrogance” or “disrespect” were severely punished (e.g., *Ann.* 3.73; 12.36). In the last resort, Roman military victory proved that the Gods “had empowered the Romans to decide what to give or to take away, and to tolerate no judges but themselves” (*Ann.* 13.56). Josephus is thus at pains to refute any suggestion of political insubordination (2.33-64), and takes immense care in handling the topic of imperial images (2.73-78). His survey of political history in Alexandria is capped, in almost every case, with reference to Roman opinion (2.37, 41-42, 56-64, 71-72, 73-77), and his convoluted portrayal of Judean history climaxes in a portrait of Judeans as Roman allies and friends (2.125-34). Yet, this display of compliance is not without its subtleties and possible counter-currents. At several points Josephus avoids criticism of Rome, but leaves knowledgeable readers the potential to refocus his charge. The Greeks “and some others” have the habit of making statues and portraits, a worthless custom that Moses despised (2.74-75). The blame for the destruction of famous temples falls more on the perpetrators than the victims (2.131)—a charge that others could apply to Rome after 70 CE (see Barclay 2005a). Even the flattery of Roman “benevolence” (2.40) and “magnanimity” (2.73) could sound unduly sweet: those attuned to double-speak, and the insincere fawning of the weak, might suspect an ironic undertone (see Mason 2005b).

Thus, within the constraints of his political circumstances, Josephus exercises the capacity to judge for himself and speaks with sufficient indirection to let others draw various conclusions. Above all, he insists on the Judean right to maintain their own customs, and keep faithful to their own laws. Apion’s charge against would-be citizens is countered by this non-negotiable requirement (2.67), and Rome’s “magnanimity” is praised precisely where she does not compel her subjects to transgress their ancestral laws (2.73). In this respect, Josephus’ flattery is at the same time a demand (cf. Scott 1985), and it is no coincidence that the segment ends with the motto that the wise remain faithful to their own laws and do not insult the laws of others (2.144). Judean compliance with Roman interests is duly offered, but it can never be granted through compromise of the laws and customs that form the heart of Judean culture.

**(2.1) 1** In the former book, my most esteemed Epaphroditus,<sup>1</sup> I demonstrated our antiquity, confirming the truth from the writings of Phoenicians, Chaldeans, and

*Summary of  
Book 1*

<sup>1</sup> The dedication mirrors that in 1.1, with a different epithet (τιμιώτατέ μοι), for variety’s sake; cf. 2.296. On Epaphroditus, see note to “Epaphroditus” at 1.1. It

is common to begin a second book with a short summary of the first and, where appropriate, a secondary dedication; cf. Diodorus 2.1-2; Philo, *Mos.* 2.1; *Prob.*



Apion

Egyptians,<sup>2</sup> and providing many Greek writers as witnesses;<sup>3</sup> I also issued a counter-statement to Manetho, Chaeremon, and certain others.<sup>4</sup> **2** I shall now begin to refute the remaining authors who have written something against us,<sup>5</sup> and in venturing a counter-statement<sup>6</sup> against Apion the “scholar,”<sup>7</sup> it occurred to me to wonder whether

1; Acts 1.1-2 (with Barrett 1994: 64-67); cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 8.1-2; 13.1-2.

<sup>2</sup> For antiquity (ἀρχαιότης) as the theme of the first two-thirds of Book 1, see note to “antiquity” at 1.3. This clause has particularly influenced the ascription of titles to this treatise; see Introduction § 4. The three non-Greek sources of evidence are here, as in Book 1, given greatest emphasis: Phoenician (1.106-27), Chaldaean (1.128-60), and Egyptian (1.73-105). Their different ordering here may reflect a de-emphasis on the Egyptian material, since the epithet “Egyptian” is now almost entirely negative, especially in the Apion-segment. The introductory segments in Book 1 (1.6-68) again get no mention.

<sup>3</sup> On the “witness” language, see note to “witnesses” at 1.79. In the Greek segment (1.161-214), the category “writers” (συγγραφεῖς) is remarkably broad (see note to “compositions” at 1.161). The sentence to this point is a close echo of Josephus’ summary of his achievement in 1.215.

<sup>4</sup> Only here and in 2.2 does Josephus use the term ἀντίρρησις (“counter-statement” or “refutation”). He does not treat these Egyptian exodus narratives as “accusations,” as he does parts of Apion’s material (2.6-7) and the charges of Apollonius Molon (2.147): those require what he calls a “defense” (ἀπολογία, 2.147; cf. 2.137). Manetho’s narrative is relayed and refuted in 1.227-87; Chaeremon’s in 1.288-303. Oddly the Lysimachus section (1.304-20) is here made indefinite and plural—perhaps because Lysimachus is not yet finished with (cf. 2.16, 145), and perhaps to give the impression of comprehensiveness. Troiani (138) thinks Josephus here includes his response to the critics of his own historiography (1.47-56).

<sup>5</sup> This statement suggests that Josephus understands the whole of Book 2 as refutation, even the positive presentation of the Judean constitution in 2.151ff.; Josephus’ introduction of that segment in 2.145-50 confirms that impression (see Introduction § 1). Apion is thus included in this wider (and purportedly comprehensive) refutation, and Josephus’ reply to him will include other authors, cited as his sources (2.79, 112). The verb ἐλέγχω (“refute,” “convict,” or “censure”) was prominent in 1.3-4; its moral tone is evident in 2.5.

<sup>6</sup> The text here is corrupt. The whole phrase in L reads: καὶ τοῖς τῆς πρὸς Ἀπίωνα τὸν γραμματικὸν ἀντιρρήσεως τετολμημένοις, which makes little sense.

Niese posits a lacuna after ἀντιρρήσεως; the Latin appears to paraphrase the whole sentence. The ed. princ. emends the start of the clause to καίτοι περὶ τῆς and omits τετολμημένοις altogether, an emendation followed by most modern editors (Naber, Reinach, Thackeray, Münster). But a simpler and quite adequate emendation by Boysen reads κὰν τοῖς τῆς ... ἀντιρρήσεως τετολμημένοις (cf. *Ant.* 2.25 for this meaning of τολμάω); this is approved by Giangrande (1962: 108-9, n.4) and is translated here.

<sup>7</sup> Josephus immediately foregrounds the label “scholar” (γραμματικός); later uses (2.12, 14, 15, 109) indicate that its tone is ironic. The term means an expert in Greek language and literature (especially Homer) and fits Apion well. Apion is known to us only in fragments (*FGH* 616) and from comments by Josephus and other ancient sources. For analyses of his life and work see Sperling 1886; Gutschmid 1893: 356-71; Cohn in *PW* 1.2803-06; Montanari in *New Pauly* 1.840-41; Schürer revised 3.604-07; van der Horst 2002: 207-21; Dillery 2003; Jones 2005. He rose to prominence in Alexandria in the early years of the first century CE, gained Alexandrian citizenship (2.32), and succeeded Theon as head of the Alexandrian academy (so the *Suda*). He became a world-famous scholar, known in Rome and to the emperor Tiberius (probably before 26 CE; Pliny, *Nat.* preface 25), and was especially prominent in the years 37-41 CE when he conducted a famous lecture tour of Greece (Seneca, *Ep.* 88.40) and headed the Alexandrian delegation to Gaius, blaming the city’s disturbances on the Judeans (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.257-60); he was also personally known in Rome to such luminaries as Pliny the elder (*Nat.* 30.6). According to the *Suda*, he continued to teach in Rome during Claudius’ reign, and probably died around 50 CE (Jacobson 1977). He was thus a well-known figure in the two most important cities of the Roman empire (Rome and Alexandria), and spoke Latin well enough to write a treatise on it (Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 680d). He was clearly a scintillating public performer who left a lasting impression on his hearers, but his writings were also famous (*non incelebres*, Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 5.14.2), especially his five-book *Aegyptiaca* (“Egyptian Matters”) and his works on the language and text of Homer (Neitzel 1977). The fact that he was mentioned by all the writers indicated above, as well as by Aelian (*Nat. an.* 10.29; 11.40) and several early Chris-

it is necessary to make the effort.<sup>8</sup> **3** For some of what he writes is similar to what has been said by others;<sup>9</sup> some things he has added in an extremely artificial manner;<sup>10</sup> but most is of the nature of burlesque<sup>11</sup> and contains, if the truth be told, gross ignorance,<sup>12</sup> as if concocted<sup>13</sup> by a man who is both despicable in character and a lifelong rabble-rouser.<sup>14</sup> **4** However, since most people, because of their folly, are captivated by such language rather than by literature of a serious nature,<sup>15</sup> and enjoy

tian authors (Tatian, the Pseudo-Clementines, etc.; see Reading Options), indicates his fame both in his lifetime and long thereafter. The label γραμματικός, much used by Josephus (see above), is also how he is known by Seneca and Pliny among others (see *FGH* 616, T.5). Aulus Gellius considered him an *eruditus vir* with an encyclopedic knowledge of things Greek (*Noct. att.* 6.8.4; 5.14.1); after his sparkling Greek tour he was dubbed “*Homericus*” (Seneca, *Ep.* 88.40). But he was also known as a grossly self-important figure, who liked to “blow his own trumpet” and was vain enough to think that he conferred immortality on others by dedicating his books to them (Pliny, *Nat.* preface, 25). His brilliant rhetoric was also, apparently, aggressive and bombastic: his nickname, “Pleistonikes” was taken to mean “highly quarrelsome” (Jacobson 1977; cf. 2.56), and Josephus’ criticism of his self-advertisement (2.136; cf. 2.17) is echoed by a remark on his love of ostentation by Aulus Gellius (*Noct. att.* 5.14.3). His scholarship was clearly ingenious, but also sometimes erratic and far-fetched. Many of our sources comment on his striking, but unconvincing, interpretations of texts or natural phenomena (e.g., Seneca, *Ep.* 88.40; Pliny, *Nat.* 30.18; 37.19; Aelian, *Nat. an.* 11.40), and his philological explanations of Homeric terms were later considered eccentric (Neitzel 1977). Josephus knows a good deal about Apion’s life (and death, 2.144) and deploys or masks that information where it suits his argument. It is striking that he never indicates here (despite *Ant.* 18.257-60) Apion’s role in the Alexandrian delegation against the Judeans, although the material in 2.33-78 clearly relates to that dispute. As Jones has shown (2005), he uses elements of Apion’s negative reputation (as a self-important orator and idiosyncratic scholar) to great effect. But in his assault on Apion’s *ethos* (his chief rhetorical strategy), Josephus’ main weapon is denigration of Apion’s (purported) Egyptian ethnicity; see Barclay 1998a and Jones 2005.

<sup>8</sup> In other cases, Josephus finishes his refutations with a statement that he need say no more (1.287, 303, 320). Only here does he start with a claim that he hardly need bother, although he actually gives more attention to Apion than to any other opponent (2.8-144).

<sup>9</sup> It is convenient to present Apion as unoriginal, and thus insignificant; cf. 2.6, 8.

<sup>10</sup> Greek: λίαν ψυχρῶς. Josephus uses the adjective in a similar sense (2.255; cf. *War* 6.200). From its lit-

eral meaning “cold,” the word was employed in the context of rhetoric to mean “artificial,” “exaggerated,” or “empty”; see Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3 *passim*. This matches Apion’s reputation for bombast and dubious scholarship (see note to “scholar” at 2.2).

<sup>11</sup> The term (βωμολοχία) is a hapax in Josephus, and suggests low vulgarity and clownishness; the verb is used of priests of Cybele in Plutarch, *Pyth. Orac.* 25. It was (and remains) a common rhetorical device to accuse one’s most violent critics of resorting to “gutter” tactics, with implications of both social and moral inferiority; cf. Origen’s objections to Celsus in *Cels.* 1.37; 4.30; 6.74.

<sup>12</sup> Greek: πολλὴ ἀπαιδευσία, the greatest imaginable insult to one styled a “scholar” (2.2), for whom παιδεία is his defining virtue. The noun is used again in 2.38, 130, and the cognate adjective in 2.37; cf. the related terms ἀμαθία (“ignorance,” 2.26), φλυαρία/φλυαρήματα (“nonsense,” 2.22, 116), and *omnium gurdissimus* (“the greatest imbecile of all,” 2.88).

<sup>13</sup> The term (συγκείμενα) and related verb συντίθημι are favorites of Josephus (see note to “like” at 1.293); cf. *finxit* at 2.110.

<sup>14</sup> No grounds are given for this moral characterization, which signals the significance of *ethos*-assaults in Josephus’ rhetoric. “Despicable” (φᾶύλος) is a statement about morality as well as status: cf. 1.53 and its use against Judeans in 1.210; 2.236, 290. “Rabble-rouser” (ὀχλαγωγός) seems a strange accusation to throw against a pillar of the Alexandrian establishment, and does not match his reputation evidenced elsewhere. But it is repeated in 2.136 and may reflect Josephus’ judgment on his role in the Alexandrian civic riots (cf. 2.68-69; *Ant.* 18.257-60), generalized as an enduring character trait. Cf. Philo’s characterizations of the Alexandrian civic leaders (oddly not including Apion) in *Flacc.* 20, 135-45; there Isodorus is dubbed ὀχλικός (*Flacc.* 135). Apion accused the Judeans in Alexandria of causing civic strife (2.68).

<sup>15</sup> After the dismissive comments of 2.3, Josephus has to give some justification for the fact that he *will* make a serious effort to refute Apion. This first explanation (the second comes at the end of the section) runs the risk of insulting Josephus’ readers, but is put in generalized terms to explain Apion’s wide popularity. The readers are thus presumed to share Josephus’ scorn for “most people” (οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων; cf. the “rabble” of the previous section), whose “folly” is dem-

insults, while finding expressions of praise irksome,<sup>16</sup> I have deemed it necessary not to leave even this man unscrutinized,<sup>17</sup> since he has composed a charge against us as though in a lawsuit.<sup>18</sup> **5** Besides, I notice that it is also the case that most people are particularly delighted<sup>19</sup> whenever someone who has begun to slander another<sup>20</sup> is himself convicted of vices pertaining to himself.<sup>21</sup> **6** Now it is not easy to follow Apion's discourse or to know for sure what he intends to say.<sup>22</sup> Roughly—as his material is in great disorder, with lies all jumbled up<sup>23</sup>—some of what he says falls into the same category as the material that we have already scrutinized concerning

onstrated by their vulnerability (note the passive, “are captivated”) and low-brow tastes.

<sup>16</sup> Greek: χαίρουσι μὲν ταῖς λοιδορίαις, ἄχθονται δὲ τοῖς ἐπαινοῖς. The language is remarkably close to Demosthenes, *Cor.* 3, and may be borrowed from it: Demosthenes speaks of the natural tendency of all people τῶν μὲν λοιδοριῶν καὶ τῶν κατηγοριῶν ἀκούειν ἡδέως, τοῖς ἐπαινοῦσι δ' αὐτοὺς ἄχθεσθαι (“to listen gladly to insults and accusations, but to find those who praise themselves irksome”). In fact, Demosthenes' statement makes better sense, since praise is more likely to be irksome when it is self-praise. For Josephus' sensitivity regarding his encomium on the Judean constitution, see 2.147. The language of “insult” (λοιδορία) had been used in 1.3, 219-20, 319; it will figure prominently in this segment in its verbal form (2.30, 32, 34, 49, 142, 144; cf. the noun in 2.34 and the echoing statement in 2.295; *detrahere* in 2.111).

<sup>17</sup> On the root of this term (ἀνεξέταστον), see note to “scrutinize” at 1.288: Josephus will scrutinize his character as much as his arguments.

<sup>18</sup> This is the second reason for Josephus' reply. The language of “charge” or “accusation” is prominent throughout this segment: κατηγορία (2.7 [bis], 137); κατηγορος (2.132); κατηγορέω (2.117, 137, 142); ἐγκαλέω (2.137, 138); *accuso* (2.56, 68, 79); *accusatio* (2.63); *culpo* (2.68); *increpo* (2.81). The reference to a “lawsuit” (δίκη) might suggest that Josephus has in mind particularly Apion's role in the Alexandrian embassy, which went to Gaius in 38/39 CE with accusations against the Alexandrian Judeans (*Ant.* 18.257-60; cf. Smallwood 1981: 235-50; Barclay 1996a: 51-60). There are many elements of the Alexandrian material here (2.33-78) that would fit that context precisely (see note to “Alexandria” at 2.33). Despite an early Christian misunderstanding, there is no good evidence that Apion wrote a treatise specifically against Judeans (see Schürer revised 3.606-7; Jones 2005: 310-15); certainly the only work Josephus mentions is his *Aegyptiaca* (2.10). Thus we should conclude that Apion incorporated material reflecting that Alexandrian crisis into his large-scale work, which cannot have been composed until after 39 CE. The precise literary context of this

material is unknown. The portrayal of Apion's material as a “lawsuit” accusation enables Josephus to respond with all the tricks of the court-room, including exaggeration, appeals to emotion, and (particularly) *ethos*-assaults on his “accuser.”

<sup>19</sup> Josephus comes even closer here to placing his readers in this category of “most people” (cf. οἱ πολλοὶ ἄνθρωποι, 2.4); he will certainly provide the “delight” he here mentions. Since *ethos*-attacks were open to the charge of “gutter-tactics,” it was always best, as here, to make a pretense of being above such things, and to insist that one is only responding to one's opponent in kind.

<sup>20</sup> The language of “slander” (βλασφημέω; see 1.2, 59, 221) will recur frequently in this segment: βλασφημία (2.32, 143); *blasphemia* (2.79, 88); cf. *detraho* (2.90, 111); *derogo* (2.73); *derogatio* (2.89).

<sup>21</sup> Josephus regularly turns charges against Judeans back on Apion: concerning Alexandrian citizenship (2.28-32, 42, 71-72), the character of Alexandria (2.34), religion (2.65-67), political sedition (2.68-70), political weakness (2.125-34), diet and circumcision (2.137, 143). Most of these depend on characterizing Apion as “Egyptian”; see note to “Apion” at 2.28, and Barclay 1998a.

<sup>22</sup> Josephus writes as Apion's intellectual superior; cf. 2.3 and the charge of Apion's “stupidity” in 2.13, 18.

<sup>23</sup> Josephus repeatedly accuses Apion of lying: (κατα)ψεύδομαι: 2.14, 28, 29 [bis], 32, 121, 122, 144; ψεῦσμα (2.6, 12, 115); *mentio* (2.79, 85, 90); *mendacium* (2.82, 98, 111); *fallacia verba* (2.88). The “disorder” here implies (what Josephus considers) a confusion of material, rather than a wide distribution, and seems to apply particularly to the third category (see 2.7). In 2.148 Josephus contrasts Apollonius' spread of material with Apion, who has his “grouped together” (ἀθρόον). If we may believe 2.7, there seem to have been two main contexts for Apion's comments on Judeans: the exodus narrative (in the third book of the *Aegyptiaca*, according to 2.10) and the Alexandrian issue. Josephus judged it in his interests to extract from these the material that he himself groups in 2.79-144.

the migration of our ancestors from Egypt;<sup>24</sup> 7 some is a charge against the Judeans who reside in Alexandria;<sup>25</sup> thirdly, there is mixed up with these a charge concerning the ritual practiced in our temple and the rest of our rules.<sup>26</sup>

(2.2) 8 That our fathers were neither Egyptians by descent<sup>27</sup> nor expelled from there because of bodily injury or any other such afflictions,<sup>28</sup> I think I have already demonstrated not merely adequately but more than adequately.<sup>29</sup> 9 I shall mention briefly the material that Apion adds.<sup>30</sup> 10 In the third book of his *Aegyptiaca* he says this:<sup>31</sup>

*Apion on the exodus*

<sup>24</sup> See 2.8-27. Josephus does not describe this as constituting a “charge” (cf. 2.7), and some may have been complementary about Moses (2.10-11). By characterizing it as repetitious (cf. 2.3), Josephus can avoid recounting Apion’s full narrative, and will isolate only those “artificial” features he can ridicule. What Apion seems to have depicted as an “expulsion” (2.8, 20) is here termed merely a “migration” (cf. 2.16, 17, 28).

<sup>25</sup> For the legal language of a “charge,” and the relationship to the Alexandrian crisis in 38-39 CE, see note to “lawsuit” at 2.4. The political charges brought against Alexandrian Judeans at that time are very clear in 2.65, 68, 73, but can be detected throughout 2.33-78.

<sup>26</sup> Greek: νόμιμα, a term much used in Book 2 (2.48, 152, 203, 213, etc.). It is closely related to “laws” (νόμοι), and may sometimes overlap with that term, but need not imply the same degree of legal definition; these are practices which are regulated by custom or precedent. The contents of this third category, which Josephus has artificially separated in 2.79-144, were apparently incorporated with the other two topics (on the “mixing” or “disorder,” see 2.6). It is difficult now to reconstruct how the topics related. Regarding the temple (see 2.79-120), the charge of ass (or ass-head) worship (2.79-88, 112-20) might have been connected with the account of the exodus, to judge from the association between the two made by Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.4.2; cf. 5.3.2). Similarly the accusation of sacrificing “tame animals” (2.137) probably concerns specifically the sacrifice of rams and oxen, associated with Moses’ revulsion against Egyptian religion (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.2). The ban on pork (2.137) may be related to the diseases allegedly suffered by Moses’ followers, requiring their expulsion (2.15; cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.2). On the other hand, the alleged annual sacrifice of a Greek (2.89-110), the oath against Greeks (2.121-24), and the charge of religious stupidity or impiety (2.112, 125) are more likely to relate to the political accusations of anti-Greek and anti-Roman behavior in the Alexandrian riots; they may even supply, together with the ass-stories, some justification for Gaius’ plan to “reform” Judean cult by installing a statue of himself in the Jerusalem temple. By extracting and grouping these elements in his own way, Josephus can conduct the argument on his

terms; for instance, his refutations on the topic of the temple reinforce one another.

<sup>27</sup> Josephus worked hard to address this issue in 1.219-320 (see especially 1.252, 278, 314); “Egyptians by descent” was used before at 1.252, 275, 298, 317. Apion’s claim, implied here, is also evident in 2.28 (and explicit in relation to Moses in 2.10). For Apion such descent would have political as well as historical significance, since it could be used against the claim of Judeans to “Alexandrian” status (see 2.38).

<sup>28</sup> “Bodily injury” (λύμη σωματίων, repeated in 2.289) would normally mean physical impairment, not pollution (*pace* Thackeray, “contagious diseases”). Josephus uses λύμη in the sense of “harm” or “injury” at 2.232; *War* 7.418; *Ant.* 9.96; 17.121. Josephus may here substitute a medical category for one originally to do with pollution (cf. note to “people” at 1.234); cf. his other paraphrases of Apion at 2.15, 23, which also suggest forms of physical impairment. Apion claimed that the expellees contracted groin tumors during the desert march (2.20-27), but we cannot tell from Josephus what he considered to be the cause of their expulsion. For similarly unspecified “afflictions” (συμφοραί), see 2.122. However, if Apion linked the Judeans’ ban on pork (2.137) with the scabies infection contracted by the Judeans’ ancestors (so Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.2), that may represent his version of the plague that necessitated their exodus.

<sup>29</sup> For Josephus’ statements on a job well done, cf. 1.287, 303; here οὐ μετρίως μόνον ... πέρα τοῦ συμμέτρου (cf. 1.303, μετρίωτερον, in a different sense). It suits Josephus to present Apion as largely repeating previous versions of this story. But it is possible that Apion’s story was actually the most devastating (see Appendix 3).

<sup>30</sup> For the language of “additions,” see 1.3, 17. Josephus will mention just three: on Moses’ prayer-houses (2.10-14); on the date of the exodus (2.15-19); and on the contraction of groin tumors (2.20-27). These have no doubt been selected because they are most easily refuted or made to look absurd. As Troiani (141) suggests, it is possible that Apion himself signalled these as additions to his literary sources (from oral tradition, 1.10, or from his own calculations, 2.17). In fact, Apion may be the source through whom Josephus



Moses, as I heard from the elders of the Egyptians,<sup>32</sup> was a Heliopolitan,<sup>33</sup> who, being pledged to his ancestral customs,<sup>34</sup> used to build open-air prayer-houses<sup>35</sup> in line with whatever circuits the sun had,<sup>36</sup> and used to turn them all towards the east; for that is also the orientation of Heliopolis.<sup>37</sup> 11 In place of obelisks he set up pillars,<sup>38</sup> under which there was

gained knowledge of Chaeremon and Lyismachus (cf. 2.20). Troiani suggests this also with regard to Manetho, but Josephus' lengthy quotes suggest that he had independent access to the latter.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. the title of Manetho's work (1.73); both concern the history of Egypt, but probably more besides. According to Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 5.14.4, there were 5 books in this work. Tatian (*Ad Gr.* 38) says that Apion, following Ptolemy of Mendes, records Amosis' destruction of Avaris in Book 4, and Africanus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10.16) connects this event with the exodus. But Africanus is not trustworthy on this matter (see note to "year" at 2.17), and there is no reason to question Josephus' location of this material in Apion's work. What follows is introduced and concluded as if a verbatim citation, which it may well be. Textual problems in both sentences (see below) suggest the text is either corrupt or compressed, though we cannot tell if Josephus cites a text of Apion already garbled or whether the difficulties were created by Josephus, or the tradents of his text. Josephus has picked out this snippet because he finds it bizarre and offensive, and judges it easily discredited.

<sup>32</sup> The phrasing suggests that Apion does not count himself an Egyptian (he does not say "our elders"; cf. 2.28-32, 135). From our fragments of his work, it appears that Apion liked to cite his sources: e.g., eyewitness accounts (Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 5.14.4; 6.8.4), the priests of Hermoupolis (Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.29), Ctesion of Ithaca (Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 16f), and Posidonius and Apollonius Molon (*Apion* 2.79). Here he uses a formula that refers to folk-lore and oral tradition (cf. Manetho's sources in *Apion* 1.105, 229). Similarly, Philo talks of learning about Moses from both "the sacred books" and "some of the elders of the nation" (*Mos.* 1.4: πρεσβύτεροι, as here). Josephus (wilfully?) misconstrues this reference in 2.13.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Manetho, regarding Osarseph, in 1.238, 250. The place of origin, whose name means "city of the sun," is important for the sun associations to follow. Josephus records Joseph's marriage to the daughter of the priest of Heliopolis (*Ant.* 2.91) and states that Jacob and his sons settled there (*Ant.* 2.188). The city is also the centre of the nome in which the temple of Onias was constructed, at Leontopolis (*War* 1.33; 7.420-36; *Ant.* 12.387-88; 13.62-73, 285; 20.236); it is just possible that the following description of prayer-houses has some link with that fact (see below, at "Heliopolis").

<sup>34</sup> "Being pledged" (κατηγγυημένος) is a rare use

of the passive of κατεγγυάω (to give, or make another give, something as security). His ancestral customs are apparently taken to be *Egyptian* and unshakeable. What follows need not imply criticism of Moses, just that his behavior betrayed his Heliopolitan origins. But since we do not know when and where Apion placed the building work to be described, it is hard to see what nuances are intended.

<sup>35</sup> The term (προσευχαί) is distinctively Judean in its application to a meeting-place or building. It is well-attested in Ptolemaic inscriptions from Egypt (Horbury & Noy 1992: nos. 9, 13, 22, 24, 25, 117, 125, 126, 127) and was similarly known in Rome (Philo, *Legat.* 156; Juvenal, *Sat.* 3.296); see Hengel 1971; Levinskaya 1996: 207-25; Levine 2000. "Open-air" suggests that the location, or the main part of the structure, was unroofed (cf. Acts 16.13?), and the following reference to the circuits of the sun (?) suggests that this was structurally necessary. Apion appears to be offering some etiological explanation for an aspect of "prayer-houses" recognizable to his readers, but the problems in our text, and the lack of context, make this impossible to discern. For other etiological aspects of exodus stories, see Appendix 3.

<sup>36</sup> Greek: εἰς οἴους εἶχεν ἥλιος περιβόλους (L, followed by Niese). The Latin reads: *templa enim quae habuit haec civitas ...* ("for the temples that this city had ..."). For ἥλιος ("sun"), S reads ἡ πόλις ("the city"). This is followed by Naber, Reinach, and Thackeray (cf. Jacoby, *FGH* 3.C, 127), understanding περιβόλους ("circuits") as the walls or precincts of the city. L's Greek is certainly difficult and probably corrupt, but the circuiting of the sun seems to be important in relation to the preceding "open-air" and the following 2.11, and the word ἥλιος ("sun") should probably be retained. Schreckenberg 1977: 163-64, tentatively suggested reading εἶδεν ("saw") in place of εἶχεν ("had"), an emendation followed in Münster but not adopted here.

<sup>37</sup> For the importance of solar-worship in Heliopolis, see Allen in Redford 2001: 2.88-89; Kákosy in *LÄ* 2.1111-13. It is not clear if Apion is talking about Moses' practice in Egypt (Müller 226) or in the new city settled by his followers and equipped with prayer-houses (so Jacoby, *FGH* 3.C, 127; Schäfer 1997a: 29). In this case, the point might be that the peculiar customs of Judeans were adaptations of Egyptian religious practices. But which customs? Although Josephus mentions Judean worship as east-facing, or sun-revering, in

the base of a sundial sculptured in relief;<sup>39</sup> this had the shadow of a statue<sup>40</sup> cast upon it, in such a way that this went round in accordance with the course of the sun as it travels continuously through the air.<sup>41</sup>

12 Such is the amazing statement of the “scholar.”<sup>42</sup> Its falsity does not need to be argued, but is quite evident from the facts.<sup>43</sup> For neither did Moses himself, when he constructed the first Tent for God, place in it any such sculptured object, nor did he instruct his successors to make one.<sup>44</sup> And Solomon, who later constructed the sanc-

*Errors in  
Apion's story*

isolated cases (*Ant.* 3.115; 4.305; *War* 2.128, of the Essenes; cf. Ezek 47:1 and *m. Sukkah* 5.2-4 of the Jerusalem temple), these were hardly familiar or distinctive enough to found this comment about Moses’ “prayer-houses.” In the Egyptian context, Philo’s comment about the Therapeutae greeting the rising sun (*Contempl.* 89), if it reflects any reality, is hardly applicable to other Judeans. The temple in Leontopolis, associated with “the city of the sun” (Is 18:18-19), may have contained a special feature relating to light, though Josephus describes lamp-light as important, not sunlight (*War* 7.428-29). Perhaps the prayer-houses known to Apion (in Egypt or Rome) were east-facing, but we do not have archaeological evidence to establish this.

<sup>38</sup> The obelisks of Heliopolis were famous: see Jer 43:13; Herodotus 2.111.4 (with Lloyd 1988: 42-43); two were transported by Augustus to Rome in 10 BCE and placed in the Circus Maximus and Campus Martius (Ammianus Marcellinus 17.12). Moses is here made responsible for a modification of this tradition, perhaps a *corruption* of his Egyptian culture, to discredit his own degenerate offshoot (Boys-Stones 2001:71-72). But what Apion has in mind by these pillars, and the sundial described hereafter, is obscure. For the five pillars at the entrance to the Tabernacle, see Exod 26:37 (*Ant.* 3.123), but Apion would had to read the LXX very carefully to know about those, or about the two enormous pillars in Solomon’s temple, I Kgs 7:15-22 (see Reinach 1900: 14).

<sup>39</sup> Greek: ὑφ’ οἷς ἦν ἐκτύπωμα σκάφης (L and other codd. read σκάφη). ἐκτύπωμα means something carved in relief (Josephus picks up the term in 2.12). σκάφη can mean a boat (so Thackeray), but also the concave, hemispherical base of a sundial (Vitruvius 9.8.1: *scaphe sive hemisphaerium*; other references in Reinach 1900: 13; cf. Gibbs 1976: 30-35, 60); the latter sense fits better with what follows.

<sup>40</sup> Here again the text seems corrupt: L and S read ἀνδρός (“of a man”); Münster follows Thackeray and Reinach in emending to ἀνδριάντος (“of a statue”). There is no equivalent term in the Latin. The statue is presumably what constitutes the upright in the sundial; cf. Herodotus 2.149.2, referring to pyramids with stone figures on the top. If Apion knew the LXX well, it is

just possible that he is alluding to the cherubim whose wings “overshadowed” the top of the ark (Exod 25:18-20); but it is a long stretch from there to a sundial. If Apion refers here to a statue, or something equivalent, it would have been useful fodder for his attack on the Judean refusal to allow statues of the emperor (2.73); if Moses allowed such a thing, their denial of this honor to the emperors could be ascribed only to political insubordination, not religious taboo.

<sup>41</sup> There are minor problems in the Greek at the start of the clause (L, S read ὡς ὅτι; Münster, following Reinach, reads ὃν οὗτος) but the general sense is moderately clear: as the sun circles the sky, the shadow tells the time. Is Moses being credited here with the invention of the sundial? If so, this is a high honor (cf. Vitruvius 9.8.1, ascribing the “hemisphere” or σκάφη to Aristarchus of Samos; cf. Pliny, *Nat.* 2.187). Feldman suggests (1988: 198-99) that a famous pillar, of unknown origin, served as a sundial and was attributed to Moses. In truth, without the larger context, we cannot tell what Apion was claiming, nor why. On sundials in antiquity, see Gibbs 1976.

<sup>42</sup> On Josephus’ ironic use of this label (again in 2.14, 15), see note to “scholar” at 2.2. He is here refuted by the simple statement of a few facts. The adjective θαυμαστός (“amazing”) and its cognate verb will be used frequently in response to Apion (2.20, 25, 28, 125, 135; cf. *admiror*, 2.79), with heavy sarcasm; cf. 1.302.

<sup>43</sup> Josephus here contrasts the deployment of arguments (Greek: λόγοι, “words,” i.e., “artificial” proofs) with the use of facts (Greek: ἔργα, “acts,” i.e., “inartificial” proofs). The “facts” will actually be drawn from the Judean scriptures—no neutral source. “Falsity” (ψεῦσμα, see note to “up” at 2.6) is immediately asserted as entirely “evident,” since Josephus likes to declare his judgments immediately, before conducting the argument to support them (cf. 1.252).

<sup>44</sup> On Moses’ Tent (Tabernacle), see Josephus’ description in *Ant.* 3.102-50, based on Exodus 25-27, 36-38. It was emphasized there that the curtain tapestry had no shapes of living things “molded” on it (LXX ἐξετυπουντο, from the same root as the noun ἐκτύπωμα in 2.11; *Ant.* 3.113; cf. 3.126). But Josephus did there mention some features which might be seen to corre-

tuary in Hierosolyma, refrained from any such curiosity of the kind that Apion has fabricated.<sup>45</sup> **13** He says that he heard from “the elders” that Moses was a Heliopolitan; evidently, being younger himself, he has trusted those who, because of their age, knew Moses and were his contemporaries!<sup>46</sup> **14** With regard to the poet Homer, though he is a “scholar” he would not be able to say with confidence what his homeland was,<sup>47</sup> nor with regard to Pythagoras, who lived just about “yesterday or the day before”;<sup>48</sup> but with regard to Moses, who preceded these men by such a vast number of years,<sup>49</sup> he gives his opinion with such ease, trusting the report of elders, that he is clearly telling lies.<sup>50</sup>

*The date of the exodus*

**15** With respect to the date<sup>51</sup> at which he says Moses led out the lepers, the blind,

spond to Apion’s description: the tent had prominent pillars (*Ant.* 3.123), faced east, to catch the rising sun (3.115), and had a very important carving in its holiest place, the two “figures” (πρόστυποι) of the cherubim (3.137, based on Exod 25:18-20; 37:7-9). Moses’ instruction to his successors may allude to the second commandment (Exod 20:4; *Ant.* 3.91; *Apion* 2.191).

<sup>45</sup> Solomon’s temple is described in *Ant.* 8.61-98 (based on 1 Kings 6-7). It contained two prominent pillars (*Ant.* 8.77-78), the cherubim (8.72-73, 103), and ten lavers, with carved reliefs of animals (8.81-86). Josephus had criticized Solomon for the construction of bronze bulls in the temple (*Ant.* 8.195). But none of these would correspond to Apion’s sundials.

<sup>46</sup> Having contradicted Apion’s facts, Josephus ridicules his purported source. Where Apion had meant “the elders” in the sense of the bearers of oral tradition (see note to “Egyptians” at 2.10; cf. *Ant.* 13.292), Josephus takes him to mean strictly the next generation above him. Moreover, Josephus arbitrarily deduces that these “older people” claimed to know Moses at firsthand. Since Apion is soon shown to have dated the exodus hundreds of years before (2.17), this is clearly a complete misconstrual of his meaning, but Josephus is not above taking cheap rhetorical shots. There is an added nuance of Apion’s gullibility, taking things “on trust,” rather than finding them out for himself; the verb πιστεύω (“trust”) will be repeated in the next section.

<sup>47</sup> The title “scholar” (γραμματικός) here has special irony, since it signals above all an expertise in Homeric literature; Apion was famous in this field, and was dubbed “Mr. Homer” (*Homericus*) after a notable lecture tour of Greece (Seneca, *Ep.* 88.40). Homer’s birthplace had been debated since the Archaic period (see, e.g., *Hym. Hom. Apollo* 172-73; Chios; Pindar frag. 264 [ed. Maehler]: Chios or Smyrna; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 3.11: Colophon, Smyrna, Athens, or Egypt); the issue was famously irresolvable. Josephus may assume that Apion was as uncertain on this as everyone else. But it is possible that he alludes to a specific anecdote, according to which Apion claimed to have called

up the “shades” to enquire from Homer himself about his homeland but, when he had received an answer, declared himself unable to divulge it (Pliny, *Nat.* 30.18). The argument is structured *a minori*: if Apion does not know the equivalent facts in his area of expertise, how can he claim to know the birthplace of someone else? This and the parallel argument, about relative antiquity, have only superficial force, since historical knowledge is normally patchy, and can be more accurate on some remote or distant facts than on matters nearer to hand.

<sup>48</sup> For this expression, also in 2.154, see note to “before” at 1.7. Josephus always uses it in this treatise in relation to the comparative youth of the Greeks. In 1.14 Pythagoras is named among the first Greek philosophers and in 1.162 dubbed “ancient” (ἀρχαῖος), as suits the rhetorical needs of that context. Here, by contrast, he is considered (comparatively) recent. He probably lived in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. His homeland is named without hesitation in 1.162 as Samos, but is here (as often elsewhere) regarded as a matter of uncertainty: see note to “Samian” at 1.162, and the options canvassed in Diogenes Laertius 8.1; Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 1, 5; Clement, *Strom.* 1.14.62.

<sup>49</sup> On the dating of Homer, some time after the Trojan War, see note to “events” at 1.12; on Pythagoras, see the previous note. Josephus consistently dates Moses at least 2,000 years in the past (1.36; 2.226; *Ant.* 1.16).

<sup>50</sup> Apion’s naivety is reinforced with the further reference to “trust,” but the main thrust of the charge is that he cannot know the truth on this matter and is simply making things up (cf. 1.15). The last word (καταψευσάμενος, “telling lies”) echoes ψεῦσμα (“falsity”) in 2.12, to bracket the whole discussion.

<sup>51</sup> The following discussion of Apion’s dating (2.15-19) gives Josephus an opportunity both to expose discrepancies between different authors (2.15-16; cf. 1.293-303) and to convict Apion of a historical error (2.17-19). Josephus thus emerges as the better “scholar.”

and those whose feet were crippled,<sup>52</sup> the precise “scholar” is in complete agreement, I should imagine, with his predecessors.<sup>53</sup> **16** In fact, Manetho says that the Judeans left Egypt during the reign of Tethmosis, 393 years before Danaus’ flight to Argos,<sup>54</sup> Lysimachus when Bocchoris was king, that is, 1700 years ago,<sup>55</sup> and Molon and some others as seems good to them.<sup>56</sup> **17** Apion, being of course the most reliable of them all,<sup>57</sup> fixed the date of the exodus precisely during the seventh Olympiad, and in its first year,<sup>58</sup> the year in which, he says, the Phoenicians founded Karchedon (Carthage).<sup>59</sup> He certainly added this reference to Karchedon thinking it would be

<sup>52</sup> The last phrase (τὰς βόσσεις πεπηρωμένους) is almost certainly Josephus’ own (cf. its use in *Ant.* 7.61, 113); cf. the reference to the “lame” in 2.23, where Josephus notes the absurdity of Moses leading across the desert people who are unable to walk.

<sup>53</sup> Josephus supplements yet another use of “scholar” (γραμματικός, cf. 2.2, 12, 14) with the adjective “precise” or “accurate” (ἀκριβής); cf. 2.17. He seems to presuppose that truthfulness would require agreement among sources (cf. 1.26, 293) and that disagreement discredits them all (cf. 1.15-27). A historian in the Greek tradition would argue otherwise.

<sup>54</sup> On the dating, see note to “Argos” at 1.103. Here again Josephus does not correlate the various dates by placing them on a common chronological scale.

<sup>55</sup> See note to “Egyptians” at 1.305. In 1.312 Josephus suggested that Lysimachus had made up this name, but here he is a real king, with a datable reign. Bocchoris probably reigned ca. 720–715 BCE, but from some versions of Manetho’s account of the 24<sup>th</sup> Dynasty it was possible to conclude that he reigned earlier in the eighth century, and for 44 years (see Motzo 1912-13: 466-67). It is likely that Apion, following Lysimachus, also placed the exodus in Bocchoris’ reign, but specified the precise year (see 2.17). Josephus, however, places Bocchoris in the much more distant past, for reasons that remain obscure. One has the impression that he has plucked his figure out of the air. He makes no attempt to correlate this with the date of Danaus’ flight to Argos, unless the πρό here should be interpreted in another sense, as “1700 years earlier,” rather than “1700 years ago.” Josephus omits mention of Chaeremon, for obvious reasons: he *agreed* with Manetho on the dating of the exodus (1.288).

<sup>56</sup> For Molon, who has not previously been mentioned or introduced, see note to “Molon” at 2.79. The reference to “Molon and some others” (cf. 2.145) is vague, and no dates are specified; but Josephus needs a third name to make a rhetorical tricolon. Since he discussed Moses (2.145), it is likely that Molon made some effort to place him historically. Moses’ fame was sufficiently widespread to encourage non-Judean authors to integrate him into larger chronological schemes, at least from the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE (see

Wacholder 1968). Josephus’ suggestion that they did this arbitrarily (ὡς αὐτοῖς ἔδοξεν) matches his complaint about Greek historical license, 1.20.

<sup>57</sup> Josephus echoes ironically Apion’s huge self-opinion (see 2.2, note at “scholar”). This “most reliable” scholar turns out here to be demonstrably wrong.

<sup>58</sup> The Olympiad dating starts in 776/75 BCE, so the seventh Olympiad is 752-49 BCE, and its first year 752 BCE. Using the Greek chronological scheme, Apion is able to place Egyptian events into a framework by now universally accepted. Apion surely mentioned the name of the Egyptian king in whose reign the exodus took place, and this was almost certainly Bocchoris: on other matters he agreed with Lysimachus (2.20), and Josephus’ silence on this matter is suspect (it would signal the *agreement* he wishes to deny). Bocchoris could have been taken to reign at this period (see note to “ago” at 2.16), so Apion is merely specifying the precise year during his reign. Africanus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10.16) is certainly wrong to claim that Apion placed Moses’ exodus at a much earlier point in time, during the reign of Amosis. It is possible to trace how this error arose. According to Tatian (*Ad Gr.* 38), Apion reported the claim by Ptolemy of Mendes that Amosis destroyed Avaris, and followed Ptolemy in placing Amosis in the time of Inachus. In the same passage from Tatian, Ptolemy of Mendes is reported (whether accurately or not) as having claimed that the Judeans, under Moses, left Egypt in the time of Amosis. Tatian does *not* say that Apion either reported this last claim or agreed with it, but the juxtaposition of these remarks led Clement to imply (*Strom.* 1.101.5), and Africanus to state, that Apion followed Ptolemy in dating the exodus to the time of Amosis. Some scholars have been similarly misled (e.g., Wacholder 1968: 478-79).

<sup>59</sup> On the date of the founding of Carthage, see note to “Karchedon (Carthage)” at 1.125. The origins of Carthage were sometimes placed rather earlier: according to Timaeus (*apud* Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.74) in 814/13 BCE (cf. Cicero, *Resp.* 2.42), according to Pompeius Trogus (in Justin, *Epitome* 18.6.9) in 825 BCE. Apion’s alignment of dates is by no means arbitrary. Where Timaeus had dated the founding of



very clear evidence of his veracity, not realizing that he was incorporating something that refuted himself.<sup>60</sup> **18** For if one may believe the Phoenician records concerning the colony,<sup>61</sup> king Eiromos is there recorded as having lived more than 150 years before the founding of Carthage.<sup>62</sup> Concerning this man, I earlier provided proofs from the Phoenician records **19** that Eiromos was a friend of Solomon who built the sanctuary in Hierosolyma, and contributed much towards the construction of the sanctuary.<sup>63</sup> But Solomon himself built the sanctuary 612 years after the Judeans left Egypt.<sup>64</sup>

*The crossing of  
the desert*

**20** Having guessed, for the number of those expelled, the same figure as Lysimachus (he says there were 110,000),<sup>65</sup> he offers an amazing and persuasive

Carthage and Rome to the same year (814/13 BCE), Apion agrees with the correlation but shifts it to the date fixed by Porcius Cato and by then universally agreed as the year of Rome's foundation, 752/1 BCE (Cicero, *Resp.* 2.18). Thus, although Josephus does not here reveal it, Apion apparently effected a triple correlation between the founding of Rome, the founding of Carthage, and the exodus from Egypt. We have to suppose that this had some symbolic significance for Apion (so Momigliano 1977: 187-88; cf. Troiani 144). Just as the simultaneous founding of Carthage and Rome symbolized their future animosity, as bitter rivals for control of the Mediterranean, so the dating of the exodus and the foundation of the Judean nation in this very year signalled the future hostility between Judeans and Rome. Apion later attempted to prove this hostility through the evidence of historical events (2.50, 63), political disturbances (2.68), and disrespect towards the emperors (2.73); but that the Judean nation began in the same year as the founding of Carthage, simultaneous with the foundation of Rome, was a harbinger of future trouble. Josephus understandably omits reference to Rome in this context, and focuses only on the alignment with Carthage.

<sup>60</sup> On Apion's unconvincing "additions," see 2.3, 9. Josephus is delighted to find a point at which Apion's cleverness backfires, his self-refutation (or "conviction," ἔλεγχος) echoing the principle of 2.5. The fact that Apion did not even realize this is further confirmation of his ignorance (see 2.3).

<sup>61</sup> The text is uncertain. L reads περὶ τῆς ἀπιστίας ("concerning the disbelief"), which must be wrong (although supported by the Latin). Niese suggests removing the phrase; ed. princ. changes to περὶ τῆς ἀποικίας, an emendation followed by Naber, Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster, and translated here. For Josephus' valuation of the Phoenician records, see 1.8, 106.

<sup>62</sup> Josephus depends on his earlier citation from Menander (not directly the Phoenician records) in 1.121-26, whose figures add up to 155 years, 8 months (1.126). Münster follows Niese's conjectural emenda-

tion of πλείοσι ("more") to πέντε ("five"), thus making the figure of 155; I prefer to keep the text as it stands. The argument here (2.18-19) has three steps: i) Eiromos was 150+ years before the founding of Carthage; ii) Eiromos was a contemporary of Solomon; iii) Solomon can be dated 612 years *after* the exodus. Although the first two derive (at one remove) from the Phoenician records, the last is dependent on Josephus' scriptures, an additional source not here identified.

<sup>63</sup> See 1.113-20, citing Dios and Menander on the contact between Eiromos and Solomon. Their *friendship* is actually attested only by Josephus himself, in his introduction to the citations (1.109, 111), and Eiromos' contribution to the *Jerusalem* sanctuary is similarly inferred by Josephus, not stated in his Phoenician sources; see note to "roof" at 1.110.

<sup>64</sup> This last fact, simply stated by Josephus, can only derive from his biblical source. 1 Kgs 6:1 has the interval as 480 years (LXX: 440), but Josephus records it variously as 592 years (*Ant.* 8.61) or 612 (*Ant.* 20.230, as here). The reasons for the discrepancies are obscure. If we add the 143 years from the building of the Jerusalem temple to the founding of Carthage (1.126), that would make the exodus 755 years before the establishment of Carthage—a large margin of error on Apion's part! If one were to accept Apion's dating of the founding of Carthage, in 752 BCE, that would date the exodus at 1507 BCE, still somewhat short of the 2,000 years Josephus places between Moses and his own day (see 2.14, note at "years"). But Josephus does not perform any such computation, or commit himself to Apion's date for the founding of Carthage.

<sup>65</sup> Josephus had not recorded the number in his précis of Lysimachus (1.307-9; cf. Manetho in 1.89 and Chaeremon in 1.292). It is odd that he should advertize here Apion's *agreement* with Lysimachus, after emphasizing differences in dating in 2.15-17. He probably does so because Apion himself indicated his agreement with Lysimachus, and perhaps used Lysimachus explicitly as his source. Their agreement on the date of the exodus (see 2.17) could be explained in the same way, and it is possible that most of Apion's narrative was

reason<sup>66</sup> for how, he says, the *sabbaton* got its name.<sup>67</sup> **21** When they had travelled for six days, he says,<sup>68</sup> they contracted swellings in the groin<sup>69</sup> and for this reason rested on the seventh day, after arriving safely in the land that is now called Judea;<sup>70</sup> and they called that day *sabbaton*, preserving the Egyptian language, for the Egyptians call the inflammation of the groin *sabbatōsis*.<sup>71</sup> **22** Would not anyone either

*The origin of  
sabbaton*

built on that of Lysimachus, supplemented with his own additions; what follows here perhaps fills out the “considerable difficulties” recorded by Lysimachus (1.310; see 2.3). Indeed, Josephus may have known Lysimachus only through Apion (so Troiani 145). In any case, while acknowledging this agreement, Josephus cannot allow it as evidence of their truthfulness (despite 1.26): it can be only a matter of chance, each plucking a figure out of the air (cf. the guessing by Greek historians in 1.15, 45). The large number will serve Josephus’ rhetorical purposes in 2.22.

<sup>66</sup> For “amazing” (θαυμαστήν), see note to “scholar” at 2.12. “Persuasive” (πιθανήν) is similarly sarcastic (cf. ἀπίθανος in 1.105), as was “most reliable” in 2.17. Josephus thus loads the rhetorical scales against his opponent, before he begins his argument (see further Barclay 1998a). He speaks here of Apion’s offering a “reason” (αἰτία), and it appears that all Apion’s “additions” had etiological purposes—concerning the “prayer-houses,” the Judeans’ hostility to Rome (see note to “Carthage” at 2.17), and now the Judean word *sabbaton*.

<sup>67</sup> The Hebrew term שַׁבָּת was regularly transliterated into Greek (σάββατον and variants) and Latin (*sabbaton* or *sabbata*). For its use in Egypt, see CPJ 10 and the names, such as Sambathion, which seem to be derived from it (see Tcherikover in CPJ III: 43-56). In one variant or another, the term occurs very regularly in comments on Judeans by Roman authors (e.g., Ovid, *Remedia* 220; Horace, *Sat.* 1.9.69; Seneca, *Ep.* 95.47; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.159; Martial, *Epigr.* 4.4.7; Suetonius, *Aug.* 76.2; *Tib.* 32.2). It naturally occasioned some speculation as to its meaning and origin; cf. Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 671f-672a, who connects it with “Sabi,” a Bacchic cry to Dionysus. Apion ingeniously offers a narrative that explains both the seventh-day rest and its distinctive Judean name.

<sup>68</sup> It is uncertain whether this passage is verbatim citation or paraphrase. It is not clearly demarcated by a citation formula (placed before or after the quotation), as in 1.93, 165, 185, 201; 2.10, etc. Nor is it unambiguously paraphrase or précis, as in cases of indirect speech (e.g., 1.232, 289; 2.25). Here “he says” (φησίν) is placed within the text from Apion (also in 2.33), and there is some awkwardness in the Greek (σωθέντες, “after arriving safely,” hangs loosely in the sentence). Since it may be more paraphrase than citation, I refrain from

using quotation marks, unlike other translators. Without its context, it is impossible to tell what this 6-day journey represents, and it is tempting to take it as the journey all the way from Egypt to Judea. But from a later précis of Apion (2.25) there are reasons to think that this could be the journey from Sinai.

<sup>69</sup> Greek: βουβῶνας ἔσχον. The term βουβῶν can mean the groin (cf. *War* 3.335) or a swelling in the groin. Here it means the latter. It recurs later in this section in the phrase ἄλγος βουβῶνος (“inflammation of the groin”).

<sup>70</sup> Apion here explains the distinctive Judean custom of rest on the 7<sup>th</sup> day, combining rest at a journey’s end with rest required for medical recuperation. Other authors also identified some feature of the exodus as explaining the sabbath. Pompeius Trogus (in Justin, *Epitome* 36.2.14) speaks of a 7-day fast in the desert (explaining sabbath fasts); Plutarch alludes to the notion of a 7-day flight from Egypt (Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 363 c-d); and Tacitus has the Judeans arrive and rest after a 6-day crossing (*Hist.* 5.3.2; 5.4.3).

<sup>71</sup> Greek: σαββάτωσις (L) or σαββάτωσιν (ed. princ.), followed by Niese and Naber. Of the Latin texts, one (P) has *sabbato* and others (C, R, V) *sabbo*. In 2.26-27 Josephus insists that σαββῶ and σάββατον are very different, and suggests that Apion gave an interpretation of the former, Egyptian, term. There are two possible solutions: 1. The Greek text here should be emended (in line with some of the Latin MSS), to read σαββῶ; so Reinach 1900:14-15, Thackeray, and Münster; *sabbato* and σαββάτωσις represent scribal alterations to suggest some link with *sabbaton*. 2. Josephus is not citing Apion verbatim (see note above, at “says”) but giving a shortened version of his argument, leaving out a step in Apion’s logic. Apion probably claimed that the Egyptian word for groin/penis was σαββῶ, and that its inflammation was known as σαββάτωσις (a made-up word, its ending matching other medical terms). This inflammation was what gave the *sabbaton* its name. In shortening Apion’s argument, Josephus misses out the first step, though he knows it and refers to it in 2.26-27. Realizing that the reasoning given here did not match 2.26-27, some of the scribes of the Latin textual tradition created a match by writing here *sabbo*. This second solution seems to me now the most likely (*contra* Barclay 1998a: 207, n.27) and commends itself as soon as one breaks away from the

*Implausible  
features of the  
story*

laugh at such nonsense or alternatively detest the effrontery in writing such things?<sup>72</sup> Obviously, all 110,000 contracted such inflammation of the groin!<sup>73</sup> **23** But if they were blind and lame and sick in every way, such as Apion says they were, they would not have been able to make even one day's journey!<sup>74</sup> And if they were able to cross an extensive desert and, moreover, defeat those who opposed them,<sup>75</sup> all taking part in the fight,<sup>76</sup> they were not afflicted *en masse* with groin-swellings after the sixth day.<sup>77</sup> **24** For it is not natural for such a thing to happen to those on a march;<sup>78</sup> many thousands in army units march at a steady pace continuously for

illegitimate assumption that 2.21 represents a complete and verbatim quotation from Apion. For another example of Josephus' response not quite matching the way he cited his source, see, e.g., 1.245 with 1.274. Apion had a special delight in ingenious etymologies, as we know from his many suggestions with regard to obscure Homeric terms (Neitzel 1977; van der Horst 2002: 214-20). He clearly preferred original and striking solutions, which others found unconvincing. If he knew Lysimachus, he may have taken a cue from Lysimachus' malicious suggestion about the origin of the name *Hierosolyma* (1.311) and composed a similarly mischievous explanation for the name *sabbaton* (cf. his joke on the name "Onias" in 2.49). He was able to deploy his superior knowledge of Egyptian vocabulary and could reinforce hereby the claim that the Judeans were, by origin, Egyptians. The word *sabbo* probably meant (or was claimed by Apion to mean) groin (cf. Jablónski 1804: 235-42 on the Coptic and Sahidic terms for circumcision, though the inferences he draws are not all convincing). Apion probably claimed that the 6-day march produced an inflammation of the groin (which he dubbed *sabbatōsis*), giving its name to the day on which they were forced to rest. Because Josephus has not given us Apion's full reasoning, we cannot trace his etymological claims with confidence, but that outlined above is, characteristically, both inventive and philologically implausible. (The alternative explanation by Scheller 1955 has σαββάτωσις derive from *sabbaton*, rather than vice versa, as a 7th-day rest from sexual activity necessitated by groin inflammation: but this provides no link with *sabbo* or with Egyptian vocabulary.)

<sup>72</sup> Josephus likes to offer two alternatives, both devastating to Apion's reputation (see again at 2.26 below). Here the choice is between Apion spouting "nonsense" (φλυαρία; cf. φλυαρήματα, 2.116 and the many accusations of "ignorance" from 2.3 onwards) and Apion, in full knowledge of his lies, showing wilful effrontery (ἀναίδεια; cf. 2.26 and the adverb in 1.46; 2.287; ἀναισχύντως, 2.32; *praesumo* in 2.80, 89; *impudentia canis*, 2.85).

<sup>73</sup> For the sarcastic "obviously" (δῆλον), see 2.13. It is not clear from 2.21 that Apion had claimed that eve-

ryone contracted the inflammation: if he had, Josephus would surely have made that explicit in his paraphrase. By now exaggerating Apion's story, Josephus makes his reply very much easier; on this general tactic see Gruen 2005.

<sup>74</sup> This is now the third time Josephus has paraphrased Apion's description of the expellees, in each case in different terms: see 2.8, with note to "afflictions," and 2.15, with note to "crippled." Here it is in his interests to choose terms which suggest an inability to travel, in order to render Apion's narrative inconsistent (cf. 1.278). Josephus' own account of the desert-crossing (*Ant.* 4.1-175) notably omits reference to the plague of Numbers 21.

<sup>75</sup> It is not clear if this motif of combat originates from Apion and, if so, whether he referred to battles in the desert (cf. Manetho, 1.251) or on arrival in Judea (cf. Lysimachus, 1.310; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3.2). Alternatively, Josephus may be imputing this to Apion on the basis of his own scriptural source: see, e.g., the battles against the Amalekites (Exodus 17; *Ant.* 3.39-60), the Amorites (Numbers 21; *Ant.* 4.85-95), the Midianites (Numbers 25; *Ant.* 4.159-62), and the Canaanites (the book of Joshua; *Ant.* book 5); see further below, 2.157.

<sup>76</sup> Greek: μαχόμενοι πάντες. Reinach considered this πάντες textually suspect, and Giangrande (1962: 115) suggests emending it to πάντως, linking it with the οὐ at the start of the next clause ("by no means"). But there are good reasons for Josephus to include this word in its present emphatic location: he needs to press Apion's narrative to say, implausibly, that *all* were sick, yet *all* fought. Josephus' own accounts of the desert battles (*Ant.* 3.49-50; 4.159) did not, in fact, entail complete mobilization.

<sup>77</sup> The *en masse* (ἄθροοι) reinforces Josephus' representation of Apion's claim regarding all 110,000 (2.22). Josephus' logic might work if all were regarded as simultaneously combatant and sick; but it is not clear why they could not fight first and contract groin-tumors after a subsequent march.

<sup>78</sup> L and S read ἐξ ἀνάγκης (Latin: *vel ex necessitate*), but the phrase looks like a gloss (amplifying "natural") and is best omitted (so Münster; cf. Schreckenberg 1977: 164-65). Reinach and Thackeray

many days.<sup>79</sup> Nor is it likely that such a thing should happen by chance—that would be the most absurd notion of all.<sup>80</sup> **25** This amazing Apion stated previously that they arrived in Judea in the course of six days,<sup>81</sup> but says otherwise that Moyses, having ascended the mountain between Egypt and Arabia called Sinaeus, was hidden for forty days, and descended from there to give the Judeans the laws.<sup>82</sup> But how was it possible for the same people both to remain for forty days in the desert, a waterless place, and to cross all the intervening distance in six days?<sup>83</sup> **26** The linguistic transposition regarding the naming of the *sabbaton* reflects gross effrontery or terrible ignorance.<sup>84</sup> For *sabbo* and *sabbaton* are very different from each other.<sup>85</sup> **27** Ac-

take the phrase with the preceding verb to render the sense “on a forced march” (Müller 232-33, under military duress), but there are no good parallels for such an expression in Greek. Josephus wants to present two (and only two) choices (cf. 2.22): the pandemic was either a medical inevitability or pure chance. Both are mentioned in order to be dismissed.

<sup>79</sup> The parallel is hardly convincing. Trained soldiers might be in a better physical condition for such marches than a miscellaneous bunch of emigrants.

<sup>80</sup> Apion presumably suggested something more convincing than this. Josephus returns to arguments from likelihood, as used in countering Manetho (1.252-78). For “most absurd” (ἀλογώτατον), see the parallel claims in 1.255, 259, 271. But if something were claimed to happen entirely by chance, and thus for incalculable reasons, it is hard to see how one could rule it out on the basis of what is likely or reasonable.

<sup>81</sup> For “amazing” (θαυμαστός again) see note to “scholar” at 2.12. “Stated previously” reflects Josephus usual sense of the verb προλέγω (here προείρηκε; only once in *Apion* does it mean “stated publicly,” 2.211). The following “otherwise” (πάλιν) suggests that Apion made these two statements in different contexts. At first glance they appear to stand in simple contradiction: one cannot cross the whole desert in 6 days and also spend 40 at Sinai (Stern 1.397). But Josephus does not accuse Apion of quite this contradiction, and the reference at the end of this section to the “intervening” distance suggests that the 6-day journey was only the last stage of the desert-crossing, perhaps from Sinai to Judea. Reinach (63 n.1) offers a less plausible solution: that Apion talked of a 7th-day rest in the desert, and only of its *institution* as the sabbath on arrival in Judea.

<sup>82</sup> If this reflects Apion’s own description, it might suggest that he had good access to Judean tradition, either to the LXX (Gager 1972: 124), or to Judean texts based upon it (cf. Aristobulus in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8.9.38–8.10.17); cf. Pompeius Trogus in Justin 36.2.14 (Moses on Sinai). For the 40 days on Sinai see Exod 24:18; 34:28; for the covering with cloud, Exod 24:15-16. We cannot be sure why Apion referred to this incident, but the reference to being “hidden” suggests that he represented Moses as pulling a trick (cf. the depic-

tion in 2.145), either to enhance the authority of his laws (pretending that he had unique access to God, while merely hiding on the mountain) or to increase his own prestige (pretending that he had died and come back to life). Origen, *Cels.* 2.55-56, suggests possible parallels between Moses’ disappearance on the mountain and figures in Egyptian and Greek mythology who claimed to have been to Hades and back, though it is not clear whether these parallels are hypothetical or derive from actual Greek skepticism. For Josephus’ own account of this incident, see *Ant.* 3.75-98 (the 40 days at 3.95).

<sup>83</sup> Josephus emphasizes the aridity of the desert (ἐν ἐρήμῳ καὶ ἀνύδρῳ τόπῳ), as in 1.277; 2.157. His logic seems to be that, if they went for 40 days without water, they would have been too dehydrated to march for 6 days in order to cross all the intervening distance (τὴν μεταξὺ πᾶσαν) to Judea (see Barclay 1998a: 217-18). Presumably Apion could have denied that the desert was completely arid; he might even have used the story, reported by Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.3.2), of an ass leading the Judeans to water (see note to “sort” at 2.79). In fact, Josephus himself knows about sources of water in the desert, whether at Marah (Exod 15:23-25; *Ant.* 3.1-8) or struck from the rock (Exod 17:1-7; *Ant.* 3.33-38). Although the desert is generally waterless (*Ant.* 3.296), even at Sinai Josephus’ narrative implies some supplies of water (*Ant.* 3.76-78). Thus, in attempting to identify an inconsistency in Apion he has created one with himself.

<sup>84</sup> For the two options, see note to “things” at 2.22. For “ignorance” (here ἀμαθία) see note to “ignorance” at 2.3. For other cases where Josephus finds change (μετάθεσις) unconvincing, see 1.250, 286; 2.115.

<sup>85</sup> For the presence of *sabbo* here, despite its absence in 2.21, see note to “*sabbatōsis*” at 2.21. Josephus can only assert their difference in meaning (hardly denied by Apion) but he cannot, or at least does not, disprove Apion’s etymological connection. Apion’s claim is outrageous: the Hebrew has no discernible connection with any such Egyptian word. But Josephus does not have the philological expertise to prove this, and can only assert the difference in *sense* of the two words.



ording to the language of Judeans,<sup>86</sup> *sabbaton* means rest from all work,<sup>87</sup> while among Egyptians *sabbo*, as he says, means an inflammation in the groin.<sup>88</sup>

*Apion as  
Egyptian*

(2.3) 28 Such are some of the things that the Egyptian Apion<sup>89</sup> has invented concerning Moyses and the departure of the Judeans from Egypt, being more imaginative than the others.<sup>90</sup> And why should we be amazed if he lies about our ancestors, claiming that they were Egyptians by descent?<sup>91</sup> 29 He used to lie about himself in the opposite direction.<sup>92</sup> Although he was born at an Oasis of Egypt<sup>93</sup> and was, as

<sup>86</sup> Elsewhere in *Apion* Josephus refers to this distinctive language (1.319), termed the language (διόλεκτος) of Hebrews (1.167) or Judeans (here). It is striking that he should call Hebrew the Judeans' language, although most Judeans in the Diaspora neither spoke nor read it (see Introduction § 9.C). But *sabbaton* was known (as a loan-word) even to Greek speakers.

<sup>87</sup> The root means "rest" (cf. *Ant.* 1.33, explaining σάββατα); the reference to work derives from the 4<sup>th</sup> commandment (cf. 2.234).

<sup>88</sup> As suggested above (see note to "*sabbatōsis*" at 2.21), Apion probably read *sabbo* as groin, and coined the term *sabbatōsis* for its inflammation. Here, as in 2.21, Josephus is not concerned to trace out fully or clearly the steps in Apion's argumentation, and his misrepresentation renders Apion's case all the less convincing.

<sup>89</sup> This is the first time Apion has been dubbed "Egyptian"; he was not introduced as such in 2.2-3 (cf. Manetho in 1.73). Although his name (derived from Apis) might be a contributory factor, Josephus will give his justification for the label in 2.29. From this point on, Josephus' response to Apion will be dominated by his representation as "Egyptian." His identity is the focal point of the present, transitional, passage (2.28-32); thereafter it is mentioned repeatedly in *ad hominem* response to Apion concerning Alexandria (e.g., 2.41, 65-67, 69-70) and Judean cult and customs (e.g., 2.81, 122, 128-33, 138-39, 140-44); see Barclay 2004: 119-21. Very many of Josephus' arguments rely on this labelling: it draws on well-established stereotypes about Egyptians (see note to "reputation" at 2.31) and enables Josephus to attack Apion's *ethos* from multiple angles.

<sup>90</sup> What were earlier called "additions" (2.3, 9, 17) are now Apion's "invention" (ἐκκαινοποίησε; cf. *Ant.* 20.216). Josephus implies that all the others were imaginative (ἐπινοέω), but Apion more so.

<sup>91</sup> Once again, it is the claim of Egyptian descent that Josephus highlights (see 2.8, note at "descent"). Having described Apion sarcastically as "amazing" (θαυμαστός) 3 times (2.12, 20, 25), Josephus now turns the motif around: as soon as one grasps his dishonorable motives, perhaps one need not be amazed (θαυμάζειν). While the authors cited earlier stood under the general

heading of Egyptian envy and hatred (1.223-26, 287), Apion's individual motives are to be explored in great detail. Josephus probably knew more about him, and also greatly enlivens his rhetoric with such personal attacks. The charge of "lying" (cf. note to "up" at 2.6) occurs no less than 4 times in this bridge passage (2.28-32).

<sup>92</sup> Falsely claiming that Judeans were Egyptians, Apion falsely denied that he *was* an Egyptian. The argument that follows depends on the ambiguity of identity labels. The labels to be juxtaposed derive from 5 main sources: 1. Place of birth (which might or might not correspond to ancestry or "homeland"). 2. Ancestry (i.e., parentage and related claims to ethnic identity). 3. Homeland (a partly subjective label which might or might not be correlated with place of birth or residence). 4. Legal status (citizenship and/or taxation status). 5. Culture (a loose category, embracing language, education, and customs, including religion). Occasionally the discussion will be complicated still further by reference to other labels of (probably) military origin (2.36). The various types of label allow for complex combinations, and are a rich source of confusion and rhetorical invention. When it suits his rhetoric, Josephus will allow that the same people can have multiple labels (e.g., "Judeans" by ancestry and culture can be "Alexandrians" by residence or citizenship). But in characterizing Apion, he insists on a single, essentialized, definition: either Apion is "Egyptian" or he is "Alexandrian," and since he is the former by birthplace, he must be naturally "Egyptian" also in ancestry, homeland, legal status, and culture. On ethnicity and the ambiguity of labels in Ptolemaic Egypt, see Goudriaan 1988 and 1992.

<sup>93</sup> Greek: ἐν Ὀάσει τῆς Αἰγύπτου. Since the place-name lacks an article, I leave the translation indefinite, though it is possible Josephus thought there was a single place called "Oasis." In fact, there were several Oases (see Wagner 1987), clustered particularly in two regions known to the Romans as Oasis Parva (west of Oxyrhynchus) and Oasis Magna (in the Libyan desert, west of Thebes); see Talbert 2000: Maps 73 and 79 respectively. Later Josephus will speak of Apion's birthplace as "in the deepest depths of Egypt" (2.41). This may be a rhetorical flourish, but if it has a geographical

one might say, the original Egyptian,<sup>94</sup> he disowned his true homeland and people,<sup>95</sup> and, while falsely claiming to be an Alexandrian,<sup>96</sup> acknowledges the depravity of his people.<sup>97</sup> **30** Understandably, then, those whom he hates and wishes to insult he calls “Egyptians”;<sup>98</sup> for if he had not considered Egyptians utterly worthless,<sup>99</sup> he would not himself have deserted his own people.<sup>100</sup> Those who think highly of their own homelands are proud to be named after them, and censure those who improperly lay claim to that origin.<sup>101</sup> **31** In relation to us, Egyptians are affected in one of

sense it might suggest the more southern and remote Oasis Magna, which was 7 days’ travel from Thebes or Abydus (Herodotus 3.26; Strabo 17.1.42). To compensate for Josephus’ vagueness, scholars speculate on particular locations in Oasis Magna, such as El Khargeh or El Dakhleh (Sperling 1886: vi-vii; Wagner 1987: 138). Since all Josephus says about Apion is polemically slanted, this piece of information may not be trustworthy. But there is no reason why Apion could not have been born here and then have moved to Alexandria for his education, as the route to his academic and political success. However, the inferences that Josephus draws from this place of birth must certainly be questioned.

<sup>94</sup> Greek: πάντων Αἰγυπτίων πρῶτος (literally, “first of all Egyptians”; cf. 1 Tim 1:15-16 on Paul as “first” of sinners). Josephus suggests he is coining an expression (cf. 2.165), and the meaning might be equally conveyed by expressions like “as Egyptian as they come,” “the quintessential Egyptian,” or “an Egyptian *par excellence*.” Josephus infers from Apion’s birthplace that he was an Egyptian in all the other senses outlined above (ancestry, homeland, legal status, and culture). He was known to others as a “Greek” (Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 7.8.1) or “Alexandrian” (Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 16f) scholar; apart from Josephus, only the Suda calls him “Egyptian” (cf. Jones 2005: 291-93, noting Pliny, *Nat.* 30.99, on the scarab and Apion’s own *gens*). On the labels that probably best fit Apion, see note to “him” at 2.32.

<sup>95</sup> Treating Apion now as an “Egyptian” in all respects, but knowing that he regarded himself as an “Alexandrian” (2.32), Josephus accuses him of denying his *real* identity, and makes this a moral fault by portraying it as a betrayal of his land and people (cf. 2.30, 143-44). From Apion’s remark about “the elders of the Egyptians” (rather than “our elders”), there is reason to suspect he did not identify himself as “Egyptian,” and anyone with Alexandrian citizen status (2.32) would certainly not welcome the label “Egyptian.” Cf. his identification with Alexandria in 2.135.

<sup>96</sup> Josephus’ charge that this is a false claim (cf. 2.42) seems gratuitous. Whether Apion inherited Alexandrian citizen status at birth or was subsequently granted it (see note to “him” at 2.32), the label was

perfectly legitimate. One can hardly imagine Apion being one of the Alexandrian delegates to Gaius, arguing about citizen claims (*Ant.* 18.257-60), if there was a shadow of doubt about his own status. But Josephus’ logic operates on a (false) dichotomy between “Egyptian” (birthplace) and “Alexandrian” (citizenship).

<sup>97</sup> As throughout, I translate γένος by “people” (see note to “people” at 1.1), to avoid the misleading associations of the term “race.” But the Greek word suggests an entity defined by descent and ancestry. By mentioning his place of *birth*, and employing γένος 3 times in 2.29-30, Josephus represents Apion as integrated with the Egyptian people, and thus associates him with the cultural traits for which Egyptians were known. “Depravity” (μοχθηρία) is a strong term (cf. 1.222), suggesting deep moral deficiency; on the reputation of “Egyptians” see note to “reputation” at 2.31.

<sup>98</sup> Josephus recognizes that Apion writes from a stance other than “Egyptian,” but explains this as a sign of his self-hatred! It is not clear that “Egyptian” was, in all respects, a negative epithet for Apion. After all, he wrote a 5-book *Aegyptiaca*, and his depiction of the Heliopolitan Moses was not apparently written in scorn. On the other hand, Roman taxation (introduced in 24/23 BCE) privileged Alexandrians, who would undoubtedly claim to be superior to “Egyptians.” In any case, for Josephus the term has now a comprehensively negative valence. On hatred as a motive, see 1.70, 224, 287; 2.20 (in all cases emanating from “Egyptians”); cf. Lysimachus’ hatred (1.304) and that of the Alexandrians (2.32). “Insult” (λοιδορία) is a term frequently employed in this segment (see note to “irk-some” at 2.4).

<sup>99</sup> Greek: φαυλοτάτους, a term containing both moral and social scorn (cf. 1.175); here the social connotations are uppermost. Josephus had earlier dubbed Apion φαύλος (2.3).

<sup>100</sup> Reading τὸ γένος (with Thackeray, Reinach and Münster), in place of L’s τοῦ γένους; if the latter is read, some word must have dropped out (Niese). For “desertion” (φεύγω) cf. 2.144: Apion is not just hiding his identity but betraying his own people.

<sup>101</sup> If Egypt is Apion’s homeland (πατρίς, 2.29), he should be proud to call himself an “Egyptian.” Actually, Apion probably claimed Alexandria as his πατρίς

two ways: they either boost themselves by claiming kinship with us, or they drag us by association into their poor reputation.<sup>102</sup> **32** But the noble Apion<sup>103</sup> seems to want to present his slander of us to the Alexandrians as a kind of payment for the citizenship given to him.<sup>104</sup> Knowing their hatred of the Judeans who live among them in

(2.34, 135) and he *did* censure those (such as Judeans) who (in his view) improperly claimed Alexandrian status (2.38, 65). If the principle enunciated here applies to Judeans, it suggests that Josephus would link the label Ἰουδαῖος (“Judean”) to the “homeland” Ἰουδαία (Judea; cf. 1.179); see Introduction § 9.

<sup>102</sup> This is one of the finest rhetorical turns in the treatise which accounts for the Egyptian tendency to regard the Judeans as “Egyptian” by origin, but does so on the presumption that “Egyptian” is a derogatory label and that Judeans are superior (cf. for the Samaritans, *Ant.* 11.341); moreover, it suggests that the Egyptians recognized their own inferiority! In fact, Egyptian pride in her superiority to other nations, in antiquity and culture, was known outside Egypt from Herodotus onwards. But Josephus trades here on a long tradition of scorn of the Egyptian people as greedy, arrogant, and fickle (cf. *Ant.* 2.201), and of Egyptian religion as laughable and insane (cf. *Apion* 1.223-26). Of course, many aspects of Egypt, especially her religion and its ancient “philosophy,” fascinated outsiders; even the Greeks could record their indebtedness to her wisdom. Such positive tropes were rhetorically useful in Book 1 (e.g., 1.8-10, 28; cf. 2.140-41 on Egyptian priests). But for the purposes of this argument with Apion, Josephus depends on multiple negative stereotypes, especially as they circulated in Rome. In Roman literature we find Egyptians ridiculed as effeminate (Lucan, *Pharsalia* 8.542-44), fickle (*B. Alex.* 24; Curtius Rufus 4.1.30; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.11), reckless/cowardly (Dio Cassius 50.24.6-7; 51.17.1-2), impulsive (Juvenal, *Sat.* 15) and insolent (Pliny, *Pan.* 31.2; Seneca, *Consol.* 19.6); for scorn of Egyptian animal cults in particular, see 1.224, note at “animals.” See full analysis in Reinhold 1980; Sonnabend 1986; Berthelot 2000; Isaac 2004: 352-70. Josephus employs contempt of Egyptians as a rhetorical foil, utilizing Roman disdain of one subservient people to redeem the honor of another (see further Barclay 2004).

<sup>103</sup> “Noble” (γενναῖος) is used sarcastically again of Apion in 2.42, of Lysimachus in 1.319. In all cases it is juxtaposed with clearly ignoble conduct (abuse, slander, defamation); cf. *liberi* (2.79, with lies). Packed into this one section, to set the tone for all that follows, is an impressive combination of terms: slander, hatred, insult, lying, and shamelessness.

<sup>104</sup> Josephus knows that Apion was an Alexandrian citizen: as head of the Alexandrian academy and leader

of the delegation to Gaius, he must certainly have been so. But he presents him here as enjoying that citizenship only by grant, having been born an “Egyptian” in an Oasis (2.29). This is rhetorically important, as Josephus can play on his “natural” Egyptianness and present his Alexandrian status as artificial, and even illegitimate (2.29-30, 41-42). There is therefore good reason to question whether Josephus presents the matter correctly, especially as he wilfully confuses the various identity labels (see note to “direction” at 2.29). At least 4 options may be considered: 1. Josephus was right about Apion’s birthplace and in dubbing him an Egyptian by ancestry; he acquired Alexandrian citizenship only as an adult, by a grant. 2. Josephus was entirely wrong: Apion was not born in an Oasis, but was born and bred in Alexandria as an Alexandrian citizen (Willrich 1895: 172-76). 3. Josephus was mostly wrong: Apion was born in an Oasis, but as an Alexandrian citizen (i.e., he inherited this status from his citizen parents; Reinach 116 n.1; Troiani 146). 4. Josephus was half-right: Apion was born in an Oasis, but came from a “Greek” family (in lineage and culture), was educated in Alexandria and acquired Alexandrian citizenship (Lévy 1900: 188-95). We can only judge probabilities here. There were certainly Alexandrian citizens who lived in the countryside, so it is possible that Apion was born an Alexandrian in an Oasis (cf. Wagner 1987: 119, n.3, referring to a *strategos* of the Oasis Parva, during the reign of Tiberius). Thus Willrich’s refusal to accept Josephus’ notice on Apion’s birthplace is unnecessary; he fails to allow for the different senses in which the label “Egyptian” could be used. But if Josephus is right that Apion’s citizenship was not by birth but by grant (i.e., if this is not just Josephus’ own inference), it is likely that Apion came from a family in the countryside that considered itself “Greek” (see Wagner 1987: 224-28 on Greek names in the Egyptian Oases, and the complaint by a Greek in the *chora* that he was considered a barbarian, *P. Oxy.* 14.1681, cited by Delia 1991: 38). For tax purposes these might be labelled “Egyptians,” but in terms of their language and culture they probably followed “Greek” tradition. We know that Apion’s father had a good Greek name, Poseidonius (Africanus, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10.16; cf. Sperling 1886: v-vi, showing that “Pleistonikes” was Apion’s nickname, not his patronymic). If he was born into a wealthy “Greek” household in the countryside, Apion could have been sent to Alexandria for his ex-

Alexandria,<sup>105</sup> he sets out to insult those Judeans, and to include all the rest,<sup>106</sup> in both cases lying shamelessly.<sup>107</sup>

(2.4) 33 Let us examine, then, the terrible and shocking things<sup>108</sup> of which Apion has accused the Judeans who live in Alexandria.<sup>109</sup> When they came from Syria, he says,<sup>110</sup> they took up residence on a harborless shore, neighbors to the flotsam

*Apion on  
Alexandria*

tensive Greek education. Thus I judge the most likely options to be 3. or 4. If we give Josephus the benefit of the doubt on Apion's birth-place and his later acquisition of Alexandrian citizenship (option 4), we can catalogue Apion's identity labels as follows: 1. By birth-place, an "Egyptian." 2. By ancestry, probably "Greek." 3. In terms of his "homeland," his prior attachment came to be with Alexandria (2.34, 135). 4. As to legal status, he was by birth an "Egyptian" (i.e., neither a Roman nor an Alexandrian), but became an "Alexandrian" citizen. 5. In terms of his culture, he clearly regarded himself as "Greek": his literary scholarship was focused on the Greek corpus, and he ranked himself with the very best in that tradition (2.135). On Apion's identity, see further Jones 2005, rightly noting the complexity of labels, especially those that purport to be "ethnic."

<sup>105</sup> Cf. 2.70, associating this hatred with, in particular, the "Egyptian" element. The reference here is to the communal tensions which climaxed in the riots of 38 CE (see note to "Alexandria" at 2.33). Josephus elsewhere reports this "hatred" as long-term and ingrained (*War* 2.487, 489); cf. Philo, *Legat.* 120, 170.

<sup>106</sup> Most of the material reported in 2.33-78 is specifically related to Alexandrian Judeans, but some of Apion's comments had more universal reference (2.68), and all could damage the reputation of Judeans everywhere, especially if they were portrayed as inherently insubordinate to Rome (2.68, 73). If the stories about the temple belong in this context (2.79-124) they also cast a slur on all Judeans.

<sup>107</sup> The language exactly mirrors that used of Lysimachus (1.320), and finishes this paragraph with a charge of "lying" parallel to 2.14. Cf. note to "up" at 2.6.

<sup>108</sup> Greek: δεινὰ καὶ σχέτλια (a literary phrase, found, e.g., in Aristophanes, *Ran.* 612; Isocrates *Callim.* 35). Its use here may be ironic, as Josephus leads with an item which seems harmless enough.

<sup>109</sup> For the language of "accusation," see note to "lawsuit" at 2.4. Josephus here gives a heading for the second section of his reply to Apion, 2.33-78, but we can deduce from 2.7 that some of the later material (2.79-144) was incorporated in this Alexandrian material. We may reconstruct his argument under four headings:

1. The Judeans in Alexandria are of low status, liv-

ing in one of its least desirable locations (2.33). We may perhaps associate with this Apion's general denigration of Judeans as a nation with no famous figures (2.135), and with a history of continual military defeat (2.125); cf. Josephus' insistence that they were not "despised" (2.47).

2. The Judeans have no right to be considered "Alexandrians," in the sense of Alexandrian citizens (2.38). On the contrary, there are merely foreigners (*peregrini*, 2.71). That they are *not* citizens was proved by: a) the fact that they were left out of civic grain-distributions by both Cleopatra (2.60) and Germanicus (2.63); and b) their refusal to participate in the civic cults (2.65).

3. The Judeans are in general exclusive and anti-social: they do not have Gods in common with other peoples (2.117; cf. 2.65, 79); they are clannish (2.68); and they are in principle hostile to Greeks, swearing oaths of hostility to Greeks (2.121) and conducting, it is reported, an annual sacrifice of a Greek in the Jerusalem temple (2.89-96).

4. The Judeans have proved to be politically subversive, especially in relation to the Romans: they waged war against Ptolemy Physcon (2.50, 56); they flouted the will of the Roman ambassador, Thermus (2.50); they were removed from the administration of the grain-supply to Rome (2.64); they were the cause of civic unrest in Alexandria, in which they took up arms (2.68; cf. 2.35); and they refused to accord the emperors proper honors, through imperial images (2.73; cf. *Ant.* 18.257-58). As we have already seen, this opposition to Rome, a common trait among all Judeans (2.68), was already foreshadowed by the formation of the nation in the very year of the foundation of Rome (see note to "Carthage" at 2.17).

It is strange that Josephus makes no mention here of the unrest in Alexandria (hinted at in 2.35?) and the role of Apion in the Alexandrian delegation to Gaius (cf. *Ant.* 18.257-60), although many of these charges relate very specifically to the legal and political issues raised in that dispute. He perhaps preferred to allow here no indication that Judeans had actually, on a specific occasion, taken part in unrest in Alexandria when it was under Roman rule. As we shall see, in this response to Apion he goes out of his way to portray Judeans as completely supportive of Roman power.

<sup>110</sup> As in 2.21, "he says" is embedded in the sentence, with the same resulting uncertainty about the



*The Judeans’  
place of  
residence*

thrown up by the waves.<sup>111</sup> **34** Well, if the location is a matter of insult, he is insulting—not his own home city, but the one he professes to be such—Alexandria:<sup>112</sup> for the sea-board is a part of that city and is, as all acknowledge, the finest residential quarter!<sup>113</sup> **35** And if the Judeans gained possession of this spot by use of force, so as later not to be ejected, that is testimony to their courage.<sup>114</sup> Alexander gave them a place for their residence<sup>115</sup> and they obtained privileges equal to those of the

status of this sentence as *précis* or verbatim citation (see note to “says” at 2.21). The Latin translation here reads *in Syriam* (“into Syria,” rather than from it), the translators perhaps thinking of the harborless Palestinian coastline. But Josephus understands Apion to be talking of the Judeans’ settlement in Alexandria, and there is no reason to think he completely misunderstood him. Apion was probably speaking of the original Judean settlement in Alexandria, but we do not know when he thought this took place. Although he clearly knew of the land called Judea (2.21), for some reason he refers to their origin as “Syria,” perhaps using the general term current in the Ptolemaic period (Stern 1.398). We can only speculate on whether this had further, polemical intent.

<sup>111</sup> Greek: γειτνιασάντες ταῖς τῶν κυμάτων ἐκβολαῖς. Thackeray’s “beside the spot where the waves break on the beach” does not capture the scornful tone, or the probable sense of ἐκβολαί. Since Alexandria was famous for its two harbors, and its docks on Lake Mareotis, the location is made to sound peripheral as well as insalubrious. Elsewhere Josephus claims that the Ptolemies assigned the Judeans a “place” of their own (*War* 2.488), and cites Strabo reporting that “a large part of the city was set aside for this nation” (*Ant.* 14.117). Philo claims that in his day (early 1<sup>st</sup> century CE) there were Judeans all over the city, but especially in 2 of the 5 quarters of the city, which were even called “Judean” (*Flacc.* 55-56; cf. *Legat.* 132). During the riots of 38 CE he says Judeans were confined to a small section of one of these, but spilled out onto the beaches and among the tombs (*Flacc.* 56, 122; cf. *Legat.* 127). Also, Josephus reports that in the violence of 66 CE, Judeans were concentrated in the Delta-quarter of the city (*War* 2.495). The area identified in *Apion* 2.33, 36 would appear to be in the north-east of the city, between the Lochias promontory (with its palaces), to the west, and the eastern cemeteries, to the east; see Fraser 1972: 1.35, 55; Kasher 1985: 247-50. This may or may not be the Delta-quarter. Fraser 1972: 2.109-10, n.270 notes a papyrus (*BGU* 1151) from 13 BCE which places the Delta-quarter to the west of the city. Pace Fraser, it is possible that Apion and Josephus are here describing the other, eastern center of Judean residence—Philo says there were *two*—and that this is

not the same as the (western) Delta-quarter to which Judeans were confined in 66 CE.

<sup>112</sup> Repeating the language of “insult,” Josephus claims *both* that Apion is insulting his own πατρίς (cf. 2.29-30) *and* that this is only a pseudo-homeland in any case (his real one is Egypt, 2.29). Cf. 2.5 for Josephus’ aim to turn his opponent’s rhetoric back on his own head. In fact, Josephus will not allow the insult to stand, even thus retroverted: he goes on to claim that the place Apion insults is a highly desirable location.

<sup>113</sup> Josephus’ claim is sufficiently imprecise to sound plausible (he had lived in Alexandria in 69-70 CE, 1.48; *Life* 415). For the geography of the city see Strabo 17.1.8-10 and Fraser 1972: 1.7-37. The sections of the city by the Mediterranean harbors, or on the shore of Lake Mareotis, were probably the most pleasant, but that does not mean that all of the sea-board was equally attractive.

<sup>114</sup> This sentence seems tangential to the argument and potentially damaging to Judeans, with its mention of the use of force (cf. 2.68). It may represent an accusation by Apion that the Judeans had no right to live even in this undesirable end of the city, and that they had obtained and kept it only by violence. If so, it would allude to the violence in the city in 38 and 41 CE (see Barclay 1996a: 51-56). In the riots of 38, Philo portrays the Judeans as passive (*Flacc.* 55-72), but he hints that the “Greeks” understood themselves to be *victims* (*Flacc.* 72; cf. the search for weapons in the Judean homes, *Flacc.* 86-94); no doubt each side accused the other of initiating the trouble and perpetrating atrocities. In the renewed conflict in 41 CE, on the death of Gaius, even Josephus admits that Judeans were the instigators of violence (*Ant.* 19.278). Josephus here does not deny the use of force, but keeps the issue vague and the occasion unspecific: with a brief reference to Judean “courage” (ἀνδρεία, cf. 2.234, 272, 292), he passes on to the evidence of political privileges. One wonders why he did not simply omit this aspect of Apion’s charge.

<sup>115</sup> The Greek “place” (τόπον) has no article, though some editors insert one (cf. the Latin *hunc locum*). Josephus’ vagueness is matched by his comment in *War* 2.487-88 that Alexander gave Judeans the right of residence, on the basis of their support, and that his

Macedonians<sup>116</sup> 36 (I don't know what Apion would have said if they had taken up residence near the necropolis and were not established near the royal palace!),<sup>117</sup> and to the present day their tribe has had the title "the Macedonians."<sup>118</sup> 37 If Apion had read the letters of Alexander the king,<sup>119</sup> and of Ptolemy, son of Lagus;<sup>120</sup> if he had

*Recognition of  
Judeans' rights*

successors gave them "their own place." His tendency to trace Judean rights back to Alexander is noticeable also in 2.37, 42-43 and represents a widespread pattern of fiction in the Hellenistic era (see Tcherikover 1959: 321-22). The earliest evidence of Judean presence in Alexandria is from the early Ptolemaic period (Judean names in the eastern cemeteries: Horbury & Noy 1992: nos. 1-8).

<sup>116</sup> Greek: ἴσῃς παρὰ τοῖς Μακεδόσι τιμῆς ἐπέ-  
τυχον (the παρὰ should perhaps be omitted, Schreckenberg 1997: 165; Münster). Alongside this puzzling remark we should place 5 others from Josephus: i) *Apion* 2.36: to the present day their "tribe" (φυλή) has the title "Macedonians"; ii) *Ant.* 12.8: Ptolemy I Soter rewarded the loyalty of Judeans and made them τοῖς Μακεδόσιν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἰσοπολίτας; iii) *War* 2.487-88: Alexander gave Judeans permission to reside in Alexandria ἐξ ἰσομοιρίας [or ἰσοτιμίας] πρὸς τοῦς Ἑλληνας and allowed them χρηματίζειν Μακεδόνας ("to call themselves Macedonians"). These 3 references to Judeans in Alexandria are inconsistent and vague: it is not clear either what the label "Macedonians" means, nor what rights it might entail. The problem is hardly clarified by our other 2 references: iv) *Ant.* 12.119: Seleucus I granted Judeans in Asia and Lower Syria πολιτεία (see note to "citizenship" at 2.39) and declared them to be τοῖς ἐνοικισθεῖσιν ἰσοτίμους ... Μακεδόσιν καὶ Ἑλλησιν; v) *War* 5.460: Antiochus Epiphanes had a unit of "Macedonians," a label which represents not their ethnicity but their training and equipment. This last notice probably gets us closest to the meaning of the label "Macedonian" in Alexandria. From Egyptian papyri (reinforced by studies of Hellenistic armies, Launey 1949: 293, 309-37; cf. 353-64 on Macedonian military technique), it appears that "Macedonian" was a title for military units, and had nothing to do with Macedonian ancestry, nor with civic rights or privileges. There is some evidence for ethnic Macedonians forming the royal bodyguard in the Ptolemaic palace in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE, but not thereafter (Fraser 1972: 1.53, 80). The papyri reveal Judeans listed alongside "Macedonians" (*CPJ* 30), but also, in one case from 14 BCE, a Judean (Alexander) labelled a "Macedonian" (*CPJ* 142 = *BGU* 1132). It seems that the best way to correlate this material is to suggest that: a) some Judeans fought in "Macedonian" army units in the Ptolemaic period; b) this is an elite military status, but says nothing about their civic or legal rights; c)

Josephus misunderstands or misrepresents this phenomenon to suggest that all Judeans had (unspecified) civic rights equal to (ethnic) Macedonians, who he presumes to have been the most privileged early residents in the cities concerned. See further Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.14-15; Tcherikover 1959: 322-24; Fraser 1972: 1.53; Kasher 1985: 88-89, 190-91, 285-87 (the latter wrongly associating with the title some legal privileges). As often in this segment, Josephus' imprecise claim to high political status appears to be hyperbole based on ignorance and misrepresentation.

<sup>117</sup> This sentence seems out of place, and would fit better after the end of 2.34: Niese suggests it might be transferred there, and Reinach rearranges the text accordingly. If Apion and Josephus are talking about the district to the east of the Lochias promontory, it was at the opposite end of town to the western necropolis (Strabo 17.1.10, the main cemetery of their day) and near the royal palaces located on the Lochias promontory (Strabo 17.1.10; Fraser 1972: 1.21-24). But it was also next to the main cemeteries in use in the early Ptolemaic period (Chatby, El-Ibrahimiya, Hadra; Horbury & Noy 1992: xiii-xvi). Josephus likes to suggest that Apion had the facts against him.

<sup>118</sup> For this term, here recognized to be a label, see note to "Macedonians" at 2.35. By speaking of "their tribe" (αὐτῶν ἡ φυλή) Josephus gives the impression of a political category, such as the "tribes" of Alexandrian citizens (Delia 1991: 63-68). But there is no known tribe or deme of this name, and he is almost certainly confusing a military label, applicable to some Judeans, with a civic status supposedly shared by all (Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.14-15). Kasher's suggestion (1985: 211) that this represents a "tribe" within the Judean *politeuma* misconstrues Josephus' statement and has no supporting evidence.

<sup>119</sup> Josephus offers no information about these letters, their purpose or subject matter. If he is not inventing wholesale, he must have in mind some letter concerning Judean rights, authentic or fabricated, preserved in Judean traditions. Multiple Judean legends grew up about Alexander's visits to the region, before and after his advance to Egypt, some preserved by Josephus (*Ant.* 11.313-45), some cited by him from Ps.-Hecataeus (*Apion* 1.192-93; 2.43), and some we know from elsewhere (e.g., rabbinic tales and recension C of Ps.-Callisthenes, *Alexander Romance*; see Tcherikover 1959: 41-50). Josephus relates below (2.42) Alexan-

read the documents of his successors as kings of Egypt<sup>121</sup> and the monument that stands in Alexandria and records the rights that Caesar the Great gave to the Judeans<sup>122</sup>—if, I say, he knew all these things but had the effrontery to contradict them, he was malicious; if he knew none of them, he was an ignoramus.<sup>123</sup>

*Judeans as  
"Alexandrians"*

**38** To be amazed how those who are Judeans were called "Alexandrians"<sup>124</sup> is a

der's scrutiny and reward of Judeans arriving in Alexandria, and perhaps knew some pseudepigraphical letter in that connection (cf. 2.62).

<sup>120</sup> Ptolemy I Soter (305–282 BCE) is referred to below (2.44), appointing Judeans to garrisons; Josephus perhaps knew of some associated "letter." On his relationship to Judeans see *Ant.* 12.1-10 and *Apion* 1.186, with note at "Egypt." Josephus naturally omits mention here of his enslavement of Judeans and their transfer to Egypt.

<sup>121</sup> The documents and the kings are unspecified; cf. Josephus' version of Claudius' decree (*Ant.* 19.281), with its reference to the "documents" possessed by Judeans relating to the rights they received from kings. Josephus elsewhere admits that what was written about Judeans by Persian and Macedonian authorities was not generally believed, because it was not publicly accessible (*Ant.* 14.187); thus here, as there, his prime evidence will come from Roman public documentation.

<sup>122</sup> The final and heftiest evidence is Roman (cf. 2.40-41, 61-64, 72, 73-78), perhaps because Apion's charges included in particular an accusation of anti-Roman behavior (see note to "Alexandria" at 2.33). This "monument" (Greek: *στήλη*, a inscribed pillar or slab) is elsewhere said by Josephus to be bronze and to state that the Judeans were "citizens of the Alexandrians" (*πολίται Ἀλεξανδρέων*, *Ant.* 14.188; on bronze tables see Pucci ben Zeev 1995). Josephus does not make this definite claim here (though it would have fitted the context perfectly), but tones it down to a vaguer "rights" (*δικαιώματα*; cf. *War* 7.110 with a similar statement about Judean rights in Antioch). "Caesar the Great" (cf. 2.61) is explicitly "Caesar Julius" in *Ant.* 14.188, but there are several reasons to think that, if such a monument existed, it was in the name of Caesar Augustus, not Julius Caesar (Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.56, n.20; Smallwood 1981: 233, n.53; Gruen 2002: 285, n.134). Though he visited and fought in Alexandria, Julius Caesar had no right to make political dispositions there, while Augustus, on annexing Egypt in 30 BCE, was likely to confirm or redefine the political arrangements in the city. Josephus elsewhere alludes to Roman confirmation of Judean honors in this context (*War* 2.488), and Claudius' letter to Alexandria confirms the right of Judeans in Alexandria to live according to their own customs, "as in the time of the God Augustus" (*CPJ* 153, lines 86-88). Augustus intervened

to remove the right of the Judeans to appoint an ethnarch (Philo, *Flacc.* 74, in about 11 CE), but this *stēlē* seems to have concerned their right to observe their ancestral customs, from a date (before 27 BCE) when "Caesar" was a prominent part of Augustus' nomenclature. If so, it had nothing to do with the *political* rights of Judeans in the city (despite *Ant.* 14.188), and is thus only remotely relevant to this context. It is striking that Philo, who lived in Alexandria and would have known it better, makes no reference to it, despite praising Augustus to the skies (*Legat.* 143-58).

<sup>123</sup> Josephus offers the same two alternatives as in 2.22, 26: Apion was either brazen or stupid, but here his effrontery would show him to be malicious (*πονηρός*). "Ignoramus" (*ἄπαιδευτος*) matches the charge of "ignorance" (*ἄπαιδευσία*) in 2.3, and will be confirmed in the very next section. Even if Apion knew of the Alexandrian *stēlē*, he would hardly have considered it relevant to his denial of Judean political rights.

<sup>124</sup> The term "Alexandrian" was potentially ambiguous (see Delia 1991: 23-28). In administrative documents, in which citizenship status is relevant, the term clearly means a citizen of Alexandria, even without further specification of deme and tribe. But in subjective or informal contexts, non-citizens could (and did) use the term to indicate that Alexandria was their place of origin or permanent domicile; in this context, only the citation of deme or tribe could clarify that one was a proper Alexandrian citizen. Why was Apion concerned that Judeans employed the label "Alexandrian"? Josephus does not afford us access to the context of his discourse, but we can deduce that Apion contested the right of Judeans to Alexandrian citizenship. Josephus cites Apion as asking "why, if they are citizens (*si sunt cives*) do they not worship the same Gods as the Alexandrians?" (2.65), and elsewhere implies that he accused them of making an illegal claim to citizenship (2.42). This is clearly the force of Apion's reference to the exclusion of Judeans from Alexandrian grain-distribution by both Cleopatra (2.60) and Germanicus (2.63). He thus made quite clear his own opinion, that they were no more than *peregrini* (2.71). Josephus' response, although poorly formulated, makes a claim for the rights of Judeans to Alexandrian citizenship (2.41-42, 65-67), and thus confirms that this was what Apion denied or disputed. (For Josephus' confusing use of the label "Alexandrian" elsewhere, see *Ant.* 14.188, 236;

symptom of similar ignorance.<sup>125</sup> For all who are invited to join a colony, even if they are from widely different peoples, take their name from its founders.<sup>126</sup> 39 What need is there to cite instances from other peoples? Our own people who reside in Antioch are called “Antiochenes”; for the founder, Seleucus, gave them citizenship.<sup>127</sup> Similarly, those in Ephesus and throughout the rest of Ionia have the same

19.281.) It is another matter to decide what the Alexandrian disputes, and delegations to Gaius, were really about. It is possible that Apion exaggerated the issues in dispute, and that there were others not mentioned here; and it is certain that, if citizenship was an issue, this would have concerned only a small cadre of elite Judeans in Alexandria. Unfortunately, our other evidence for these disputes is extremely hard to interpret, being either fragmentary (the papyri) or heavily biased (Philo). Even the other tantalizing evidence for disputes about the title “Alexandrian” is subject to multiple interpretations (on the Helenos papyrus, *CPJ* 151, see Tcherikover ad loc. and Delia 1991: 26; on Philo, *Legat.* 194, 350, see Smallwood 1970 ad loc.). For recent discussion of these highly controversial issues see Barclay 1996a: 60-71; Honigman 1997; Gruen 2002: 71-83. In his resolution of the issue, Claudius seems to have made a clear distinction between “Alexandrians” and “Judeans,” the latter told they were living in a city “not their own” (ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ πόλει, *CPJ* 153, lines 82-83, 95). Josephus’ response to Apion slides confusingly between the different possible senses of civic labels (denoting citizenship or merely residence), between general honors and specific legal rights, and between citizenship of a Greek city and Roman citizenship. The slipperiness of his argument may arise partly from ignorance and partly from deliberate obfuscation. But there may also be echoes of a rhetorical strategy, also deployed by Philo, to promote an alternative (and utopian) view of citizenship, which could envisage the civic integration of Judeans even while allowing their observance of ancestral customs and their non-participation in civic cult (2.67; see Honigman 1997).

<sup>125</sup> See note to “ignorance” at 2.3.

<sup>126</sup> Alexandria was a “colony” in the broad Hellenistic sense of a migrant settlement; but Judeans did not go there by invitation (*pace* 2.42). In the cases Josephus cites (Alexandria, Antioch, and Ephesus) citizens took their names from the city rather than from the founders, but clearly by the authority of the founders (2.39). Josephus wishes to trace Judean honor in Alexandria back to Alexander himself (2.35, 37, 42), a connection which, he presumes, accords a moral right to citizen status.

<sup>127</sup> Greek: πολιτεία. The term is ambiguous, covering a range of civic rights (cf. the variety of usage in

Philo, *Legat.* 157, 193, 349, 363; *Flacc.* 53). The possession of a common name “Antiochenes” is weak evidence for full citizen rights, and Josephus may employ πολιτεία precisely because its meaning can be both general (civic rights) and particular (citizenship). But elsewhere in this context the gift of πολιτεία means the grant of citizenship (2.32, 41, 42) and the (disingenuous?) use of the term gives Josephus the scope to suggest the more particular claim without having to define or defend it. The label “Antiochenes” is meant to stand in parallel with “Alexandrians” (2.38), but in both cases the discussion obscures the different senses of the label. Elsewhere, Josephus makes imprecise and inconsistent reference to the status of Judeans in Antioch. In *War* 7.43-45 he recounts the gathering of Judeans under encouragement from the successors of Antiochus (not Seleucus), and claims that after Antiochus Epiphanes IV the Judeans were granted ἐξ ἴσου τῆς πόλεως τοῖς Ἑλλησι μετέχειν (“to share the city on an equal basis with the Greeks”); cf. *War* 7.110-11 with reference to their δικαιώματα (“rights”). In *Ant.* 12.119-24 their civic rights appear to gain clearer definition and are dated earlier, as here in *Apion*: Seleucus Nicator I (312-280 BCE) is said to have granted Judeans πολιτεία “and declared then privileged equally with the Macedonians and Greeks who settled there” (*Ant.* 12.119), a privilege proved by a grant of money to those unwilling to use Gentile-processed oil (see Barclay 1996a: 256-57, n.63). In that context Josephus also records the refusal of Vespasian and Titus to accede to the Antiochians’ demand, after the Judean War, that the resident Judeans be deprived of τὰ δίκαια τὰ τῆς πολιτείας (12.121). Although Josephus uses the term πολιτεία four times in this passage (*Ant.* 12.119-24), it is no clearer what he means by it, nor what were the actual political rights of Judeans in Antioch. While some might have had citizen rights, this cannot have been true of all: he may be alluding to some lesser civic status, as a recognized body of foreign residents, permitted to live, trade, and follow their own customs (cf. Kasher 1985: 297-309; Smallwood 1981: 359-60, conjecturing some special status as a πολίτευμα). Josephus’ vagueness and inconsistency suggest that he did not know what these rights were nor when they were granted. See Kraeling 1932: 137-39; Tcherikover 1959: 328-29; Appendix C in Josephus Loeb volume VII; Barclay 1996a: 244-45.



name as the native citizens, that having been afforded to them by the Successors.<sup>128</sup> **40** Has not the benevolence of the Romans<sup>129</sup> ensured that their name has been shared with practically everyone, not only with individuals but with sizeable nations as a whole?<sup>130</sup> Thus, those who were once Iberians,<sup>131</sup> Tyrrhenians,<sup>132</sup> and Sabines<sup>133</sup> are called “Romans.” **41** And if Apion discounts this type of citizenship, let him cease

<sup>128</sup> “Successors” (διάρδοχοι) is a general term for the kings who ruled over Alexander’s conquests after his death; the lack of definition here is notable. Having the same name as “citizens” (πολίται) is by no means the same as sharing their status, but this seems to be the best Josephus can do: the argument against Apion’s objection (2.38) is conducted in a conceptual and terminological fog. In *Ant.* 12.125-26 the Greeks in Ionia petition Marcus Agrippa against the Judeans, regarding the πολιτεία that Antiochus II Theos (261-249 BCE) had given them (the Greeks? Or the Judeans?): if the Judeans were to be their “kinsmen” (συγγενεῖς), they should worship the same Gods. Once again, both the terms and the rights they describe are obscure. From a later passage (*Ant.* 16.27-60), it appears that what is at stake is not citizenship but the right of Judeans to follow their own laws (16.27, 60; regarding Judeans in Ephesus, cf. *Ant.* 14.262-64; 16.167-68, 172-73). It is possible that some Judeans were proper citizens in some Ionian cities, but there is no unambiguous evidence for this; in *Ant.* 14.259, the reference to Judeans in Sardis as both κατοικοῦντες and πολῖται is confusing (cf. 14.235). See, in general, Tcherikover 1959: 327-30; Trebilco 1991: 167-72; Barclay 1996a: 259-62; Pucci ben Zeev 1998: 219-20. For Judeans in Ephesus as Roman citizens, see *Ant.* 14.225-30, 234, 237, 240.

<sup>129</sup> “Benevolence” here translates φιλανθρωπία, a term Josephus uses regularly in depicting Roman attitudes and actions towards Judeans (*War* 6.333; *Ant.* 12.124; 14.195, 208, 267, 313; 19.290), as well as the character of Titus (*War* 4.96; 6.324, 341; 7.107). Josephus here mirrors the flattery of Rome displayed by such admirers as Polybius (e.g., 1.83.9; 10.38.3) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. rom.* 1.9.4, 41.1, 89.1; 3.11.5-6; 14.6.3-6), and reinforces the Roman self-image of liberality to the nations they had subdued. For the theme in relation to kings and Roman emperors, see Berthelot 2003: 37-43.

<sup>130</sup> This case suits Josephus better, since the name “Roman” was co-extensive with citizenship, at least in theory. The spread of Roman citizenship, first in Italy and then, from Julius Caesar onwards, to the provinces, was a policy much debated in Rome, with ample opportunity for Roman self-congratulation for a “generosity” that bound individuals and communities in gratitude and loyalty to the imperial power. Thus,

Cicero celebrates the Roman capacity to turn enemies into fellow citizens; since Romulus, he claims, our forefathers have never ceased to make others citizens, not only towns, but “whole nations” (*gentes universae*, *Balb.* 31). Continuing this trope, Claudius is reported to have reminded the Senate of the spread of citizenship, in terms closely parallel to those here used by Josephus: *ut non modo singuli viritim, sed terrae, gentes in nomen nostrum coalescerent* (“so that not only individuals, singly, but lands, nations, might unite under our name,” Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.24-25). Cf. Aristides, *Pan.* 63. Like Philo (*Legat.* 285), Josephus echoes back to the Romans their own self-praise; he had himself acquired Roman citizenship from his benefactor, Vespasian (*Life* 423). On the spread of Roman citizenship to the provinces, from Julius Caesar to Trajan, see Sherwin-White 1973: 225-64.

<sup>131</sup> “Iberia” is the ancient name for Spain, more recently termed *Hispania* by the Romans. Josephus here generalizes and exaggerates Roman policy in the interests of his rhetoric. Roman policy of urbanization in these important Western provinces created *municipia*, initially with Latin status, not full Roman citizenship. Julius Caesar founded a number of *municipia* in Baetica, and Augustus granted citizenship to about 50 communities (*coloniae* and *municipia*, Richardson 1996: 134-49; cf. Dio 43.39.5; Pliny, *Nat.* 18.4.117). Josephus’ comment is perhaps more influenced by Vespasian’s reorganization of the Spanish provinces (ca. 74 CE), in which all *municipia* could, in principle, attain Latin status, with Roman citizenship granted to magistrates and their families on completion of their terms of office (Richardson 1996: 188-210; cf. Pliny, *Nat.* 3.30). Latin status allowed rights of marriage and commerce with Romans, but did not entitle one to the name *Romanus* (Sherwin-White 1973: 108-16). Knowledgeable readers could understand Josephus’ exaggeration as flattery by a provincial, or perhaps, as conveying an ironic undertone, since Rome was not, in fact, as generous as she sometimes claimed (for ironic possibilities in Josephus’ speech, see Mason 2005a).

<sup>132</sup> Otherwise known as Etruscans, the ancient rivals of Rome in Tuscany, subdued in stages during the 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BCE; they were granted citizenship during the Social War (91-87 BCE).

<sup>133</sup> This is an even more ancient case. Cicero recycles Roman myth that Romulus had made Sabine en-

to call himself an “Alexandrian.”<sup>134</sup> For he was born, as I said above, in the deepest depths of Egypt,<sup>135</sup> so how could he be an “Alexandrian” if he discounts the grant of citizenship, as he sees fit to do in our case?<sup>136</sup> In fact it is only to Egyptians that the Romans, who are now rulers of the world,<sup>137</sup> have refused to grant any form of citizenship.<sup>138</sup> 42 But Apion is so noble<sup>139</sup> that, considering himself worthy of acquiring privileges from which he was debarred,<sup>140</sup> he attempted to bring false

emies friends of Rome by granting them citizenship (*Balb.* 31); in reality this took place during the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE. Josephus is sufficiently attuned to Roman tradition to be able to deploy these examples, even if he is hazy on the dates and details.

<sup>134</sup> The vague expression masks the political and legal differences between Roman citizenship and citizenship of a Greek city such as Alexandria. On Romans with dual citizenship (place of birth and adopted city of Rome), see Cicero, *Leg.* 2.5.

<sup>135</sup> Greek: ἐν τῷ βαθυτάτῳ τῆς Αἰγύπτου; the superlative may be merely a rhetorical flourish. The birth-place is named as “Oasis” in 2.29. On this birth-place, and what this does or does not mean for the identity labels appropriate to Apion, see notes to “Egypt” at 2.29 and to “him” at 2.32.

<sup>136</sup> Josephus implies that someone born in the depths of Egypt is, by definition, an “Egyptian” and can only be an “Alexandrian” by a special grant. This is certainly an incorrect assumption (some with proper, inherited, Alexandrian citizenship were born outside Alexandria), and if it is the *basis* for the statement that Apion was an Alexandrian only by civic grant (2.32), that statement cannot be trusted; see note to “him” at 2.32. Josephus suggests that Apion is disputing, in principle, the possibility of a grant of Alexandrian citizenship; see note to “Alexandrians” at 2.38.

<sup>137</sup> Greek: οἱ κύριοι οὖν Ῥωμαῖοι τῆς οἰκουμένης. Josephus peppers his *War* with reference to the Romans as rulers of the world (e.g., *War.* 2.397, 580; 3.6, 71, 107, 480; 4.178; 5.366; 6.43); the theme is central to Agrippa’s speech, *War* 2.345-401 (see Rajak 2002: 147-61). He makes the same claim of individual emperors (e.g., *War* 1.633; 2.36, 179; 3.402; 4.622, 656; 5.88). The statement here, if it is not a gratuitous act of fawning, is meant to emphasize that, out of all the peoples under their control, the Egyptians have been singled out for ignominy. The “now” indicates that this status is recent (over Egypt only since 30 BCE); whether it also hints that this status may be lost in the future is unclear (see *War* 5.367 and note to “others” at 2.127).

<sup>138</sup> “Any form of πολιτεία” could mean “any form of civic rights,” but more likely in context means “any form of citizenship” (i.e., whether Alexandrian or Roman). Again Josephus blurs the difference between Roman and Greek citizenship; cf. 2.71-72. Roman

administration divided the population of Egypt into three classes: *Romani* (Roman citizens), ἄστοί (citizens of one of the three Greek cities in Egypt), and *peregrini* (“foreigners,” i.e., the rest). In general (enlistment in the legions is the main exception), the only people admitted into Roman citizenship were those who were already ἄστοί, since only these were considered sufficiently “civilized.” Pliny’s correspondence with Trajan, requesting Roman citizenship for his *peregrinus* therapist, Harpokras (*Ep.* 10.5-7, 10), is generally taken to prove that, in Egypt, only Alexandrian citizenship could qualify one for Roman citizenship (Pliny has to ask for the Alexandrian status retrospectively, on legal advice). But, as Delia argues (1991: 41-45), Pliny is probably being economical with the truth, and citizenship in any of the Greek cities would have sufficed. The Romans preferred not to interfere in the matter of local citizenship, preserving some semblance of autonomy in the hands of city councils. But since Alexandria had no council, Roman governors or emperors had to take a closer interest in the make-up of the Alexandrian citizen body (see, e.g., Claudius’ letter, *CPJ* 153, lines 52-73). Trajan appeals to precedent to stress that Roman rulers very rarely conferred Alexandrian citizenship on anyone (Pliny, *Ep.* 10.7), but the case of Harpokras proves that it did occasionally happen. However, it no doubt assisted Pliny’s case that he did not describe the man as an “Egyptian.” Roman prejudice against Egyptians attributed to them, beside political instability and absurd religion, an unfamiliarity with the rule of law and magistracies (Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.11: *inscia legum et ignara magistratum*). Given the reputation of Alexandria as a volatile city, and the primacy of law within the definition of Roman citizenship, it was certainly unlikely that anyone with the label “Egyptian” would be granted either Alexandrian or Roman citizenship. They were even forbidden in Roman law from marrying ἄστοί and from serving in Roman legions (Delia 1991: 37).

<sup>139</sup> For the ironic use of “noble” (γενναῖος), see note to “Apion” at 2.32.

<sup>140</sup> The claim is based on the statement at the end of 2.41: the Romans would not allow an “Egyptian” to be an Alexandrian citizen. Apion’s Alexandrian status was previously claimed to be “false” (2.29) and is here declared illegal, in order to provide a neat rhetorical

*Alexander's  
honor of  
Judeans*

charges against those who justly received them.<sup>141</sup>

For it was not for lack of people to inhabit the city, which he was founding with such care, that Alexander assembled some of our people there;<sup>142</sup> rather, having carefully scrutinized all, he accorded this privilege to our people as a reward for their virtue and loyalty.<sup>143</sup> 43 For he held our nation in honor, as Hecataeus also says concerning us:<sup>144</sup> because of the kindness and loyalty that the Judeans showed to him,<sup>145</sup> he added the Samaritan territory to theirs, free of tribute.<sup>146</sup>

contrast: Apion rules out what is legitimate for the Judeans, but claims the same thing illegitimately for himself. Josephus offers no explanation of how Apion skirted the law in this matter.

<sup>141</sup> On “attempt” (ἐπιχειρέω) as implying failure, see 1.13, note at “histories.” “Bring false charges” (συκοφαντέω) is a term not otherwise used in *Apion*, but employed by Josephus occasionally elsewhere (verb or cognate noun in, e.g., *War* 1.11; *Ant.* 10.114; 16.170; *Life* 52). The term itself implies that the charges are false and malicious (for the more neutral “accusation” language elsewhere, see note to “lawsuit” at 2.4). Josephus remains vague about the “privileges” he is defending, and about who was entitled to them. From this point on he shifts attention away from legal rights to the *honor* that Judeans in Egypt received from one ruler after another.

<sup>142</sup> Here begins a survey of the history of relations between Judeans and the rulers of Egypt (from Alexander to Augustus), which runs till 2.64. The focus subtly shifts from political rights in Alexandria to tokens of general admiration or respect, but the theme of political loyalty is particularly prominent. It appears that Apion had charged that Judeans were a politically in-subordinate group (see note to “Alexandria” at 2.33). In fact, Josephus mentions Apion comparatively rarely in the course of this narrative, and sometimes only for what he has *omitted* (2.48, 62), suggesting that some of the material is shaped by Josephus’ own interests, and not all of it is demanded by his response to Apion. Some of the stories recounted derive from *Antiquities* (e.g., 2.44-47); others are new in Josephus’ repertoire. The apposite material about Chelkias and Ananias (*Ant.* 13.284-87, 348-52) is omitted here, for no obvious reason, but the fact that the narrative does not continue beyond Augustus may be due to Josephus’ unwillingness to rehearse the narrative of the riots in 38 CE, or Claudius’ settlement, or the further violence in 66 CE. There is little personal invective against Apion; the vitriol is redirected against Cleopatra, with a view to her reputation in Rome (2.56-60).

Alexander’s foundation of the city, in 331 CE, was variously recounted (e.g., Arrian, *Anab.* 3.1; Plutarch, *Alex.* 26; see Fraser 1972: 1.1-7); these confirm Josephus’ reference to his special interest in the

place (though he left its organization to Cleomenes), but the notion of a special assembling of Judeans is implausible and reflects Judean national pride rather than historical reality.

<sup>143</sup> “Loyalty” (πίστις) is an important theme in this narrative (cf. 2.43, 44; *fides* in 2.52, 61, 64), though we cannot tell what Josephus (or his pseudo-Hecataean source, 2.43) had in mind to exemplify this virtue in this case. In *Ant.* 12.7-9 (which speaks of Ptolemy I, not Alexander, taking Judeans to the new city), there is reference to their pledges (πίστεις) to Alexander after his defeat of Darius (12.8), but this hardly matches the account of *Ant.* 11.317-18. It appears that Josephus knew a number of inconsistent stories about the relationship between Alexander and the Judeans, and deployed those that suited his narrative at appropriate points.

<sup>144</sup> The paraphrase to follow (perhaps an acute abbreviation of a larger narrative) is not directly relevant to Judeans in Alexandria: it appears Josephus had no better “evidence” for Alexander’s favorable attitude to Judeans (cf. 2.35, 37). As in 1.183-204, Josephus is almost certainly citing a Jewish pseudepigraphon (see Appendix 2). Although efforts have been made to defend its attribution to the authentic Hecataeus (e.g., Gager 1969: 135-36), there are overwhelming reasons to consider it a later Judean forgery, since its claim is both implausible and anachronistic (see Gauger 1982: 38-40 and especially Bar-Kochva 1996a: 113-21). Those who propose an authentic substratum have to concede that the historical information is exaggerated or distorted (Stern 1.23-24; Schürer revised 3.672-73), and it is simpler to attribute it to the pseudo-Hecataeus who wrote extensively about the Judeans in the time of Alexander and Ptolemy I (1.183-204). There is no reason to regard this as derived from a second pseudo-Hecataeus, *pace* Wacholder 1974: 263-73, who wrongly attributes all of 2.43-47 to this source.

<sup>145</sup> We cannot tell what pseudo-Hecataeus recounted to support this notion, though the context is probably military; cf. the reference to Judeans in Alexander’s army (1.192; *Ant.* 11.339). Perhaps this source displayed Judeans as supporting Alexander during his siege of Tyre, or in a punitive expedition against the Samaritans (see next note).

<sup>146</sup> According to a thinly attested tradition (not re-

44 And Ptolemy, son of Lagus, had opinions about the Judean residents in Alexandria similar to those of Alexander.<sup>147</sup> For he entrusted<sup>148</sup> to them the fortresses throughout Egypt, reckoning that they would guard them loyally and nobly;<sup>149</sup> and when he wanted to establish firm control over Cyrene and the other cities in Libya, he dispatched a segment of the Judeans to settle there.<sup>150</sup> 45 His successor Ptolemy, surnamed Philadelphus,<sup>151</sup> not only set free all of our people who happened to be prisoners of war in his realm,<sup>152</sup> but also often donated money,<sup>153</sup> and—this is the

*Ptolemy I and  
Judeans*

*Ptolemy II and  
Judeans*

laid by Josephus), the Samaritans revolted against Alexander's commander, Andromachus, and were brutally punished as a result: so Curtius 4.8.9-11 and Eusebius, *Chron.* 123d. There is some archaeological evidence to support this (see Stern 1.448-49; cf. Tcherikover 1959: 47-48). This is conceivably the narrative context for this remarkable notice. But Samaria and Judea were separate territories under the Ptolemies and Seleucids, and it is highly implausible that Alexander should allow a large tract of land to be tribute-free (cf. the limited sabbath-year concession to Judea, recorded in *Ant.* 11.338; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 116-17). In fact, this notice seems to reflect much later conditions. In 147/6 BCE Demetrius II gave Jonathan three southern toparchies of Samaria tribute-free (1 Macc. 11.34; cf. 10.30, 38), and in two campaigns (of 112/111 and 108/107 BCE) Hyrcanus captured the whole of Samaria (*Ant.* 13.255-56, 275-81). As Bar-Kochva argues (1996a: 134-36, following Willrich, Walter et al.), it appears that pseudo-Hecataeus here provides legitimation for the Hasmonean conquest, claiming that the territory was Judean by rights in Alexander's settlement of the area. See further Marcus in Appendix C to Josephus Loeb VI: 523-28. Doran's suggestion that the notice refers to a village called Samaria in Egypt (1985: 913-14) is implausible: the "addition" of this territory only fits the context of Judea.

<sup>147</sup> Despite this statement, what follows has nothing to do with Alexandria, but concerns the deployment of Judeans in Egyptian fortresses and in Cyrene. In the effort to maintain a narrative that mentions each Ptolemy in succession, Josephus is forced to draw in what little information he had. Josephus has, it seems, 3 sources of information on Ptolemy I Soter (reigned 305-282 BCE): Agatharchides (cited in 1.205-12), who describes him as a cruel despot; pseudo-Hecataeus (cited in 1.183-204), who apparently gave a wholly positive portrayal of the king and of his relations with Judeans; and pseudo-Aristeas, who describes the king as enslaving many Judeans, but excuses him for this and indicates that he placed Judeans in fortresses (*Aristeas* 13-15, 36). In *Ant.* 12.1-10 Josephus mixes materials from these sources; here, he uses material from *Aristeas* on the fortresses, while the notice about despatch to Cyrene is either invented

or perhaps derived from pseudo-Hecataeus.

<sup>148</sup> Reading ἐνεχείρισε with ed. princ. and all modern editors; L has ἐνεχέρησε.

<sup>149</sup> This reference to fortresses is derived from *Aristeas* 13 and 36 (the latter describing the Judeans as πιστούς, cf. πιστώδης, "loyally," here); Josephus had earlier used this detail in *Ant.* 12.8, 45 (cf. 3 Macc. 6.25). The Ptolemies probably continued the Persian policy of manning border-posts with garrisons of foreign soldiers (cf. the Judeans at Elephantine). We know of Judeans in the Ptolemaic army from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE (*CPJ* 18-32; see Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.11-15; Modrzejewski 1995: 83-87; Barclay 1996a: 22-23); cf. the "Judeans' camp" in the Delta (*War* 1.191; *Ant.* 14.133; Schürer revised 3.48-49). But there is no reason to think that the Judeans were specially singled out for this role; indeed they were often indistinguishable from other "Syrians" (Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.4-5).

<sup>150</sup> The other cities in the Pentapolis were Berenike, Apollonia, Ptolemais, and Teucheria. The region was controlled by the Ptolemaic kings but this notion of planned settlement may be mere inference from later realities, if it is not derived from pseudo-Hecataeus. Cf. Josephus' citation of Strabo on the Judeans as the 4<sup>th</sup> element in the population of Cyrene, *Ant.* 14.114-18. We know almost nothing about early Ptolemaic settlement in Cyrenaica; see Applebaum 1979: 130-38; Barclay 1996a: 232-33.

<sup>151</sup> Reigned 282-245 BCE. From here to 2.47 Josephus is entirely dependent on *The Letter of Aristeas*, which he had already used extensively in *Ant.* 12.11-118; but he does not reveal here either his source or his earlier version of this material. Once again there is nothing here specifically about Judeans in Alexandria.

<sup>152</sup> According to *Aristeas* 12-27, there were 100,000 of these (cf. *Ant.* 12.11, 24-33: 120,000). Josephus' vague "all who happened to be" (εἴ τινες) masks the fact that these had been brought to Egypt as slaves by Ptolemy I; that would hardly have fitted the impression just given by 2.44. Cf. the efforts to excuse the king in *Aristeas* 14, 23 (echoed in *Ant.* 12.29).

<sup>153</sup> This is remarkably vague, indicating neither to whom money was donated nor why. Josephus' "often" may reflect the multiple gifts mentioned in his source:



greatest thing—was enthusiastic to get to know our laws and to read the books of our holy writings.<sup>154</sup> **46** Thus he sent requesting that men be dispatched who would translate the law for him,<sup>155</sup> and the commission that these things be well written he assigned to no ordinary figures, but to Demetrius of Phalerum, together with Andreas and Aristaeus<sup>156</sup>—Demetrius being the most learned man of his time,<sup>157</sup> **47** the latter two his chosen bodyguards<sup>158</sup>—these were the people to whom he assigned this commission. He would hardly have been eager to learn about the laws and our ancestral philosophy<sup>159</sup> if he had despised the people who employed

i) the compensation to the owners of Judean slaves (*Aristeas* 20: 20 drachmas per head, totalling 400 talents; *Ant.* 12.25-33: 120 drachmas per head, totalling more than 400 talents); ii) the gifts to Eleazar, including money for sacrifices in Jerusalem (*Aristeas* 33; *Ant.* 12.40-41, 58: 50 talents of gold, countless precious stones, 120 talents for sacrifices); iii) support for the translators (*Aristeas* 301; *Ant.* 12.102); iv) gifts to the translators on their departure (*Aristeas* 319-20; *Ant.* 12.114-17: 2 talents per head).

<sup>154</sup> That Josephus singles this out as the most important item is not simply because his source is focused here; it is also because the laws and scriptures are central to his understanding of Judean culture. For the king to honor these therefore indicates his appreciation of the heart of the Judean tradition. In his introduction to *Antiquities*, Josephus paraded this story as an illustration of Gentile interest in the scriptures (*Ant.* 1.10-12). Indeed, Ptolemy Philadelphus represents the ideal reader of Josephus' own works, which communicate the substance of those scriptures (*Ant.* books 1-11) and the chief features of these laws (*Apion* 2.145ff.). *Aristeas* represents the initial impetus for the project as coming from Demetrius (9-11, 28-32; *Ant.* 12.12-16). But the king's enthusiasm and admiration for the scriptures (*Aristeas* 38-40, 312, 317) are strong, and are developed by Josephus (*Ant.* 12.48-49, 110, 114) to the extent that the king recognizes them to contain the laws of God (*Ant.* 12.89-90). Whether the translation of the Septuagint was in fact a royal project, or (more likely) a necessity instituted by Alexandrian Judeans, is a matter of debate; see Momigliano 1975a: 91-92; Veltri 1994; N. Collins 2000: 115-81.

<sup>155</sup> For the sake of his argument, Josephus emphasizes the initiative of the king, but he condenses the story so much that he does not indicate whence the translators came, or who dispatched them.

<sup>156</sup> *Aristeas* has Demetrius suggest the project, instruct the translators, and welcome their product (9-11, 28-40, 301-17; *Ant.* 12.12-16, 34-39, 110-13), while *Aristeas* and Andreas serve in the king's court, suggest the freeing of slaves, and act as envoys between Philadelphus and the high-priest Eleazar (12, 40, 43, 173; *Ant.* 12.17-27, 50, 53, 86).

<sup>157</sup> Cf. 1.218. An Athenian peripatetic philosopher, *strategos*, and orator (ca. 345–282 BCE), Demetrius fled Athens in 307 BCE and served as librarian in Alexandria under Ptolemy I (from ca. 297 BCE; see *FGH* 228). Better sources indicate that he actually disapproved of Philadelphus' accession to the throne, and was accordingly banished in 283 BCE, dying in exile (Diogenes Laertius 5.78; Cicero, *Rab. Post.* 23). But in depicting this friendly relationship between Demetrius and Philadelphus, Josephus follows the erroneous legend embedded in *Aristeas* (for an alternative view, defending the account in *Aristeas*, see N. Collins 2000: 58-114). The description of Demetrius' learning (παιδεία ... διαφέροντα; cf. Cicero, *Brut.* 9) is not derived from his introduction in *Aristeas* 9 (*Ant.* 12.12); the phrase is used of Andreas and *Aristeas* in *Aristeas* 43; *Ant.* 12.53. Παιδεία is a term of high value in *Apion* (cf. 1.21, 73, 129, 181; 2.171), and it matters to Josephus that people of the *highest* intellectual (Greek) training recognize in Judaism something immensely admirable (cf. 1.175; 2.281).

<sup>158</sup> In *Aristeas*, the author's role in court is unspecified, while Andreas and Sosibius are the chief bodyguards (12; cf. *Ant.* 12.17-18, where *Aristeas* is one of the king's closest friends). But Andreas and *Aristeas* are paired as envoys, "highly honored" by the king (*Aristeas* 40, 43; *Ant.* 12.50, 53).

<sup>159</sup> Greek: τὴν πάτριον ἡμῶν φιλοσοφίαν (cf. Philo, *Legat.* 156; *Mos.* 2.216; *Somn.* 2.127); earlier Josephus had spoken of his own expertise in "the philosophy" contained in the scriptures (1.54). In *Ant.* 1.10 Philadelphus is described as interested in "the law and the arrangement of the constitution," but Josephus also there suggests that the law contains matters worthy of philosophical enquiry (*Ant.* 1.25). There is no special stress on Judean "philosophy" in *Apion*. Here, besides Judeans, several nations are described as having their own wisdom (σοφία) or philosophy (φιλοσοφία): Egyptians (1.28; 2.140-41), Chaldeans (1.129), and Greeks (1.14, 51; 2.168, 239, 255, 281); and several ("Greek") individuals are described in these terms (1.162, 165, 175-76, 183; 2.269). Aristotle recognizes the "philosophical" virtue of the Judean he meets (1.177-81), but Josephus associates moral virtues more

them and had not rather greatly admired them.<sup>160</sup>

(2.5) 48 It has escaped Apion's notice how the [Macedonian] kings of his ancestors,<sup>161</sup> almost every one of them in succession, were extremely kindly disposed towards us.<sup>162</sup> Thus Ptolemy III, called Euergetes, after winning the whole of Syria by force,<sup>163</sup> did not sacrifice thank-offerings for his victory to the Gods in Egypt but came to Jerusalem and, as is our rule, performed many sacrifices to God<sup>164</sup> and dedicated votive offerings befitting the victory.<sup>165</sup> 49 Ptolemy Philometor and his wife

*Ptolemy III  
and Judeans*

with "law" and "constitution," and takes the parallels with Greek "philosophy" to lie more in (what we would call) the theological dimensions of the Judean tradition (2.168-69, 239, 255, 281; the last concerns both belief and practice). For the relationship between "philosophy" and "constitution", see Introduction § 9.F and the debate between Mason 1996 and Haaland 1999. If Judaism is an "ancestral philosophy," it is in *Apion* a singular phenomenon, not split into rival Judean "philosophies" (cf. *War* 2.119; *Ant.* 18.11). Josephus is content to use the Greek term "philosophy" for his own tradition, but here, as in 1.54, through a process of transculturation, it becomes the vehicle for something distinctively Judean.

<sup>160</sup> On Apion's portrayal of the Judeans as despicable, see 2.33, 125, 135. Josephus' inference is not very secure (one can desire to know about something without greatly admiring it), but he wants to portray a consistent pattern of royal admiration (cf. *Ant.* 12.118; θαυμάζειν or its Latin equivalents are used again in this positive sense in 2.49, 56, 60; cf. 1.162, 165). What delights Josephus is that his national tradition is honored by his nation's political and cultural masters *on its own terms* (even if in translation), and *in its central expression*. For Josephus' use of the Septuagint legend, see Krieger 2000.

<sup>161</sup> Greek (in L and S): οἱ τῶν προγόνων αὐτοῦ Μακεδόνων βασιλεῖς. This would be more naturally construed as "the kings of his Macedonian ancestors," but one of Josephus' chief rhetorical weapons is to portray Apion as "Egyptian" (from 2.28 onwards), and to describe his ancestors now as "Macedonian" would undermine this strategy completely. Willrich (1895: 176) considered that Josephus here slipped, and let out the truth about Apion's Macedonian ancestry, but such a slip would be extraordinarily maladroit. Thackeray, also taking "Macedonian" with "ancestors," understood this as Josephan irony; but in other cases where Josephus indicates that Apion might be considered something other than "Egyptian" (e.g., 2.34, 49), he makes it quite clear that the claim is false. If we here take the phrase as it stands, it seems best to understand it as a rather clumsy reference to the Ptolemies as "the kings (of Macedonians) of his ancestors", with "of Macedonians" inserted to clarify that this is not about the

Pharaohs. The insertion may be Josephus' own (Paret, cited by Lévy 1900: 192), or a scribal gloss (so Naber, Reinach, and Münster, with Lévy 1900: 191-92); hence the square brackets in the translation above.

<sup>162</sup> The topic has now broadened out to include any tokens of royal favor towards Judeans, in Alexandria or Egypt, or indeed in Judea. This may be justified by Apion's global critique of Judeans (2.28), or may reflect Josephus' desire to make use of whatever material he had to hand. "Almost every one in succession" highlights the fact that, after Alexander, he has cited Ptolemy I (2.44), Ptolemy II (2.45-47) and now Ptolemy III (2.48). After that, however, he skips to Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II (2.49-55), then jumps again to Cleopatra VII (2.56-60).

<sup>163</sup> Ptolemy III Euergetes I reigned 247-221 BCE. At the start of his reign, during the third Syrian War (246-41 BCE), he captured huge swathes of Seleucid territory, and so controlled the whole of the eastern Mediterranean: see *OGIS* 1.54; Polybius 5.58; Catullus 66.35-36.

<sup>164</sup> This visit to Jerusalem is otherwise unattested and may derive from parallel legends (e.g. Philopator in Jerusalem in 3 Macc. 1.6-9). Josephus likes to portray Hellenistic kings and Roman authorities offering worship in, or sending sacrifices to, the Jerusalem temple: e.g., Alexander (*Ant.* 11.336), Ptolemy Philadelphus (*Ant.* 12.50), Demetrius (*Ant.* 13.55), Antiochus Sidetes (*Ant.* 13.242-45), Sossius (*Ant.* 14.488), and Agrippa (*Ant.* 16.14); see Cohen 1987: 412-15. Josephus takes this to signal special honor of the Judeans and their God, but, as Cohen points out (1987: 415), in the context of a conquest (Judea would be part of "Syria"), the king would regard this offering of sacrifice as indicating his new role as representative of the conquered people before the deity (locally understood) who had granted him victory. Josephus' claim that the Jerusalem worship was a *substitute* for worship of the Egyptian deities reflects the logic of his own exclusive monotheism, but is totally implausible (Müller 247): the Ptolemies' authority in Egypt was maintained by their full participation in, and appropriation of, Egyptian religion.

<sup>165</sup> Reading ἄξια ("befitting," with Hudson, Naber, Reinach, Münster, and Schreckenburg 1977: 165, fol-

*Philometor and  
Cleopatra II*

*Alexandrian  
civil war and  
Onias*

Cleopatra entrusted their whole kingdom to Judeans,<sup>166</sup> and the commanders of the whole army were Onias<sup>167</sup> and Dositheos,<sup>168</sup> Judeans. Apion mocks their names,<sup>169</sup> but one should admire their achievements and not insult them, rather thank them for saving Alexandria,<sup>170</sup> of which he claims to be a citizen.<sup>171</sup> **50** For when the Alexandrians were at war with Queen Cleopatra and were in danger of coming to a terrible end, these men forged a treaty and freed them from their internecine woes.<sup>172</sup>

lowing the Latin), rather than ἄξιως (“fittingly,” in L and S, followed by Niese and Thackeray). We know almost nothing about relations between Judeans and Euergetes I, but the two earliest synagogue inscriptions from Egypt (Horbury & Noy 1992: nos. 22, 117) are dedicated “on behalf of” the king and Berenice, his wife.

<sup>166</sup> Ptolemy Philometor VI reigned from 180–145 BCE; he married his sister, Cleopatra II, in 175 BCE. She is specifically named here since she is pivotal to the following narrative, as the legitimate bearer of the Ptolemaic line. This broad claim is clarified in the following statement about the army, which itself seems exaggerated. The “entrusting” (πιστεύω) mirrors the “loyalty” (πίστις) which is a characteristic of Judeans in this story (see 2.42, note at “loyalty”). Besides Onias (see below), we know of a Judean intellectual in the court, Aristobulus (2 Macc. 1.10); cf. Josephus’ story of Philometor’s support for Judeans against Samaritans (*Ant.* 13.74–79).

<sup>167</sup> This may be Onias IV (son of the murdered high-priest, Onias III), who fled to Egypt (according to Josephus’ chronology) in ca. 162–160 BCE and was permitted to set up a military settlement in Leontopolis (*War* 7.421–36; *Ant.* 13.62–75; on this figure as Onias IV, not Onias III, see Stern 1.405–6). This settlement, with its own temple, was known at “Onias’ land” (*War* 1.190; *Ant.* 13.65; 14.131) and was certainly of political value to Philometor (see Barclay 1996a: 35–37). *CPJ* 132 is addressed to a figure obviously intimate with the royal court, and in a position of political importance (in the Heliopolite nome?): the name of the addressee appears to begin Ὀνι (as read by Wilcken) and thus is likely to be Onias. However, the papyrus cannot be later than 164 BCE, so to connect this with Onias IV would require an adjustment of Josephus’ dating (advocated by Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.244–46; Modrzejewski 1995: 123–25). Even so, it is a stretch from the papyrus evidence, and from his control of “Onias’ land” to have him here jointly in command of the whole Ptolemaic army. This claim, not advanced in Josephus’ earlier works, is probably concocted to legitimate the military intervention described in 2.50.

<sup>168</sup> Dositheos is a common name for Judeans in Egypt. A more famous Dositheos is known from 3 Macc. 1.3 and *CPJ* 127 as prominent in the court of

Ptolemy Philopator IV (see Barclay 1996a: 104). It is not clear whence Josephus has derived this figure: he does not feature in the statement by Apion (2.50) nor in the rest of Josephus’ narrative (2.51–56).

<sup>169</sup> Josephus does not reveal the basis of the mockery, but mentions this first (before the more serious charges of 2.50, 56) to suggest that Apion’s criticism operates at a trivial level. Onias’ name could easily be associated with ὄνος, “ass.” From here a link could be made to the purported worship of the head of an ass in the Jerusalem temple (2.80) and/or to the Sethian connotations of the ass (see van Henten & Abusch 1996: 307 n.132).

<sup>170</sup> Josephus immediately directs the readers’ reaction (for “admiration,” cf. 2.47), before mentioning Apion’s political charge: they were not “against the city” (2.50) but acted to save it. Josephus will not allow Judeans to be seen as in any sense anti-Alexandrian.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. 2.29, 34, 42. Josephus keeps reminding his readers that Apion is untrustworthy and his purported connection to the city artificial. Here it is implied that, if his claim were true, he would have been grateful for the Judeans’ preservation of his city.

<sup>172</sup> In this context Josephus mentions a number of phenomena: i) this “war” of Alexandria against Cleopatra, the accompanying internecine woes, and a truce brokered by Onias and Dositheos; ii) Onias’ leading of an army against the city, when Thermus was present (2.50); this is portrayed as happening “subsequently”; iii) Physcon’s arrival from Cyrene to oust Cleopatra and her children; iv) Onias’ war against Physcon on her behalf (2.51–52, 56); v) Physcon’s plan to have Judeans in Alexandria trampled to death by elephants (2.53–55). It is not clear how these are interconnected, or whether Josephus has represented them in proper sequence, but it is obvious that his depiction of who was fighting for whom, and with what motive, is heavily slanted. Apion apparently presented Onias’ action as against the city (2.50), against Physcon (2.56), and against the interests of Rome (2.50, see notes below). But the phenomena being discussed here—civil war and competing claims to the Egyptian throne—could clearly be understood from several angles.

Unfortunately, our papyrological evidence for this period does not shed much light on the political events,

But subsequently, Apion says,<sup>173</sup> Onias led a considerable<sup>174</sup> army against the city,

and our literary sources (Polybius, Diodorus, Livy, Justin's epitome of Pompeius Trogus) are slim and fragmentary. We can, however, deduce the following (cf. Hölbl 1994: 157-83; Otto 1934; Otto and Bengtson 1938). After a period of triple rule, shared by Ptolemy VI Philometor, his wife Cleopatra II, and his brother Physcon/Euergetes II (170-64 BCE), Philometor was temporarily ejected from Alexandria (164-163 BCE), but reinstated by Rome and through popular recall (Diodorus 31.17c; 31.18). The kingdom was then divided: Philometor ruled Egypt, and Physcon Cyrene (Polybius 31.10, 17-19, 20; see Fraser 1972: 2.213, n.224). Since Josephus refers to Onias' action on behalf of Cleopatra (not Philometor), the events he discusses must be subsequent to this, and to the death of Philometor on campaign in 145 BCE. As he left for this campaign Philometor had installed his young son, Neos Philopator, as co-ruler (Samuel 1962: 144), but Physcon came from Cyrene to claim the whole kingdom, married Philometor's widow (and his sister) Cleopatra II, and murdered the infant Neos Philopator (Justin 38.8.2-4; Diodorus 33.6; Pompeius Trogus, prologue 38). In this context our sources refer to Physcon's revenge on the supporters of the murdered infant: a purge of the leading citizens of Alexandria (Justin 38.8.3), his mercenary troops' slaughter of his own Alexandrian supporters (Justin 38.8.5), and executions and banishments on false charges (Diodorus 33.6). If we may believe these sources (with their evident bias against Physcon), the change of regime involved considerable bloodshed. But it is notable that none describes any act of resistance to Physcon, or any "war" on behalf of Cleopatra, who married her brother speedily enough; Justin even says that Physcon gained the throne "without a struggle" (*sine certamine*, 38.8.3; see Willrich 1904: 247-48).

After the birth of a son, Memphites, to the new royal couple (Diodorus 33.13), Physcon (=Ptolemy VIII, Euergetes II) also married Cleopatra's daughter (his niece), Cleopatra III, but a civil war broke out in 132/31, forcing Physcon and Cleopatra III to flee to Cyprus, leaving Cleopatra II as sole ruler in Alexandria (Justin 38.8.11; Livy epitome of Book 59). After murdering Memphites in Cyprus (Diodorus 34/35.14), Physcon managed to return to Alexandria (in ca.127 BCE) and, by means unknown, the Ptolemaic factions were reconciled by 124 BCE; from this point on, the three monarchs re-established their joint rule, which lasted until Physcon's death in 116 BCE. No doubt, Physcon's return in 127 BCE was the occasion for further purges, but a fragment of Diodorus (34/35.20), which probably

belongs in this context (see Walton in the Loeb edition ad loc.; also Fraser 1972: 2.217 n.240), relates the unexpected clemency showed by Physcon to Marsyas, the general of the Alexandrians, since "he was now beginning to undergo a change of heart and by acts of kindness aimed to remedy the hatred of the populace against him."

Although the arrival of Physcon from Cyrene (2.51) must relate to the regime change in 145 BCE, we should not assume, as is usual (e.g., Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.21-23), that all the other events here mentioned by Josephus fit into this single context. There were two main periods of strife in Alexandria involving Cleopatra, in 145 and in 132-124 BCE—besides native revolts and apparently regular conflict between Physcon's troops and elements in the population (Diodorus 33.20; Polybius 34.14). The "intencine woes" of 2.50, 52 could refer to either of these occasions. It is likely that they should be identified with the events of 145 BCE (Thermus' presence—see below—makes best sense in that context), but since our other sources refer to no "war" in that context it is possible that they should be placed in ca. 127 BCE (in which case Josephus' depiction of events is very misleading). The subsequent legend of the elephants (2.53-56) is not historical, but the festival (2.55) is more likely to have celebrated the unexpected reprieve of Judeans in 127 BCE than the events of 145 BCE.

Josephus presents the two Judeans as peace-makers. He will later admit Onias' opposition to Physcon, but he first insists that Onias and Dositheos acted as intermediaries between Alexandria and her queen, and as saviors of them both.

<sup>173</sup> As in 2.21, 33, Josephus relays a statement from Apion, with "he says" embedded within the sentence. This is more likely paraphrase than verbatim citation, and the odd double description of Thermus' presence at the end of this sentence may suggest he has condensed or omitted elements in Apion's description. Because we do not know the context of Apion's statement, nor the circumstances that Josephus describes in the previous sentence, we cannot know what Onias' action represents. It is striking that Apion cast this event up against the Alexandrian Judeans nearly 200 years after it took place.

<sup>174</sup> L and S read ὀλίγον ("small"). Holwerda (followed by Naber and Münster, and tentatively by Thackeray and Reinach) suggested that a negative is missing: οὐκ ὀλίγον would make the army "not little," i.e., "considerable." It is unclear whether Apion understood this army to consist of fellow Judeans, but he



*Physcon's  
failed attempt  
to crush  
Judeans*

when Thermus the Roman ambassador was there and actually on the spot.<sup>175</sup> **51** Rightly done, I would say, and with full justification.<sup>176</sup> For the Ptolemy surnamed Physcon,<sup>177</sup> on the death of his brother Ptolemy Philometor, set out from Cyrene with the intention of expelling Cleopatra and the king's children<sup>178</sup> from the kingdom, in order to acquire the kingdom for himself unjustly. **52** For this reason Onias waged war against him in support of Cleopatra,<sup>179</sup> and did not abandon his loyalty towards the kings,<sup>180</sup> whatever the exigency. **53** Indeed, God visibly attested to the justice of his cause.<sup>181</sup> For when Ptolemy Physcon was not bold enough to<sup>182</sup> fight Onias' army, but had gathered and arrested all the Judeans in the city, with their children and

seems to have held this incident against Judeans in general, not Onias alone.

<sup>175</sup> Polybius records the names of a number of legates appointed by the Roman senate to support Physcon's claim to Cyprus in the 160s and 150s BCE (Polybius 31.10, 17, 20; 33.11). In the last of these, dating to 155/154 BCE, the 5 legates are headed by Gnaeus Merula and Lucius (Minucius) Thermus (Polybius 33.11). In supporting Physcon, Rome appears to have abandoned her treaty with Philometor (Polybius 31.20) and probably supported Physcon's accession to the whole Egyptian kingdom in 145 BCE. Rome had a strong interest in Egyptian affairs: C. Popilius Laenas had famously forced Antiochus Epiphanes to withdraw from Alexandria in 168 BCE (Polybius 29.27), and the younger Scipio visited Egypt on a diplomatic mission early in Physcon's reign (139 BCE: Diodorus 33.28b; Justin 38.8.8). It is thus plausible to imagine Thermus following up his earlier commission and being present in Alexandria at Physcon's installation in 145 BCE (Briscoe 1969: 61; Otto 1934: 118-19, 131-32). If Thermus was present to support Physcon, Onias' opposition could be construed as Judean resistance to Roman policy. This appears to have been Apion's point (cf. note to "Carthage" at 2.17); Josephus oddly includes this notice, but passes over it quickly and does not allow the reader to consider its implications.

<sup>176</sup> Josephus does not deny the historical facts, but he reinterprets them as a justified intervention against Physcon (not against "the city"). The events in 2.51-52 are thus given a strong moral slant.

<sup>177</sup> "Physcon" is a nickname, meaning "pot-bellied." Justin dwells on his gross physical appearance (enhanced by transparent clothing, 38.8.9-11). In this context, Josephus can trade on Physcon's universal reputation as a cruel, murderous, and capricious ruler (cf. Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 549c; Polybius 31.10.4; 34.14; Diodorus 33.12, 22, 23; Justin 38.3.2-6).

<sup>178</sup> From this point until the end of 2.113 there is a lacuna in the Greek MSS; we are dependent on the Latin translation (see Introduction § 10). Shutt 1987 conjectures the original Greek by retroversion from the Latin.

Since Physcon had been co-regent since 170 BCE, and the kingdom divided with his brother in 164 (see note to "woes" at 2.50), he no doubt regarded himself as entitled to inherit Philometor's portion in 145 BCE; Rome probably supported this claim (see note to "spot" at 2.50) and Cleopatra was content to marry him. Josephus' presentation of events is thus slanted, though it perhaps reflects the claims of the supporters of Neos Philopator (Justin 38.8.3). Of Philometor's children (*fili*), Eupator had already died in 150 BCE, and Neos Philopator was murdered by Physcon in 145 BCE (Justin 38.8.2-4). Of the daughters, Physcon married Cleopatra III in 141/140 BCE. Expulsion was not, it seems, the fate of any in the family.

<sup>179</sup> Physcon's "unjust" acquisition of power (2.51) is here made to legitimate Onias' support of Cleopatra against him. Josephus gives the impression that this war took place as soon as Physcon claimed the throne, but there are reasons to place this event somewhat later (see note to "woes" at 2.50). Although he admits, and justifies, this war (cf. 2.56), Josephus displays the Judeans in the role of victims, not aggressors (2.53-55).

<sup>180</sup> For the motif, see note to "loyalty" at 2.42. Physcon is treated as an illegitimate claimant, and Cleopatra the representative of the proper royal line. Onias' attack is thus not a revolt, nor an act of treachery, as Apion probably claimed (cf. 2.68).

<sup>181</sup> Josephus has to work hard to justify Onias (cf. "rightly done" in 2.51); reference to God's intervention in history is rare in his work and found only here in *Apion*. The visible attestation may be the whole unexpected course of events, or more specifically the apparition of 2.54. For parallels in Josephus' work, see *Ant.* 10.234-35; 11.329-36, both averting insults to, or attacks on, Judeans.

<sup>182</sup> Latin: *cum ... praesumeret* ("when he was bold/rash"). Niese, followed by Reinach, Thackeray, and Münster, inserted a negative (*non*), giving the meaning above. This seems necessary to preserve some narrative logic. Josephus knew (at least from Apion) of Onias' challenge to Physcon, and he knew from another source (see below) the story of Alexandrian Judeans and drunken elephants. He attempts to sew them together,

wives,<sup>183</sup> and placed them, naked and bound, in front of elephants, to be crushed to death by them, and for this purpose had also got the animals drunk,<sup>184</sup> things turned out quite contrary to what he had planned. **54** For the elephants left untouched the Judeans placed in front of them, but charged at Physcon's friends, killing many of them.<sup>185</sup> Subsequently, Ptolemy saw a terrifying apparition, which forbade him to harm those people,<sup>186</sup> and **55** when his favorite concubine (whom some call Ithaca, others Eirene)<sup>187</sup> urged him not to perpetrate so great an impiety, he yielded to her and repented of what he had already done and was about to do.<sup>188</sup> Hence, the Judeans who are settled in Alexandria are known to celebrate this day as a festival, rightly, since they were visibly granted deliverance by God.<sup>189</sup> **56** Apion, however, who brings malicious charges against everyone,<sup>190</sup> dared to accuse the Judeans even

but the result is awkward.

<sup>183</sup> This is clearly quite a different matter from Onias' army. Josephus now gives a compressed version of a tale we find, with similar shape but partly different content, in 3 Maccabees. In common with that text is the gathering of the defenseless Judeans in Alexandria, their exposure to drunken elephants (who turn back on their handlers), the repentance of the king, and a Judean festival to commemorate the events. The festival (2.55; cf. 3 Macc. 6.30-40; 7.18-20) appears to be the common source of these different versions (there is no reason to think that Josephus knew 3 Maccabees directly): the variant names of one of the characters (2.55) indicate the multiplicity of versions available to Josephus. The most striking difference is that 3 Maccabees places this incident in the time of Ptolemy Philopator IV. In fact, the story seems sufficiently self-contained to be attached to almost any Alexandrian king, though the name of the concubine Eirene (2.55, see note ad loc.) matches another legend independently linked to Physcon. Physcon had a reputation for utter ruthlessness (see note to "Physcon" at 2.51), so this tale easily attached itself to his name.

<sup>184</sup> Cf. 3 Macc. 3.25-5.10, with heightened pathos (though without the nakedness), and enormously extended suspense. On 3 Maccabees as a text, see the differing judgments of Barclay 1996a: 192-203; Gruen 1998: 222-36; cf. the full treatment by Johnson 2004.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. 3 Macc. 5.45-6.21, spun out with a long prayer; for the "friends," cf. 3 Macc. 5.19, 26, 34, etc. The recoiling of the intended punishment is reminiscent of Mordecai and Haman (*Ant.* 11.267), just as the resulting festival shares elements in common with Purim (*Ant.* 11.291-92).

<sup>186</sup> The apparition in 3 Macc. 6.18-20 is simultaneous with the elephant debacle and concerns two angels, visible to all except the Judeans (cf. 2 Macc. 3.24-28). Josephus has a purely private vision, with a voice of warning.

<sup>187</sup> Josephus seems to know more than one version of the story. Eirene is named as Physcon's concubine

in Diodorus 33.13. There is no such figure in 3 Maccabees.

<sup>188</sup> The concubine, the apparition, and the wayward elephants form 3 different means of persuading Physcon to change his mind. Such are the accretions common to legends, though it is telling that in this version Physcon finally yields to a woman. Cf. the role of Pilate's wife in Matt 27:19. The king's repentance, without female aid, is recounted and demonstrated in 3 Macc. 6.22-29; 7.1-12.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. 3 Macc. 6.30-40 (in Alexandria); 7.18-20 (in the chora). The wording here is close to 3 Macc. 6.36. This annual festival in Alexandria may be taken as a historical fact; it is another matter what positive turn of events initially gave rise to it. If we have to choose between the reigns of Philopator and Physcon, the latter is more likely, given the turbulence of his reign and his reputation for cruelty. Willrich's argument that the festival commemorates a later event, during the reign of Lathyrus in 88 BCE (Willrich 1904), was refuted by Lévy 1950-51. Although we know of synagogue inscriptions dedicated to Physcon (Euergetes II; Horbury & Noy 1992: nos. 24 and 25), and even the grant of asylum by the king to another synagogue (Horbury & Noy 1992: no. 125), this does not rule out the possibility of strained relations between some Judeans and Physcon at some point during his reign. Wherever we place the Onias incident (see note to "woes" at 2.50), the festival suggests some crisis for Judeans unexpectedly averted. It is possible that this concerns Physcon's decision to marry Cleopatra II rather than fight her (so Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.22; cf. Fraser 1972: 1.121; 2.215, n.232), but it is equally likely that it reflects the circumstances of Physcon's return to the city in ca. 127 BCE, when he took an unexpectedly conciliatory attitude to his opponents (cf. the reprieve of Marsyas in Diodorus 34/35.20, cited above). On this period see Otto and Bengtson 1938: 66-67, with reference to the "bad times" mentioned in 2 Macc. 1.5 (124 BCE?).

<sup>190</sup> If this is his universal practice, his case against the Judeans is nothing special. No other examples are

for the war waged against Physcon, when he ought to have commended them for it.<sup>191</sup>

*Cleopatra VII  
and her faults*

He also made mention of Cleopatra, the last queen of the Alexandrians,<sup>192</sup> as if it were a matter of reproach against us that she was ungracious towards us,<sup>193</sup> instead of using his energy to indict *her*,<sup>194</sup> 57 who was steeped in every kind of injustice and criminal activity<sup>195</sup> against her close relations,<sup>196</sup> her husbands (who still loved her),<sup>197</sup> and in general against all Romans and the commanders, her benefactors;<sup>198</sup>

offered, but Josephus may be trading on his reputation as a quarrelsome figure, if that is how his nickname “Pleistonikes” was understood (see Jacobson 1977).

<sup>191</sup> Only now is it explicit what Apion’s accusation was about; but by this time the action has been reinterpreted as *loyalty* to the Ptolemaic dynasty (2.51), its virtue attested by God (2.53). On Apion’s “daring” (Latin: *praesumo*; Greek: τολμᾶω?), cf. Lysimachus in 1.318. Josephus likes to tell the reader what Apion *should* have said (cf. 2.49, 60), posing as his moral superior.

<sup>192</sup> Cleopatra VII (born 69 BCE) reigned from 51–30 BCE. She was, of course, queen of Egypt and not just Alexandria, but Josephus perhaps wants to emphasize the fact that Alexandria, Apion’s claimed “homeland,” no longer has a monarch but is subservient to Rome (cf. 2.125).

<sup>193</sup> Josephus does not reveal until the end (2.60) the comparatively slight matter at issue here: the fact that she did not include Judeans in the grain-distribution in Alexandria during a food-shortage. This was part of Apion’s argument about Alexandrian citizenship, but by introducing it in this generalized form Josephus suggests that this was part of a settled policy against Judeans—indeed, a form of “ungraciousness” (on *ingrata* in this sense, see Müller 251). Josephus’ rhetoric successfully obscures and exaggerates the issue at hand, in order to place Cleopatra and Judeans in a state of mutual hostility.

<sup>194</sup> Again Josephus lectures Apion (cf. 2.49, 56, 62). Josephus has turned the issue into an opportunity to lambast Cleopatra and now begins a catalogue of accusations (2.57–60) that build on his earlier works and mirror the Octavian propaganda that had become embedded in the Roman tradition. In his *War* Josephus had criticised Cleopatra for her designs on Herod’s kingdom, and for her control of Antony’s policies through her sexual charms (*War* 1.359–67, 389–97, 439–40; 7.300–302). These points had been repeated and amplified in *Antiquities*, with a further assault on her character by reference to her treatment of her family and her predatory sexuality (e.g., *Ant.* 15.88–110, 256–58; see van Henten forthcoming). These same charges are echoed in the present catalogue, but supplemented by comments on her relationship with *Rome*. At these points,

Josephus’ discourse is closely aligned to the campaign of vilification first launched by Octavian in the build-up to the battle of Actium, and mirrored thereafter in Augustan poetry and subsequent historiography (Dio 50.24–30; Propertius 3.11.29–56; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.675–713; Horace, *Carm.* 1.37; Volkmann 1958: 157–62; Becher 1966; Zanker 1988: 57–61; Hughes-Hallett 1990: 54–94). Josephus thus accommodates himself to the official Roman perspective, and forges an alliance in polemic against their common “enemy.” This full, and barely relevant, outburst against Cleopatra is a further sign of the Romanized stance he adopts in this treatise.

<sup>195</sup> The catalogue, which forms a single sentence in 2.57–58, is organized by theme, not historical sequence. It begins with general moral charges parallel to those used in *Ant.* 15.89, though without specific emphasis on her greed.

<sup>196</sup> Cf. *War* 1.359; the details will be provided below in relation to her sister and brother.

<sup>197</sup> Latin: *vel circa maritos suos, qui etiam dilexerunt eam*. Blum translates “soit contre ses maris, ou ses amants,” conjecturing that the Latin translator misunderstood here a reference in the Greek to her lovers (see Thackeray ad loc.). That might make better sense, though the charge of betraying a *loving* husband is perhaps comprehensible as exacerbating her offense. She was married as a young girl to her two brothers in succession; she competed with the first for the kingdom and was reputed to have had the second poisoned (see note to “treacherously” at 2.58). Julius Caesar was reputed to be her lover (and father of Caesarion), but was never her husband; Mark Antony was also never technically married to her, though he will here be described as her husband (2.59) and he acknowledged their children as his heirs (see note to “children” at 2.59). Josephus elsewhere charges her with sexual promiscuity (*Ant.* 15.97), but here will keep her relationship with Julius Caesar purely political (2.58).

<sup>198</sup> “Commanders” translates Latin *imperatores*. The term was used for a Roman general during the Republic, and later adopted by Roman emperors (see Mason 2001: 140, n.1403). The figures in view are Pompey, Julius Caesar, and Mark Antony. Her ingratitude for their “benefactions” is here wrapped up with a

who murdered her sister Arsinoe in a temple, although she had done her no harm;<sup>199</sup> **58** who even assassinated her brother treacherously<sup>200</sup> and plundered her ancestral Gods and the tombs of her forefathers;<sup>201</sup> who gained possession of her kingdom from the first Caesar<sup>202</sup> but dared to rebel against his son and successor,<sup>203</sup> corrupted Antony by her sexual charms,<sup>204</sup> and made him an enemy of his country and disloyal to his friends,<sup>205</sup> some of whom she deprived of their royal status,<sup>206</sup> while oth-

claim regarding her global opposition to Rome, which is how she appears in Octavian/Augustan propaganda.

<sup>199</sup> The incident is described in more detail in *Ant.* 15.89. There the murder takes place through Antony (here the blame is not diffused), while Arsinoe was a suppliant in the temple of Artemis in Ephesus. The tale is told (as the result of the compact with Antony, sealed in Tarsus in 41 BCE) in similar terms in Dio 48.24.2 and Appian, *Bell. civ.* 5.9 (though the latter says she had moved from Ephesus to the temple of Artemis Leucophryne in Miletus). Arsinoe had made a bid for the throne of Egypt in the turmoil of 48/47 BCE (Dio 42.39; Lucan, *Phars.* 10.519-23), and had been paraded in Julius Caesar's triumphal procession in Rome, but allowed to seek asylum in Ephesus. While she remained alive, she was a potential threat to Cleopatra, and certainly not the harmless victim portrayed here.

<sup>200</sup> Cf. again *Ant.* 15.89: she poisoned him, when he was only 15 years old, because she knew he would acquire the kingdom. Cleopatra initially shared rule with the older of her brothers, Ptolemy XIII, but a power-struggle, inflamed by Julius Caesar's arrival in Alexandria, resulted in the "Alexandrine War" (48-47 BCE), at the end of which the boy disappeared (Appian, *Bell. civ.* 5.9) or was found drowned (Florus 2.13.60; Dio 42.43.4). Having installed her as queen, Caesar then arranged her marriage to her other brother, Ptolemy XIV Philopator (Dio 42.44.1-4), and the pair stayed in Rome in 46-44 BCE, until Caesar's death. Returning to Egypt in 44 BCE, with Caesarion as her heir, Cleopatra had good political reasons to rid herself of her brother. By September of that year, he was dead (aged 15/16), and the finger of suspicion naturally pointed to the queen (cf. Porphyry in *FGH* 260 frag. 3.15-17; Grant 1972: 97-98).

<sup>201</sup> Cf. *Ant.* 15.90-91, on the violation of temples and tombs. Dio mentions her need for money at the start of her reign, "not even leaving temples untouched" (42.34.1), and describes her desperate gathering of resources after the battle of Actium, "not sparing holy shrines" (51.5.4-5). The reference to tombs is unique to Josephus. Josephus avoids identifying the temples as Egyptian, given his scorn of Egyptian religion. Her impiety thus embraces her immediate family, her ancestors, and her Gods.

<sup>202</sup> Julius Caesar's presence and eventual military success in Alexandria in 48-47 BCE resulted in Cleo-

patra's secure possession of the throne; see Appian, *Bell. civ.* 2.90 (with reference to troops left to support her regime, 3.78; 4.59); Florus 2.13.54-60; Dio 42.36-44. The episode could be turned against Julius Caesar (for dallying with an eastern princess and fathering her child), but Josephus understandably omits mention of their personal relationship.

<sup>203</sup> Josephus assumes his readers will know this describes Octavian, Julius Caesar's adopted son. From Cleopatra's perspective, her son by Caesar, Ptolemy Caesarion, was his proper (and natural) heir, and in the "Alexandrian Donations" of 34 BCE she and Antony indicated his role, together with that of their children, in the future rule of the empire (Dio 49.41; Plutarch, *Ant.* 54). But Josephus here reflects the Augustan view that Cleopatra "rebelled" against the rightful succession to Caesar (cf. her depiction as *infidelis*, 2.60).

<sup>204</sup> This is a constant refrain in the depiction of Antony and Cleopatra, a piece of Augustan propaganda that has stuck in the record ever since. Josephus utilized this motif in his earlier work (*War* 1.243, 359, 390; 7.300-302; *Ant.* 14.324; 15.88, 93: the last passage adds to sex the influence of drugs). It is ubiquitous in Roman literature, which plays on the image of Antony as enslaved by love, emasculated, orientalized, and morally corrupted, a traitor to his Roman values and traditions: see, e.g., Propertius 3.11 (with Griffin 1985: 32-47); Appian, *Bell. civ.* 4.38; 5.1, 8-9; Florus 2.21; Dio 48.24.2; 48.27.2; 49.34.1; 50.5; 50.24-30; Plutarch, *Ant.* 25; 29; 37.4.

<sup>205</sup> Octavian declared war on Cleopatra, not Antony, thus depicting her as the one who turned Antony against Rome: Appian, *Bell. civ.* 5.11; Dio 50.24-30; Plutarch, *Ant.* 60; cf. Josephus in *War* 1.390; *Ant.* 13.191-92. The "friends" here are probably his eastern allies. Josephus had earlier portrayed Cleopatra as controlling Antony's eastern policy, coveting the properties ruled by his "friends," especially Herod (*War* 1.359-65, with reference to "friends" in 1.361; *Ant.* 15.74-79, 88, 91-95, 104, 256-58).

<sup>206</sup> Boysen considers this phrase, and the rest of the section, misplaced or textually corrupt; but it is only necessary to resolve a textual problem in the following phrase (see next note). Again, Josephus echoes his earlier claims (*War* 1.359-65), with special reference perhaps to Lysanias, King of Chalchis, and Malchus (*War* 1.440; *Ant.* 15.92; Plutarch, *Ant.* 36).



*Battle of Actium*

ers she deceived<sup>207</sup> and forced into evil ways.<sup>208</sup> **59** But what more need be said, when she abandoned even him, her husband and the father of their children,<sup>209</sup> in the naval battle,<sup>210</sup> and forced him to give up his army and his supreme power and to follow her?<sup>211</sup> **60** Finally, when Alexandria had been captured by Caesar,<sup>212</sup> she was reduced to such straits that she judged she could hope for survival if she could kill the Judeans with her own hands,<sup>213</sup> having been conspicuous for her cruelty and disloyalty to everyone. Would you not think it something to be proud of if, as Apion says, she did not distribute grain rations to the Judeans at a time of famine?<sup>214</sup>

*Roman testimony to Judean loyalty*

**61** She, however, suffered a due penalty,<sup>215</sup> while we have Caesar the Great as witness to the support and loyalty we displayed on his behalf against the Egyptians;<sup>216</sup>

<sup>207</sup> Reading *decipiens* (with Schreckenberg 1977: 165-66; Münster) in preference to *demens* ("being mad") read by most Latin MSS, or *deiciens* ("throwing down") in one. On the trap in which she attempted to ensnare Herod, see *Ant.* 15.96-103.

<sup>208</sup> It is often claimed that she led Antony into crime (*War.* 1.361; *Ant.* 15.94, 99; Dio 48.24.2; Appian, *Bell. civ.* 5.9); but if this is about his friends, it may concern her reputed career in sexual seduction (*Ant.* 15.97).

<sup>209</sup> The two were never married, and ancient accounts vary as to whether Antony considered her his wife (Suetonius, *Aug.* 69; Plutarch, *Ant.* 31.2). Cleopatra gave birth to twins (Alexander, surnamed Helios, and Cleopatra, surnamed Selene) in 40 BCE, and to another son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, in 36 BCE. Crucially, Antony acknowledged these as his children and heirs (Dio 49.32.4-5; 50.1.5) and divided the prospective empire between them and Caesarion (Plutarch, *Ant.* 36); Octavian had his will read in the Senate, to influence Roman opinion against him (Dio 50.3; Plutarch, *Ant.* 58). Josephus elsewhere has Herod predict her disloyalty to Antony (*Ant.* 15.99).

<sup>210</sup> This is famous enough in Rome to need no name: the battle of Actium, fought on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 31 BCE (see Carter 1970). See Virgil's famous description in *Aen.* 8.675-713.

<sup>211</sup> Josephus repeats the prejudiced account of her conduct, which has her initiate the flight from Actium, compelling Antony to follow suit: see, e.g., Dio 50.15, 33; Florus 2.21.8-11; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.707-8; Plutarch, *Ant.* 63.5; 66.3-5. This is the ultimate example of her ruination of a great Roman general, who flees from battle to follow a woman.

<sup>212</sup> After Actium, Octavian took military action to capture the city in 30 BCE (Dio 51.6-15).

<sup>213</sup> The oddity of this statement has led some to suggest that the text is corrupt. How could she kill the Judeans "with her own hands," how would this ensure her survival (*salus*), and would we not expect some reference here to her suicide ("with her own hand")? Noting this, Boysen put *Judaeos* in brackets and Reinach suggested inserting *se* ("herself"; so also Münster; cf.

Thackeray note ad loc.). However, the following clause about cruelty and disloyalty to everyone is perhaps best anticipated by a specific example of the same (which is hardly applicable to suicide); and it is not clear how she could gain *salus* through suicide. Dio says that, on arrival in Alexandria after Actium, she killed leading citizens who were pleased at the result of the battle (51.5.4-5), and it is possible that some Judeans fell into this category, especially after Herod abandoned Antony and made his peace with Octavian, even assisting his advance on Egypt (*War.* 1.386-97; Plutarch, *Ant.* 71.1). Josephus may thus allude to Judean victims in this purge, exaggerating the queen's personal involvement.

<sup>214</sup> Apion's statement, linked to that about Germanicus (2.63), probably noted this incident as proof that Judeans were not citizens of Alexandria (Wilcken 1928: 52-53). It is thus a comparatively minor incident in the larger story of Cleopatra's actions, but provides the hook on which Josephus can hang his extended invective against her. We cannot identify the date of the incident, but we know of two periods of serious famine during Cleopatra's reign: i) at the start of her reign (51-50 BCE), when a decree had to be issued diverting all grain to Alexandria (BGU VIII 1730; cf. Grant 1972: 49); and ii) two years (43-42 BCE) when the Nile failed to flood, causing serious food shortages (Seneca, *Nat.* 4.2.16; Appian, *Bell. civ.* 4.61, 63; *OGIS* 194; see Troiani 159; Vogel in Münster ad loc.). Josephus has by now done enough to turn this event into a mark of credit to Judeans, that they were insulted by so wicked a woman.

<sup>215</sup> Antony's and Cleopatra's suicides were famous, spawning multiple legends; see, e.g., Dio 51.6-16; Plutarch, *Ant.* 76-86. Cleopatra's is here depicted not as a noble death, but as a penalty for her disloyalty to Rome (or her mistreatment of Judeans); by contrast her victims were honored by Rome, as the rest of this section will record.

<sup>216</sup> Cf. 2.37 and the *stēlē* wrongly there attributed to Julius Caesar. This loyal support apparently refers to the assistance given by Hyrcanus and Antipater to

besides, we have the Senate and its decrees,<sup>217</sup> and letters from Caesar Augustus that acknowledge our services.<sup>218</sup> 62 Apion should have inspected these letters<sup>219</sup> and examined the various kinds of testimony made in the reigns of Alexander and all the Ptolemies, and those composed by the Senate, besides those from the greatest Roman commanders.<sup>220</sup> 63 If indeed Germanicus was not able to distribute grain to all the inhabitants of Alexandria, that is an indication of the failure of the crops and the shortage of grain, not grounds for an indictment of the Judeans.<sup>221</sup> For the shrewd opinion<sup>222</sup> of all the emperors<sup>223</sup> concerning the Judeans who inhabit Alex-

Mithridates, who came to the support of Caesar, when he was holed up in Alexandria in 47 BCE: see *War* 1.187-92; *Ant.* 14.127-48, 192-93; 16.52; Smallwood 1981: 37-38. By supporting Caesar, the Judeans enabled him to secure Cleopatra's reign, in opposition to many Alexandrians: but Josephus presents this as a war against "Egyptians," and does not reveal that its result favored Cleopatra.

<sup>217</sup> In context, this may refer specifically to the honors accorded in *senatus consulta* to Antipater, for his support of Caesar: see *War* 1.200, 282-85; *Ant.* 14.144 (with the text of a decree in 14.145-48, though this originates from a much earlier date); 16.48, 53. In *Ant.* 14.190-222 Josephus collects a set of decrees by Julius Caesar and the Senate regarding Hyrcanus and the Judean nation; cf. his conclusion in 14.265-67 on the friendship and alliance between Romans and Judeans (see Pucci ben Zeev 1998). These have nothing to do with Judeans in Alexandria, or with Apion's argument, but when it suits his case Josephus broadens the topic to include any and all Judeans.

<sup>218</sup> The only letters of Augustus that Josephus cites elsewhere are about Judeans in Asia (*Ant.* 16.162-66; cf. those from Agrippa in 16.167-73). Elsewhere he refers to Augustus' decision on the Judean "ethnarch" in Alexandria (*Ant.* 19.283), but apparently knew of no document on this matter.

<sup>219</sup> Josephus again knows what his opponent should have done (cf. 2.49, 56 [bis], 73). The implication is that he is grossly ignorant (2.37).

<sup>220</sup> Latin: *imperatores* (see note to "benefactors" at 2.57). Josephus would certainly want to include the "greatest" emperors like Augustus and Tiberius, Titus, and Vespasian; but in this context the term could also embrace Pompey, Antony, and Julius Caesar. This grand, generalizing, statement looks like a concluding summary, matching 2.37 at the start of this historical survey, though with greater emphasis on the Roman testimony. But there are two more sections of this survey to come (2.63-64), which contain awkward facts no doubt raised by Apion. Josephus' tactic is to isolate these facts, as single, untypical, phenomena, each with its own local explanation; they are therefore here placed in the context of a "wider" picture, which shows

the Judeans' consistently high reputation. Elsewhere, Josephus can use a single fact to draw a large positive conclusion (e.g., 2.43); here he will smother Apion's details with a blanket of generalized good impressions.

<sup>221</sup> Germanicus' action must have been part of Apion's argument: Josephus would hardly volunteer the information himself. It fits alongside the reference to Cleopatra in 2.60: both figures demonstrated, through their grain distributions in Alexandria, that they did *not* consider Judeans to be Alexandrian citizens. And since Germanicus was Gaius' father (as well as Tiberius' adopted son), this would have been weighty evidence in the case that Apion brought before Gaius in the delegation of 38/39 CE. Germanicus visited Egypt in 19 CE (without the permission of Tiberius), just before he died. His visit was wildly popular in Alexandria and, according to Tacitus, he gained favor by opening the granaries and lowering the price of grain (*Ann.* 2.59). Suetonius, *Tib.* 52, suggests that there was a huge and sudden food-shortage in the city, but that suggestion was probably a later legitimization of his visit (Hennig 1972: 363-64). There may have been a temporary shortage of grain, but not necessarily a famine, and access to cheap grain was probably restricted to Alexandrian citizens (perhaps only 10-15% of the population; so Wilcken 1928: 51-52; Hennig 1972: 362-63; *pace* Weingärtner 1969: 91-95 who gives greater credence to Suetonius). Josephus carefully omits all reference to status, and makes out that there was simply not enough grain to go round; he cannot admit the real reason, that Judeans were not considered citizens. But he does not provide a good alternative explanation of why Judeans were excluded from the grain-distribution, while others were included. Nor will he risk a character-assault on Germanicus, parallel to that launched against Cleopatra for her similar act of discrimination (2.56-60); cf. *Ant.* 19.223 for his awareness of Germanicus' very high reputation.

<sup>222</sup> Latin: *quid sapiant*. Shutt 1987 suggests the Greek read ὅτι φρονούσιν, which could be translated, "that [the emperors] thought well of [the Judeans]."

<sup>223</sup> Latin: *imperatores*: see note to "benefactors" at 2.57. Here it is probably best translated "emperors," since Josephus sets against a single figure, Germanicus

andria is clear: **64** for the management of the grain-supply was taken away from them no more than from the rest of the Alexandrians,<sup>224</sup> but they have preserved the greatest token of trust, granted them long ago by the kings, namely the custody of the river,<sup>225</sup> judging them to be in no respect unworthy in these matters of the entire custody.<sup>226</sup>

Apion on  
citizenship

**(2.6) 65** Further, he asks: “Why then, if they are citizens, do they not worship the same Gods as the Alexandrians?”<sup>227</sup> To which I respond: “Why in your case, al-

(from the imperial family, but not an emperor), the decision of the emperors themselves, indeed of *all* of them.

<sup>224</sup> Josephus slips in here another aspect of Apion’s case, which he would hardly mention had it not been cast up against the Judeans in Alexandria. By sandwiching it between two statements of imperial respect for Judeans, he hopes to neutralize its force; and by stressing the next matter as “greatest” (*maximam*) he minimizes its significance. We do not know what exactly Apion referred to here, though he perhaps exaggerated what Josephus correspondingly downplays. After annexing Egypt in 30 BCE, and in view of its significance as a source of grain for Rome (the *annona*), Augustus undoubtedly placed the grain-supply under the overall jurisdiction of the Roman prefect (Garnsey 1988: 231-35, 254-57); the Roman administration created two procuratorships of the Alexandrian granaries (Pavis D’Esurac 1976: 134-39; for the earlier Ptolemaic control of grain-production and distribution see Préaux 1939: 117-51). If this displaced a high-ranking Judean, it could be taken by Apion as a sign of Roman mistrust, or disparagement, of Judeans in Alexandria. Philo makes general remarks about wealthy Judean businessmen and ship-owners in Alexandria (*Flacc.* 57; cf. *Legat.* 129; Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.48-50), one of whom might have had a prominent role in the administration of the shipments to Rome. Josephus insists that the job was taken away from Judeans no more (literally: “no less”) than from “the rest of the Alexandrians” (he implies that the title applies to Judeans as well). If the job was given to a Roman that is true, but he has not allowed us to hear Apion’s depiction of this matter.

<sup>225</sup> Latin: *fluminis custodiam*. The reference to the kings and to custody is reminiscent of the earlier general remark about the “fortresses” (φρουρία) entrusted to Judeans by Ptolemy I (2.44); and with specific reference to the river, one may think of the Judean unit stationed at Pelusium, the strategically important eastern mouth of the Nile (*War* 1.175; ca. 55 BCE; so Thackeray and Vogel in Münster ad loc.) But it is not clear if this arrangement would have continued in the Roman era (as Josephus here claims for the “river custody”), when the Ptolemaic army was disbanded. Tcherikover suggested that Josephus is speaking of

policing or customs duties on the Nile (in *CPJ* 1.53, n.14; cf. Kasher 1985: 108). But the evidence for this is sparse or uncertain: i) we know of a Judean presence at Schedia (Horbury & Noy 1992: no. 22), the important customs-post for traffic on the Nile approaching Alexandria (Strabo 17.1.16); but we do not know if Judeans there were involved in customs duties; ii) Josephus refers to two figures he calls “alabarchs” (Alexander, *Ant.* 18.259; Demetrius, *Ant.* 20.147). If these titles represent what other sources call “arabarchs,” they seem to have had control over customs on the eastern side of the Nile (Tcherikover in *CPJ* 1.49, n.14; Schürer revised 3.136, n.43). In truth, we cannot tell what Josephus has in mind, though we may suspect that he exaggerates its importance, and its relevance to Judeans in Alexandria (cf. 2.6) may have been limited. On the administration of the Nile, see Bonneau 1993.

<sup>226</sup> After *fluminis custodiam*, the text reads: *totiusque custodiam nequaquam his rebus indignos esse iudicantes*. I have attempted to translate this as it stands (and is supported by Münster), but the text is almost certainly corrupt. Editors have suggested a number of substitutes for *custodiam* (was Josephus speaking of “the whole province” or “the whole frontier”? See Boysen, Reinach, and Thackeray ad loc.). We are reduced to conjecture, but the climactic statement in Josephus’ historical survey clearly emphasized the total confidence which the Romans placed in Judeans. In the present context, Roman opinion is not just the latest, but also the most important historical truth.

<sup>227</sup> I place the question in quotation marks, to represent the rhetorical drama that Josephus here creates (his reply, addressed to “you,” continues to the end of 2.67). This is not necessarily a verbatim citation from Apion, but may be a summary of his line of argument, whose tone is variously represented as amazement (2.67) and accusation (2.117). Apion apparently challenged the claim that (some) Judeans could be considered Alexandrian citizens (Latin *cives* surely represents Greek πολῖται): the preceding references to the grain-supply (2.60, 63) confirm that this is about full Alexandrian citizenship, not the use of the term πολίτης in some other sense (*pace* Kasher 1985: 278; Gruen 2002: 78). Apion’s challenge operates on the understanding that citizens should be fully engaged in the

though you are Egyptians,<sup>228</sup> do you wage among yourselves huge, implacable battles over religion?<sup>229</sup> **66** Is it not indeed for this reason that we do not call you all ‘Egyptians,’<sup>230</sup> nor even collectively ‘human beings,’ since you worship beasts contrary to our nature, nurturing them with great care,<sup>231</sup> although our (human) race, at any rate, is clearly one and the same?<sup>232</sup> **67** But if there are so many differences of opinion among you Egyptians, why are you amazed if these people, who came to Alexandria from elsewhere, remained faithful in such matters to laws established from the very beginning?”<sup>233</sup>

cults of the city, which did indeed cement and express civic identity (cf. *Ant.* 12.125-26). Citizens were divided into tribes and demes (Delia 1991: 49-70), which performed representative roles in the festivals of the city (Delia 1991: 58-59; on religion in Ptolemaic Alexandria, see Fraser 1972: 1.189-301). If they refused to take part in such activities, Judean citizens could be considered to have disenfranchised themselves; further accusations of impiety to the emperors (2.73) or intolerance to others (2.79, 117) could easily follow. Judean who were or claimed to be citizens apparently claimed exemption on the basis of their ancestral customs, but it was precisely this assertion of double identity (Judean and Alexandrian) which caused offense and challenged the structure of citizen-participation assumed in the Greek civic tradition (Honigman 1997; cf. Barclay 1996a: 69-70; Trebilco 1991: 173-85).

<sup>228</sup> This placement of Apion among “Egyptians” (cf. note to “Apion” at 2.28) is the foundation of the following argument, which would not work at all were he considered a “Greek.” Alexandria was not a site of traditional Egyptian religion, and its religion was dominated by Greek, rather than native Egyptian, traditions (Fraser 1972: 1.189-90).

<sup>229</sup> Josephus’ logic runs: if the Judeans’ religious practices are considered awkwardly different, that is nothing compared to the depth of difference internal to the Egyptian population. Josephus had earlier noted such differences (1.225; cf. *Ant.* 1.166; 13.66), but here alludes to a trope particularly common in sources from the Roman era, expressing surprise, alarm, and horror at the violence which could arise from competing animal cults in the Egyptian countryside: see, e.g., Dio 42.34.2; Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.21, 24; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 380a-c; and especially Juvenal, *Sat.* 15 (the war between Ombi and Tentyra resulting in cannibalism). Josephus aligns himself with Roman incomprehension and horror at such “uncivilized” behavior.

<sup>230</sup> In fact, Josephus’ argument relies on this collective label. He does not reveal what sub-categories he would employ.

<sup>231</sup> Josephus adds another dimension to his attack on Egyptian religion: the worship of animals is bad enough (1.224-25), but to worship *dangerous* animals,

which threaten human beings, suggests not only perversity but a spirit alien to the interests of humanity (cf. 2.86, 139). Ever since Herodotus commented on the cult of crocodiles in Egypt (Herodotus 2.65, 71-74), this had been a subject that both fascinated and appalled Greek and Roman writers: cf. Strabo 17.1.44 (the danger of crocodiles to the human race); Cicero, *Tusc.* 5.78 (the worship of ibis, asp, cat, dog, and crocodile); Diodorus 1.87-89 (hawk, eagle, wolf); Aelian, *Nat. an.* 4.44 (cats, icheumons, crocodiles, hawks); Juvenal, *Sat.* 15.1-2 (“monsters,” such as crocodiles); cf. Philo, *Decal.* 78 (the fiercest and most savage animals); *Contempl.* 8-9; *Legat.* 139, 163; *Decal.* 80 (they become like the creatures they venerate).

<sup>232</sup> Latin: *cum genus utique nostrorum unum itaque idem esse videatur*. The text may be corrupt (some MSS read *cum genus utique nostrorum vestrumque idem esse videatur* [“since, at any rate, our and your race is clearly the same”], and editors suggest *atque* or *idque* in place of *itaque*) and the meaning is obscure. If *genus nostrorum* (“our race”) concerns the human race (cf. *naturae nostrae*, “our nature,” in the previous clause), this reinforces the point that the Egyptians are inhuman: the human race is everywhere the same, but they stand out in cultivating animals which are hostile to humanity (so Whiston, Müller 255, Reinach, Shutt 1987; cf. *Ant.* 2.94). But if *genus nostrorum* means the Jewish people (γένος; cf. *genus nostrum* in 2.69), this returns to the previous point about Egyptian disunity: at least our Judean people is clearly united (cf. 2.68, 179-81; so Thackeray). On balance the former construal is more likely, but the Latin translation may obscure Josephus’ meaning.

<sup>233</sup> If native Egyptians tolerate such huge differences amongst themselves, why can they not tolerate difference in those who come from abroad? The question shows how far Josephus has distorted the point, which is about *Alexandria* (not Egypt), and the common practice expected, and practiced, among Alexandrian citizens. Apion did not need reminding that Judeans came from elsewhere (cf. 2.33), and Josephus’ stress on this could, in fact, *support* Apion’s argument, since it indicates the Judeans’ *foreignness* to Alexandria. Indeed, in the final result of Apion’s delegation,



Apion on civil  
unrest

**68** He also places on us the responsibility for civil unrest.<sup>234</sup> If there were any truth in this accusation regarding the Judeans settled in Alexandria, why does he censure us all, wherever we are, over our reputation for harmony?<sup>235</sup> **69** Moreover, anyone would discover that those who stirred up discord were Alexandrian citizens of Apion's sort.<sup>236</sup> For as long as it was Greeks and Macedonians who possessed this citizenship, they incited no discord against us, and did not interfere in our ancient religious customs.<sup>237</sup> But when a mass of Egyptians sprang up in their midst, at a time of confused conditions, then this feature was constantly on the increase.<sup>238</sup> Our nation, however, remained unadulterated.<sup>239</sup> **70** Such people, therefore, were the ori-

Claudius' letter emphasizes this by telling Judeans in Alexandria that they are living "in a city not their own" (ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ πόλει, *CPJ* 153, line 95; cf. Barclay 1996a: 59, n.29). Josephus attempts to turn Judean difference into a virtue: they are simply being faithful to their laws (an important theme in 2.145ff.), which are legitimized by their extremely ancient pedigree (cf. 2.69, 154-56). He may imply here a different, and idealized, understanding of citizenship which enables the civic integration of people practicing very different customs (cf. *Ant.* 16.174-78). Honigman 1997 examines the Stoic roots of this utopian concept, and its deployment by Philo, suggesting an echo also here.

<sup>234</sup> Latin: *seditio* (original Greek probably στάσις). Apion's charge was probably focused primarily on the responsibility of the Alexandrian Judeans for the riots in 38 CE: cf. 2.35 with its allusion to violence in the Judean quarter. The Alexandrian spokesmen before Gaius and Claudius clearly blamed the Judeans for the trouble: Claudius refused to enquire into the history sufficiently to apportion blame, but issued a stern warning against Judeans lest they create trouble in the future (*CPJ* 153, lines 73-104). Recent literature on these riots includes Barclay 1996a: 51-60; Gruen 2002: 54-83; Gambetti 2003 (*non vidi*); Collins 2005. Strikingly, Josephus does not here make any mention of these historical events, although he knows about the στάσις in Alexandria both in 38 and in 41 CE (*Ant.* 18.257; 19.278). He prefers to leave the charge uncontextualized—perhaps because it was easier to deal with in that form; it would have been damaging to recount any events in which Judeans were involved in political unrest.

<sup>235</sup> Latin: *cur omnes nos culpat ubique positos eo quod noscamur habere concordiam?* This is probably not sarcasm ("why not censure us all for this, since we are well-known to be unanimous?"; cf. Whiston and Shutt 1987), but an attempt to turn another of Apion's accusations back against himself, as a mark of inconsistency. Apion probably accused Judeans of i) notorious clannishness: being internally committed to one another to an exclusive degree; cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.103-4; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1 (*apud ipsos fides obstinata*); al-

ready in Cicero, *Flacc.* 66, using the term *concordia* found here; ii) political trouble-making, both in Alexandria and elsewhere; cf. Roman perceptions aired in *War* 2.489-98; 6.328-40; 7.421, and Claudius' declaration that he would regard any future trouble from Judeans as a "common plague for the world" (*CPJ* 153, lines 99-100). Josephus twists these into mutual contradiction: how can Judeans be both trouble-makers and harmonious? Internal communal harmony is here elided with political harmony across communal boundaries.

<sup>236</sup> Josephus is about to put the blame on "Egyptians," but manages to combine both personal and ethnic insult by suggesting that these were people of the same class as Apion: Egyptians who illegally wormed their way into Alexandrian citizenship (cf. 2.28-32).

<sup>237</sup> It is convenient to suggest a narrative of decline, from purity and peace to confusion and war. The case of Physcon (2.51-55) is now omitted from view. As in 3 Macc. 3.8-10, "Greeks" are allowed to enjoy a positive role in the story (cf. their virtues in 2.70).

<sup>238</sup> Like Philo, Josephus blames the trouble on the "Egyptian" element in the Alexandrian population (*Flacc.* 17, 29, 92-93; *Legat.* 166, 205; cf. Goudriaan 1992; Pearce 1998: 92-95; Niehoff 2001: 58-92; Gruen 2002: 63-65, the last inclined to regard this as more than mere rhetoric). But this also reflects a general opinion that the Alexandrian population had degenerated from its former greatness, and that this was attributable to ethnic "mixing"; see, e.g., Philo, *Legat.* 120; Polybius 34.14 (though with *positive* comment on Egyptians); Livy 37.18; 38.17.11; cf. the "Boule-Papyrus," *CPJ* 150 and Claudius' concerns in *CPJ* 153, lines 53-55. Goudriaan suggests that Philo's derogatory view of the Alexandrian masses as "Egyptian" was shared by "an Alexandrian Hellenic inner circle" (1988: 118). There is evidence that Judeans themselves could be considered "Egyptians" in this polemical context (*CPJ* 156c, lines 25-26). On the population mix in Ptolemaic Alexandria, see Fraser 1972: 1.60-83, esp. 75-83. Josephus is vague about when and how the mixing took place.

<sup>239</sup> Latin: *nostrum vero genus permansit purum*. Shutt 1987 takes this to mean that Judeans remained

gin of this trouble, since the populace, wholly lacking Macedonian steadfastness and Greek good sense,<sup>240</sup> together evidently adopted the malicious habits of the Egyptians<sup>241</sup> and put into effect their ancient hostility towards us.<sup>242</sup> **71** In fact, the truth is quite the opposite of what they dare to cast as a reproach against us.<sup>243</sup> Although most of them obtain the rights of this city<sup>244</sup> improperly, they dub as “aliens”<sup>245</sup> those who are known to have obtained this privilege from their masters.<sup>246</sup> **72** For none of the kings seems to have bestowed civic rights on Egyptians,<sup>247</sup> nor now do any of the emperors,<sup>248</sup> while in our case Alexander brought us into the city,<sup>249</sup> the kings augmented our status,<sup>250</sup> and the Romans have seen fit to preserve it for all time.<sup>251</sup>

**73** Likewise, Apion attempted to denounce us because we do not set up statues of the emperors<sup>252</sup>—as if they did not know this or needed Apion to mount their de-

*Apion on  
imperial statues*

uninvolved in violence (“blameless,” reconstructing the Greek adjective as ἀνεπίκλητον). But the Latin and the immediate context suggest a different point (so Thackeray and Blum): that when Egyptians were mixing with the rest of the Alexandrian population, they did *not* mix with Judeans; cf. 1.1 and Josephus’ concern to keep Judeans and Egyptians unmixed in 1.229, 278, etc. In 2.257 Josephus reports Plato’s ideal of a “pure” constitution (there the Latin *purus* translates καθαρός).

<sup>240</sup> Macedonian *constantia* (Greek: καρτερία?) is also a Judean trait in 2.146. Greek *prudencia* (Greek: φρόνησις?; cf. 2.183, 242) has a hint of superior education and social status; Philo’s account of the Alexandrian events in his *In Flaccum* is riddled with status-snobbery.

<sup>241</sup> Josephus can take this moral characterization for granted, matching Roman ethnic prejudice; see note to “reputation” at 2.31.

<sup>242</sup> The perception is common to Josephus (cf. 1.223-26, 287; *War* 2.487) and Philo (*Flacc.* 29; *Legat.* 166, 170, 205). On its historical roots, see Appendix 3.

<sup>243</sup> Apion’s voice is now merged into that of the “Egyptians” (cf. 2.32), and the specific accusation made against him in 2.42 is accordingly generalized.

<sup>244</sup> Latin: *ius eius civilitatis*. The context (2.71-72) suggests that Josephus is speaking about the rights of Alexandrian citizenship.

<sup>245</sup> Latin: *peregrini*: in the Egyptian context, the label applied to the mass of the population, who were neither Romans nor citizens of one of the Greek cities. Cf. Philo, *Legat.* 54, 172 for Flaccus’ announcement about Judeans in these terms.

<sup>246</sup> The MSS read *qui hoc privilegium ad omnes imperasse noscuntur*. I here follow Boysen’s emendation (also adopted by Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster): *qui hoc privilegium a dominis impetrasse noscuntur*. For the Egyptians as perpetually under “masters,” cf. 2.72, 128. For Josephus’ insistence on the public status of Judean rights, cf. 2.37.

<sup>247</sup> Latin: *ius civilitatis*, which again refers to citizenship. Josephus backdates the bar he had earlier attributed to the Roman emperors (2.41); but the historical evidence largely supports him (see Fraser 1972: 1.60-78).

<sup>248</sup> See note to “citizenship” at 2.41.

<sup>249</sup> See 2.35, 42. Josephus here begins a summary of earlier evidence, though the language is even more vague concerning civic rights, which is the topic at issue.

<sup>250</sup> Latin: *auxerunt* (“increased” or “augmented”); some object like “status” has to be supplied. Presumably this does not concern numerical growth; cf. the earlier discussion of Ptolemaic honors (2.37, 44, 47, 49, 62).

<sup>251</sup> Again, the Latin does not indicate what the Romans have preserved; the material cited earlier (2.37, 61-64) was diverse and imprecise. But the Roman evidence is climactic, not only as the latest, but also as the most important verdict on Judeans, and determinative for the future. Writing after Claudius’ settlement of the Alexandrian troubles, and with knowledge of (a version of) his decree (*Ant.* 19.280-85), it is remarkable that Josephus does not refer to that definitive judgment (which includes reference to “preserving” Judean privileges, 19.285). This might suggest that he has done little or nothing to update a brief devised by Alexandrian Judeans from the time of Apion, or, more likely, that he prefers to keep this whole discussion of Alexandrian politics in the Roman era unspecific, lest he fall foul of fluctuations in the reputations of emperors (only those of Julius Caesar and Augustus were secure, 2.37, 61).

<sup>252</sup> Latin: *imperatorum non statuamus imagines*. Although *imagines* can include portraits/paintings, the verb here implies the erection of an object like a statue, and the Latin translator has chosen a different term (*figura*) for a “portrait” (2.74). Josephus leaves to the end of the Alexandria section Apion’s most dangerous political accusation. Again this must relate in the first instance to the Alexandrian riots. Elsewhere (*Ant.*

fense,<sup>253</sup> when he ought rather to have admired the magnanimity and moderation of the Romans, since they do not compel their subjects to transgress their ancestral laws, but accept such honors as it is pious and legitimate for their donors to offer;<sup>254</sup> for honors provide no gratification<sup>255</sup> if conferred under compulsion or force.<sup>256</sup> **74** The Greeks and some others consider it good to erect statues;<sup>257</sup> indeed, they take pride in painting portraits of their fathers, wives and children;<sup>258</sup> some also acquire

18.257-58) Josephus relates Apion's charges, where Judeans are compared unfavorably with other subject nations, who set up temples and altars in honor of the emperor; cf. Isodorus' charge that they did not offer sacrifice on Gaius' recovery, Philo, *Legat.* 355. Philo reports that during the riots in Alexandria imperial busts or statues were introduced into synagogues by hostile crowds (*Flacc.* 41-52; *Legat.* 133-34); but while the Alexandrian delegations were in Rome they heard the devastating news of the emperor's decision to erect a statue of himself in the Jerusalem temple (*Legat.* 184ff.). If Apion's charge related primarily to Alexandria, it perhaps represented the Judeans' complaints about the imperial statues as a sign of their impiety and their political offensiveness to Rome (see note to "Alexandrian" at 2.33; cf. *Ant.* 18.57, on Pilate's standards). If his accusations included the subsequent protest about Gaius' statue (40 CE), he could have depicted all Judeans as threatening rebellion against Rome (cf. *War* 2.194), or at least as uniquely impious towards the emperor. Despite *Ant.* 18.257-58, Josephus does not here link Apion's accusation with particular events in Alexandria, nor to Gaius' claims to divine honors. Indeed, he does not at first indicate that the imperial images here discussed have *religious* significance, as if the discussion were about the Judean aniconic tradition in general. On the sensitivities of the topic in Flavian Rome, see below, note to "God" at 2.76.

<sup>253</sup> Apion's charge is immediately deflated. The Judeans' aniconic religion was, indeed, well known. In the late Republican era it elicited some admiration from Varro (*apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 4.31; see below, note to "human beings" at 2.75), and in the early Principate from Strabo (16.2.35). Tacitus notes the political implications of the ban on images: *non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus honor* (*Hist.* 5.5.4), but his tone is not notably hostile (cf. *Hist.* 5.9.2 on the Gaius episode). His attitude to the imperial cult is in any case well-shrouded (cf. *Ann.* 15.74; Gruen 2002: 44-45). Gaius was the only emperor who threatened to make an issue of this, but, as Apion and other Alexandrians knew, it could be used in local circumstances to cause the Judeans acute political embarrassment.

<sup>254</sup> Apion is given another lesson, in the proper stance towards Rome (cf. 2.40-41). On imperial images, Josephus portrays Romans as learning to understand

and respect Judean scruples: e.g., Pilate (on the military standards, *War* 2.169-74; *Ant.* 18.55-59); Vitellius (also on standards, *Ant.* 18.121-22); and Petronius (on the statue of Gaius, *War* 2.184-203; *Ant.* 18.256-309). In general, he represents Roman rulers as granting Judeans the right to live according to their ancestral customs (esp. *War* 5.405; 6.101-2, 333-35; *Ant.* 12.122-24; 16.27-60, 160-78; 19.280-91), and he is right to represent this as a symptom of Rome's generally pragmatic and flexible attitude to local cultures (see Pucci ben Zeev 1998). Philo makes the same point in the same context (*Legat.* 153-58, 161, 240, 298, 301, 311-14, 322), and Claudius' decision on Alexandria illustrates the policy well (*CPJ* 153, lines 86-88). Roman tolerance, governed by self-interest, and within definite limits (cf. *Ant.* 16.60), is here presented in the flattering terms that Romans liked to hear (cf. 2.40): cf. references to their kindness and generosity in such matters in *Ant.* 16.32-34; 19.290.

<sup>255</sup> The Latin text (*non enim honoris gratiam habent*) is best emended to *non enim honores gratiam habent* (so Boysen, Reinach, and Münster) as translated here.

<sup>256</sup> The phrase may allude to the violence employed in the Alexandrian context, or threatened in relation to the Jerusalem temple; cf. Philo on Augustus' renunciation of force, *Legat.* 155, 157.

<sup>257</sup> The phrase seems designed to avoid reference to the Romans themselves, although everything said here could apply to Romans. Cf. Josephus' description of Vespasian's art-store (*War* 7.158-59) and Cicero's complaint of a Rome already over-crowded with statues (*Tusc.* 5.102; cf. Pliny, *Nat.* 34.93). Since Josephus is about to make a principled criticism of such art (2.75), but wishes to avoid any antithesis between Judean and Roman culture, it is convenient to project the practice elsewhere. Moreover, statuary and painting could be depicted, in an austere Roman tradition, as symptoms of Greek decadence and extravagance: see Livy 25.40.1-3; Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.4; *Verr.* 2 *passim*, esp. 2.4.132-34.

<sup>258</sup> Blurring contextual distinctions, Josephus moves the discussion from the political and religious sphere into the realm of private and domestic art, thus removing the sting of Apion's accusation; cf. the similar mixture of genres in the explanation of idolatry in

statues of people with whom they have no connection, while others do the same even for favorite slaves. So what is surprising if they appear to render this honor also to their rulers and masters?<sup>259</sup> **75** On the other hand, our legislator<sup>260</sup>—not as if he were prophesying that Roman authority should not be honored,<sup>261</sup> but because he disdained a means that is useful neither to God nor to human beings,<sup>262</sup> and because an inanimate object is proved to be inferior to every animate creature, and much more to God<sup>263</sup>—forbade the making of statues.<sup>264</sup> **76** He did not prohibit that good

*Judean attitude  
to statues and  
to Romans*

Wisd 14:15-21. Domestic portraiture had many commemorative functions: see, e.g., the use of ancestral masks among the Roman elite (Polybius 6.53). Elite Judeans also made portraits and statues of their children, despite Josephus' claim: see, e.g., Alexandra's portraits of her children (*Ant.* 15.26-27) and the statues of Agrippa's daughters (*Ant.* 19.357). On Greek portraiture and Roman painting see Richter 1965; Ling 1991.

<sup>259</sup> The argument works *a minori*: if people give this honor even to their slaves, who are lower on the social scale, they will naturally do the same for their superiors. But the suggestion that such art is routine and even casual also hints at the worthlessness of the "honor" thus shown to their imperial masters (cf. 2.41), while the reference to appearance (Latin: *videantur*) could be taken to suggest insincerity. Josephus obscures the political power of images, and their immense value for Roman propaganda (Zanker 1988; Hannestad 1988; Gregory 1994), but also hints at the empty fawning practiced by Rome's subjects.

<sup>260</sup> Latin: *legislator* (Greek: νομοθέτης?); used only once before in *Apion* (1.316), this becomes the chief title of Moses after 2.145. It is important to insist that this ban was not newly-instituted, but of huge antiquity (cf. 2.67): it could in no way be understood as specifically anti-Roman.

<sup>261</sup> The central statement explaining the ban is here prefaced, as it will be supplemented (2.76), with a denial that Judeans intend any disrespect to Rome. Vogel in Münster (ad loc.) considers that Josephus may have in mind Zealot interpretation of Exod 20:4 as directed against Rome.

<sup>262</sup> Latin: *sed tamquam causam neque deo neque hominibus utilem despiciens*. The tone is strong, and conveys a sneer of cultural snobbery, but falls short of declaring the use of images idolatrous or impious. In fact, Josephus here draws upon a strain in the philosophical tradition that stood in unreconciled tension with cultic practice. As the Stoics insisted, if God is (by definition) all-sufficient, he hardly needs sacrifices, temples, or the worship offered before statues; and it could be argued that visual representations of the divine were inherently misleading. Thus Varro thought that for their first 170 years the Romans' religion had been aniconic, a more pious tradition: those who set up

images "for the people" had introduced error and diminished reverence for the Gods (*apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 4.27, 31; cf. 7.5). Similarly, Seneca is recorded by Augustine as pouring philosophical scorn on the ritual enacted before the statue of Jupiter, while insisting that "wise men will observe all these rites as instructed by the laws, not as gratifying to the Gods" (*apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 6.10). And in the most extended discussion of religious imagery, Dio Chrysostom's 12<sup>th</sup> Oration, the tension between reason and art is fully explored, though finally unresolved. As in his discussion of mythology (2.239), Josephus can thus utilize elements of the philosophical tradition to support his Judean aniconic tradition, though its roots lie quite elsewhere (see further Barclay forthcoming a).

<sup>263</sup> The Latin MSS read, to the end of the section: *et quoniam totius animati multo magis dei inanimatu (animatu C) probatur inferius interdixit imagines fabricari*. Three types of emendation have been suggested: i) Niese (followed by Reinach and Münster) emends *inanimatu* to *inanimatas ut*: "and because he banned the making of inanimate statues of everything animate, and still more of God, as is shown below (*ut probatur inferius*)." This is taken to be a forward reference to the discussion of the character of God, and the ban on images in 2.167, 190-92; but if so, it would be a unique example of forward reference to any part of 2.145-286. ii) Naber, following the Latin ed. princ. (1480), reads *inanimati* (to agree with *dei*: "he banned the making of statues of everything animate, and still more of the inanimate God"), and Thackeray follows, while also adding *ut*, and thus constructing the phrase *ut probatur inferius*, like Niese. But it is strange, and without Josephan parallel, to describe God as "inanimate." iii) Boysen suggests a simpler solution, emending *inanimatu* to *inanimatum* ("an inanimate object"). No *ut* need be inserted as *inanimatum probatur inferius* can mean (as here translated) "an inanimate object is proved to be inferior." This is probably the best available solution, and it appears to operate on the principle that a) statues should be similar to what they represent; and b) something inferior (in material) cannot adequately represent something superior; the point is taken further in 2.190-91. In other words, the point here is not about form (whether a human form can represent



men be paid homage with other honors, secondary to God:<sup>265</sup> with such expressions of respect we give glory to the emperors and to the Roman people.<sup>266</sup> 77 We offer on their behalf perpetual sacrifices,<sup>267</sup> and not only do we conduct such rites every day at the common expense of all Judeans,<sup>268</sup> but we perform no other sacrifices on

the divine), but about the materials employed (whether wood, stone, or metal, all inanimate). Cf. similar remarks about the inadequate materiality of images in Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.4 (*materiis mortalibus*); Seneca *apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 6.10 (*materia vilissima atque immobilis*); Plato, *Leg.* 931a; Polybius 6.47.9-10 (both on the contrast between inanimate images and animate humans/deities). On this general philosophical ground, Moses' critique of images would disqualify Roman religious practice as much as Greek, indeed any iconic religion at all. But Josephus does not press the point thus aggressively.

<sup>264</sup> As throughout this paragraph, I translate *imagines* as "statues"; but the broader category "images" (Greek: εἰκόνες) would fall under the same strictures. Moses' ban (Exod 20:4-6; Deut 5:8-10; cf. *Ant.* 3.91) is amplified in 2.190-91. In the course of his historical narratives, Josephus referred to this ban on several occasions (*War* 1.403-14 // *Ant.* 15.328-41; *War* 1.648-55 // *Ant.* 17.149-63; *War* 2.169-74 // *Ant.* 18.55-59; *War* 2.184-203 // *Ant.* 18.256-309), but with little religious and no philosophical explication. The ban here is not connected to worship, but implied to cover *any* statuary, a generalization characteristic of this whole discussion.

<sup>265</sup> Josephus insists on a clear distinction between humanity and God, with the implication that even emperors cannot cross this line. The topic was potentially delicate since Titus and Domitian had established a cult of the Flavian *gens* and "Domitian, who succeeded his brother without the prestige of military achievement, heightened court ceremonial, and came closer to introducing divine honours for himself than any of his predecessors, except Gaius" (Liebeschuetz 2000: 987; cf. Scott 1936: 88-132, but also the cautionary remarks about Domitian's purported title "Dominus ac Deus," Jones 1992: 108-9). Among the other forms of Judean honor, our sources mention inscriptions, plaques, shields, gilded crowns (Philo, *Legat.* 133), the dedication of buildings "on behalf of" rulers (e.g. Horbury & Noy 1992: nos. 13, 22, 24, 25), and sacrifices in the Jerusalem temple (see 2.77). Philo records Gaius' complaint that the latter were offered *for* him and not *to* him (*Legat.* 357).

<sup>266</sup> The temple sacrifices had this double object (*War* 2.197), as had Herod's temple in Caesarea (*War* 1.414); cf. Price 1984: 40-47 on dedications in Asia to

"Roma" or "Populus Romanorum."

<sup>267</sup> Here and throughout this section Josephus uses the present tense, despite the cessation of temple sacrifices in 70 CE. This claim was crucial during the Gaius-crisis, when the temple still functioned (Philo, *Legat.* 157, 317; see next note), but looks odd here. It is tempting to conclude that Josephus simply recycles material from that earlier context, but it is notable that he frequently speaks of the temple in the present tense in *Apion* (see note to "God" at 2.193). It is hard to see what else Josephus could have appealed to here as a mark of special Judean honor to the emperors, and he prefers to present the Judean constitution in its ideal, temple-focused form, rather than admit its present damaged state.

<sup>268</sup> The tradition of offering sacrifices for foreign political overlords appears to have begun in the Persian period: cf. Ezra 6.9-10 (*Ant.* 11.119); 1 Macc. 7.33. Josephus elsewhere records the Judean claim to sacrifice twice daily for the emperor and the Roman people (*War* 2.197), and Philo says that Augustus instituted daily Jerusalem sacrifices for the emperor and the Roman people, of a bull and two lambs (*Legat.* 157, 291, 317; cf. 280). But Philo insists that this was at Augustus' own expense, rather than, as Josephus claims here, at the expense of the Judean community. Both authors have rhetorical interests in presenting the matter their way, Philo in praise of Augustus, Josephus as a sign of universal Judean respect for Rome. It has been suggested that both are partly right: if the cost of the sacrifices came out of Judean provincial taxes to Rome, both parties could be claimed to be the donors (Schürer revised 2.311-12; Smallwood 1981: 148, n.20; Pucci ben Zeev 1998: 472). However, in another context, Josephus reveals that the sacrifices were generally considered to be paid for by Rome: this was the reason why Eleazar insisted on their cessation in 66 CE, since he argued that all offerings *from foreigners* should be rejected (*War* 2.409-17). In recounting the frantic discussion of Eleazar's proposal, Josephus does not record any argument to the effect that this was really Judean money (in taxation) after all. Thus, his claim here looks specious, perhaps influenced by the fact that the other daily offering, the *Tamid*, was offered "at public expense" (ἐκ δημοσίου, *Ant.* 3.237; cf. Exod 29:38-42; Num 28:2-8). He clearly needs to assert that *all* Judeans *willingly* contribute to this critical mark of respect for

a common basis, not even for children;<sup>269</sup> it is only for the emperors that we collectively exhibit this exceptional honor, which we render to no (other) human being.<sup>270</sup> 78 Let these remarks together form a sufficient rebuttal of Apion's statements on Alexandria.<sup>271</sup>

(2.7) 79 I am amazed<sup>272</sup> also by those who have supplied Apion with fodder of this sort,<sup>273</sup> that is, Posidonius<sup>274</sup> and Apollonius Molon.<sup>275</sup> For, on the one hand, they

*Slander of the temple*

Rome. Its political significance is evident in the fact that its cessation in 66 CE was taken as the moment when the Judean Revolt began.

<sup>269</sup> Latin: *neque pro filiis*. The phrase seems odd (the text is possibly corrupt). It has been suggested that Josephus means the imperial children (Thackeray, followed by Shutt 1987, referring to Ezra 6.10; Bar 1.11; cf. *Aristeas* 45), but it would be strange for Josephus to advertize that these were *not* honored in the same way. Given his emphasis elsewhere on the raising of children (1.60; 2.204), Josephus could mean sacrifices for the welfare of offspring, which would be an individual, not a communal affair.

<sup>270</sup> Josephus' phraseology (*quem hominum nulli persoluimus*) could suggest that the honor and its recipient are unique in both degree and kind; this is as close as he gets to allowing that the emperor could be an exceptional kind of person.

<sup>271</sup> Josephus signals the end of the Alexandrian section (2.33-78; cf. 2.7) with his usual claim of sufficiency (cf. 1.287, 303; 2.8).

<sup>272</sup> The tone is ironic (behind *admiror* probably lies θαυμάζω): for its use regarding Apion, see note to "scholar" at 2.21.

<sup>273</sup> "Of this sort" (*huiusmodi*) is vague, and this loose attachment signals the fact that this third section of Josephus' reply to Apion (2.79-144) collects a variety of material which was originally linked either to his exodus account or to his attack on Alexandrian Judeans (see 2.7, with note at "rules"). The three temple stories here gathered (2.79-88; 2.89-111; 2.112-20) vary in their polemical angle. The first, concerning the worship of an ass (or ass-head) in the temple (2.80), could have been connected to either of Apion's main topics. Troiani (163) suggests that Apion linked this story with the criticism of 2.65: the Judeans will not set up a statue of an emperor, but they have a statue of an ass instead! Alternatively, in his account of the exodus, Apion could have included the story of the ass that guided the fugitives to water, and was honored with a temple statue thereafter (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3.2; 4.2; cf. Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 4.5.2 [670 d-e]). Of the 7 sources which contain a version of the ass-libel, 4 are clearly related to the exodus (see Appendix 4), and Apion might be the source of the fable of the ass-guide, which was subsequently used by Tacitus and Plutarch. This story about

Antiochus would then constitute the proof for Apion's claim. Apion was in the habit of naming his sources (see note to "Egyptians" at 2.10; cf. 2.112), and almost certainly cited one or both of the following names in introducing this story. But it is not clear how much of the following material can be attributed to Posidonius and/or Apollonius Molon, whether both are equally responsible for such material, or what Apion himself added in his retelling of the tale. Despite acknowledging their contribution to Apion, most of Josephus' invective is directed at Apion alone, exploiting his supposed Egyptian identity.

<sup>274</sup> Posidonius of Apamea (ca. 135–51 BCE) was a Stoic philosopher, scientist and historian of extraordinary range, a towering intellectual figure in his day. Since his work is mostly lost, we rely on those who used him, and scholars dispute how to identify the Posidonian material which may lie behind our extant sources. His 52-book history covered the period from 146 to the mid-80s BCE (see *FGH* 87) and was characterized by an interest in national character. It is generally agreed that Posidonius was the main source for Diodorus Books 34 and 35 (see Berthelot 2003: 127, n.90); so the account of Antiochus Epiphanes' discovery in the Jerusalem temple of a statue of Moses seated on an ass (in the epitome, 34/35.1.1-5) may be attributed to him. It is often argued that Apion's story (2.80) cannot be drawn from Posidonius because i) Posidonius seems not to have agreed with the libel recounted in the Diodorus story, and ii) there is an obvious difference between a statue of Moses on an ass (Diodorus/Posidonius) and a golden head of an ass (Apion, 2.80). Neither of these arguments carries weight: i) it is extremely hard to tell Posidonius' authorial stance in the epitome of an author (Diodorus) who used him; but the inclusion of the libel, with its emphasis on the misanthropic character of Judean laws, fits what else we know of Posidonius rather well (see Berthelot 2003: 128-33, arguing for congruence with the Posidonian material behind Strabo 16.2.34-36). ii) There is no reason to think that an inventive author such as Apion simply repeated the material in his sources (see below, on 2.80): he could have derived from Posidonius the story of the discovery by Antiochus Epiphanes, but altered the content of what he actually discovered. Since Posidonius is named here, Apion must at least have

make it a charge against us that we do not worship the same Gods as other people,<sup>276</sup> while at the same time, when they issue lies and concoct incongruous slanders about our temple,<sup>277</sup> they do not consider what they do irreligious,<sup>278</sup> although proper gentlemen<sup>279</sup> consider a lie on any topic extremely disgraceful, and particularly so in relation to a temple that is universally acclaimed and powerful with such great sanctity.<sup>280</sup> **80** For Apion dared<sup>281</sup> to assert that in this shrine the Judeans had set up the head of an ass, and worshipped that animal,<sup>282</sup> considering it worthy of the great-

*Worship of the head of an ass*

*claimed* to draw something from him, and the framework of the Antiochus story is the most obvious common thread (*pace* Bar-Kochva 1996b, who denies any connection between Posidonius and Apion); see further Bar-Kochva 1995-96.

<sup>275</sup> The Latin text has *Apollonius Molonis* (“son of Molon”; cf. Plutarch, *Cic.* 4), but he is usually known as “Apollonius Molon” (Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων, e.g., 2.145) or simply “Molon” (ὁ Μόλων, e.g., Diogenes Laertius 3.34; Μόλων, *Apion* 2.16; Schürer revised 3.598-99). He had been mentioned in passing as giving a date for the exodus in 2.16, and will be referred to often in 2.145ff. (2.145, 148, 236, 255, 258, 295), since a considerable proportion of that segment, esp. 2.236-70, is directed specifically against him. He was born in Alabanda (Caria) in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, but practiced and lectured as a rhetor in Rhodes, alongside Posidonius (see Bar-Kochva 2000, who posits rivalry between them). There he taught and influenced both Cicero and Caesar (Plutarch, *Cic.* 4; *Caes.* 3; Cicero, *Brut.* 245, 316; Quintilian 12.6.7), and made a considerable impression on his visits to Rome in 87 and 81 BCE (Valerius Maximus 2.2.3). He appears to have written an ethnographic account of Judeans (whether a separate work, or included in a broader narrative), drawing on some Hellenistic Judean sources (e.g., for an account of the patriarchs, preserved in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.19.1-3), but with a strongly negative judgment on the Judean laws (see further on 2.145, 148, 236). If he had an account of ass-worship, we cannot trace either its content or its context. But it is possible that Josephus has included his name here because his judgment on Judean religious exclusiveness serves Josephus’ rhetorical point to follow (see next note).

<sup>276</sup> Cf. 2.65, but the point here seems more general. It is repeated in 2.117, but comes to clearest expression in 2.148, where Judeans are labelled ἄθεοι, and in 2.258, where their religious exclusiveness is detailed (see notes ad loc.). In both cases, the charge is associated with Apollonius Molon. By contrast, the *gravamen* in the Diodorus/Posidonius story (Diodorus 34/35.1.1-5) is social, rather than religious, exclusivity—misanthropy not impiety. It is possible that both Posidonius and Apollonius Molon issued both this charge and (a form of) the ass-libel, but it is more likely that Josephus

places the authors side-by-side for his own rhetorical purposes. We know that Posidonius had a form of the ass-libel, and Apollonius a criticism of Judean cultic exclusiveness. By twinning them (suggesting that both authors propagated both accusations), Josephus can accuse them of gross inconsistency.

<sup>277</sup> The accusation of lying, which had fallen silent in 2.33-78, is here resumed (see note to “up” at 2.6): it will recur 4 times in this paragraph (2.79, 82, 85, 88). The “slanders” (*blasphemiae*, see note to “another” at 2.5) are incongruous (*incongruae*) as they do not fit the facts at all (not, in this case, because they are mutually inconsistent).

<sup>278</sup> Their criticism backfires: while accusing Judeans of impiety they are guilty of it themselves (cf. 2.5). Criticism of others’ religious traditions was always open to this counter-charge (note Josephus’ sensitivity in 2.237-38), and this is a response Josephus will employ again (2.89, 111).

<sup>279</sup> Latin: *liberi*, probably reflecting ἐλευθέριοι, a term with both moral and status connotations. Cf. the depiction of Apion in 2.3.

<sup>280</sup> The higher the status of the temple, the worse the disgrace in denigrating it. Josephus had previously mentioned its renown in 1.196-99, 315. The claim is common in his *War* (e.g., 4.262; 5.17, 402, 416; 6.267; 7.4; cf. *Ant.* 13.77) and in other Judean literature, especially in contexts where the temple is threatened (2 Macc. 3.12; 5.15; Philo, *Legat.* 191, 198).

<sup>281</sup> Again *praesumo* (Greek: τολμάω?), as in 2.37, 56, 71. Despite the statement about his sources, Apion is named as author of this story, not least so that his “Egyptian” identity can be turned against him (2.81, 85-86). It is likely that Apion did not just copy his sources, but inventively combined and reshaped them for his own purposes. It appears that he put together material from three sources: 1) Old Egyptian tales associating Judeans with Seth/Typhon, and thus with worship of the ass; 2) Mnaseas’ tale of a golden head of an ass in the Jerusalem temple (2.111-14); 3) Posidonius’ story of Antiochus’ discovery of an ass-object in the temple (Diodorus 34/35.1.1-5). See further, Appendix 4.

<sup>282</sup> Latin *eum*, agreeing with “ass” (*asinus*), not head (*caput*): we have here the conflation of two different versions, the worship of an ass (cf. Josephus’ response

est reverence. He claims that this was revealed when Antiochus Epiphanes plundered the temple<sup>283</sup> and discovered this head, made of gold and worth a considerable sum of money.<sup>284</sup> **81** On this, I would say first that, since he is an Egyptian,<sup>285</sup> even if we did possess any such thing, he should certainly not have made it a matter of censure, since an ass is no worse than the hawks,<sup>286</sup> goats,<sup>287</sup> and other animals that constitute Gods among them. **82** Next, how did he not understand that in proposing his incredible lie he stands convicted by the facts?<sup>288</sup> For we always observe the same laws, to which we hold fast eternally,<sup>289</sup> and although various misfortunes have shaken our city (like others' also)<sup>290</sup> and although (Antiochus) the Pious,<sup>291</sup> Pompey

*Josephus'*  
*response*

in 2.86-87), and the worship of the golden head of an ass (cf. Mnaseas in 2.114).

<sup>283</sup> On the history, see 2.83, with notes. "Plunder" is Josephus' word (cf. 2.83, 84); we cannot tell Apion's attitude to the king. In Posidonius' story, Antiochus discovers a stone statue of a heavily bearded man, seated on an ass, with a book in his hands; he takes this to be Moses (Diodorus 34/35.1.3). This looks like a secondary version in which Posidonius (or his Seleucid sources) wished to level criticism specifically at the misanthropic laws of the Judeans, and therefore placed on the ass (an already traditional feature) both Moses and the ("misanthropic") laws, artfully combined. Apion keeps the Antiochus context, which is conveniently dramatic proof for ass-worship, but strips Moses off the ass, while putting on it the golden head he has gleaned from Mnaseas. Apart from its obvious ridicule of Judeans, why would Apion recycle and adapt this story? Did he, for instance, regard the story of Antiochus Epiphanes as a worthy precedent for the policy of Gaius? Apion's text was clearly written after the Alexandrian riots (38 CE) and perhaps during or immediately after his role in the embassy to Rome. We know from Philo that the Alexandrian embassies were in Rome when the plan was hatched that a statue of Gaius-as-Zeus be erected in the Jerusalem temple (*Legat.* 188, 346), a proposal that repeats, and surely echoes, Antiochus' reported erection of a Zeus-statue in the Jerusalem temple (1 Macc. 1.54). If Gaius needed propaganda support, and an answer to Judean protests, Apion could provide it. When Antiochus Epiphanes entered the temple he found a depraved ass-cult, and nobly civilized the barbarous Judeans by introducing proper cult, with a statue of Zeus; after an interval of further Judean barbarity, demonstrated by their behavior in Alexandria, Gaius could finally fulfil Antiochus' short-lived project, in his chosen role as hellenizing ruler.

<sup>284</sup> On the golden head, see 2.114. Although the context suggests that Antiochus plundered this valuable object, Josephus can hardly say so, if he claims that others would have been able to see this head on subsequent occasions (2.82).

<sup>285</sup> As in 2.65-67, the strategy of portraying Apion as "Egyptian" pays dividends. That this is Josephus' first response to Apion's story is testimony to the investment he makes in this personal invective.

<sup>286</sup> Latin: *furonibus*, a word of such extreme rarity that its meaning is uncertain (perhaps "ferret"; see *TLL* 6.1629; Müller 260-61). Reinach suggested that the Latin text is corrupt (proposing *felibus* or *canibus*, "cats," or "dogs"); as far as know, no-one worshipped ferrets in Egypt and Josephus would hardly use an obscure example. But the real solution to this puzzle was identified by Janne (1936): the Latin translators, who made several blunders elsewhere, mistook the Greek ὀϊκτίον ("hawk") for ἡ ἰκτίς ("ferret"). Josephus was referring to hawks, the well-known symbol of Horus.

<sup>287</sup> The ram-headed deity Ammon (Khnoum-Ra) is in mind; cf. 2.137.

<sup>288</sup> On Apion's stupidity, see note to "ignorance" at 2.3, and 2.88 below. For conviction by the facts, cf. 2.12.

<sup>289</sup> The law in question is that of 2.75; for the claim of eternal fidelity, cf. 2.67. The logic runs: if we maintain the same laws throughout all time, you would expect later visitors to see the same cult object as Antiochus saw; but they did not. Conversely, the later absence of cult objects can be extrapolated backwards, and there could have been no such statue when Antiochus plundered the temple.

<sup>290</sup> This line of argument will require a substantial list of people who had (illegal) access to the temple; it could play into Apion's hands, with his disdain of a city frequently conquered (2.125). But Josephus takes care to describe the circumstances initially as "misfortunes" (not conquests; cf. 2.125), and to suggest that this was a common experience (cf. 2.126-27).

<sup>291</sup> The Latin MSS read *Dius* (or *divus*), which appears to represent Greek Θεός, the title of Antiochus VI (*Ant.* 13.218). But the event Josephus alludes to concerned Antiochus VII, a king he (uniquely) calls Εὔσεβής ("pious"; *Ant.* 7.393; 13.244). Thus either he made a mistake here in labelling the king (Thackeray), or one should emend the Latin text to *Pius* (so Niese, Boysen, Naber, Reinach, Münster, followed here).



the Great,<sup>292</sup> Licinius Crassus<sup>293</sup> and, most recently, Titus Caesar have defeated us in war and occupied our temple,<sup>294</sup> they have not discovered there anything of that sort, but only the purest form of piety,<sup>295</sup> concerning which there is nothing we cannot communicate to others.<sup>296</sup> **83** That in fact Antiochus' plundering of the temple was unjust,<sup>297</sup> but that he was reduced to it by shortage of funds—although he was not at war with us but attacked us, his allies and friends<sup>298</sup>—and that he did not find there

Antiochus VII Sidetes (reigned ca. 139/8–129 BCE) invaded Judea and besieged Jerusalem in 132–130 BCE (*War* 1.61; *Ant.* 13.236–49). According to Josephus, he was bought off by Hyrcanus' bribery, and did not enter the temple, not even when he donated sacrifices for a festival (*Ant.* 13.243); thus he would not have been in a position to inspect the sanctuary. This is the king in the context of whose siege of Jerusalem Posidonius' version of the ass-libel was recounted (his advisers recounting the experience of Antiochus IV, Diodorus 34/35.1.1–5); there is good evidence that Josephus knew at least a version of this story (see Berthelot 2003: 133–41).

<sup>292</sup> This and the two other witnesses are all Roman, and very famous. Pompey's capture of Jerusalem in 63 BCE, and his entry into the temple sanctuary (the Holy of Holies), were well known events in both Judean and Roman circles. Josephus recounts the shock (*War* 1.152–53; cf. 5.395–96), but stresses the general's piety in not removing any of the temple property (*Ant.* 14.71–73); cf. the strong polemics in Ps. Sol. 2 and 8:14–22. Cicero concedes that Pompey took nothing (*Flac.* 67–68); Dio thought otherwise (37.16.1–4). Cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.9.1; Smallwood 1981: 26–27.

<sup>293</sup> M. Licinius Crassus, a partner in the coalition with Pompey and Julius Caesar (60 BCE), was governor of Syria from 55 BCE. According to Josephus (*War.* 1.179; *Ant.* 14.105–9), he stripped Jerusalem of its gold, and took 2,000 talents from the temple treasury. This was perhaps in 54/53 BCE, in order to finance his ill-fated campaign against the Parthians (he died at Carrhae, 53 BCE); see Smallwood 1981: 36. Plundering the temple treasury does not mean entering or inspecting the sanctuary.

<sup>294</sup> Titus captured and destroyed Jerusalem in 70 CE; see *War* book 6. According to Josephus, he entered the sanctuary and witnessed its contents (*War* 6.260). Thus of the 4 figures here listed and supposed to verify the non-existence of an asinine cult-object, only Pompey and Titus were, on Josephus' own account, in a position to provide first-hand testimony. Josephus notably glosses over the Roman destruction of a city in revolt: along with his predecessors, Titus only “occupied” the temple (*optinuerint*); see below, note to “others” at 2.131.

<sup>295</sup> Josephus' loaded definition of “purity” is pre-

sumably a reference to its lack of images; Varro also considered Roman religion would have been purer (*castius*) without images (*apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 4.31). Tacitus makes a point of noting that, when he inspected the temple, Pompey found nothing at all in the *arcana*, *Hist.* 5.9.1 (despite the reference to the ass-image in 5.4.2).

<sup>296</sup> The Latin MSS read: *de qua nihil nobis est apud alios effabile*, which would mean “concerning which nothing can be communicated to others.” But Josephus would hardly encourage a sense of mystery at this very sensitive juncture; he knows this can be used to rouse all kinds of suspicions (2.94, 110–11; cf. *Ant.* 1.11). He will soon insist that there is nothing secret in the Judean cult (2.107, *ineffabilis*), and the same must be intended here (so Reinach 1900:15, emending the Latin here to *ineffabile*; Thackeray, Shutt 1987, and Münster follow suit).

<sup>297</sup> Josephus deflects attention from what Antiochus found in the temple to why he entered it, an issue of motive on which he can cite some historians in support (2.84). By shifting the terrain, his argument can thus appear more secure. “Unjust” (*neque iustam*) might hint at an awareness that there were accounts of this incident, and of Antiochus' treatment of the Judeans, which strongly supported his action. A Seleucid account of events, for instance, appears to have placed the removal of temple treasures after a revolt by Jason (aimed at deposing Menelaus, during Antiochus' second campaign in Egypt, 168 BCE). 2 Macc. 5.5–11 (cf. 1.7–8) speaks of this revolt (not acknowledged in 1 Macc. 1, or by Josephus in *Ant.* 12.246–50), which was probably responsible for the harsh treatment of the city, and the installation of a garrison on the Akra. But in fact the plundering of the temple probably took place the year before (see next note). For the subsequent attempt to change Judean customs and cult, a Seleucid version of history praised Antiochus for seeking to civilize this “misanthropic” and “superstitious” nation (see Diodorus 34/35.1.1–5; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.8.2).

<sup>298</sup> Cf. Josephus' version of events in *Ant.* 12.246–50, based on 1 Macc. 1.20–23, 31–35. There is reason to believe that Antiochus did despoil the temple in 169 BCE, after his first successful campaign in Egypt (170–169 BCE). He was clearly in need of money—if not to pay off the debt to Rome inherited from Seleucus IV

anything deserving of ridicule,<sup>299</sup> **84** this is what many reputable historians also attest,<sup>300</sup> Polybius of Megalopolis,<sup>301</sup> Strabo the Cappadocian,<sup>302</sup> Nicolas of Damascus,<sup>303</sup> Timagenes,<sup>304</sup> Castor the chronicler,<sup>305</sup> and Apollodorus;<sup>306</sup> all say that it was from lack of funds that Antiochus broke his treaty with the Judeans and plundered the temple, which was full of gold and silver.<sup>307</sup> **85** Such are the facts to which Apion ought to have paid attention,<sup>308</sup> had he not himself had the mind of an ass and the impudence of a dog,<sup>309</sup> which is habitually worshipped among such people;<sup>310</sup> for it

*Egyptian  
animal cults*

(see Bickerman 1979: 42-44), certainly to pay for the costs of the Egyptian war (Bringmann 1983: 37-38). But the action was not wholly without excuse: having bid higher than Jason for the post of high-priest, Menelaus was unable to make the payments he had promised (2 Macc. 4.23-29), and the king regarded the temple as in his debt (Mørkholm 1966: 142-43). Nonetheless, such acts of sacrilege needed some justification, which is probably why Seleucid chronology postdates the temple looting till after Jason's revolt, the following year (Bickerman 1979: 9-23; on the chronology, see also Goldstein 1976: 104-67). For the larger context, see Habicht 1989.

<sup>299</sup> Josephus slips in a reference to the main point, whether Antiochus found an ass-cult in the temple; but the witnesses to follow probably commented only on the second issue, Antiochus' need for money.

<sup>300</sup> Despite the polemics of 1.6-27, there are, apparently, reliable Greek historians, though they cannot be labelled "Greek."

<sup>301</sup> Polybius (ca. 200-118 BCE) wrote a 40-book history of the Mediterranean world, of which much is now lost. Josephus cites him elsewhere on Antiochus III (*Ant.* 12.135-57), and records Polybius' explanation of the death of Antiochus IV (*Ant.* 12.358-59), because of his plan to despoil a temple of Artemis in Persia (see Polybius 31.9). From another passage (Polybius 30.26.9), we know that Polybius thought Antiochus had robbed very many temples. It is possible that he somewhere narrated Antiochus' treatment of the Jerusalem temple in these terms, but where Josephus says that he *should have* attributed Antiochus' death to his sacrilege in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 12.359), he does not take the opportunity to say how Polybius *did* describe that event. Thus Josephus may be working here purely by inference.

<sup>302</sup> Strabo (64/63 BCE-21 CE), the geographer and historian, was much used by Josephus (see Shahar 2004). As well as several references to his material (*Ant.* 13.347; 14.68, 104), Josephus cites Strabo on 8 occasions (*Ant.* 13.286-87; 13.319; 14.35-36, 112, 114-18, 138, 139; 15.9-10), but never in connection with Antiochus IV. He may have been the channel through whom Josephus knew Polybius.

<sup>303</sup> Nicolas (ca. 64 BCE-early 1<sup>st</sup> century CE) was a friend of Herod the Great and court-historian, whose

144-book universal history was used extensively by Josephus, especially for Herodian history. Josephus cites him on Antiochus VII Sidetes (*Ant.* 13.251), but never on Antiochus IV.

<sup>304</sup> Timagenes of Alexandria lived in Rome in the first century BCE. His universal history "On Kings" (up to Julius Caesar) was well-known in Rome, but considered Hellenocentric. Josephus mentions him as a source for Strabo (*Ant.* 13.319; cf. 13.344, in close proximity to Strabo in 13.347), and he was probably known to Josephus only through Strabo (so Stern 1.224).

<sup>305</sup> See 1.184, with note at "recounts." His 6-book chronological work is likely to have focused on events, rather than motives.

<sup>306</sup> Apollodorus of Athens (ca. 180-after 120 BCE) also wrote a chronology of the world, from the fall of Troy to the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE. This is Josephus' only reference to him, completing a list designed to suggest wide knowledge of mainstream historical literature (cf. 1.216).

<sup>307</sup> This statement is suspiciously like that already given in 2.83: no quotations are offered from any of these works to substantiate the claim. These no doubt all referred to Antiochus IV, and it is possible that some referred to his treatment of the Judeans, including their temple. But if so, Josephus made no use of their work in his own account of the events (*Ant.* 12.246-50), which is based solely on 1 Maccabees. It is thus possible that Josephus, drawing an inference from Polybius' comment on the king's other acts of sacrilege (see above), bundled up with him all the non-Judean authors he knew who mentioned Antiochus, assuming that they would all agree with his own version of events.

<sup>308</sup> As before, having offered his own version of events, Josephus scolds his opponent for not attending to the "facts"; cf. 2.37, 62.

<sup>309</sup> The attack on Apion becomes more personal and more vicious: the ass-charge is reversed, and the two animals combine stupidity with shamelessness (cf. 2.22, 26). For similar vitriol on an Egyptian's animal-character, see Philo, *Legat.* 166, 205.

<sup>310</sup> Cf. the jackal-headed Anubis (cf. Diodorus 1.87; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 299f). This would have been an obvious moment to refer to the Sethian ass-cult; but if Josephus knows about it he leaves it unmentioned.

was not wholly beyond explanation that he told lies.<sup>311</sup> **86** We do not accord any honor or authority to asses, as the Egyptians do to crocodiles and asps,<sup>312</sup> when they consider those who are bitten by asps or snatched away by crocodiles as blessed and worthy of God.<sup>313</sup> **87** For us, as for other sensible people, asses are used to carry the goods loaded onto them, and if they wander into threshing-floors and start eating, or do not go the distance required,<sup>314</sup> they get a very good beating, as serving the labor and necessary tasks of agriculture.<sup>315</sup> **88** But Apion was either the greatest imbecile of all in concocting his false tales<sup>316</sup> or, having begun at least with some material,<sup>317</sup> he was unable to carry it through; for none of his slanders against us is successful.<sup>318</sup>

*Another temple slander: the annual murder of a Greek*

**(2.8) 89** He added another story about the Greeks,<sup>319</sup> which is full of derogatory spite against us. On this it will be sufficient to comment<sup>320</sup> that those who dare to

<sup>311</sup> Latin: *neque enim extrinsecus aliqua ratiocinatione mentitus est*. The meaning is uncertain (and the text may be corrupt). Thackeray suggests that behind *extrinsecus* lies τῶ ἕξωθεν, and translates “an outsider can make no sense of his lies.” But the phrase seems designed to explain either his lying in general (were he not so asinine and canine he would not lie so much), or this particular lie (only a character like this can explain why he tells such an inexplicable [i.e., baseless] lie).

<sup>312</sup> Cf. 2.81, whose charge is strengthened by reference to the cult of *dangerous* animals (cf. 2.66).

<sup>313</sup> Latin: *deo dignos*; Perhaps, “equal in worth to God” (cf. Shutt 1987, who reconstructs the Greek as θεοῦ ἀνταξίου). Josephus joins the tradition of ridicule directed at the cult of death-dealing animals. Cleopatra’s was the most famous death reputed to be caused by an asp (cf. 2.61, note at “penalty”), though it is unclear if this had the religious connotations claimed here (see Troiani 166). Better attested is the topos, as old as Herodotus (2.90), that some Egyptians accorded special religious significance to a death caused by a crocodile. Herodotus’ comment on the deceased (“more than a man”) suggests that this represents some sort of apotheosis (see Lloyd 1976: 366-67); cf. Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.21 (mothers in Ombos are proud at their children being carried off by crocodiles, since they have provided food for a God).

<sup>314</sup> The rule on not muzzling the ox (Deut 25:4; *Ant.* 4.233) does not apply to asses. The refusal to go further, which merits a beating, is reminiscent of the story of Balaam (Num 22:22-30; *Ant.* 4.107-11).

<sup>315</sup> In other words, in contrast to the Egyptians (1.224, see note at “animals”), Judeans observe the proper hierarchy, displaying the inferior status of animals by beating them and making them work (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 2.69). Cicero’s discussion of this providential hierarchy makes specific mention of asses in this connection (*Nat. d.* 2.158-61).

<sup>316</sup> The first of two choices, both derogatory (as in 2.22, 26, 37). The mention of lies, and the following

reference to slander (*blasphemia*), finish this paragraph (2.79-88) in the same terms as it began (2.79).

<sup>317</sup> Probably the best way of rendering the Latin *aut certe ex rebus initia sumens*. Josephus recognizes a single fact (that Antiochus raided the temple) but regards the rest as fiction; cf. the same deficiency in 2.33-34, 49, 56, 60, 73.

<sup>318</sup> On Apion as failure, cf. 2.56, 73. Of the 10 sections in this paragraph (2.79-88), 1 gives a précis of Apion’s story (2.80), 4 provide counter-evidence (2.82-84, 87), but the other 5 are devoted to polemics (2.79, 81, 85-86, 88).

<sup>319</sup> Latin: *de Graecis*. This is sometimes wrongly taken to mean “derived from Greeks” (so Thackeray, Blum; Thackeray’s note ad loc. mentions the correct alternative, and Stern 1.411 alters his translation). The Latin translator consistently uses *de* to mean “about” or “concerning” (to translate Greek περί), not least when introducing topics (e.g., 2.1 [antiquity]; 2.6, 28 [the exodus]; 2.15 [dating]; 2.78 [Alexandrian Judeans]; 2.79 [the temple]); it can be used with people as much as things (2.14, 28, 63, 90). On the other hand, when indicating a source he uses *a*: thus Apion derived his information about Moses *a senioribus* (2.13). Although the subject of the following tale concerns a single Greek, its theme is about Judean attitudes to Greeks in general (2.95, 99, 121). On the source of this tale, see below; Josephus does not say explicitly that it derives from Posidonius and Apollonius Molon, as he does in the previous case (2.79). If we ask how this tale was connected to the main elements in Apion’s treatment of Judeans (2.7), its emphasis on Judean hostility to Greeks (2.121) suggests a link with his version of the Alexandrian troubles, which could be represented as confirming this secretly nurtured hatred of “Greeks.”

<sup>320</sup> Josephus’ statements of sufficiency usually come at the end of his treatment of his opponents (e.g., 1.287, 303; 2.78). This preemptive comment (cf. 2.8) suggests a particular concern to discredit the story before it has even been heard.

speak about religion should not be unaware that trespassing through temple precincts is less impious than concocting wicked tales about priests.<sup>321</sup> **90** However, those people are more concerned to defend a sacrilegious king than to write fairly and truthfully about us and about the temple. For, in their desire to stand up for Antiochus and to cover up the faithlessness and sacrilege that he displayed towards our nation, because of his lack of funds,<sup>322</sup> they have further defamed us in producing the following mendacious account.<sup>323</sup> **91** Apion became a spokesman for the others<sup>324</sup> and

*Antiochus’  
discovery of the  
secret rite*

<sup>321</sup> “Concoct” (Latin: *confingo*) is Josephus’ regular depiction of the manufacture of stories he refutes (see note to “like” at 1.293). Josephus takes the high moral and religious ground: it is one thing for Antiochus to trespass into sacred precincts (a universally acknowledged crime in antiquity; cf. 2.102-5); but it is worse to invent scurrilous tales about the religious personnel. In fact, there is no reference to priests in the following story, in Josephus’ abridgement.

<sup>322</sup> Josephus echoes his comments on the previous story (2.83-84): the sacrilege lies in entering and plundering the temple, the faithlessness in mistreating allies. This connection in his responses to the two stories may explain why Josephus juxtaposes them, while splitting apart two versions of the ass-libel. By presenting the story as motivated in this way, Josephus can shift the spotlight onto Antiochus himself (cf. 2.97-98, 101), although his role here is fairly incidental. Josephus’ claim about Apion’s sources was taken seriously by Bickerman (1979: 9-12; 1980: 238-45) who posited the origin of this story in Seleucid propaganda, justifying Antiochus’ despoiling of the Jerusalem temple. Many interpreters have concurred with this judgement, but there is little to support it beyond Josephus’ own claim (so rightly Schäfer 1997a: 65; Gruen 2005: 47). The discovery of an ass-cult, or an annual murder of a foreigner, might be a very good reason to *destroy* the temple, or radically to reform its cult; if it was (as Josephus presents it) justification for merely *plundering* the sanctuary, that seems an unnaturally tame response. For temple plunder, all that was necessary (if justification was necessary at all) was a claim that Judeans had revolted (see above, note to “unjust” at 2.83). Thus, if these stories do represent Antiochan propaganda, they might have been designed to justify his attempts to “improve” Judean religion (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.8.4). The matter remains uncertain. It is possible that Josephus has here created a spurious motivation for Apion’s sources, to suit his own rhetorical purposes.

<sup>323</sup> Reading *quae in futuro sunt dicenda mentiti sunt* (with Niese minor, Boysen and Münster: cf. 2.125, ἐπὶ τῶ μέλλοντι ῥηθήσεσθαι). The story now abbreviated (2.90-96) can be supplemented by the detail about the oath (2.121), which Josephus detaches for rhetorical reasons. As Bickerman showed, in what remains a

standard treatment (reprinted in 1980), there are a variety of different motifs in the tale, which combines an account of an annual human sacrifice with the notion of a conspiracy, sealed by an oath of hostility (2.95). The latter motif has made the sacrifice a secret (from the victim as well as from all outsiders), and ensured that it is also an act of cannibalism. The only other version of this tale known to us is attributed to one Damocritus (Suda, s.v.; date and origin unknown), who combined the story of the asinine golden head with a tale that “every seventh year, when they had caught a foreigner, they sacrificed him and carded his flesh into small pieces, and thus killed him” (see Stern 1.530-31). This seems to be independent of Apion’s tale (several important details differ), but may derive from a common tradition. The story of human sacrifice draws on an old Greek tradition that associated this phenomenon either with long-past myth or with “barbarian” nations (see Hall 1989: 146-48). Two examples of barbarian hostility to foreigners became heavily used literary *topoi*: i) Busiris, the mythical king of Egypt, was famed for sacrificing visiting foreigners, until Heracles overpowered him and stopped the practice. The story was already refuted in Herodotus 2.45, but was endlessly recycled in art and literature (see, e.g., Isocrates, *Bus.* 5, 36-37; Apollorodus 2.5.11; the late Archaic vase reproduced as Fig. 1 in Isaac 2004). This tale became emblematic of Egyptian unfriendliness to foreigners (cf. Diodorus 1.67.9-11); ii) the sacrifice of foreigners (or specifically Greeks) by the Taurians (later “Scythians”) in the Black Sea (Pontos): this was the theme of Euripides’ play, *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, and became a trope in descriptions of savage tribes beyond the sphere of civilization (e.g., Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1148b, 19-25; Herodotus 4.106), lasting well into the Roman era (Pliny, *Nat.* 6.53; 7.9-11; Strabo 7.3.9; Lucian, *Sacr.* 13). Alongside these two paradigms of barbarity ran various tales of the use of a human “scapegoat” (φάρμακον), some within the borders of civilization, some without (Hughes 1991: 139-65). The Romans inherited this discourse of the barbarian human sacrifice and deployed it in their encounter with new tribes, notably the Galli and their Druid priests (e.g., Pliny, *Nat.* 30.13; Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.30). Cicero shows how this could be employed to prejudice a jury against Gallic witnesses (*Font.* 31), and



said that Antiochus found a couch in the temple with a man lying upon it and a table placed in front of him, spread with a feast of sea-foods and meats from animals and birds,<sup>325</sup> before which the man was stupefied.<sup>326</sup> 92 As soon as the king entered, the

Pliny evidences the Roman self-congratulation in sweeping these monstrosities from human society (*Nat.* 30.13). Human sacrifice and cannibalism as a terror-tactic in war is a related motif, sometimes tied to the above ethnic stereotypes, sometimes not (e.g., Herodotus 3.11; Diodorus 31.13; Livy 23.5.12; Josephus, *Ant.* 13.345-46; Juvenal 15.77-131; Dio 71.4.1). However, an important difference develops in the discourse about human sacrifice when it becomes associated with conspiracies (see Rives 1985): here the “insider” is suspected of a secret horror previously associated with outsiders, a cannibalistic crime that binds confederates together in a pact involving revolution, murder, and subhuman savagery (e.g., Diodorus 22.5; Plutarch, *Publ.* 4; and, famously, Catiline’s conspiracy, Sallust, *Cat.* 22; Plutarch, *Cic.* 10.4; Dio 37.30.3).

Apion’s story thus draws from a deep well of horror, whose cultural and political connotations were widely understood. If the story was believed, Judeans were cast as archetypal savages, their murderous practice sure to arouse Roman horror at this barbaric religion. The Judeans’ gruesome hatred of foreigners would put them beyond the pale of civilization and render their temple a site of irreligion. At the same time, the secret plot, sealed during a cannibalistic feast, characterizes Judeans as a revolutionary cabal, a group who, despite the appearance of civilized, even cultured, behavior, actually harbor a vicious inner hostility to others. Two features might have been particularly relevant for Apion. 1. He probably turned the motif of hostility towards *foreigners* in general into a hatred directed at *Greeks* in particular; hence the rather awkward addition of “and to Greeks in particular” in his version of the oath (2.121). Damocritus’ version, with the killing of a foreigner (ξένος), might be more original or widespread. In the aftermath of the Alexandrian riots (38 CE), where Judeans could be represented as viciously hostile to the “Greeks” in the city, this adaptation of an older myth would bear particular contemporary resonance. 2. In the context of Gaius’ controversial project to erect a statue of himself in the Jerusalem temple, it was valuable to be able to describe the cult there practiced as a barbaric horror: far from being the exalted imageless worship, of pure philosophical refinement (cf. Strabo 16.2.34), this ass-worshipping and cannibalistic cult would be radically improved by proper religion (cf. above, note to “temple” at 2.80). If the story seems to us bizarre, we should recall Apion’s extraordinary tale of groin-tumors (2.20-27), and his famous penchant for the strik-

ing, the unusual, and the ingenious (see note to “scholar” at 2.7).

If Josephus is right in his claim that Apion here draws from others (see 2.90-91), what can be conjectured about earlier uses of the tale? The frequently proposed connection with Seleucid propaganda is possible but by no means proven (see previous note). If we strip out the specific reference to Greeks, which may have been added by Apion, we are left with an oath of hostility to all non-Judeans (μηδενὶ εὐνοήσειν ἄλλοφύλω, 2.121), and this notion of universal misanthropy is precisely what we find attacked in the work of Posidonius (Diodorus 34/35.1.1-5) and Lysimachus (*Apion* 1.305-10); in both accounts of their criticisms, the same verb εὐνοεῖν is prominent (see Berthelot 2003: 106-43). (By contrast, we have no literary parallel for a complaint that Judeans were specifically opposed to *Greeks*.) Thus the tale may have developed as a dramatic representation of Judean inhospitality and unsociability. Such complaints, which seem to have developed in the second century BCE, arose from Judean faithfulness to food laws and preference for endogamy; the resentment caused could take this form of a malicious rumor about the Jerusalem temple, the famed but somewhat mysterious heart of Judean religion. Whether Apion derived this specifically from Posidonius or Apollonius Molon (cf. 2.79) cannot now be traced, given the vague and perhaps misleading way that Josephus represents his sources in this context. However, it is highly likely that Apion did more than recycle the narrative, but adapted and dramatized it for his own rhetorical and political purposes.

<sup>324</sup> Sources not named, unless Posidonius and/or Apollonius Molon are in view (2.79); it is convenient to be able to blame others for this tale (cf. 2.97-98) which cannot be so easily refuted on “Egyptian” lines, as was the last. Apion here clearly took the “Greek” point of view, which is awkward for Josephus who considers him “Egyptian.” This is the longest single extract from Apion (with the longest reply, 2.97-111), but is told in *oratio obliqua*. Josephus has clearly here abbreviated one part of it (the oath: cf. 2.121), and there was probably greater detail on the sacrificial ritual (2.95), but otherwise the story has the verve and narrative skill one would associate with a highly educated figure like Apion.

<sup>325</sup> The story is structured to draw us in to its inner horror (2.95): we discover the awful truth only by following Antiochus’ path of discovery, who hears this

man greeted his arrival with reverence as a source of enormous relief, and falling down at the king's knees stretched out his right hand, begging to be set free.<sup>327</sup> The king told him to take courage<sup>328</sup> and to inform him who he was, why he was living there, and what was the reason for his food. Then the man, with groans and tears, mournfully related his predicament.<sup>329</sup> **93** He said, reports Apion, that he was a Greek<sup>330</sup> and that, while travelling through the province on account of his livelihood, he was suddenly kidnapped by strangers,<sup>331</sup> taken to the temple and shut in there, where he was seen by nobody<sup>332</sup> but fattened up by the provision of all sorts of feasts.<sup>333</sup> **94** At first, these unexpected treats deceived him and made him happy,<sup>334</sup> but then he became suspicious, and later horror-struck; and when he finally asked the slaves who had access to him, he heard about the unmentionable law of the Judeans,<sup>335</sup> on account of which he was being fed, a practice that they repeated every year at a certain set time.<sup>336</sup> **95** They would capture a Greek foreigner<sup>337</sup> and fatten

truth only through the Greek's narration of his own gradual process of realization. Thus we begin with what looks pleasant and harmless, tokens, even, of generous hospitality.

<sup>326</sup> Latin: *et obstipuisse his homo* (the text looks corrupt as the verb should be in the infinitive). Who is the *homo* ("man")? Some think this is a reference to Antiochus and his surprise (cf. 2.98; so Niese, Vogel in Münster, Shutt 1987), but it is better taken as the victim, who later describes how he reached this state of *stupor* (2.94; so Thackeray who suggests that the underlying Greek, ὁ ἄνθρωπος, conveys the sense "the poor fellow"; also Blum and Whiston). The man's surprising psychological condition entices us to discover its cause.

<sup>327</sup> The dramatic gestures are the traditional Greek posture for a plea. The request for freedom evokes the old Greek contrast between the freedom-loving Greek and the tyrannical barbarian.

<sup>328</sup> Latin: *ut confideret*; perhaps "trust him [the king]."

<sup>329</sup> The tale is told with full pathos, the emotions carefully choreographed. We are kept in suspense while the story proceeds to the tale within the tale.

<sup>330</sup> This description is crucial for Apion's version of the tale. The intended victim is specifically a Greek (not any kind of "foreigner," as in Damocritus), but, without a more specific homeland, stands as representative of all Greeks. He is also unnamed (cf. 2.100), as it is only his ethnicity we need to know. The significance of his Greek identity will be very clearly marked in 2.95-95; cf. 2.121.

<sup>331</sup> This is the traveller's nightmare, and the very opposite of the Greek virtue of ξενία (hospitality). The arbitrary choice of this innocent figure makes his planned sacrifice all the more horrendous.

<sup>332</sup> The motif of secrecy (cf. the "unmentionable law" of 2.94) is crucial: with Antiochus the reader is

discovering the terrible secret at the heart of Judean religion.

<sup>333</sup> In this ultimate inversion of hospitality, the stranger is feasted not because he is welcomed, but to render him a better meal for *others* to feast upon! For the motif of deceit, cf. the famous meal of Thyestes, who was tricked into eating his own sons while a guest at a feast.

<sup>334</sup> Latin: *primum quidem haec sibi inopinabilia beneficia prodidisse et detulisse laetitiam*. It seems a stretch to take *prodidisse* this way (so also Thackeray, from its sense "betray"). But this seems better than taking the verb to mean "produce," as *detulisse* then becomes redundant.

<sup>335</sup> The dark secret we hear at 3 removes: through Antiochus, from the Greek, and finally from the temple servants. The secrecy explains why no-one has heard of this terrible truth before: behind their known laws, which make social intercourse difficult, lies a secret law expressing their inner hostility and inhumanity.

<sup>336</sup> In Damocritus' version, every 7th year (no doubt associated with Judean observance of the sabbath). It is even worse to have this take place every year. For the motif of a set date (sometimes annual) on which a figure is made a scapegoat for others (by expulsion or death), see Bickerman 1980: 235-38, though his cross-cultural comparisons (under Frazer's label of the "Saturnalian king") are of doubtful value. Parallel ancient scapegoat rituals are purificatory, and not generally expressive of ethnic or other hostilities: they sometimes involve foreigners (e.g., Diodorus 2.55.3-6), but usually not (see, e.g., Strabo 11.4.7; Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.54; Herodotus 7.197). If Roman readers were reminded of anything in their own history here, it would be of the rare, and now firmly discontinued, practice of burying alive two pairs of Gauls and Greeks (in 228, 216 and 113 BCE): see Livy 22.57.6; Pliny, *Nat.* 30.12; Plutarch, *Quaest. rom.* 83, all emphasizing how

him up over a year, then take him out to a certain wood and kill the man and sacrifice his body in accordance with their rites,<sup>338</sup> and eat from his innards<sup>339</sup> and, whilst sacrificing this Greek, would swear that they would nurture hostility towards Greeks;<sup>340</sup> then they would throw the dead man's remains into a pit.<sup>341</sup> **96** This man, he reports, said he had only a few days of his life left,<sup>342</sup> and begged for release from his dire condition, out of respect for the Gods of the Greeks<sup>343</sup> and in order to foil the Judeans' plots on his life.<sup>344</sup>

*Implausible  
features of the  
story*

**97** A story of this sort is not merely full of every kind of tragedy; it also bristles with a cruel impudence.<sup>345</sup> It does not, however, absolve Antiochus of sacrilege, as those who wrote it to gratify him imagined.<sup>346</sup> **98** For it was not because he foresaw such a thing that he invaded the temple; rather, as they admit, he found it unexpectedly.<sup>347</sup> So he was, of his own volition, evil, impious, and godless to an equal de-

“unRoman” this practice was (Beard, North and Price 1998: 80-82).

<sup>337</sup> It seems redundant to have both terms; this may indicate that Apion added the term “Greek” to the original story, about a “foreigner” (cf. 2.121). The adjective “Greek” occurs no fewer than 4 times in this climactic revelation about the Judean rite (2.95-96).

<sup>338</sup> As Bickerman noted (1980: 237-38; contested by Schäfer 1997a: 63-64), it is odd to kill the man and then sacrifice him (one only sacrifices a living animal): as he suggested, this may indicate the seam between two kinds of story, one of an annual human murder, the other of a cannibalistic feast associated with the swearing of an oath. Certainly disparate motifs have been combined in this narrative, though we cannot tell at what stage or by whom. Not all human sacrifices entailed cannibalism, but since sacrifice normally entailed sharing a feast from the victim, it was natural for tales of horror to combine the motifs. The conspiracy tradition generally did involve some cannibalistic trait.

<sup>339</sup> Latin: *ex eius visceribus* (Greek: τῶν σπλάγγων?); at Greek sacrifices one normally shared in a feast of the vital organs of the animal, while meat from the limbs was offered on the altar, and the rest of the meat boiled to be eaten in the temple or elsewhere. One would imagine that Apion gave further lurid details, especially regarding the drinking of blood, a common element in the making of pacts (mixed with wine, Diodorus 22.5; Sallust, *Cat.* 22).

<sup>340</sup> There is good reason to think that Josephus gives the fuller version of this oath in 2.121, when he revisits this trait in order to make a different rhetorical point. For what this suggests about Apion's adaptation of the story, see note to “account” at 2.90. The oath is a common feature of a political conspiracy (cf. 1.238 in an apparently unrelated story). For a parallel oath of hostility, see SIG I.527, cited by Bickerman 1980: 226-27. On oaths to commit crimes (including murder) and to practice social hostility see Philo, *Spec.* 2.13, 16.

<sup>341</sup> This is the ultimate indignity: what is left of the

victim is not even accorded a decent burial.

<sup>342</sup> The text is corrupt, but with Boysen (also Reinach, Thackeray, and Münster) I read *de vita* rather than *debita*. The drama of the story is increased by this eleventh-hour rescue.

<sup>343</sup> The generalized category represents the antithesis between wholesome Greek religion and its barbarous and impious opposite.

<sup>344</sup> The Latin is incomprehensible (*et superantes in suo sanguine insidias Iudaeorum*): one can only conjecture a possible meaning something along these lines. Blum suggests that *in suo sanguine* means “against his race.” Did Apion's story finish at this point? Perhaps so, since the discovery of a terrible truth was its main point. But Josephus switches the focus to Antiochus and thus considers the story incomplete (2.101).

<sup>345</sup> Cf. Apion's canine *impudentia* in 2.85; the story itself is as cruel (towards Judeans) as its fictional events (towards Greeks). In describing it again as a “story” (cf. 2.79; *fabula* = Greek μῦθος?), Josephus evokes the standard criticisms of the mythical genre as full of pathos and literary invention but devoid of truth (cf. 1.25, 27). The reference to “tragedy” may allude to the influence on Apion of Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris* (see note to “account” at 2.90); so Jacobson 2001.

<sup>346</sup> Echoing 2.90, Josephus imagines the motive for the story, and declares it a failure. On fictionalizing history to gratify kings, cf. 1.25. Although Josephus' tactic is normally to turn against Apion, the “Egyptian,” here he aims his critique at those he imagines to have been the originators of the story. This has the advantage of shifting attention away from the Judeans in the story to the king. If he had known it, he could surely have turned the myth of the Egyptian Busiris against Apion (cf. 2.132, and see note to “account” at 2.90).

<sup>347</sup> See 2.92 for the king's surprise. Josephus here seems to take the “invasion” (Latin: *accedo*, with a hostile sense) as the sacrilege, and not just the plunder (2.90).

gree,<sup>348</sup> however superabundant may be their lies,<sup>349</sup> whose nature is very easily recognized from the story itself.<sup>350</sup> **99** For it is known that our laws are at odds not only with the Greeks, but particularly with Egyptians and many others.<sup>351</sup> Do not some of them happen to visit our country at some time or other?<sup>352</sup> So why should it be solely against those [Greeks]<sup>353</sup> that we conduct<sup>354</sup> a renewed taking of oaths through bloodshed?<sup>355</sup> **100** And how would it be possible for all Judeans to assemble for these sacrifices? Would there be sufficient innards for so many thousands to eat, as Apion says?<sup>356</sup> And why, after discovering this man, whoever he was—Apion does not give us his name—...<sup>357</sup> **101** Or why did the king not take him back to his homeland in a triumphal procession,<sup>358</sup> although, by doing such, he could have got himself a reputation for piety and for exceptional devotion to Greeks, and gained, indeed, strong support from everyone as a counter to the hatred he received from Judeans?<sup>359</sup>

<sup>348</sup> Reading the awkward Latin *iniquus impius et nihilominus sine deo*; a copula is missing between the first two adjectives, or one of them is to be deleted (so Boysen). Far from defending “proper” religion (2.96), Antiochus ignores its taboos. Any interference with a temple was open to such a polemical response.

<sup>349</sup> Following Boysen (*quantavis sit mendacii superfluitas*; Reinach, Thackeray, and Münster). The story is characterized as a lie (cf. 2.90) before the refutation begins.

<sup>350</sup> Latin: *ex ipsa re*. This could mean the event or the story, but for Josephus the event is only a story anyway. Before he offers counter-facts (1.102-9), Josephus will expose the implausibility of the narrative, as he had done against Manetho (1.254-87).

<sup>351</sup> To allow a straight antithesis between Judeans and Greeks might be tempting (cf. the antithesis created in 1.6-27), but would be dangerous, not least in confirming the Judeans to be barbarian. Josephus attempts here a double tactic: to displace the antithesis as more applicable to Egyptians, and to diffuse it, as generalizable (“many others”). A third tactic is possible: to deny any substantive antithesis with Greeks. Josephus gestures at the first two rhetorical tactics here, but will return to the subject of this oath later (2.121-24) to deploy the third line of argument. (Reinach, 78 n.3 rightly noted that the two passages were closely linked, but wrongly concluded that 2.121-24 was textually misplaced; it would create an impossible inconsistency to insert it *alongside* the comment here). Josephus has plenty of evidence for the contrast between Greek and Judean laws (e.g., 2.74-75, 163-67, 250-51; cf. Philo, *Mos.* 1.2), but he here glides over the point to place the emphasis on Egyptians and “many others.” The parallel between this last phrase and 2.74 (“some others”) suggests that he again avoids naming Romans in this context. On the contrast with Egyptians, see 1.224-26.

<sup>352</sup> This is the first of 6 rhetorical questions ad-

ressed to the narrative, a tactic reminiscent of 1.254-59.

<sup>353</sup> Reading *illos* after *solos*, an insertion suggested by Reinach and followed by Münster.

<sup>354</sup> Reading *ageremus*, following Sobius, with Naber, Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster. Latin MSS have *egeremus* or *ereremus*.

<sup>355</sup> Latin: *renovata coniuratione per effusionem sanguinis*. The *coniuratio* suggests that Josephus recognizes the conspiracy motif in the tale (2.95); there was in fact no reference to blood in his abbreviated version (see note to “innards” at 2.95).

<sup>356</sup> As far as we can tell from 2.95, Apion did not specify who was gathered, nor how many. As elsewhere, Josephus exploits this gap, exaggerates his source, and thus dismisses it as impossible (cf. 1.257; 2.22-23).

<sup>357</sup> Niese, Boysen, and Münster consider that the question does not run on into the next section, and thus posit a textual lacuna. Apion did not name the man, as he was a representative “Greek,” but Josephus takes this as a sign that the story is fictional. He had not raised the same objection against Clearchus’ story of an equally anonymous Judean (1.175-82).

<sup>358</sup> Josephus implies that the story is implausible because it is incomplete, but it is so only on his reading, in which the main character is Antiochus. By filling out a different ending, the spotlight is shifted onto the vulnerable reputation of Antiochus.

<sup>359</sup> Taking the story to be an apology for Antiochus (2.90, 97-98), Josephus suggests that he was both morally and politically weak, needing as much support as he could get. The real Antiochus may have gained a reputation as an eccentric (Polybius 26.1.10-11), but could not have been unduly worried if he was hated by some Judeans, who constituted only a tiny pocket of the Seleucid empire. Tacitus represents him as attempting to abolish Judean *superstitio* and introduce Greek *mores* (*Hist.* 5.8.2), a version of events akin to this story in Apion.



*Facts regarding access to the temple*

**102** But I leave these matters now: stupid people should be refuted by facts, not arguments.<sup>360</sup> All those who saw the design of our temple know what it was like<sup>361</sup> and how its sanctity was kept intact and impenetrable.<sup>362</sup> **103** For it had four surrounding courts,<sup>363</sup> and each of these had its own protection in accordance with the law.<sup>364</sup> Thus, anyone was allowed to enter the outer court, even foreigners,<sup>365</sup> only menstruating women were prohibited entry.<sup>366</sup> **104** To the second court all Judeans were admitted,<sup>367</sup> together with their wives if they were free of all impurity,<sup>368</sup> to the

<sup>360</sup> Cf. 2.12, 82 for the same appeal to “facts,” what rhetorical theorists called “inartificial” evidence, compared to the “artificial” proofs from argument (e.g., about implausibility, 2.97-101). Josephus implies that Apion is too stupid to be able to understand arguments (see note to “ignorance” at 2.4). The facts to follow in 2.102-9 concern access to, and organization in, the temple, detailed in order to show the impossibility of the Greek’s confinement and feast, as described in the story (2.107, 110). Presumably Josephus thinks he has said enough in 2.97-101 to show the implausibility of the sacrifice, the cannibalism, and the oath (2.95), which were the heart of the accusation. He will return to the oath, with some counter facts, in 2.121-24; oddly he never offers facts to disprove the possibility of human sacrifice or cannibalism in the Judean tradition. The design of the temple is a matter he knows very well, as a once-serving priest. He has discussed the topic twice already (*War* 5.184-247; *Ant.* 15.391-425), but makes no reference to his earlier treatments.

<sup>361</sup> Josephus suggests this is common knowledge (cf. 2.109-10), although only Judeans could have known what was beyond the barricade, and by this time a whole generation had passed since the buildings were destroyed. Without drawing attention to the matter, Josephus describes the temple structures in the past tense, but the laws governing access (2.105-6) and the cultic activity (2.108-9) in the present tense (cf. 2.76-77). The past tense is rhetorically appropriate in relation to events at the time of Antiochus.

<sup>362</sup> Latin: *intransgressibilem eius purificationis integritatem*. The initial emphasis is on the “impenetrable,” with the system of courts regulating access, and thus excluding the possibility of a hidden Greek. Later it will shift to the controls over temple furniture and food-stuffs (to refute the idea of a feast), and to the large number of personnel (to rule out the notion of a carefully guarded secret). For the emphasis on sanctity, inherent in any temple but variously regulated, see Josephus’ comments in *War* 1.26; 5.194; 6.122. It will sometimes be unclear what Josephus means by “the temple” (see note to “temple” at 2.106), an ambiguity that aids his argument more than once.

<sup>363</sup> Latin: *quattuor etenim habuit in circuitu porticus*. Here and elsewhere the noun *porticus* must

translate not *στοά* (*pace* Shutt 1987), but either *ἀυλή* (*War* 5.227) or, more likely, *περίβολος* (*War* 5.186 and elsewhere). *In circuitu* need not mean “in a concentric arrangement,” but conveys the sense that the sanctuary building is at “the middle” (*War* 5.207). In his earlier accounts (in *War* 5 and *Ant.* 15), the emphasis had been on the engineering and architectural splendor of the temple complex: here, the focus lies entirely on the rules for access. For plans of the Herodian temple, based on Josephus and the Mishnaic tractate *Middot*, see Sanders 1992: 308-14, derived from Busink 1980.

<sup>364</sup> The reference to the law implicitly contradicts 2.94. The protection (*custodia*) is based on the laws of purity; Josephus elsewhere refers to 7 degrees of purity (*War* 1.26; cf. *m. Kelim* 1.8). It was also enforced with guards: see Philo, *Spec.* 1.156; *m. Mid.* 1.1-2; Sanders 1992: 82.

<sup>365</sup> For this huge outer or “first” court, see *War* 5.190-92; *Ant.* 15.410-15; *m. Mid.* 2.1-2. It was paved and surrounded by magnificent porticoes. Josephus’ comment that “even foreigners” were allowed stresses Judean openness: even the subsequent restriction to Judeans (2.104) is worded in a way which does not specify the *exclusion* of Gentiles, and makes no mention of the famous barricade (see below). For Josephus’ sensitivity on this point, see 2.121-24.

<sup>366</sup> Cf. *War* 5.227; 6.426. *m. Kelim* 1.8 indicates other exclusions as well (men and women with a flux; women after childbirth). Either Josephus is following a different rule (Bauckham 1996: 331-32) or, more likely, he here distributes the impurity exclusions, so that one (and only one) is applicable to each court: outer court (no menstruating women); second court (no women with other [undefined] impurities); third court (no impure men); fourth court (only priests); inner sanctuary (only high priests). Menstruating women were regarded as not only impure, but a highly contagious source of impurity for others: Lev 15:19-24; *Ant.* 3.261. The taboo was very common in the ancient world (cf. *Ant.* 1.322-23).

<sup>367</sup> The statement implies, but does not state, the exclusion of Gentiles, and notably omits all mention of the chest-high balustrade (*δρῦφρακτος*), with its notice that no foreigner was allowed beyond that point on pain of death. Josephus gave a full description of this

third, male Judeans if they were clean and purified;<sup>369</sup> to the fourth, priests wearing priestly vestments;<sup>370</sup> but to the inner sanctuary,<sup>371</sup> only the high priests dressed in the vestments special to themselves.<sup>372</sup> **105** Indeed, so careful is the provision for all

barrier on the other occasions on which he described the temple design (*War* 5.193-94, as containing “the law of purity”; *Ant.* 15.417), and elsewhere indicates the Romans’ respect for this restriction (*War* 2.341; 4.182; 6.124-26; cf. Philo, *Legat.* 212). Two of the inscriptions have been found (see references and literature in Stern 2.47; Smallwood 1970: 270). The exclusion of non-Judeans from the temple was indeed well-known (*Ant.* 12.145; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.8.1), and it might have served Josephus’ argument to cite this written notice excluding such people as the kidnapped Greek in the story—except that he was destined to die in any case! Josephus’ silence is partly explained by the general paucity of architectural detail (there are no references here to the steps, the platform, the walls, or the gates leading into the temple enclosure, *War* 5.195-206; *Ant.* 15.418), but seems to reflect also his desire to omit or play down anything that could be construed as hostility to foreigners (cf. 2.121-24, 236-78).

<sup>368</sup> The “women’s court” (γυναικῶν ἵτις, *War* 5.199, 204) was at the eastern end of the temple enclosure; cf. *War.* 5.198-200; *m. Mid.* 2.5); it was entered through Nicanor’s gate (for men?) or gates to the north and south (for women?). The “they” here are the women (Latin: *mundae*). Since menstruants were not allowed into the outer court (2.103), this must refer to other forms of impurity (e.g., after childbirth, Lev 12:2-8; cf. 2.198). On the possibility that Josephus misrepresents the purity access rules for literary purposes, see note to “entry” at 2.103. This would make best sense of the fact that he implies in the next phrase that *men* in a state of impurity were allowed into the women’s court (just no further), whereas we have excellent reason to think that ritually impure men were not allowed to proceed into the walled enclosure at all (i.e., any further than the barricade); so Josephus says elsewhere (*War* 5.227; *Ant.* 15.418; cf. *m. Kelim* 1.8). Josephus’ statement here is thus at the very least “misleading” (Bauckham 1996: 333). He contradicts himself and the facts, in order to hold over to the next stage of ingress (into the court of the Israelites) a further rule of purity.

<sup>369</sup> Men mounted a further 15 steps, through a huge gate at the western end of the Women’s Court (*War* 5.204-6). This next area is called in the Mishnah “the court of the Israelites” (e.g., *m. Mid.* 2.5-6), and from it women were excluded (*War* 5.199, 227; *Ant.* 15.419). In *Ant.* 15.417-19 the women’s and the men’s courts are bracketed as the “second,” before reference to the court of the priests (the “third”). Here Josephus extends the

numbering, and, for the sake of neatness, delays to this point the rule about purity for men, although it actually applied beforehand (see previous note).

<sup>370</sup> Cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.8.1, referring to a “boundary” (*limes*), which Josephus describes as no more than a half-meter high parapet (γείσιον, *War* 5.226) and the Mishnah as either a half-meter step or a change in flagstones (*m. Mid.* 2.6). Whether laypeople could bring their sacrifices into the priests’ court, or how they laid hands on them when passing them to the priests for slaughter, is unclear (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.198-99; *m. Kelim* 1.8). The wearing of priestly (linen) vestments, a sign of sacred duty, marked out those priests who were officiating at the time (on the vestments, see Sanders 1992: 92-99; *Ant.* 3.151-58). Once again, Josephus oversimplifies, since he says elsewhere that even priests who did not, or could not, officiate (and thus were not wearing the special vestments) could go into the priests’ court, if they were in a state of purity, to receive their portions of the sacrifices (*War* 5.227-28); but only the officiating priests, totally sober and clothed in fine linen, could approach the altar (*War* 5.229).

<sup>371</sup> We might expect a reference to the sanctuary building (ναός, cf. *War* 5.215-19), but Josephus, wishing to signal another step in grades of purity, moves straight to its inner sanctum (Latin: *adytum*, translating ἄδυτον, *War* 5.236; cf. Philo, *Mos.* 2.94; *Legat.* 306, using both singular and plural forms; elsewhere in Josephus ἅγιον ἁγίου, “holy of holy,” *War* 5.219). The utter inaccessibility of this room (except to the high priest), and its total emptiness, are emphasized in *War* 5.219.

<sup>372</sup> On the high priest’s special garments, worn on festival days, see *War* 5.231-36; *Ant.* 3.159-78, 184-87; Sanders 1992: 99-102. Josephus does not mention here the one occasion per year on which the high priest entered this inner chamber, the Day of Atonement (cf. *War* 5.236; Philo, *Legat.* 306), perhaps because this might be taken to support the possibility of a man being kept in the temple out of sight for a whole year, until an annual sacrifice (cf. 2.93-95). Also unmentioned in this survey of the temple is any reference to the numerous rooms around the temple complex: apart from the porticoes in the outer court (*War.* 5.190-92; *Ant.* 15.411-16), we know of rooms or porticoes in the women’s court (*m. Mid.* 2.5), rooms in the gateways (*War* 5.203; *Ant.* 15.418; *m. Mid.* 1.4, 6), rooms for storage and meetings around the court of the Israelites and of the priests (*War* 5.38, 200; 6.282; *m. Mid.* 5.3-4), and rooms integral to

aspects of the cultic activity that a time is set for the priests to enter at certain hours.<sup>373</sup> hence, in the morning, when the temple was opened, the priests had to enter who were to offer the traditional sacrifices,<sup>374</sup> and again at midday, until the temple was closed.<sup>375</sup> **106** Finally, it is not even permitted to carry any vessel into the temple.<sup>376</sup> The only items placed therein were an altar,<sup>377</sup> a table,<sup>378</sup> an incense al-

the sanctuary building itself (*War* 5.220-21; 6.252, 261; *m. Mid.* 4.3); see full discussion in Busink 1980. Since any of these could have been sites to conceal the Greek victim in the myth, Josephus maintains a tactful silence on them all, though his main emphasis is not on places to hide, but on the restriction of access into temple zones.

<sup>373</sup> This reinforces the general sense of control over access to the temple (both to whom it was granted and when). Although it is unspecified what is being entered (“the temple” in the next clause), Josephus gives the general impression that no personnel (e.g. “servants,” 2.94) could come and go to any part of the temple complex where the Greek might be secluded.

<sup>374</sup> Latin: *facientes traditas hostias*; the alternative translation offered by Thackeray, “to offer the victims delivered to them,” is less likely. The allusion is to the *Tamid*, offered in the morning and evening (Exod 29:38-42; Num 28: 2-8; cf. *War* 6.94; *Ant.* 3.327). But the Mishnah makes clear that at least some of the priests designated for the morning sacrifice slept overnight in the temple, while the enclosure was shut (*m. Tamid* 1.1-2), an arrangement perhaps hinted at also in *War* 6.299 (cf. Sanders 1992: 116-17, with n.17). Of course, in this context Josephus would not want to encourage the thought of *anyone* sleeping overnight in the temple.

<sup>375</sup> Does this suggest the arrival of a second shift at midday? Cf. the handover at midday in 2.108; Bauckham (1996: 334-35) concludes that the matter is unclear in both Josephus and the Mishnah. On the evening/late-afternoon sacrifice, see *m. Pesah.* 5.1, with Sanders 1992: 117.

<sup>376</sup> This sentence seems designed to exclude the constant supply of food envisaged in 2.91, 93, but in its straightforward sense is wholly unrealistic unless “temple” is here defined extremely narrowly, to mean the inner sanctum itself. There are 5 possible referents for “the temple” (Latin: *templum*): i) the whole temple mount, including even the outer court; ii) the sacred walled enclosure (i.e., beyond the barricade and gates); iii) the area of sacrifice restricted to priests; iv) the sanctuary building (usually in Josephus, ὁ ναός), including both its first chamber (containing the incense altar, table of shewbread, and lampstand) and the inner sanctum; v) the inner sanctum alone. Josephus seems to envisage the Greek being kept in one of the last 3 (see

2.110), and the following list of items (found “therein”) were located in iii) and iv). But both the priests’ sacrifices on the external altar and the items in the first chamber of the sanctuary required many a “vessel” (*vas*), which Josephus knew about and even refers to immediately below (2.108). The only place into which, it appears, no vessel was carried (because none was needed) was the inner sanctum, and it may be that, for the sake of his argument, Josephus temporarily restricts the meaning of “temple” to this space, and imagines the Greek imprisoned there. Alternatively, we have to conclude that he means that “no vessel other than those which belonged to the temple” was to be carried in (so Bauckham 1996: 338, suggesting that sacrificial materials could be brought into the walled enclosure only in temple vessels, certified to be pure). But then Josephus’ statement is very misleading (he says “any vessel,” *vas aliquod*) and one could well imagine the Greek’s feast being brought in on temple dishes. The ban attributed to Jesus in Mark 11:16 is equally mysterious, but appears to apply to the outer court and relate to commerce there, not to the purity of the sanctuary building (Bauckham 1996: 338-39). Both texts seem to trade on the unfamiliarity of their readers with the organization of the temple.

<sup>377</sup> This cannot mean the indoor incense altar, which is listed later, so must mean the altar for burnt offerings in the court of the priests (cf. 1.198). Noting the lack of reference to the laver (Exod 30:17-21), Bauckham suggests that Josephus lists only the moveable objects (1996: 336-37), but this huge stone altar was hardly in that category. If “therein” (*in eo*) includes the priests’ court, Josephus again omits mention of the numerous chambers around the court, and their contents (see note to “themselves” at 2.104).

<sup>378</sup> This and the following two items form a trio often mentioned in descriptions of the temple: see, e.g., *War* 1.142; 5.216; *Ant.* 8.90, 104; 12.250; 14.72; Philo, *Mos.* 2.101-5; 1 Macc. 1:21-22; 4:49; Heb 9:2-4. This golden table of the shewbread (Exod 25:23-40; cf. *Ant.* 3.139-43) was well-known in Rome, where it was exhibited in the emperors’ triumphal procession (*War* 7.148) and sculptured on Titus’ Arch. Josephus notably omits mention of the bread laid on this table, to which he elsewhere gives careful attention (*War* 5.217); that would undercut his denial of the possibility of a feast.

tar,<sup>379</sup> and a lampstand,<sup>380</sup> all of which are also listed in the law.<sup>381</sup> **107** There was really nothing more—neither the performance of any unmentionable mysteries<sup>382</sup> nor the provision of a feast within.<sup>383</sup> What I have just said has the witness of the whole nation and the evidence of the procedures.<sup>384</sup> **108** For although there are four tribes of priests,<sup>385</sup> and each one of these tribes contains more than 5,000 men,<sup>386</sup>

<sup>379</sup> Latin: *turibulum*, a term which normally means “censer” (and is so translated by Thackeray and Blum). But all our sources speak of incense censers in the plural (θυίσκαι, Exod 25:29 LXX; 3 Kgdms 7:36 LXX; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.150; 1 Macc. 1:22; θυμιατήρια, *Ant.* 4.57). Here *turibulum* must translate θυμιατήριον, a term that normally means “censer” (hence the Latin translation), but has a special sense in Jewish literature in Greek, namely, the altar of incense (so rightly Bauckham 1996: 336). This golden altar (Exod 30:1-10; *Ant.* 3.147-48, 198; cf. Ps.-Hecataeus in 1.198; Philo, *Mos.* 2.101) was regularly supplied with spices (*War* 1.152; 5.218; *Ant.* 14.72), which Josephus also omits to mention.

<sup>380</sup> The famous 7-branched lampstand (Exod 25:31-40; 37:17-24; *Ant.* 3.144-46, 199; Philo, *Mos.* 2.102-3) was also well-known in Rome, suffering the same fate as the table (see above).

<sup>381</sup> For the references in the law, echoed in *Ant.* 3, see above. This list is apparently meant to be exhaustive, and thus would rule out at least the “couch” (*lectum*) mentioned in 2.91. By this reference to the law, Josephus indicates that all this is public knowledge (so accessible to Apion, 2.109-11), in contrast to the “unmentionable law” referred to in the story (2.94; cf. 2.103).

<sup>382</sup> The adjective is designed to echo 2.94, and its “unmentionable law.” Elsewhere Josephus shows some concern to stress that the temple and its proceedings should be clearly and publicly known (*War* 1.26). It may be that the stories he has cited were not the only speculations on its rituals, and that the “reports” among Gentiles about its contents (*War* 6.260) were not all complimentary.

<sup>383</sup> Again it is unclear where the feast (2.91, 93) is imagined to have taken place. Although he has mentioned the altars, Josephus has omitted all reference to their necessary supplies—meat, oil, wine, grain, etc. Elsewhere he indicates that the rebels could live off the supplies stored in the temple for some time (*War* 5.8, 104, 564-65).

<sup>384</sup> The question of evidence is crucial but difficult for Josephus. Excluded by the barricade, Gentiles could not examine the inner realities of the temple, but it is their suspicions he is trying to allay. The forcible entry of Gentile conquerors provides one opportunity for testimony (2.82), the law another (2.103, 106). The appeal here to the whole (Judean) nation would hardly satisfy

a suspicious Gentile, if the matter at stake is a dark Judean secret. In fact, this has to resolve into an appeal to the knowledge of priests (2.108-9), since only they could witness the inner realities of the temple; but they are hardly an impartial witness on the subject of the alleged criminal rite.

<sup>385</sup> Latin: *licet enim sint tribus quattuor sacerdotum*. Josephus elsewhere speaks of 24 πατριαί (“families”) of priests, distinguished from the “tribe” (φυλή) of Levi, each serving in the temple for a week, from sabbath to sabbath (*Ant.* 7.365-67, drawn from 1 Chron 24:4, 7-18). This arrangement, he insists, continues to his own day (*Ant.* 7.366). In the same passage he uses ἐφημερίς as an alternative for πατριαί (*Ant.* 7.367), and this term, usually translated “course,” is found elsewhere as the standard label for the 24 units within the priestly body (*War* 4.155; *Ant.* 12.265; *Life* 2); in the last case φυλή is a label for a subdivision within the unit (see Mason 2001 ad loc.). Evidence from the New Testament (Luke 1:5-8) and the DSS (4Q320-25, 328-30) suggests that this division into 24 units was indeed standard, as it represented the pattern of priestly activity in the temple. Since Josephus nowhere else speaks of the priestly body as divided into four, it has been argued that the Latin (or underlying Greek) text is corrupt, and should here read 24; if the following 5,000 is correct, that would lead to a total of 120,000 priests (Schürer revised 2.247; Bauckham 1996: 339-47). Since numbers are particularly prone to textual corruption, and the Latin is evidently corrupt elsewhere, this is by no means impossible; and if the number seems extremely high (Schürer suggests it includes Levites, women, and children), we can appreciate Josephus’ temptation to exaggerate in this context, where the largest possible number of witnesses is required. However, there are good reasons to accept the text as it stands: i) A total of 120,000 priests would be ridiculously high, and unlikely to be accepted by any of Josephus’ readers; conversely, at our best estimate, there were about 20,000 priests in Josephus’ day (Jeremias 1969: 204-5; Sanders 1992: 78-79). ii) In the Latin translation of Josephus, the term *tribus* always translates Greek φυλή (e.g., in *Apion* 2.36 and *Ant.* 1-5 *passim*). Thus, there is good reason to doubt that the Greek term underlying *tribus* was either of the two terms used by Josephus for the 24 priestly “courses.” iii) In the rest of this sentence, Josephus will make clear that these “tribes” are subdivided for their priestly activity: they



they perform their duties in smaller units for a fixed period of days.<sup>387</sup> When these are completed, other priests come to take over the sacrificial tasks.<sup>388</sup> They assemble in the temple at midday and receive from their predecessors the keys of the temple<sup>389</sup> and all the vessels, counted out,<sup>390</sup> with nothing by way of food or drink being brought into the temple.<sup>391</sup> **109** For it is forbidden to offer such things even on the altar, apart from what is prepared for the sacrifices.<sup>392</sup>

*Conclusion on Apion's tale*

What then shall we say about Apion<sup>393</sup>—except that he has offered incredible tales without examining any of these things?<sup>394</sup> But that is a disgrace! For did he not promise, as a “scholar,” to offer a true conception of history?<sup>395</sup> **110** Although he knew

perform their duties “in smaller units for a fixed period of days” (*particulariter per dies certos*). This looks like a reference to the weekly period of service for each priestly “course” (the smaller units within a course might serve for only one day in the week). Thus the “tribe” must be a unit bigger than one of the 24 courses. iv) There is a biblical tradition which divides the priestly body into four, the four clans who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:36-39; Neh 7:39-42). Although there is no evidence that this subdivision was of practical significance, later rabbinic texts suggest it was remembered, and co-ordinated with the 24 courses (y. *Ta'an.* 68a; t. *Ta'an* 2.1, 216; cf. Stern 1976: 587-89). v) For rhetorical reasons, Josephus might wish to choose a unit larger than the 24 “courses.” These probably varied in size, and in any case were not larger than several hundred; it sounds more impressive to suggest that there are thousands of people who might know what is going on in the temple at any one time. vi) Although Josephus elsewhere uses the term *φύλη* either for the larger body from which priests are drawn (the tribe of Levi) or for the smallest unit within the priestly body (a subdivision of the “course”), in this apologetic and non-technical work he might choose to use it more loosely for the traditional priestly clans; cf. the non-technical usage of the term in 2.36.

<sup>386</sup> Cf. Ps.-Hecataeus' estimate of 1,500 priests in total (1.188; 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE?). The evidence from *Aristeas* 95 (700 priests serving at a festival) is of uncertain value: see the discussion in Jeremias 1969: 204-5; Sanders 1992: 78-79; Bauckham 1996: 346-47.

<sup>387</sup> “In smaller units” translates *particulariter* better than “in turn” (Bauckham) or “by rotation” (Thackeray). This refers to the 24 “courses,” which served for a week each (see above, note at “priests”). 4Q320-21 carefully co-ordinates the service of each course with the calendar.

<sup>388</sup> This process of handover is alluded to also in 4Q323, 324; *m. Tamid* 5.1; *m. Sukkah* 5.8.

<sup>389</sup> Cf. the references to the keys in *m. Tamid* 1.1; *m. Midd.* 1.8-9.

<sup>390</sup> The vessels (*vasa*; cf. 2.106) include the cups,

plates, and bowls used in the sacrifices (cf. Exod 25:29; *Ant.* 3.150; *War* 1.152; 6.388; 1 Macc. 1:22). Their counting out (*m. Tamid* 3.9 says there were 93) suggests not only their value but also the ordered and public control of temple practices; nothing irregular could be smuggled in.

<sup>391</sup> Josephus again rules out the possibility of the feast described in the story (2.91, 93). But, as with the vessels in 2.106, the meaning is unclear. Plenty of food and drink was of course brought into the temple for the sacrifices. Either Josephus means that no-one could bring *their own* foodstuffs into the temple (so Bauckham 1996: 339-41) or, as in 2.106, by “temple” here he means the inner sanctum. That might explain the logic of the following sentence: no-one can bring food into the inner sanctum, and even to the altar outside one can only take what is designated for sacrifice (not human consumption).

<sup>392</sup> A double point: one cannot bring food even to the altar (far less into the inner sanctum), or at least what is brought to the altar is for sacrifices alone, not for a feast. Feasts that resulted from the sacrifices are not mentioned here, as Josephus wishes no reference to eating anywhere in the temple, not even by the priests who served there.

<sup>393</sup> Latin: *quid ergo Apionem esse dicimus*. Naber, followed by Thackeray and Reinach, questioned the presence of *esse*, but there is little difference in sense. Turning on Apion (rather than his sources, 2.97-98), Josephus finds no opportunity to attack him as an “Egyptian,” only as a “scholar.”

<sup>394</sup> “Incredible” (*incredula*) was also used to dub the ass story (2.82, *incredibilis*).

<sup>395</sup> Reading *historiae enim veram notitiam se proferre grammaticus non promisit* as a rhetorical question. Niese suggests emending the text from *non promisit* to *compromisit* (“he promised”; Boysen is inclined to agree), making it a statement, rather than a question. The title “scholar,” not used since 2.15, mocks Apion's pretense to know facts (cf. note to “scholar” at 2.2). Since Apion has been dubbed an Egyptian, not a Greek, Josephus cannot use quite the same tactic as in 1.6-27

the sanctity of our temple, he omitted to mention it<sup>396</sup> but invented his account of the Greek man's arrest, his unmentionable nourishment,<sup>397</sup> the extremely rich splendor of his feasting, and the slaves entering in where not even the noblest Judeans are allowed to go, unless they are priests.<sup>398</sup> **111** This, then, is the grossest impiety and a deliberate lie<sup>399</sup> intended to mislead those who are unwilling to investigate the truth—since it is by means of such “crimes” and “unmentionable” phenomena, as recounted above, that they have attempted to insult us.<sup>400</sup>

**(2.9) 112** Again, ridiculing us as excessively superstitious,<sup>401</sup> he includes Mnaseas in his story.<sup>402</sup> According to Apion, the latter recounts that when the Judeans were

*Mnaseas' story  
of a golden  
ass-head*

against “Greek” historians, but the scholar-title is a near equivalent.

<sup>396</sup> Apion is charged here not with ignorance (cf. 2.3), but with wilful suppression of the truth (cf. 2.37, 48). Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.8.1 indicates knowledge of the general rules barring access first to Gentiles and then to non-priests, but the story Apion recycles is of a secret rite that could be understood to circumvent the publicly known rules.

<sup>397</sup> “Unmentionable” had been used earlier in relation to the law (2.94) and the mystery (2.107); there was nothing particularly secret or nefarious about the food itself, except that it was used to fatten up the Greek for sacrifice.

<sup>398</sup> This indicates that by “within” Josephus must mean areas where only priests could go (see note to “temple” at 2.106). The purity barriers are now transmuted into indicators of status, in order to rule out the role of slaves in 2.94. But in 2.103-4 the rules concern only ethnicity and gender.

<sup>399</sup> As in 2.79, 89, the “impiety” lies not with the Judeans, but with those who slander them. This is the third time the Greek-ritual has been called a lie (cf. 2.90, 98), and it is “deliberate” because, it is assumed (2.110), Apion knew otherwise.

<sup>400</sup> The same phrase (*detrahere temptaverunt*) is used in the Latin translation of 1.220 (Greek: ἐπιχέιρησαν λοιδορεῖν); for Josephus' use of the language of “insult,” see note to “irksome” at 2.4. This is the only indication of the influence of Apion, or at least of these stories he employs, on others; the “they” here are those he has misled, not those who supplied the material to him (2.89-91). As in 2.4, Josephus assumes that Apion has influenced others. But apart from the parallel tradition in Damocritus (see note to “account” at 2.90), there is no evidence for the circulation of Apion's tale.

<sup>401</sup> The Latin text reads *piissimus*, the adjective describing Apion: “Again, as one who is extremely pious, he ridicules [us] ...” (so Naber, Niese, Thackeray). Josephus can certainly use irony in his introductions to new topics (cf. 2.79), but it is hard to see what would be so “pious” about Apion's attitude here. It seems better to follow Niese in his conjectural emendation

(*piissimos*; followed by Boysen, Reinach, and Münster), which could translate the Greek δεισιδάρμονας in the sense of “superstitious.” This makes clear what Apion is ridiculing, and fits exactly the tenor of the story (esp. 2.113), which runs parallel to other tales denouncing “superstition” related by both Mnaseas and his contemporary Agatharchides (1.205-12, see below; see also Strabo 16.2.37 on the “superstitious” priests and tyrants in Judea, probably derived from Posidonius, two generations after Mnaseas). If this represents Apion's tone, his use of this story not only confirmed the rumor of Judean ass-worship (cf. 2.79-88) but also illustrated the Judeans' religious stupidity (cf. 2.125).

<sup>402</sup> For the language of “story”/“myth” (here *fabula*), cf. 2.89, 97, 112. “Mnaseas” is Niese's reconstruction from Latin *mnafeam*, but is undoubtedly correct (and followed by all editors); Boysen thinks the word *testem* has dropped out (“he includes Mnaseas as witness to his story”). Mnaseas had been mentioned earlier in 1.216, and elsewhere at *Ant.* 1.94. Originally from Patara in Lycia, he was a pupil of Eratosthenes in Alexandria (according to the *Suda* on the latter); since Eratosthenes lived 285–194 BCE, we can date Mnaseas no later than the first half of the second century BCE (see Laqueur in *PW* XV, 2250-52; Fraser 1972: 1.524-25, 781-82). His main work, preserved only in fragments (*FHG* 3.149-58, omitting this text), was a survey of cultures, divided into at least 3 regions (Europe; Asia; Libya). Its emphasis appears to have been on the myths, religions, and marvels of each region, and this comment on Idumea/Judea no doubt came from the survey of Asia. In the second book of “On Asia,” Mnaseas commented critically on the Syrian taboo regarding the consumption of fish: this he explains by reference to a cruel queen Atargatis, who banned others from eating fish (because she wanted them all herself!), and is commemorated in sacrifices of fish to the eponymous goddess, consumed “of course” by the priests themselves (*apud* Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 346d-e). This suggests that Mnaseas was no more “anti-Judean” than he was “anti-Syrian”: the tone of his work was rationalistic (and euhemeristic), with sardonic comment on the strange superstitions of the natives in various countries. Indeed,

conducting a war against the Idumeans<sup>403</sup> a long time ago,<sup>404</sup> there was a certain man in one of the Idumean cities called Dorii<sup>405</sup> who used to worship Apollo there and who came to the Judeans—he says his name was Zabidos—and then promised to hand over to them Apollo, the God of the Dorians,<sup>406</sup> and that he would come to our temple, if they all withdrew.<sup>407</sup> **113** The whole population of Judeans believed him.<sup>408</sup> Zabidos in fact made a wooden contraption, which he placed around himself; he fastened to it three rows of lamps<sup>409</sup> and walked about in such a way that he ap-

the main focus of the story to follow, as Josephus reports it, is not the ass-head in the temple, but the extreme naivety of the Judeans in matters of religion, resulting in serious damage to themselves. This is closely parallel to the critique of the sabbath-rule by Agatharchides (see 1.205-12), a near contemporary of Mnaseas in the Alexandrian school (see note to “Agatharchides” at 1.205). Both understood themselves as representing “reason” and “civilization”; from their lofty intellectual heights, others’ customs were poorly understood and easily exaggerated. The following tale combines a number of motifs (a venerated ass; mass credulity; religious trickery; laughable impersonation of the Gods), some of which may represent Mnaseas’ own invention as much as the sources from which he drew. Our access to the original is impeded by the fact that we are mostly (for 2.112-13) dependent on a Latin translation of Josephus’ text, the Latin itself containing several items which are textually corrupt. Josephus clearly knew Mnaseas only at second hand (via Apion), and reports Apion’s account in a highly condensed form, including only those items that he will later critique (2.115-20). In these circumstances, and since we lack the context and narrative flow of the anecdote, much of its force remains obscure. Its roots may lie in hostility between Idumeans and Judeans, but we can hardly speculate further (see Bickerman 1980: 252-55; Appendix 4).

<sup>403</sup> The MSS read *Iudaeos* (“Judeans”) and in the following clause read “in one of the Judeans’ cities” (*in aliqua civitate Iudaeorum*). But this makes no sense (what would Apollo have to do with a Judean civil war?), and in his response Josephus explicitly refers to Idumea (2.116—the text is secure in the first occurrence of the word). Thus it is necessary to emend the text to *Idumaeos* and *Idumaeorum* (“Idumeans”), first suggested by Gelenius, noted by Niese and Boysen, and accepted by Naber, Reinach, Thackeray, and Münster.

<sup>404</sup> Latin *longo quodam tempore*, better read in this sense than “of long duration” (*pace* Thackeray). The vague time-reference suggests an old fable that no one was able to date; but it suits Josephus’ purpose to have it in the distant past, before Antiochus IV (2.120). Hostility between Judeans and Idumeans (= “Edomites”) seems to have gone back several centuries BCE.

<sup>405</sup> Josephus will later refer to Apion’s city as “Dora” (Δῶρα, 2.114, 116), and elsewhere (*Ant.* 19.300, 303) refers to the inhabitants of the real, Phoenician, city of Dora as Δωριῆται or Δωριῆοι (some MSS Δωριῆοι). Mnaseas and Apion were no doubt referring to the Idumean city generally called Adora, about 5 miles south-west of Hebron. Unless he is deliberately misrepresenting his source, Josephus seems to have found the spelling Dora in his text of Apion; but this could be a corruption in transmission, easy to understand and evidenced elsewhere in the textual tradition of Josephus’ own works. The city Adora is named in *War* as Adoreon (1.63) and Adoreus (1.66). In *Antiquities*, it is variously called Adoraim (8.246), Dora (13.207, according to all MSS), Adora (13.257), and again Dora (*Ant.* 14.88, in most MSS; Adora in P). It is possible that Josephus himself used different spellings of the name and even *himself* on occasion called the city Dora (despite his scorn in 2.115-16). Alternatively, the name was altered through scribal error to Dora in *Ant.* 13.207 and 14.88 (most MSS). The same error might have occurred in the text of Mnaseas or Apion (we cannot know at what stage), or they may be using an alternative version of the city’s name.

<sup>406</sup> On “Dorians,” see previous note. In a hellenized environment, the Idumean God Kos was identified with Apollo: see, e.g., the inscription from the temple of Apollo in Memphis, dedicated by members of the Idumean diaspora in Egypt (OGIS 737; 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE).

<sup>407</sup> Bickerman suggests (1980: 253) that there lies behind this story the notion of the *evocatio* of another’s deities, calling them over to support one’s own cause; but the rite was rarely practiced by the Romans and it is uncertain if a Greek writer would allude to it. The condition of withdrawal (out of respect for the holy?) is crucial for the remainder of the story, but ignored in Josephus’ response (2.118-20).

<sup>408</sup> The motif of Judean gullibility seems central to the story. The charge recurs occasionally in later literature (Horace, *Sat.* 1.5.100; Galen, *Puls.* 2.4).

<sup>409</sup> The rationale for this disguise is unclear: it either represents some element in Idumean representations of Kos/Apollo, or it parodies Judean use of lamps in worship (see note to “rites” at 2.118). Mnaseas en-

peared to those standing at a distance to be like stars travelling upon the earth.<sup>410</sup>

**114** The Judeans, stunned by this strange sight, remained at a distance keeping still,<sup>411</sup> but Zabidos, completely untroubled, sneaked into the sanctuary, tore off the golden head of the pack-ass<sup>412</sup>—so he wittily writes<sup>413</sup>—and went off quickly back to Dora.<sup>414</sup>

**115** Well, may we not say, for our part, that Apion overloads the pack-ass—that is, himself<sup>415</sup>—weighing it down with both stupidity and lies?<sup>416</sup> He writes about places which do not exist and alters the location of cites that he does not know.<sup>417</sup>

**116** For Idumea borders on our territory, adjoining Gaza, and it has no city named Dora,<sup>418</sup> however, there is a city called Dora in Phoenicia, near Mount Carmel,<sup>419</sup> though this has nothing to do with Apion’s nonsense, since it is four days’ journey from Idumea.<sup>420</sup> **117** And why does he still accuse us of not having Gods in common with the rest of humanity,<sup>421</sup> if our ancestors were easily persuaded in this way

*Errors in the story*

joys the religious fakery involved, and the naivety of those taken in by it—a motif as old as the Trojan horse and common ever since in scornful comment on others’ “superstitions” (e.g., Herodotus 1.60; Josephus in *Ant.* 18.65-80; Lucian, *Alex.*).

<sup>410</sup> The presence of “stars” on earth is perhaps understood as a portent, a signal of divine presence; the portents of woe and divine *departure* from Jerusalem include a star hovering over the city, *War* 6.288-300. From this point (the last three words of 2.113), the Greek text resumes.

<sup>411</sup> The story is reminiscent of Agatharchides’ depiction of Judeans standing by on a sabbath while Ptolemy I captured Jerusalem (1.209-10): it carries the same charge concerning the damage nations do to themselves by their senseless “superstitions.”

<sup>412</sup> The ass-head is mentioned almost in passing, and it is impossible to tell how central it was to Mnaseas’ story, or what Mnaseas or Apion made of it. “Pack-ass” translates κόνθων, a variant on the normal word for ass (ὄνος); we cannot tell what Greek word was used in 2.80 (the Latin translation uses *asinus* both here and there). To argue from this term that Mnaseas’ story portrayed the ass as carrying a passenger (Moses) seems precarious (*pace* Bar-Kochva 1996b: 315). As Bickerman noted (1980: 253), the story suggests that the golden head is torn off a statue of a whole ass, the rest being made of some less precious material. On the relation between this story and 2.80, see Appendix 4.

<sup>413</sup> The “he” here could be either Apion or Mnaseas. Josephus interrupts them at this sensitive spot, to deflate their narrative as nothing more than a joke.

<sup>414</sup> Following the Latin: *ad Dora* (the Greek εἰς Δῶριν suggests the city’s name is Doris); cf. note to “Dorii” at 2.112. The Judean attempt to win over the Idumeans’ God backfires, with the Judean God stolen instead. The capture or destruction of one’s enemies’ Gods removes their source of power and signals one’s

own superiority; for examples from Egypt see Bar-Kochva 1996b: 316, n.17.

<sup>415</sup> Josephus turns the story back on Apion (not Mnaseas), as so often; cf. 2.85 (“the mind of an ass”). Again he fails to exploit the Egyptian associations of the ass.

<sup>416</sup> Another story is dismissed as pure lies (cf. note to “up” at 2.6). For stupidity (here μωρολογία, close in form to μυθολογία [“fable”] in 2.120), cf. 2.22, 116.

<sup>417</sup> The arguments against Mnaseas’ story begin (2.115-16) and end (2.119-20) with the evidence of external “facts.” Josephus can speak with authority on the names of places in his native land, and can easily charge Apion with ignorance (see note to “ignorance” at 2.3).

<sup>418</sup> Gaza was a Hellenized city on the coastal plain, with its own territory; Idumea was inland and in the hill-country south of Judea, to the west of the Dead Sea. Josephus knew very well that there was an Idumean city called Adora, and may even once have spelt it “Dora” himself (see note to “Dorii” at 2.112). But in this context he will not admit to that knowledge, or make any allowances to Apion.

<sup>419</sup> Dora, or Dor, is on the Phoenician coast, about 7 miles north of Caesarea, 15 miles south-west of Mount Carmel; cf. *War* 1.50, 156, 409; *Ant.* 13.223-24, 324; 15.333; 19.300-11; *Life* 31; Mason 2001: 39, 185-89, with literature.

<sup>420</sup> L and Latin have “Judea,” but Niese’s emendation to “Idumea” is clearly right. It is about 95 miles from Dora to Adora (in the north of Idumea) by ancient routes (see Talbert 2000). The time taken would depend on the mode of travel; it is in Josephus’ interests to make the gap large.

<sup>421</sup> Josephus’ next tactic is a charge of inconsistency (cf. 2.25, 68), which only works if the responsibility for Mnaseas’ story lies with Apion, who is held also responsible for the charge of religious difference. This



that Apollo would come to them,<sup>422</sup> and thought that they saw him walking about with the stars on earth?<sup>423</sup> **118** Obviously these people had never previously seen a lamp<sup>424</sup>—these who perform so many and such magnificent lamp-lighting rites!<sup>425</sup> Nor did anyone of all those myriads encounter him as he walked through the land!<sup>426</sup> And he found the walls devoid of guards, though a war was raging!<sup>427</sup> I pass over the rest.<sup>428</sup> **119** The doors of the sanctuary were sixty<sup>429</sup> cubits high, and twenty cubits wide,<sup>430</sup> all overlaid with gold and practically solid metal.<sup>431</sup> They were shut each

latter was made in a very specific context by Apion, regarding Alexandria (2.65). But it is the generalized form of 2.79 to which Josephus here seems to allude, and there it is attributed to Posidonius and Apollonius Molon.

<sup>422</sup> “Our ancestors” is as chronologically vague as the time notice in 2.112, and the argument depends on continuity of Judean belief and custom over time. In Josephus’ précis (2.112-13), it was not clear that the persuasion was “easy,” but the exaggeration is minor. Josephus is right that the story seems to presuppose belief in the power of Apollo, whom the Judeans wished to take residence in their temple.

<sup>423</sup> This may be the right interpretation of Zabidos’ camouflage, as personifying the God. Josephus takes it for granted that Judeans would accord no such respect to others’ deities (cf. 1.192, 200-4; 2.236-78).

<sup>424</sup> The sarcasm introduces the first of 3 arguments concerning the internal implausibility of Apion’s tale. This first gives a minimal interpretation of the sight that stunned the Judeans (2.113-14): it was the long-distance impression of stars in motion, rather than mere lamps, that Mnaseas was describing.

<sup>425</sup> Greek: οἱ τὰς τοσαύτας καὶ τηλικαύτας λυχνοκαΐας ἐπιτελοῦντες. The phrase seems to refer to any rites involving lamps, not just festivals (*pace* Reinach and Thackeray). The lighting of lamps (also alluded or referred to in 1.308; 2.282) was practiced by Judeans in a number of different contexts. Seneca, *Ep.* 95.47 suggests the lighting of lamps in homes on sabbaths (cf. *m. Šabb.* 2.6-7), and Persius, *Sat.* 5.180-81 the same on “Herod’s day” (see Horbury 1991). But these perhaps echo the lighting of lamps (including the lampstand, 2.106) in the temple on festivals, particularly at Sukkot (see *m. Sukkah* 5.2-3) and Hannukah. The latter, commemorating the rededication of the temple in 164 BCE, was even called “Lights” (*Ant.* 12.319, 325; cf. 1 Macc. 4:48-51; 2 Macc. 1:8-9; cf. *m. B. Qam.* 6.6 for the domestic equivalent; see Schürer revised 1.163, n.65 for literature).

<sup>426</sup> The myriads are the population of Judea, an encounter with any of whom would have destroyed the optical illusion. But Josephus ignores the agreement that they would “withdraw” (2.112); the impression of stars is made at a distance, which is where the Judeans

dutifully stayed (2.113-14). In other words, the story explicitly excluded this objection, even in the highly condensed form in which Josephus cites it.

<sup>427</sup> In a war (2.112) guards would certainly be expected (at the gates of the city and temple); but, again, the compact of 2.112 would imply a temporary suspension of normal security.

<sup>428</sup> Cf. the conclusions to other arguments from implausibility (1.303, 320; 2.102). In fact, Josephus has already commented on almost every detail in his précis. The final argument (2.119-20) will return to externally attested facts.

<sup>429</sup> So the Latin, followed by all editors; “7” (L and S) must be a mistake.

<sup>430</sup> As Vogel notes (in Münster ad loc.), Josephus is citing facts relating to the Herodian temple (the only one he knows), though they were not relevant to the time of Mnaseas, let alone the distant history he relates (2.112). By “the doors of the sanctuary” (τοῦ ναοῦ αἱ θύραι) Josephus means not the doors in the 10 gates around its walled enclosure, but the single pair of doors in the sanctuary building itself (ὁ ναός), leading from the porch into the sanctum. This is confirmed by the dimensions and specifications here given. The doors in the 10 gates were 30 cubits high and 15 broad (*War* 5.201-6; according to *m. Midd.* 2.3, 20 high and 10 broad); only the doors at the west end of the women’s court was higher (40 cubits, *War* 5.204). However, the doors into the sanctum were 55 cubits high and 16 broad (*War* 5.111; the 16 is presumably the total of both), while the room it opened into was 60 cubits high and 20 broad (*War* 5.215). Josephus has applied the dimensions of the room to its doors, but the exaggeration is not huge (rightly Bauckham 1996: 344-46; contrast Sanders 1992: 60, who misconstrues the reference of this text). Moreover, only the sanctuary gates were completely overlaid with gold (see next note); most of the doors in the wall-gates had mixed gold and silver overlay (*War* 5.201); Nicanor’s gate was made of bronze (*War* 5.201).

<sup>431</sup> Cf. *War* 5.208, 210. The last phrase here translates καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν σφυρήλατοι, a puzzling expression which seems to mean that they were just about entirely “beaten metal” (as in a hand-beaten metal statue). This presumably emphasizes their weight, with

day by no fewer than 200 men,<sup>432</sup> and it was forbidden to leave them open.<sup>433</sup> **120** So it was easy, I suppose, for that lamp-bearer to open these gates by himself and to go off with the pack-ass's head!<sup>434</sup> Did the head return to us itself, or did he, having taken it and gone away, bring it back to the temple for Antiochus to find<sup>435</sup>—and provide a second fable for Apion?<sup>436</sup>

**(2.10) 121** There is a further lie<sup>437</sup> concerning an oath, that we swear by the God who made heaven and earth and sea<sup>438</sup> to show good will to no foreigner, and especially not to Greeks.<sup>439</sup> **122** Once he had got in the way of lying,<sup>440</sup> he ought to have

*Alleged oath of hostility to foreigners*

the greater percentage of metal content.

<sup>432</sup> Both Greek and Latin read “200” here. Hudson emended the text to “20,” in light of Josephus’ comment that it took 20 men to close Nicanor’s gate (*War* 6.293). To salvage the 200, it has been suggested that Josephus is thinking of gangs of 20 men each for the 10 gates of the temple (so Thackeray and Reinach ad loc.). But as we have seen, Josephus is not talking about the wall-gates, but the sanctuary doors; and in any case, the Zabidos story did not require all 10 gates to be opened (rightly Bauckham 1996: 345-46). Josephus appears to be extrapolating the necessary manpower from the smaller wall doors (each 30 by 15 cubits, requiring 20 men) to the larger sanctuary doors (each 60 by 10, if 20 is the total of the two in breadth); adding the weight of gold, and some rhetorical exaggeration, it is not impossible to reach a figure of 200. The impression from rabbinic texts that a single priest could open these doors from the inside (*m. Tamid* 3.7; *Midd.* 4.2) can only mean their unlocking; it must have taken a good number of priests to push the doors open, though Josephus’ figure is clearly extreme.

<sup>433</sup> This applies at night (cf. 2.105; *War* 4.298; 6.293), which is here presumed to be when Zabidos pulled off his stunt. Without this condition (not explicit in the tale), the details about the doors would be irrelevant.

<sup>434</sup> I follow Niese’s reconstruction of the text (the sentence is corrupt in both L and Latin); Reinach, Thackeray, and Münster do likewise. Since the Judeans were inviting Apollo into their temple (2.112), Zabidos-as-Apollo would hardly have to force his way in; the implausibility is here fabricated by Josephus.

<sup>435</sup> Again Niese (followed by Münster) makes best sense of a corrupt text. The Greek word translated “gone away” (ἀπιῶν) could be taken as the name Apion (so Thackeray), but, in context, is best taken as here, or omitted as a gloss (so Reinach). The logic requires not only that the incident took place before the time of Antiochus, but also that king found *the same* ass-head, not a replacement of that stolen by Zabidos.

<sup>436</sup> “Fable” (μυθολογία) closes the discussion of this tale in similar terms to those in which it was begun (2.112, *fabula*; cf. 2.89, 97).

<sup>437</sup> The text is awkward, and some words are probably lost. The topic is the same oath as that described in 2.95 and, at first sight, the paragraph looks misplaced (cf. 2.99). Reinach indeed suggested (78, n.3) that it initially belonged after 2.111, but was relegated to the margin by Josephus in final editing, and reintroduced, in the wrong location, by a copyist. There may be a trace here of incomplete editing, since the topic is the same as 2.99, but the rhetorical strategy is different. However, it is best understood as a second attempt at an awkward issue: whereas earlier Josephus had dismissed the purported oath against Greeks as implausibly specific (2.99), here he denies its existence outright, and suggests an alternative (against Egyptians) as a more plausible fiction. The charge of Judean unso-ciability will continue to rankle with Josephus throughout the rest of this treatise (2.148, 236-86).

<sup>438</sup> Greek oaths were often by sky (Zeus or Helios), earth (Demeter or Ge), and sea (Poseidon); see Plescia 1970: 4, 27, 39, 63-64. Allowance is here made for Judean sensibilities (probably by Apion: if he had made the oath polytheistic, Josephus would have had a further angle of attack). Cf. the angelic oath in the same terms in Rev 10:6. In fact, Judean anxiety about the second commandment led some to recommend *not* mentioning God in oaths at all (e.g., Philo, *Decal.* 84-85; *Spec.* 2.2-8; Matt 5:33-37: the alternatives include earth, sun, and heaven). Judean use of a pagan formula, “under Zeus, Ge, and Helios,” is attested in a manumission document from Gorgippia (*CIJ* 690), though that is not precisely an oath. For God as creator of heaven, earth, and sea, cf. Neh 9:6; Ps 146:6; Acts 4.24; *Ant.* 4.40. On oaths of personal hostility (e.g., refusal to help or eat with one’s enemy), cf. Philo, *Spec.* 2.16-17.

<sup>439</sup> This seems to be the oath in Apion’s version of the Greek-sacrifice story, earlier given in shortened form in 2.95. It may indicate that Apion adapted a general oath of hostility to “foreigners” to convey the impression of a special antagonism with Greeks (see 2.90, note at “account”). A complaint about Judean inhospitality is first attested in Hecataeus (ca. 300 BCE; in Diodorus 40.3.4: ἀπάνθρωπόν τινα καὶ μισόξενον βίου), specifically related to their experience of expulsion from Egypt (see Berthelot 2003: 80-94). The

said, “to show good will to no foreigner, and especially not to *Egyptians*.”<sup>441</sup> For then his remarks about the oath would have fitted his opening fictions,<sup>442</sup> if our ancestors were driven out by his Egyptian kinsmen,<sup>443</sup> not for any criminality but because of their afflictions.<sup>444</sup> **123** From the Greeks we are separated more by geography than by customs,<sup>445</sup> so we feel towards them neither hatred nor envy.<sup>446</sup> On the contrary, many of them have agreed to come over to our laws,<sup>447</sup> and some have remained

charge later becomes more generalized and widespread: cf. Diodorus 34/35.1.1-5 (drawn from Posidonius: Judeans avoid mixing with other nations, treat them as enemies, do not share meals with others, and show them no good will at all); Lysimachus in *Apion* 1.309 (they show good will to no-one and offer not the best but the worst advice); Apollonius Molon in *Apion* 1.148, 258 (they are misanthropic and refuse to share fellowship with people of different beliefs and a different way of life); see Berthelot 2003: 106-50, placing this persistent stereotype in cultural context. The prejudice was taken up by Roman authors: see, e.g., Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1 (*adversus omnes alios hostile odium*, connected with Judean food laws and preference for endogamy); Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.103-4 (refusing to show others the way); Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.7.21 (*gens perniciose ceteris*); cf. Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 5.33 (Judeans have long been in revolt not only against Rome but against humanity; they cannot join with others at table or in religious rites); see Berthelot 2003: 156-71, suggesting the added influence of the Judean Revolt. The theme even finds an echo in the Pauline letters (1 Thess 2:14-15: they are opposed to all people).

<sup>440</sup> The double emphasis on “lies” (2.121 and here) labels this story as definitively as each of the 3 previous topics concerning the temple (2.79, echoed in 2.82, 85; 2.90, echoed in 2.98, 111; 2.115).

<sup>441</sup> Once again, Josephus is Apion’s instructor (cf. 2.62, 73, 101). In 2.99 Egyptians were mentioned, but alongside “many others” to whom the oath could have applied; here they are singled out, since Judean hostility can be safely directed against a people consistently denigrated in this context.

<sup>442</sup> For the implied charge of inconsistency, cf. 2.68, 117.

<sup>443</sup> Greek: ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων τῶν συγγενῶν (with no pronoun to indicate whose kinsmen they are; the Latin omits “kinsmen” altogether). The phrase is generally taken to mean that the Judeans were driven out by *their* kinsmen (so Blum, Thackeray), with “kinsmen” placed in inverted commas to signal that this is only what Apion claimed (2.28-31). This would certainly heighten the crime (expulsion of one’s own relatives), but, given Josephus’ acute sensitivity on this point (2.8, 28), one would expect him to signal that this relationship was only what Apion and others claimed, not the

truth: the Greek would require “so-called” (cf. 2.34). It is better to take the text as here translated, in line with the consistent representation of Apion as an Egyptian. By this relationship Apion is practically implicated in the expulsion.

<sup>444</sup> Greek: συμφοραί, as in 2.8, a neutral term which avoids reference to plague and suggests cruelty in expelling an unfortunate people. Victims of this massive injustice, Judeans have every right to hate Egyptians and swear the purported oath against them. For the dishonorable Egyptian motives in hating Judeans, see 1.223-26.

<sup>445</sup> The comparative allows for some differences in custom, but these are here played down (cf. 2.99, where they are acknowledged but made part of a general phenomenon). Elsewhere in this treatise, the difference between Judean and Greek custom is played up (e.g., 2.74-75, 163-67, 250-51; cf. Philo, *Mos.* 1.2). The statement here echoes the claims about Judean geographical isolation in 1.60-68, but in that context difference in life-style was also fully acknowledged (1.61, 68). Given the realities of the Diaspora, and of Greek presence in the Judean homeland, neither passage reflects the facts contemporary to Josephus. Once again the rhetorical needs of a particular argument control Josephus’ depiction of reality.

<sup>446</sup> The twin causes of ethnic hatred identified by Josephus; cf. the Egyptian attitude to Judeans (1.224; 2.31). Where he acknowledges difference in custom from the Greeks, he is happy to accept their envy (2.280-85), but not their hatred.

<sup>447</sup> Greek: πολλοὶ παρ’ αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους νόμους συνέβησαν εἰσελθεῖν (there is no need to emend the text, *pace* Reinach, following Herwerden). Josephus is describing “proselytes,” but never uses that term, and has a variety of expressions to describe Gentile commitment to live under Judean laws (cf. 2.210, 261; *Ant.* 3.318; 13.257-58, 318-19; 15.254-55; 18.82; 20.17, 35, 38, 139, 145-46; *Life* 149; see Cohen 1987: 419-21). They are mentioned here for a number of reasons: they prove that, far from Judeans envying Greeks, the reverse is true (cf. 2.261); that, far from feeling hostility towards Greeks, Judeans are happy to have them adopt their laws (more explicit in 2.209-10); and that Greeks had the opportunity to witness at first hand whether Judeans swore any such oath (2.124). Apart from

faithful,<sup>448</sup> while others have not maintained their endurance,<sup>449</sup> but have withdrawn again.<sup>450</sup> **124** None of these has ever said that he heard this oath being sworn among us;<sup>451</sup> only Apion, it seems, has heard it—because he was the one who concocted it!<sup>452</sup>

**(2.11) 125** One should also be particularly amazed<sup>453</sup> at the great intelligence<sup>454</sup> in what Apion goes on to say. For he says that it is evidence of the fact that we do not employ just laws or worship God as we should<sup>455</sup> that [we do not govern,]<sup>456</sup> but are subservient to other nations, one after another, and that we have experienced some misfortunes affecting our city<sup>457</sup>—while they, obviously, have become

*Apion's  
denigration of  
Judean history*

Josephus (see above), other evidence for the phenomenon of proselytes in the 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> centuries CE includes Philo (e.g., *Virt.* 102-8, 182, 212-19; *Spec.* 1.51-53, 309; 4.178), the New Testament (e.g., Matt. 23:15; Acts 2.11; 6:5; 13.43), Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.5.1), Juvenal (*Sat.* 14.96-106), and a few inscriptions (e.g., *CIJ* 1385; Lüderitz 1983: no. 12; cf. Williams 1998: 171-72; Cohen 1999: 161 n.74). This scattered evidence, and Josephus' vague "many," do not enable us to calculate how common this phenomenon was (for a maximal interpretation, sometimes unpersuasive, see Feldman 1993: 288-341). See further Goodman 1994a; Cohen 1999, esp. chapters 5-7.

<sup>448</sup> To "remain faithful" (ἐμμένειν) to the laws is a key expression in this treatise: cf. 1.42, 261; 2.144, 150, 153, 182, 221, 257, 278.

<sup>449</sup> Greek: τὴν καρτερίαν οὐχ ὑπομείναντες, a slightly awkward expression, which combines two terms emphasized in 2.145ff: καρτερία is a central Judean virtue in 2.146, 170, and ὑπομένειν ("maintain faithfulness"; "endure") a key characteristic (e.g., 2.234-35). Judean law will be presented as an extremely rigorous discipline, and here proselyte apostasy is implicitly attributed to Greek softness (not Judean unfriendliness).

<sup>450</sup> Josephus mentions this potentially embarrassing fact for the sake of the next sentence. He elsewhere cites one example: Polemo, who renounced the Judean practices he had adopted on marrying a Herodian princess, when the marriage was dissolved (*Ant.* 20.145-46). The category of apostate proselytes was probably small, but here serves an important rhetorical purpose. On "apostasy" in the Diaspora see Barclay 1998b; Wilson 2004.

<sup>451</sup> Renegade proselytes provide the perfect corroboration for Josephus' denial of the oath-phenomenon: they are outsiders with inside knowledge.

<sup>452</sup> "Concoct" (συντίθημι) is one of Josephus' favorite terms; see note to "like" at 1.293. The oath was part of the Greek-sacrifice story, which Josephus elsewhere attributes to others (2.90-91), not just Apion. But it is convenient to close this discussion with a personal

attack on his opponent, as elsewhere (2.88, 120).

<sup>453</sup> For the sarcasm in Josephus' "amazement" (θαυμάζειν), see note to "scholar" at 2.12.

<sup>454</sup> Reading συνέσεως with ed. princ. and all modern editors. Apion's stupidity here is not just his ignorance of history (2.130, 133) but also his lack of awareness that his attack rebounds against his own Egyptian people (2.126, 128-29, 133).

<sup>455</sup> Apion's critique of the Judean law is hinted at in 2.25 and explicit in 2.94, 137; impiety towards God (he surely said "the Gods") is a charge represented in various forms in 2.65, 73, 117, and in the temple stories. An attack on laws/customs and religion goes to the heart of a people's culture, as understood in antiquity. The same topics were twinned by Apollonius Molon (2.145-48), and the accusation will be tackled in full by Josephus in 2.145ff.

<sup>456</sup> The phrase (τὸ μὴ ἄρχειν) is not present in L, or implied by the Latin, but the Greek seems to require some such phrase. Niese posits a lacuna, but other modern editors (including Münster) follow ed. princ. in supplying the phrase translated here. I place it in square brackets as an editorial addition.

<sup>457</sup> Apion's depiction was perhaps fuller and more graphic (for Josephus' anodyne language of "misfortune," cf. 1.34; 2.82). Apion certainly recounted the plundering of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes (2.80), and may have focused specifically on the checkered history of the Jerusalem temple (cf. Josephus' attention to temples in 2.129-31). It would have been easy enough to depict Judean history as a succession of periods of political "enslavement," to Persians, Ptolemies, Seleucids, and Romans (all mentioned in 2.125-34); cf. the derogatory reference to Judean culture in 2.135. Tacitus likewise refers to the Judean nation as "the meanest part of the subjects" (*despectissima pars servientum*) in the kingdoms of the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians (*Hist.* 5.8.2). Apion appealed here to a cultural logic widely accepted in antiquity, and enthusiastically endorsed by Rome: political and military success is a sign of virtue and piety (securing divine aid), while defeat and subjugation



accustomed from the very beginning to ruling over the most dominant city rather than serving the Romans!<sup>458</sup> **126** Yet even one of *them* would refrain from such boasting.<sup>459</sup> And of the rest of humanity, there is no one who would not say that this argument of Apion turns equally<sup>460</sup> against himself.<sup>461</sup> **127** It has fallen to few

tion are sure proofs of cultural inferiority and religious failure. Roman self-congratulation on her piety, rewarded by the acquisition of her empire, is eloquently voiced by Cicero (*Har. Resp.* 19) and taken as familiar enough to be the subject of sustained attack by Tertullian (*Apol.* 25-26). Conversely, by the same logic, subject nations could be disdained for their obviously inferior culture/piety. Cicero used this logic against Judeans in the aftermath of Pompey's capture of Jerusalem: that the Judean nation has been conquered, subject to tribute, and enslaved shows "how dear it is to the immortal Gods" (*Flacc.* 69; cf. *Prov. Cons.* 5.10 on Syrians and Judeans as nations born to slavery). In Josephus' own time, after the crushing of the Judean Revolt and the destruction of the temple—vividly portrayed by the Flavians in coins, triumphal procession and monumental arches—this logic must have seemed all the more salient. It is certainly repeated in Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 10.4: the Judean God is enslaved, with his own special people, to the Roman deities) and in Celsus (*apud Origen, Cels.* 8.69: see how much help God has been to them: instead of being masters of the world they have been left no land or home; cf. Julian, *Gal.* 218a-c).

Given the facts of history and the prevalence of this logic, this is a particularly difficult argument for Josephus to handle. By and large, following the Deuteronomistic tradition, he agrees that God rewards virtue with success, and punishes sin with failure (see the programmatic statement in *Ant.* 1.14, and Attridge 1976). He is prepared to accept that Rome's empire is a reward for virtue (or valor, ἀρετή, *War* 3.71), and explains the crushing of the Judean revolt as God's punishment of the rebels and their gross impiety (e.g., *War* 5.401, 408; 7.327-33). But here he cannot afford to agree that Apion's logic is borne out by the conduct of a corrupt segment of the Judean nation. In the paragraph that follows (2.125-34), he i) partly accepts the charge of multiple Judean "misfortunes," but dilutes its effect by suggesting that these are a universal phenomenon (2.126-27); ii) partly denies the charge by reference to periods of Judean success (2.132, 134); and iii) suggests a quite different logic, in which such misfortunes are the fault not of the victims but of the perpetrators (2.130-31); see further Barclay 2005a.

<sup>458</sup> Greek: αὐτῶν [with ed. princ. and most modern editors, in preference to L's αὐτοί] δηλον ὅτι πόλεως ἡγεμονικωτάτης ἐκ τῶν ἀνωθεν ἄρχειν, ἀλλὰ

μὴ Ῥωμαίοις δουλεύειν συνειθισμένων. This involves some transposition in word-order (following ed. princ., Naber, Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster), but seems to make best sense. The "most dominant city" is presumably Rome, and the whole statement is heavily sarcastic. In what follows "they" will refer to the Egyptian nation (2.128-29); both Egypt and Alexandria can be represented as "enslaved" to Rome (*War* 2.384-87), a condition which Josephus implies can be backdated to the very beginning (of what era?). It is striking that the fortunes and the status of nations are discussed immediately with reference to Rome (cf. the close of the paragraph in 2.134). Roman hegemony is highlighted throughout this segment as the defining political reality, and her opinion taken to be the defining truth (cf. 2.37, 40-42, 56-64, 71-72, 73-77). Josephus stands as the spokesman of one subject nation playing its reputation off against another, by reference to their status and favor in the eyes of the imperial power. But embedded within this very discussion are passages which could be heard to relativize, and even criticize, Roman power (2.127, 131); the politics, the constraints, and space for resistance of the "post-colonial" subject are neatly encapsulated within the complex set of rhetorical maneuvers that follow.

<sup>459</sup> The sentence is textually corrupt in at least one place, and its meaning uncertain. I translate here the following text: καίτοι τούτων ἄν τις ἀπόσχοιτο τοιαύτης μεγαλαυχίας (the last word, in place of μεγαλοψυχίας [L and S], is an emendation universally accepted). A number of editors follow Niese's emendation of the verb to ἀνάσχοιτο, thus rendering the sense "someone might tolerate such a boast from them (=the Romans)" (so Thackeray and Calabi); Reinach (followed by Münster emends τοιαύτης to τοιαύτας ("such boasts," accusative plural); he also alters the word order to make this a question. But the verb and adjective are probably best left alone: the point is that the Romans who belong to "the most dominant city," would not be as boastful as the madly arrogant Apion. The sentence thus attributes to Romans proper modesty, while simultaneously gesturing to their world-dominant status (cf. 2.41).

<sup>460</sup> L's ἱκανός is rightly changed to ἱκανῶς in ed. princ. and by all modern editors: the adverb is usually to be translated "sufficiently," but here appears to have the sense, "to the same degree."

<sup>461</sup> Cf. the rhetorical tactic of 2.5. All that follows

to gain sovereignty over a period of time,<sup>462</sup> and changes have again brought even these under the yoke to serve others;<sup>463</sup> most peoples have been subject to others on many occasions.<sup>464</sup> **128** So it is only the Egyptians (because the Gods, so they say, fled to their country for refuge and were saved by changing into the form of animals)<sup>465</sup> who have the special privilege of not having been subservient to any of those who conquered Asia or Europe<sup>466</sup>—these who throughout all time have not gained a single day of freedom, not even at the hands of their indigenous masters.<sup>467</sup> **129** The way in which the Persians treated them, who not only once but on many occasions sacked their cities, razed their temples to the ground and slaughtered what they consider to be “Gods”<sup>468</sup>—I would not blame them for

*Egyptian  
ignominy*

by way of “reversal of the charge” is relevant only to Egyptians, not to Alexandrians (among whom Apion, in reality, would have numbered himself).

<sup>462</sup> L’s impossible διακαίροπτίας is split by Naber (and Thackeray) into διὰ καιροπτίας (Thackeray: “by waiting on opportunity”). But καιροπτία is otherwise unattested in Greek literature (see Müller 276) and I here follow Reinach’s emendation διὰ καιροῦ τινός.

<sup>463</sup> The topic of the passing of empires is not uncommon in Greek literature (see de Romilly 1977), and is a staple of Judean apocalyptic (e.g., Daniel, Sibylline Oracles). Josephus elsewhere makes reference to fate, fortune, or providence in connection with Roman success (e.g., *War* 2.360, 390-91; 3.354; 4.179; see Lindner 1972). But the notion that the Roman empire itself might eventually succumb to this pattern could only be voiced with circumspection. Polybius has the Roman general Scipio weep at the destruction of Carthage and the fate of other empires, and when prompted, express his fears for Rome itself (38.22); and Josephus has Titus exclaim more generally that no human affairs are secure (*War* 3.396). But it is a different matter for a subject of Rome to express this in his own voice. Josephus here confines his remarks to the past tense, and makes no explicit reference to Rome; but the application of this sentiment to the Roman empire, and to the future, could certainly be made by those inclined to do so. Elsewhere he refers to God going the rounds of the nations and giving sovereignty *now* to Italy (*War* 5.367; cf. the “now” in *Apion* 2.41). This could imply, but certainly does not state, a future limit to that period of rule. Josephus’ interpretation of Daniel’s vision of empires is notoriously indirect and incomplete (see Bruce 1965; Mason 1994). It appears, however, that Josephus did expect the Roman empire to wane, though not in the immediate future; what role Israel might have in and beyond that waning is spoken only obscurely in *Ant.* 4.114-17, 125; 10.207, 210 (see de Jonge 1974; Spilsbury 2003).

<sup>464</sup> Cf. the same πολλάκις in 1.34; for the Egyptians, however, this is not just their frequent, but their constant state (2.128)! The more the experience is

universalized, the less it can be taken to imply anything about the inadequacy of particular nations’ laws or piety.

<sup>465</sup> The story of the Gods’ transformation into animal shape, in flight from Seth/Typhon, appears to have ancient Egyptian roots (Griffiths 1960b), but became popular in Greek discourse as a mythological explanation of Egyptian animal cults. The trope is common in both Greek and Latin literature, before and after Josephus’ lifetime (e.g., Diodorus 1.86.3; Ovid, *Metam.* 5.319-31; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 379c-f; Lucian, *Sacr.* 14; Apollodorus 1.6.3; Antoninus Liberalis, *Metam.* 28.1-4; see Griffiths 1970: 545; van Henten 1993: 230-32). It is not clear that this event was claimed by Egyptians as a mark of their special status, but Josephus uses it to introduce yet another reference to risible Egyptian religion.

<sup>466</sup> The conquerors of Asia are the Persians, Macedonians, and, no doubt, the Romans (cf. 2.133); of Europe, the Romans. As the following sections show, Josephus is being cruelly sarcastic.

<sup>467</sup> Josephus is thinking of the subjection of Egyptian peasants to the Pharaohs, in line with the Greek perception that all eastern rulers were despots, and their subjects no better off than slaves. Josephus’ rhetoric thus turns the proud tradition of Egyptian independence into perpetual enslavement. Diodorus represents the Egyptians’ own perspective, in terms which mirror the cultural logic of 2.125: it is proof of Egypt’s greatness as the source of culture and the creator of the best laws that she was ruled over by kings, nearly all of them indigenous, for 4,700 years, and that their land was the most prosperous in the world (1.69.5-6).

<sup>468</sup> The denigration of Egypt is represented by assault on her religion, as in 1.76, 249. The Persians under Cambyses conquered Egypt in 522 BCE, and maintained control there, despite revolts in 486 and 465 BCE, until the great revolt of Amyrtaeus in 404 BCE re-established Egyptian independence. But in 343 BCE, Artaxerxes III (Ochus) reconquered the land, although this last period of Persian rule lasted only until Alexander’s invasion in 322 BCE (see Grimal 1992:

*Fate of temples*

that.<sup>469</sup> **130** For one should not imitate Apion's ignorance:<sup>470</sup> he has not considered the misfortunes of the Athenians or the Lacedaemonians,<sup>471</sup> the latter universally said to be the most courageous of the Greeks,<sup>472</sup> the former the most pious.<sup>473</sup> **131** I pass over the kings who were famed for their piety,<sup>474</sup> and the misfortunes they experienced in their lives;<sup>475</sup> I pass over the burnt Athenian acropolis,<sup>476</sup> the temple in Ephesus,<sup>477</sup> that in Delphi,<sup>478</sup> thousands of others.<sup>479</sup> No one has blamed these

367-82). Egyptian memory of this period, exacerbated by Greek propaganda, recalls Persian rule as extremely harsh and irreligious (Diodorus 1.44.3), with particularly lurid charges directed against the two Persian conquerors, Cambyses and Ochus: Cambyses is reputed to have destroyed temples wholesale, and killed the Apis bull (Herodotus 3.16-18, 27-29, 37-38; Diodorus 1.46.4; 95.4-5; Strabo 17.1.27; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 368f; Pompeius Trogus, *apud Justin* 19.1-6), while Ochus is said to have both killed the bull and eaten it (Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 355c; 363c; cf. Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.28; *Var. hist.* 6.8). The charges are stereotyped and probably exaggerated (other evidence suggests Cambyses integrated well into the Egyptian religious tradition; cf. Eddy 1961: 261-62), but the Persians no doubt conquered the land, and suppressed revolt, with all necessary means; in any case, in later years the myth was more powerful than the reality.

<sup>469</sup> After sullyng the reputation of Egypt at such length, Josephus suddenly changes tack; by holding this to the end, the damage is already done. He now introduces a quite different logic, that ignominy attaches not to the defeated but to those who perpetrate religious crimes (2.130-31); see Barclay 2005a: 330-31.

<sup>470</sup> Greek: ἀπαιδευσία, as in 2.3, 38; on the theme, see note to "ignorance" at 2.3. The tone is ironic, as Apion clearly did know the famous moments in history to which Josephus alludes (cf. 2.133).

<sup>471</sup> Ever since their conflict in the Peloponnesian War (5<sup>th</sup> century BCE), Athens and Sparta stood in convenient rhetorical conjunction, or antithesis, in comment on history and politics (see Todd 1996). Josephus will use other aspects of their reputation in 2.171-72, 259-68. Their "misfortunes" (lit.: "fortunes", τυχαί), in the Peloponnesian War, and in subsequent military and political history, were staples of Roman rhetoric, but frequently traced to political or moral faults not acknowledged here. By declining to give details, Josephus conveys the impression that they were victims of bad luck or injustice.

<sup>472</sup> Spartan military heroism, as at Thermopylae (480 BCE), was central to her enduring reputation (see Ollier 1972; Tigerstedt 1965-74); Josephus will return to the theme in 2.225-31, with a claim that Judeans are even tougher. The point is that the logic of 2.125 cannot apply here: there was nothing wrong with her laws.

<sup>473</sup> So there was no fault in her religion, *pace* the logic of 2.125. Athenian piety is another literary topos (Schäublin 1982: 327); cf. Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 260; Isocrates, *Paneg.* 33; Pausanias 1.17.1; Luke has Paul pass ironic comment in Acts 17:22. Josephus will use this Athenian reputation for a different argument in 2.262-68.

<sup>474</sup> "Pass over" is, of course, a way of mentioning (by the device known as *praeteritio*). L and S read here ὧν ἕνα Κροῖσον ("of whom one [was] Croesus"), but this is not represented in the Latin translation and is awkward grammatically; it may be a scribal gloss. For reconstructions of the original Greek, see Boysen ad loc. (on the basis of the Latin) and Giangrande 1962: 115-16 (somewhat speculative).

<sup>475</sup> "Misfortunes" (συμφοραί) echoes 2.125, although Apion's argument concerned nations, rather than individuals.

<sup>476</sup> This happened in 480 BCE, when Xerxes overran Attica before the battle of Salamis; see Herodotus 8.53.

<sup>477</sup> The archaic temple of Artemis was burned down in 356 BCE by one Herostratus (Strabo 14.1.22); attempts to keep the perpetrator's name from entering history were not entirely successful (Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 2.6.18; Valerius Maximus 8.14, ext. 5; cf. Iulius Solinus, *Collectanea* 40.2-5).

<sup>478</sup> The archaic temple was reputed to have burned down *accidentally* (Herodotus 1.50; 2.180; Pausanias 10.5.12-13), which hardly fits Josephus' next sentence. But Plutarch, *Num.* 9.6 records that it was once burned by Medes, and later demolished in the Mithridatic and Roman civil wars.

<sup>479</sup> The mere fact that these were temples makes the act sacrilegious; Josephus would hardly wish to name the Gods to whom they were dedicated. As Josephus is writing in the aftermath of 70 CE, the Jerusalem temple must be a case in point. But one can understand why he might not want to include it in the list, although elsewhere he is candid about the times Jerusalem has been captured or the temple destroyed (*War* 6.435-42). In this context he does not wish to remind his readers of the Revolt or the Roman destruction of the temple (cf. the careful statement in 2.82); mention of the Revolt would spoil the image of Judean friendship with Rome (2.134), and reference to the Romans would bring them

things on the victims, but on the perpetrators.<sup>480</sup> **132** Our novel accuser, Apion, turns out to have forgotten his own woes affecting Egypt;<sup>481</sup> Sesostriis, the mythical king of Egypt, has blinded him!<sup>482</sup> On our side, could we not speak of our kings David and Solomon who mastered many nations?<sup>483</sup> **133** Let us pass over them<sup>484</sup>—although Apion was ignorant of the universally known fact that the Egyptians were subservient to the Persians, and to the Macedonians who ruled Asia after them, with a status no different from slaves,<sup>485</sup> **134** while we, being free,<sup>486</sup> used to rule in addition over the surrounding cities for about 120 years up till the time of Pompey the Great;<sup>487</sup> and when all the monarchs, on all sides, were hostile to

*Judeans and  
Romans*

under the censure of the following sentence. Readers could draw their own conclusions from Josephus' indirection.

<sup>480</sup> The logic of 2.125 is now completely reversed: misfortunes such as these prove the irreligion of the aggressors, not the impiety of the victims. Could this new logic be applicable to the fate of the temple in Jerusalem? The destruction of a temple was always a sensitive matter (see Rives 2005), and in the case of Jerusalem Josephus is careful in his *War* to complicate the question of agency, attributing the destruction of the temple to God, to the impiety of the rebels, and to Titus only as the *unwilling* agent (e.g., 1.10; 6.236-43; 7.112-13). But Josephus knew that the Flavian dynasty was founded on the destruction of Jerusalem (Barnes 2005; Millar 2005) and he could imagine other readings of history (e.g., his own bare comment in *Ant.* 20.250; Eleazar's complaint of its unholy devastation, *War* 7.379; cf. Sulpicius Severus 2.30.7: an unending mark of cruelty). Nothing is said here to suggest that the Romans are the "perpetrators" of a Jerusalem sacrilege; but it does not take much for that conclusion to be drawn, and the advertized "passing over" of "thousands of others" leaves many options for the reader. Tertullian was more blunt: Rome's empire was gained through the sacrilegious destruction of temples (*Apol.* 25).

<sup>481</sup> The misfortunes of Egypt are now personalized with reference to the Egyptian Apion. His forgetfulness is as ironic as his ignorance in 2.130, 133; cf. the alternative explanation in 2.37.

<sup>482</sup> This is one of Josephus' more finely crafted witticisms. Sesostriis was an Egyptian king of legendary exploits (Herodotus 2.102-109; Diodorus 1.53-58, there called Sesoōsis). According to Herodotus, it was his son, Pheron, who went blind (2.111), but the motif was transferred to Sesostriis in some traditions (Diodorus 1.58.3; cf. 1.59.1). Josephus knows Herodotus' story, but thinks the exploits were attributed to the wrong king (*Ant.* 8. 253, 260; they apply to Isokos, his version of biblical Shishak). Only here does he suggest that Sesostriis inhabits an unreal world—as unreal as

that portrayed by Apion. Blindness is a common metaphor for the errors induced by prejudice (cf. 1.214, 226; 2.142).

<sup>483</sup> Josephus now adopts a different tack: Apion's characterization of Judean history should be countered, not accepted. Josephus does not reveal how far back in history he has to go for these counter-examples. Following the biblical accounts, he had recorded their military successes in *Ant.* 7.96-106, 159-61; 8.160-62. But the empire there described was comparatively small; and this image of warring Judean kings clashes somewhat with the claim of 1.62.

<sup>484</sup> The *praeteritio* is convenient, given the insignificance of the claim that could be advanced (see previous note); in any case, Josephus is more concerned to define Judean status in relation to Rome (2.134).

<sup>485</sup> The claim of 2.128 is repeated, now without irony. "Macedonian" rule in Egypt refers to the Ptolemies (322–30 BCE), though they were hardly at the same time rulers of Asia. The occurrence of Egyptian revolts during the Ptolemaic era indicates that some Egyptians did perceive the Ptolemies as foreign tyrants, though this was hardly true of all Egyptians, and not at all true of Greeks in Alexandria, such as Apion.

<sup>486</sup> This participial clause hangs loosely in the sentence, but forms the sharpest possible contrast to the status of the Egyptians. It seems to belong to the following clause about the 120-year period before Pompey, but could be intended to represent the status of Judeans also before and after that time; for Josephus' language of "freedom" in his earlier works, see Schwartz 2002.

<sup>487</sup> Pompey's capture of Jerusalem in 63 BCE forms the watershed; see 2.82, note at "Great." The length of the preceding period (after liberation from Seleucid rule) is rhetorically exaggerated. If, as Josephus states elsewhere, this "freedom" began with the high-priesthood of Simon (142 BCE; *War* 1.53, following 1 Macc. 13:41-42), it amounts to no more than 80 years. Elsewhere he computes the Hasmonean era (down to Herod) as 126/125 years (*Ant.* 14.490; 17.162).



the Romans,<sup>488</sup> ours alone, because of their loyalty, were maintained as allies and friends.<sup>489</sup>

*Alleged lack of inventors*

(2.12) 135 But we have not produced remarkable men, such as inventors in the arts or exceptional intellectuals.<sup>490</sup> And he enumerates Socrates, Zeno, Cleanthes, and

<sup>488</sup> L and S read: ἐκπολεμηθέντων πρὸς Ῥωμαίων. Niese minor emends to ἐκπολεμωθέντων πρὸς Ῥωμαίους. Münster preserves the participle ἐκπολεμηθέντων, as equivalent to ἐκπολεμωθέντων, but follows Niese with πρὸς Ῥωμαίους. The two verbs ἐκπολεμέω and ἐκπολεμώ are sometimes confused in the textual tradition (cf. *Ant.* 1.72; 12.381; 13.243; in 18.176 the text may be more seriously corrupt). In Josephus' usage, ἐκπολεμέω means to fight or make war on another; it is found only once in the passive, with the sense "to be at war" (with πρὸς + accusative, *Ant.* 4.101). ἐκπολεμώ has the active sense "to provoke to war" (with πρὸς + accusative, *Apion* 1.296); in the perfect passive it means "to be in a state of hostility" (e.g., *War* 2.499; 3.415; *Ant.* 13.137, with πρὸς + accusative); in other passive tenses it means to be hostile, or to go to war (*Ant.* 12.243, 381; *War* 7.425, with dative). Thus, whichever verb is read, there is no reason to translate this clause as referring to monarchs "subjugated by the Romans" (Blum), still less as "when war had been declared by the Romans" (Thackeray). But either verb might have the sense, in the passive, represented here; the clause makes good grammatical (and rhetorical) sense with the emendation to πρὸς Ῥωμαίους noted above. Josephus wishes to represent Judeans as the Romans' sole allies in the East.

<sup>489</sup> For the theme of loyalty in relation to the Romans, cf. 2.61, 64. Although the reference is not explicit, parallels elsewhere suggest that Josephus has in mind here a series of alliances between Rome and the Maccabean/Hasmonean leaders: see, e.g., *Ant.* 12.414-19; 13.163-65, 259-64, 415-19; 14.144-48, 190-222, 265-67. In most cases these texts contain the key words "friends" and "allies," or their abstract cognates (cf. "loyalty" in 14.192, and reference to hostile parties in 12.417). Up to this point, the paragraph has operated with only two categories: a nation is either free/ruling/dominant or enslaved/subservient. Now, notably, Josephus avoids speaking of Judeans as "enslaved" to Rome (cf. Agrippa II's speech in *War* 2.356-57), but uses a different and face-saving vocabulary of alliance and friendship. But, as Cicero noted, allies of Rome might think of themselves as choosing to serve Rome rather than rule others (*Leg. man.* 41). Tacitus disdained the Hasmonians as petty, quarrelsome kings (*Hist.* 5.8.3), and celebrated the moment when Pompey "tamed" (*domuit*) and Sosius "subdued" (*subegit*) the Judeans (5.9.1). Josephus finishes the discussion with the rosier possible image of relations between Judeans

and Rome: the subsequent history, with the marginalization of Judean kings and the catastrophic Revolt, is kept well out of view.

<sup>490</sup> By way of rhetorical variety, Josephus begins the new point without making explicit that this is an accusation. The criticism was voiced also by Apollonius Molon (2.148), on whom Apion may have drawn; cf. the unattributed version of the charge in 2.182. It continued to reverberate through intellectual circles: Celsus repeated it in connection with the observation that Judeans had done nothing worthy of mention by Greek historians (*apud* Origen, *Cels.* 4.31; cf. 8.53 and *Apion* 1.2, with note to "historians"). Early Greek encounters with the advanced civilization of Egypt had raised the question of whether Greeks had *derived* their skills from elsewhere (cf. 1.7). After Herodotus and Plato suggested that Greeks had learned much from Egypt, this claim became central to Hecataeus' presentation of Egyptian culture (see Diodorus 1.69.5; 96.1-3). But in the Hellenistic era, as cultures mixed and competed, many others put forward claims for great antiquity and for the earliest discovery of the knowledge or skills necessary for civilization (Thraede 1962a; Thraede 1962b; Tiede 1972). As Diodorus remarks, "not only do Greeks put forth their claims but many of the barbarians as well, all holding that it is they who are autochthonous and the first of all men to discover the things which are of use in life, and that it was the events in their own history which were the earliest to have been held worthy of record" (1.9.3). By the first century CE, a huge list could be compiled of all the competing claims, some clearly mythical, some historical: see Pliny, *Nat.* 7.191-209, which includes names from many nations, but *not a single Judean*. Judean authors certainly attempted to enter this competition (see Droge 1989: 12-48). Eupolemus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.26.1) claimed Moses as the first wise man, the inventor of the alphabet, and the first to write down laws; ps.-Eupolemus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.17.3; 9.18.2) has Abraham as the first to bring Chaldean astrology to Egypt and Phoenicia; Artapanus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.18.1; 9.23.2-3; 9.27.4-6) attributes important inventions to Abraham (astrology), Joseph (e.g., weights and measurements), and Moses (e.g., ships, weapons, hydraulics, and philosophy); and Aristobulus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.1-16) argued that Greek philosophers learned their best ideas from Moses. On Josephus' treatment of this theme, see below. For Apion, the accusation bears

the like.<sup>491</sup> Then—the most amazing thing<sup>492</sup>—he adds himself to those he has listed<sup>493</sup> and congratulates Alexandria on having such a citizen!<sup>494</sup> **136** He needed this self-recommendation. For in all other quarters his reputation was as a malicious rabble-rouser, debased in both life-style and oratory; so one may with good reason pity Alexandria if she prided herself on him!<sup>495</sup> As for our own men, who were worthy of no less praise, they are familiar to those who read our *Ancient Histories*.<sup>496</sup>

**(2.13) 137** The rest of what is written in the charge is perhaps best left unanswered,<sup>497</sup> so that he might prove the accuser of himself and of the rest of the Egypt-

*Apion's other charges*

some similarities to that of 2.125: the Judean nation is historically, politically, and culturally insignificant. It may also relate to the citizenship issue: while Alexandria is right to boast of citizens such as him (see below), worthless Judeans are not qualified for this honor.

<sup>491</sup> Socrates, the Athenian philosopher (469–399 BCE), was the most famous, and for many, the greatest philosopher; Josephus will highlight the controversy he spawned in 2.263–64. Zeno of Citium (335–263 BCE) was the founder of the Stoic school of philosophy; Cleanthes of Assos (331–232 BCE) was his successor as its head. Both were extremely famous, and Stoicism was the most popular philosophy among Roman intellectuals. That Apion lists these figures indicates that he identified himself with the Greek intellectual tradition (and not as an Egyptian), and specifically with the Stoic tradition (Bertholet 2003: 176–77).

<sup>492</sup> Greek: τὸ θαυμασιώτατον; for the ironic use of words from this root in relation to Apion see note, to “scholar” at 2.12.

<sup>493</sup> With Niese, who (following the Latin) emends the Greek text (τῶν εἰρημένων) to τοῖς εἰρημένοις. An alternative (Schäublin 1982: 324, n.62) keeps L’s text here intact, and emends the earlier τὸ θαυμασιώτατον to τὸν θαυμασιώτατον (“then he adds himself as the most amazing of those listed”).

<sup>494</sup> Josephus seizes on this bombast as an excuse for an *ad hominem* response. Apion certainly had a reputation for self-importance and ostentation (Pliny, *Nat. preface* 25; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 5.14.3); see note to “scholar” at 2.2. There may be an echo here of Cicero’s famous claim that Rome was lucky to have him as its consul (Jacobson 2000). Apion was clearly proud of his Alexandrian citizenship (cf. 2.32); whatever Josephus might say, he clearly wrote and thought as an “Alexandrian,” not as an “Egyptian.” After this comment, the Latin text reads: *quod rite facit* (“which he does rightly”). The phrase is not in L or S, and appears to be a scribal addition (there is another in 2.141). Niese minor prints an equivalent Greek phrase (ὀρθῶς ποιῶν, followed by Münster), but most editors put the phrase in square brackets.

<sup>495</sup> Josephus deflects attention away from the criti-

cism by focusing on the critic, juxtaposing his self-opinion with what is presented as the universal judgment on Apion (see note to “scholar” at 2.2, for his mixed reputation). The comments here echo 2.3: the label “rabble-rouser” is repeated and intensified (for “malicious” [πονηρός], cf. 2.37).

<sup>496</sup> For other references to this work, cf. 1.1, 54, 127; 2.287; on the relationship with *Apion*, see Introduction, § 2. It is notable that Josephus makes rather little effort to answer Apion’s criticism with examples of Judean discoverers. He may not have known his Judean predecessors who represented Abraham, Joseph, and Moses as culture-inventors (see above; cf. 1.218). Here he gestures vaguely back to his *Antiquities* with its display of people “worthy of no less praise,” but this hardly meets Apion’s specific point about “inventors.” In that earlier work, Josephus had done much to portray biblical characters with “Hellenized” virtues (see Feldman 1998a; 1998b). But the early chapters of Genesis were interpreted in *Antiquities* on the model of a Hesiodic story of decline (see Droge 1989: 35–42) and, where they are mentioned, the inventions are often of ambiguous value (e.g., *Ant.* 1.61, 64, 106, 155). Abraham is once credited with transmitting mathematics and astronomy to Egypt (*Ant.* 1.166–68), but the theme is not given prominence; for Solomon as a “wise” man, see *Ant.* 8.23–24, 42–44, etc. In the present work, some gestures are made in this direction concerning Moses, as the earliest lawgiver (2.154–56), and the source of truth for Greek philosophy (2.168, 280–81). But, despite his grand conclusion (2.295), Josephus makes no attempt to prove this point (in 2.168 he expressly declines to do so), and, in an alternative rhetorical tactic, he makes it a mark of Judean virtue that they were *not* inclined to invention/innovation (2.182–83).

<sup>497</sup> Greek: ἀναπολόγητα (“undefended”), implying that the rest has been a “defense” (ἀπολογία; cf. 2.147). For these remaining items Josephus will neither deny the charge nor defend the practice criticised: he will simply turn it back on Apion himself. Whether all were technically “charges” is unclear (for the legal language, see note to “lawsuit” at 2.4): some may have been no more than jokes, or passing jibes.

tians.<sup>498</sup> He indicts us for sacrificing tame animals<sup>499</sup> and for not eating pork,<sup>500</sup> and he mocks circumcision of the genitals.<sup>501</sup> **138** Well, the practice of killing tame<sup>502</sup> animals is something we hold in common with all the rest of humanity,<sup>503</sup> and when Apion indicts those who sacrifice them he proves himself to be an Egyptian by descent;<sup>504</sup> he would not have been indignant had he been a Greek or Macedonian.<sup>505</sup> For these peoples make vows<sup>506</sup> to sacrifice hecatombs to the Gods and use the sacrificial meat for their feasting;<sup>507</sup> and this has not resulted in the world being denuded of its flocks, as Apion feared.<sup>508</sup> **139** On the other hand, if everyone followed the

<sup>498</sup> The tactic of 2.5 is employed in a further, climactic, form. None of what follows would be effective were Apion not understood as a representative “Egyptian.” That term is used no less than 6 times in 2.137-44.

<sup>499</sup> L reads just ζῴα (“animals”), but the epithet is present in the Latin (*consueta*) and appears (probably) in the next section. It should probably be read here (so Niese minor, Thackeray, and Münster). It is difficult to see the force of Apion’s criticism. He could hardly criticise Judeans for conducting animal sacrifices; as Josephus notes (2.138), the practice was universal. The reference to “flocks” (2.138) suggests that cattle and sheep/goats are particularly in mind, and this may relate to Egyptian sensitivities. In the Persian period, the Judean temple in Elephantine was demolished by Egyptians, and allowed to be rebuilt as a site of incense and meal-offerings only (Cowley Papyrus no. 33). According to Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.4.2), Judeans sacrifice bulls in derision of Apis, and rams to spite Ammon. Apion (possibly the source of this Tacitean comment) may have represented the Judeans as renegade Egyptians who abandoned their ancestral piety by deliberately sacrificing their once sacred animals (cf. 2.143-44 where Apion is accused of abandoning *his* national piety). It is possible that Apion supplemented this serious charge by joking that Judea was thus denuded of its flocks (2.138).

<sup>500</sup> This also might be connected with Apion’s version of the exodus: according to some versions, the Judeans abstained from pork because the plague which caused their expulsion was a form of scabies caught from pigs (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.2; cf. Manetho’s connection between leprosy and sow’s milk reported in Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.16). Apion could trade on the fact that Judeans in Alexandria were known for this dietary taboo (Philo, *Flacc.* 96), and that this was one of the few facts about them generally known in Rome; see, e.g., Philo, *Legat.* 361; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.157-69; 14.98-99; Petronius, frag. 37; Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 4.5; *Cic.* 7.6; Macrobius, *Sat.* 2.4.11; Erotianus, frag. 33. In a Roman context this was a deep mystery: what else were pigs for, if not for eating (Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.160)?

<sup>501</sup> Since many native Egyptians were circumcised

(see note to “circumcised” at 2.141), Apion’s mockery of the custom again indicates that he speaks from a different cultural tradition; he himself was apparently not circumcised until close to his death (2.143). Philo also speaks of mockery of the custom (presumably in “Greek” circles in Alexandria, *Spec.* 1.1-3). The Judean custom was also well known in Rome and the butt of frequent jokes; see, e.g., Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.2; Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.99, 104; Horace, *Sat.* 1.9.70; Petronius, *Sat.* 102.14; frag. 37; Martial 7.82; 11.94.

<sup>502</sup> L reads ἡμετέρων (“our”; Latin: *nostrorum*), but ed. princ. is rightly followed by all modern editors in emending to ἡμέρων (“tame”); the contrast is with the “wild” animals fostered by Egyptians (2.139).

<sup>503</sup> While Apion would divide the world into Judeans vs. the rest, Josephus puts Judeans in the company of all humanity, in contrast to Egyptians. Although the discussion concerns religious sacrifice, Josephus use the simple verb “to kill.” This could reflect the cessation of sacrifice after 70 CE (though cf. 2.77).

<sup>504</sup> On Apion’s “Egyptian” identity in the eyes of Josephus, see note to “Apion” at 2.28, and note to “him” at 2.32. Josephus’ case is helped by the fact that he does not reveal Apion’s reasoning. It was widely believed that Egyptians would not eat animals that were generally consumed by the rest of humanity: see, e.g., Herodotus 2.18, 41-45 (sheep, cows, and goats); Erotianus, frag. 33 (sheep and goats); Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.27 (cows; cf. Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.61); on pork, see 2.141.

<sup>505</sup> These are the two other categories of Alexandrian resident recognized by Josephus (2.69-70).

<sup>506</sup> Greek: εὐχονταί. The verb probably has this sense, but could mean “take pride in” (so Blum).

<sup>507</sup> “Hecatombs” means literally sacrifices of “a hundred” (oxen), but from Homer onwards it came to mean any large-scale animal sacrifice; Thackeray notes a close verbal parallel in Homer, *Od.* 17.50. The point is that huge numbers of animals are regularly sacrificed and eaten.

<sup>508</sup> The ground of Apion’s fears is not clear; it is possible that Josephus has invented, or at least grossly distorted, Apion’s case. If he had a criticism, it was

Egyptians' customs, the world would be denuded of its humans and full of the most savage animals, which they nurture with care, thinking they are Gods.<sup>509</sup> **140** Further, if anyone had asked him whom he considered, of all the Egyptians, to be the most wise and pious, he would certainly have acknowledged that to be the priests;<sup>510</sup> **141** for they say that they were assigned two tasks by the kings from the very beginning, the worship of the Gods and the care of wisdom.<sup>511</sup> Now, all those priests are both circumcised<sup>512</sup> and abstain from eating pork<sup>513</sup>—in truth, of all the rest of the Egyptians there is not one who would sacrifice a pig to the Gods.<sup>514</sup> **142** So was

surely directed at Judeans, not at the practice of sacrifice as such. “Flocks” (βοσκήματα) could be of cattle, sheep, or goats. Did he joke that Judea was being denuded of its animal stock? If so, Josephus generalizes the point to make it seem ridiculous.

<sup>509</sup> Whatever Apion's true charge, the form in which it has been presented is now neatly turned against Egypt: their practice is far more dangerous to humanity! Josephus echoes his criticism of 2.66 (though internal Egyptian differences are now forgotten): to nurture dangerous animals (cf. 2.86) signals not only stupidity but hostility to the human race. Hecataeus had offered an explanation of why crocodiles, although honored, did not overrun the country (Diodorus 1.35.7; cf. Porphyry, *Abst.* 4.14).

<sup>510</sup> Moving to the other two points (pork and circumcision), Josephus tries a different form of response: in criticising these, Apion disloyally attacks the very best in his own culture. This is a difficult tactic for Josephus to pursue, since he has displayed nothing but derision for Egyptian culture since 1.219, and he can hardly critique Apion for deriding what he himself considers derisory (cf. 2.30-32). But if the customs concerned are attributed to Egyptian *priests*, this problem can be circumvented, since their reputation stands generally high (cf. 1.9, 28)—provided their “piety” is not expressly linked to the animal cults. Hence Josephus attributes to Apion this general regard, so he can be trapped critiquing the very best exemplars of his own national laws.

<sup>511</sup> Greek: ἐπιμέλεια σοφίας, which could mean care in the preservation of wisdom, or in its pursuit (cf. the similar language in 1.28). Special wisdom and piety were attributed by Herodotus to *all* Egyptians (2.37, 160), but were associated particularly with Egyptian priests because of their control of temples, which were also depositories of ancient lore and learning: see, e.g., Diodorus 1.73.2 (from Hecataeus); Strabo 17.1.3. Where Egyptian mythology was taken to encode (Greek) philosophy, the priests were regarded as proto-philosophers: Chaeremon certainly represented them so (see Porphyry, *Abst.* 4.6), as did Plutarch (*Is. Os.* 354 b-c); cf. Origen, *Cels.* 1.12; Lucian, *Philops.* 33-34.

<sup>512</sup> There is good reason to think that circumcision was a custom originally practiced by all Egyptians

(Herodotus 2.36-37, 104; Diodorus 1.28.3; 1.55.5; 3.32.4), and that it remained in common use during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, performed on both boys and girls at puberty (P. Lond. 24; Philo, *Spec.* 1.2; *QG* 3.47-48; Strabo 17.2.5; see Wendland 1903, who rightly refutes Reitzenstein's argument that it was practiced only by priests). After Hadrian's ban on the practice (130s CE), lay Egyptians discontinued circumcision, and priests needed special permission to continue it (Mitteis & Wilcken 1912: nos. 74-77; Otto 1905: 1.214; further evidence in Cohen 1999: 45 n.76; cf. Stern 2.260). Thus it is a mistake to interpret Josephus' remark by reference to later comments (e.g., by Origen and Jerome), which suggest that the practice was current only among Egyptian priests (*pace* Schürer revised 1.538; Holladay 1983: 236; Artapanus' reference to priests [*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.27.10] is not clearly connected to Egypt). It is possible that during the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods, only the most traditional families maintained the custom (cf. Diodorus 1.95.6; Wendland 1903: 28-29), and that would certainly include priests. But Josephus has good reason to focus here only on priests (see note to “priests” at 2.140), and this comment should not be taken as evidence, direct or indirect, that ordinary Egyptians were uncircumcised at this time. Josephus does not reveal the difference in character between Egyptian and Judean circumcision (the one at puberty for both sexes, the other at birth for boys).

<sup>513</sup> The Egyptian dislike of pigs is noted by Herodotus (2.47-48), and it was generally believed that Egyptians would not eat pork (Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 4.5; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 299f; Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.16; cf. Epictetus 1.22.4; Celsus *apud* Origen, *Cels.* 5.34, 41). This taboo seems to have been preserved with particular fidelity by priests, who are sometimes singled out in this regard (Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 352f.; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr.* 3.223, in parallel with Judeans). Again, it suits Josephus' argument to connect the ban specifically with priests.

<sup>514</sup> Reading ὕν θύει with Niese and all modern editors (L S: συνθύει). Josephus is probably influenced by Herodotus 2.47 which says that Egyptians would not sacrifice a pig to any of the other Gods, *except* at the full moon to Selene and Dionysus; but it suits him to



Apion's fitting  
death

Apion's mind blind when he contrived to insult us on behalf of the Egyptians,<sup>515</sup> but made accusations against them, who not only practice the customs insulted by him but also, as Herodotus said, taught others to get circumcised?<sup>516</sup> **143** So it seems rather fitting to me that Apion paid an appropriate penalty for slandering his ancestral laws.<sup>517</sup> He was circumcised in an emergency, because of an ulcer on his genitals;<sup>518</sup> but the circumcision did no good, gangrene set in, and he died in extreme pain.<sup>519</sup> **144** Those who are wise should remain meticulously faithful to their own laws with regard to piety,<sup>520</sup> and not insult the laws of others.<sup>521</sup> Apion, however, deserted his own laws<sup>522</sup> and lied about ours. Such was how his life ended, and here we may bring our argument to an end.<sup>523</sup>

*The Judean Constitution and Laws (2.145-286): Reading Options*

Josephus presents the final segment of the treatise (2.145-286) as continuing the apologetic strategy of the previous two (1.219-320; 2.1-144). It begins by citing the accusations against Judeans

omit this exception. The full-moon sacrifice is attested elsewhere (e.g., Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 353f-354a; Aelian, *Nat. an.* 10.16, reporting Manetho); since the pig was associated with Seth, it was sacrificed and eaten out of hostility, to assist the moon (Isis or Osiris) at the time when it begins to wane (Griffiths 1970: 281; Lloyd 1976: 216-19). Aelian (loc cit.) reports Eudoxus' assertion that Egyptians would never sacrifice a pig, but both he and Josephus fail to mention the special occasions when they did.

<sup>515</sup> For the blindness motif, see note to "him" at 2.132. Apion does not notice that his insults bounce back against his own people, and thus against himself as a national traitor. "Contrived" translates συνθέμενος, from the verb which is normally used to mean "concoct" (see note to "like" at 1.293), but here lacks an object.

<sup>516</sup> It is now rhetorically useful to introduce the impression that the practice is common to Egyptians, in order to set up the accusation of 2.143-44. Herodotus' claim (2.104) was cited above in 1.169-70, but Josephus does not refer back to that citation.

<sup>517</sup> Cf. Apion's betrayal of his homeland and people in 2.29-30. Here his criticism of Judean customs is turned around into slander of his own (cf. 2.137). The penalty is not just fair but "appropriate" (cf. 2.61), because the punishment fits the crime: the performance of his slandered national custom on his own body proved not beneficial but fatal. For another death with similarly fitting components, cf. *War* 7.451-53. The same pattern is found in relation to Antiochus IV in 2 Macc. 9:1-29; Flaccus in Philo, *Flacc.* 146-91; Egyptians in *Wis.* 11-19; on a wider scale cf. Pomeroy 1991.

<sup>518</sup> Apion's own story in 2.20-27 comes to mind, but there are no verbal parallels. Apion was apparently not circumcised before this point.

<sup>519</sup> The rhetorical fit is so perfect that one suspects

that the story was concocted by Josephus, or by others who suffered at Apion's hands. No other source relates this story, but it provides a fitting finale for Josephus' demolition of Apion's *ethos*.

<sup>520</sup> The closing *sententia* prepares the ground for major themes in the following segment. "Piety" (εὐσέβεια) is a central Judean virtue (2.146), while "remaining faithful" (ἔμμένω) to the law is a key Judean characteristic (2.150, 153, 182, 221, 257, 278). And Judean tasks are often performed ἀκριβῶς ("meticulously" or "accurately," 2.175, 187, 227, 257).

<sup>521</sup> Cf. 2.237 for Josephus' claim that this is embodied in Judean law; if any Egyptians read 2.139 or other such statements on their religion, they could have accused Josephus of hypocrisy.

<sup>522</sup> For the theme of "desertion" (φεύγω), cf. 2.30.

<sup>523</sup> Josephus thus neatly correlates the end of his argument (which is given the colorless label λόγος) with the end of his opponent. Apion has been doubly dispatched. Since Josephus does not specify here that the λόγος concerns Apion (*pace* Thackeray) and since 1.219 speaks of the beginning of the λόγος in reference to the beginning of the work (1.1-5), it could be argued that this phrase originally signalled the end of the treatise (so Hornbostel, cited in Gerber 1997: 70, n.24; D. Schwartz has independently suggested the same to me in a private communication). On this theory, 2.145ff. would be a later (Josephan) addition, tacked onto the end of the work (and primarily drawn from sources). But Josephus generally refers to this treatise as a document or text (γραφή or βιβλίον, 1.320; 2.147, 288, 296); when he uses the term λόγος it can mean his own argument (1.112, 219, 227; 2.144, 151, 238) or that of another (1.318; 2.6, 126). The context makes sufficiently clear that he speaking here of the end of his argument (against Apion). On the status of 2.145ff., see Introduction § 1.

by critics (Apollonius Molon and Lysimachus, 2.145-50), and returns to their charges throughout (e.g., 2.161, 236, 255, 270, 278). But its structure and rhetorical tone are quite different from the preceding apologetic arguments. Instead of citing and refuting accusations one by one, Josephus bundles them together at the start (2.145, 148) and then follows his own structure, which meets all these charges, but indirectly and on his own terms. In fact, the apology is at the same time an encomium (2.147, 287), using summary, paraphrase, and comparison to extol Moses, the Judean constitution, and the Judean laws.

After the introduction (2.145-50), Josephus first discusses the virtues of Moses and the “structure” of his constitution, with its unique system of “theocracy” and special emphasis on piety (2.151-89). There follows a summary of the laws (2.190-218), divided into three parts (God and cult, 2.190-98; family and fellowship, 2.199-208; foreigners and enemies, 2.209-14), and completed with a summary of punishments and rewards (2.215-18). Josephus then underlines the Judeans’ faithfulness to their laws (to the point of death), in critical comparison with the Spartans (2.219-35). There follows a long discussion of Judean attitudes to others’ beliefs and customs (2.236-86), centred on the accusations of Apollonius (2.258), but incorporating a devastating critique of myth (2.236-54) and a defense of Judean cultural self-protection, compared with Plato, Sparta, and Athens (2.255-69). Thus Judeans have no cause to emulate others’ customs (2.270-78), but others gladly emulate theirs (2.279-86), a conclusion which neatly prepares for the *peroratio* on the superiority of Judean culture (2.287-96).

*Romanized readers/hearers* would bring to this presentation of Judean culture their own impressions of Judeans (on the audience of this work, see Introduction § 7; on the rationale for this survey of reading options, see Introduction § 13). As far as we can tell from Roman literature of this period (Juvenal, Tacitus, Quintilian, Martial) and from later accounts of Roman history (Dio Cassius), Judeans were well known in Rome, where they constituted an influential ethnic community (see Barclay 1996a: 306-19; Gruen 2002: 41-53). Particular Judean customs crop up often in Judean literature, and were evidently familiar: sabbath, fasting, circumcision, and abstention from pork were all the subject of amused, and sometimes critical, comment (e.g., Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.96-106; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4-5). Judeans in Rome were also considered a clannish group, strongly supportive of each other, but unfriendly or even actively hostile towards outsiders. Juvenal accuses them of failing to show common civility (*Sat.* 14.103-4), Tacitus of *hostile odium adversus omnes alios* (*Hist.* 5.5.1). It was well known that the Judeans’ religion was highly peculiar and aniconic: they worshiped “one God and that with the mind only” (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.4). Such peculiarity could be presented in highly pejorative terms. Their abstention from common cultic practice could be labelled a form of “atheism” (Dio Cassius 67.14.1-2), or their difference regarded as sheer perversity: “they regard as profane all that we hold sacred, and permit all that we abhor” (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.1). Viewed in this light, Judeans could be regarded as an “utterly heinous nation” (*sceleratissima gens*, Seneca, *apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 6.11), but the greatest anger would fall on Romans who saw fit to imitate their customs and convert to their laws (Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.96-106; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1-2). The very fact of this criticism is evidence, however, of an alternative opinion in Rome. Like other Eastern cultures, Judean traditions clearly exercised a certain fascination in Rome, drawing individuals into imitation of particular customs, most notably the sabbath rest. Further, the Judean community was sufficiently attractive to draw admirers, supporters (“God-fearers”), and even full converts into Judean ranks, including some (noted by Dio) who were prominent in the Roman social hierarchy (see further, Introduction § 6).

Josephus’ presentation of Judean culture thus enters contested terrain, where Judeans were liable to meet both sympathy and disdain. In answering critics, Josephus never mentions Romans. The discussion is focused around figures from another time and place (Apollonius Molon and Lysimachus), and the cultural points of contact are all with the Greek tradition (Greek history, Greek philosophy, and Greek myth), not with the Roman. These were not irrelevant in Rome: any educated Romans would be familiar with the Greek themes and stories to which Josephus alludes, even if not with the authors he refutes. But Roman readers/hearers would find here no

comparison between Judeans and Romans—at least none explicit, on the surface of the text. It would have been possible, then, to dismiss this segment of the treatise as an academic exercise in cultural one-upmanship, an attempt by a learned Judean to use Greek tropes to boost his own tradition. Alternatively, a sympathetic reader could find here an indirect response to many of the anti-Judean slanders circulating in Rome, and could detect strong resonance between some of the traits emphasized by Josephus and central features of the conservative, moralistic tradition still favored by upper-class Romans.

Of the Judean customs known in Rome, all receive mention in this segment, apart from circumcision (cf. 2.137). Sabbaths, food laws, and fasts are listed among the customs imitated by others (2.282), a scenario familiar in Rome (cf. 2.284). The first two also feature, somewhat allusively, as part of the strict regime required by the Judean code (2.173-74, 234). This would hardly answer a desire to hear specific explanations of these customs, but it does place them under a rubric (Judean discipline and toughness) that could appeal to a Romanized audience. A much fuller treatment is given to allegations of the anti-social and anti-religious tendencies of Judeans. These are raised in the form of Apollonius' attack (2.148, 258) and discussed in several contexts throughout the segment. Josephus' stress on Judean "benevolence" (φιλοθρωπία) results in an affirmation that Judeans fulfil common social courtesies (2.211, in contrast to Juvenal), and in careful definition of Judean policy towards outsiders, matching the Roman self-perception of welcoming all (so long as they change their ways; 2.209-10; 259-61). The charge of "atheism" (2.148) is firmly rebutted with claims of faultless Judean theology and superior Judean piety, and explanations of the Judeans' aniconic practice (2.166-67, 190-92; cf. 2.73-78). It is doubtful that any of this would convince an unsympathetic reader, or reduce the disapproval surrounding Romans who adopted Judean customs. Where Josephus mentions this phenomenon, he does not indicate its negative corollary (abandoning Roman ways), but only those who thought highly of Judean culture in the first place could be expected to approve of such a phenomenon.

In presenting the merits of Judean culture, Josephus emphasizes a number of themes that could well expect a favorable reception in Rome (for details, see Appendix 6). The priority given to piety (2.170) could elicit approval in a self-consciously religious state, especially when allied with a conservative commitment to preserve ancestral customs and traditional beliefs (2.182-83, 226-28, 252-54, etc.). The high moral tone in the laws, especially in sexual and family matters, would appeal to Roman moralists, particularly with emphasis on severity in enforcement of the law (2.199-203, 215-17, 276-77, etc.). Frugality, simplicity, and commitment to work (2.204, 234, 281, 291, etc.) are all themes that mirror Roman ideals, as does the priority given to toughness (surpassing the much-admired Spartans) and contempt for death (2.146, 219-35, 283, etc.). These are the features that Romans admired when they weighed up the merits of other cultures (see Appendix 6), and there is good reason to expect that such elements in Josephus' depiction of Judean culture could win a sympathetic reception from a Roman audience.

*Judean readers/hearers* would surely have found this the most satisfying and encouraging segment of the treatise. Here their tradition was not only defended but positively extolled, shown to contain not only excusable laws and customs, but the very best constitutional structure, the highest form of piety, and the finest set of moral values. If the Judean laws are presented in a form supplemented by extra-biblical traditions, that would be of little concern so long as it illustrated their moral excellence, and there was plenty of precedent for such supplementation and interpretation of the Torah (see Appendix 5). Readers familiar with the Judean philosophical tradition from the Hellenistic era would recognize the claims for Moses' priority, previously articulated by Aristobulus, Eupolemus, and others: it was surely pleasing to think of the very "best" in the Greek philosophical tradition as derived (somehow) from Moses' original theology (2.168, 257, 281). Whatever the diversity among Josephus' Judean readers, almost all of the central points in his description of Judean culture appear to have been commonly supported. The excellence of Moses (the first and premier legislator) and the superior value of the law (as the defining feature of Judean culture, taught each sabbath) were shared points of reference for Judeans of all

social classes and locations. Even the continuing symbolic significance of the temple and its priests (2.190-98) was of common interest among Judeans post-70 CE, as far as we can tell from rabbinic literature and from apparent hopes for the restoration of the temple. At least in these respects, Josephus could hope that his encomium on Judean culture would be recognized and affirmed as a manifesto on behalf of all Judeans in Rome and further afield.

*Christian* interest in this segment appears to have been limited. Although Origen knew this treatise, and might have used some of this segment in this response to Celsus, there is no evidence that he did. Similarly, while other Christian authors attacked Greek mythology in terms not unlike those of Josephus (2.236-54; e.g., Ps.-Justin, *Exhortation*; Tertullian, *Apology*), their ammunition seems to be derived not from this but from parallel traditions, or from their own knowledge. The only writer (of our period) known to have used this segment did so, however, in large quantity. In the course of his *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Eusebius cited a number of Judean sources that displayed the moral and intellectual merits of the Judean tradition. Among these, gathered in book 8, is a large portion of our segment, 2.163-228 (cited in *Praep. ev.* 8.8.1-55, sandwiched between parts of *The Letter of Aristeeas*, the *Hypothetica*, a fragment of Aristobulus, and citations from four works of Philo). Eusebius made his selection carefully: the passage he has chosen is fully encomiastic in tone and displays the temporal priority of the Judean tradition (2.168, 226, an important point for Eusebius), but omits those apologetic (2.151-62) or polemical (2.236-54) features that would be irrelevant to his argument. For other Christians, eager to defend the Christian novelties, it might have served little purpose to use this segment extolling the merits of the Judean tradition. But for Eusebius, this was part of a larger argument to prove that Judean culture was both older and more virtuous than that of the Greeks—only then to maintain its supersession by Christianity. This Christian reading thus both exploits and subverts Josephus' purpose and rhetorical achievement.

In the *modern history of scholarship* this segment has been heavily cited and studied, particularly by those interested in Josephus' Judaism (for an early precedent, see Porphyry, *Abst.* 4.14). Once again source-critics have found much of interest here, both those interested in Apollonius and, especially, those hunting for sources behind this text in relation to *Hypothetica* and Ps.-Phocylides (see Appendix 5). The differences between this segment and Josephus' earlier works, in his presentation of Judean culture, have encouraged investigation of the new influences on his thought, whether from (Alexandrian?) sources (see Belkin 1936; 1936-37), or from further exposure to the Greek literary tradition (e.g., Plato's *Laws*; see Kamlah 1974; Schäublin 1982). Josephus' new depiction of the Judean constitution, in particular as a "theocracy," has attracted special interest in this regard (see Amir 1985-88; Rajak 2002: 195-218). Gerber's full-scale monograph on this segment (1997) ably investigates its internal rhetorical dynamics, and is the first to subject any section of this treatise to such study. More recently, a number of scholars have suggested that Josephus' portrait of Judeans is here specifically *Romanized* (Goodman 1994b; 1999; Mason 1996; Haaland 1999; Barclay 2000; see further, Appendix 6).

*Postcolonial* analysis would investigate the ambivalence created by Josephus' adaptation and exploitation of Greek (and Roman) cultural traditions. Josephus' presentation of the Judean tradition is clearly structured by Greek tropes and conducted within Greek frames of reference. It is Greek theology that gives him the vocabulary and concepts with which to describe God, and Greek political theory that structures his understanding of constitutions. Greek points of comparison (with Athens, Sparta, Plato, etc.) serve as the foil for, and help define, his presentation of Judean legislation, and Greek moral philosophy and ethical maxims have entered into his interpretation and expansion of the Judean laws (in 2.190-218). The very values that the Judean constitution here exhibits are drawn from the Greek tradition: piety, justice, moderation, and social fellowship are all recognizably Greek in their expression and in the accompanying modes of illustration. Even where Josephus engages in criticism of Greeks (e.g., their mythology), he does so on grounds already established within the Greek philosophical tradition, and happily acknowledges his dependence (2.238-39). In his evaluation of Greeks (admiration of Sparta and of Plato;



denigration of Greek addiction to novelty and “words”), Josephus also stands on ground shared with Romans, and there are signs that, at least at the edges of his discourse, he adopts Roman ideals in his portrayal of his own people (see Appendix 6).

But the picture is more complex than this litany of cultural absorption would suggest. One of the achievements of postcolonial analysis (specifically that of Homi Bhabha) is to unravel the ambivalences that can ensue in this form of cultural engagement. Bhabha speaks in this context of “hybridity” (1994: 93-122), a concept much more complex than cultural “absorption,” since it suggests that the duplication of the dominant culture by its subordinates simultaneously challenges the authority of the hegemonic tradition, creating an offspring that is both like and unlike itself (in this case, a Judaism both Greek and unGreek, or Roman and unRoman), an imitation that both colludes with and resists the dominance of the powerful, that is both dependent and threateningly independent (for discussions of Bhabha on this point see Moore-Gilbert 1997: 114-51; Young 2001; Moore 2005).

This alerts us to investigate whether (or how) Josephus’ portrait of his own tradition in the colors of the Greek (and Roman) traditions is simultaneously (and paradoxically) resistant to their claims to universal significance. In his initial portrait of Moses (2.151-62), Josephus seems to place Moses’ authority on a par with that of Minos and Lycurgus: if Moses appealed to the authority of God, so did they (2.161-62), and while he may have lived earlier than them (2.150-56), his laws are introduced not as products of divine revelation but as the residue of Moses’ conviction that “everything he did and thought was in accordance with God’s will” (2.160). But this muffled claim is not the last word (or the first; cf. 1.42). By the end of the treatise it is clear that Moses had a unique prophetic role in communicating God’s will (2.279, 286), and parallels between the “permeation” of the world by God and by the law suggest that the latter has an exceptionally high status (2.284). Nor is Moses’ priority a matter of merely historical advantage. It emerges with increasing clarity that Josephus wishes to advance an exceedingly bold claim that whatever is true and proper in the Greek philosophical conception of God enjoys that status because it was *learned* from Moses (2.168, 255, 257, 281). Thus the Judean tradition is not only a *better* version of the best in Greek culture—tougher, better disseminated, better balanced between word and deed, more friendly to outsiders, stricter in application, more faithfully maintained (forms of excellence that could all seem merely extensions of Greek virtues); it is also its *original* version (2.293-95), and is thus what gives Greek culture its own value-standards and concepts of excellence. This paradoxical stance, in which Greek culture is both hallowed and hollowed (cf. Moore 2005: 87), is precisely the ambivalence identified by postcolonial analysis. For all the respect he accords to Greek “wisdom,” and its usefulness in his assault on Greek mythology (2.236-57), Josephus’ ultimate standard of truth is the teaching of Moses, whose understanding of God was not just “proper” but also *true* (2.250, 255). At a revealing moment, he can even applaud the murder of Anacharsis, considered “wise” by Greeks, because he threatened to corrupt his national traditions (2.269). Judean tradition is to be respected not only because it is ancient and ancestral, but also because it declares the truth about God and the universe, a truth applicable not just to Judeans but to all (see 2.190-98, with its universalism and its ambiguity in the reference of “us”). Even the temple—single, particular, unambiguously Judean—can be affirmed as the proper correlate of this one, true God (2.193), ironically with the very Athenian claim that it is “common to all.” For this reason, Josephus can celebrate others’ imitation of Judean customs, not just because they boost Judean dignity, but because they thereby honor the *original* and the *very best* constitution in the world.

This example of Judean hybridity thus simultaneously accepts and unsettles the authority of the Greek (and Roman) tradition. By framing his discourse within the terms of Greek history and culture, Josephus affirms its significance, and places Judeans, on Greek terms, within the *civilized* segments of humanity. However, he is not willing to relativize Judean culture as just another (and derivative) version of Hellenism, but advances an uncompromising claim to Judean priority and superiority, suggesting that it is Greeks who derive their values from Moses and the

Judeans, not the other way around. This doubled (or split) stance explains why Josephus can both adopt the Greek virtue scheme and restructure it (to place “piety” on top, as a distinctive Judean emphasis), and why he adapts Greek political discourse to promote “theocracy” as a distinctive and superior form of government. Such a stance is complex, perhaps self-contradictory, certainly ambivalent, but it is what makes this segment of *Apion* peculiarly interesting as a piece of cultural self-definition.

**(2.14) 145** But since Apollonius Molon<sup>524</sup> and Lysimachus<sup>525</sup> and certain others,<sup>526</sup> partly out of ignorance, but mostly from ill-will,<sup>527</sup> have made statements about our legislator Moses<sup>528</sup> and the laws that are neither just nor true<sup>529</sup>—libeling Moses as a

*Apollonius’  
and  
Lysimachus’  
charges against  
Moses and the  
laws*

<sup>524</sup> Apollonius was mentioned earlier, in 2.16, 79; see note to “Molon” at 2.79, and, for his work on Judeans, note to “fashion” at 2.148. This new segment, which runs to 2.286, is structured differently from the previous segments, which were written in response to named critics (1.219-2.144). Here Josephus gives much more space to a positive description of the Judean constitution and laws. He offers no citations from his critics (in quotation or paraphrase), nor does he answer them point by point. Nonetheless, as this introduction (2.145-50) makes clear, this segment is still conceived, rhetorically, as a *defense* of the Judean people and their laws, and is, indeed, the only segment of the treatise explicitly labelled such (ἀπολογία, 2.147). It is thus still part of the program announced in 1.59 and 1.219: the terms “libel” and “insult” (1.219) recur prominently here (2.145, 148). Indeed references to critics or criticisms of Judeans appear throughout 2.151-286 in every major paragraph apart from the summary of the laws (2.190-218): see 2.156, 161, 182, 236-38, 255, 258, 262, 270, 278, 285. Accordingly, the conclusion to the treatise (2.287-95) includes the material of this segment in a summary of Josephus’ replies to critics. Gerber’s argument that 2.145-86 forms a separable (third) Part of the work (1997: 70, 94-99) thus goes against the grain of Josephus’ own rhetoric. See further, Introduction, § 1.

By far the most prominent critic in this segment is Apollonius Molon: he is mentioned 7 times (apart from here, 2.148, 238, 255, 258, 262, 270), not counting the conclusion (2.295). Although he is initially paired with Lysimachus (also in 2.236), Apollonius is clearly the main opponent, both in the introduction (as author of the charges in 2.148) and in 2.236-86, a lengthy response to his attack on Judean exclusivity (2.258). Moreover, the charges listed in 2.148 will all be answered in the following discussion of the constitution (see note to “claims” at 2.149). Although the *structure* of that discussion is shaped by Josephus himself (and/or his sources), its *emphases* are largely determined by the apologetic argument. Whether that apologetic task

is itself a rhetorical construct—a means to convey (and partly mask) an encomium on Judean culture—is another matter. On the genre of “apologetics” and the rhetorical device of apologetic encomia, see Introduction, § 5.

<sup>525</sup> See note to “Lysimachus” at 1.304. Josephus had paraphrased his account of the exodus in 1.304-11, and mentioned him again in connection with Apion at 2.16, 20. He will be twinned with Apollonius again in 2.236, in a generic fashion (“Lysimachus and Molons and other writers of that sort”). He may come to mind in this context because his sharp critique of Judean antisocial behavior (1.309-11) ran parallel to the main charges of Apollonius Molon (2.148, 258). He is no longer treated as a spokesman for Egyptians.

<sup>526</sup> Cf. 2.16 (“others”) and the generalizing addition in 2.236 (“and other writers of that sort”). This breadth of focus gives the impression that what follows constitutes a comprehensive reply to the remaining critics. But by becoming less precise, Josephus gives himself the freedom to structure his apology/encomium in his own way (cf. the vague reference to “critics” in 2.156, 161, 182, 238, 278, 285), while answering specific barbs from Apollonius. The imprecision may also serve a political end: Josephus can avoid naming any *Roman* critic, although he was surely aware of them (cf. 2.74: “the Greeks and some others”).

<sup>527</sup> For “ill-will” (δυσμένεια), cf. 1.2, 3, 212, 220. Unlike the case of Egyptian malice, Josephus offers no explanation of this species of ill-will. Ignorance is again identified as a factor in 2.262 (cf. folly in 2.255, 258), but more substantial *ethos*-attacks on Apollonius are kept for later (2.236, 255, 270).

<sup>528</sup> I follow Münster in reading here (as in 2.12-15) Μωσέως (Moses) rather than the form of the name found elsewhere in the text, Μωυσέως (Moses). It is principally as legislator (here ὁ νομοθετήσας; elsewhere ὁ νομοθέτης) that Moses will be discussed in what follows (2.151-62). While much else could be said about his character (cf. *Antiquities* bks 2-4; Philo, *Vita Mosi*), Josephus wishes to focus here on the laws he

charlatan and fraudster,<sup>530</sup> and claiming that the laws are our teachers in vice and not a single virtue<sup>531</sup>—I wish to speak briefly,<sup>532</sup> as best I can,<sup>533</sup> about the whole

introduced. In fact, after this point he will not be named again, but referred to only by his title, “the/our legislator.”

<sup>529</sup> “Not just” (οὔτε δικάιους) seems a mild response (cf. ἀδικῶς, 2.161, 287); the word is echoed in 2.147. The issue of truth or falsehood is also underlined in 2.147 (cf. 2.287, 295, in the conclusion), but Josephus’ argument here turns less on truth than in the earlier segments. The issue here is not the concoction of tall tales against the Judeans, but the moral evaluation of their laws.

<sup>530</sup> Greek: ὡς γόητα καὶ ἀπατεῶνα. The terms, which Josephus uses elsewhere, may be his own, rather than the critics’, but they probably represent some real attack on the integrity of Moses (cf. 2.161, 290; *Hypoth.* 6.2-4). Josephus uses γόης (“imposter,” “charlatan”) for leaders, both political (*War* 4.85; 5.317) and religious (*War* 2.261, 264; *Ant.* 20.97-98, 160, 167, 188, 264), who hoodwink the common people, gaining power by deceptive claims. The abstract noun, γοητεία, is used of Justus’ oratory in *Life* 40 (cf. *War* 4.391), and the verb, γοητεύω, of Eleazar in *War* 2.565. Similarly, ἀπατεῶν (from the root ἀπατ-, signifying cheating or deception) is used of religious leaders (prophets or priests) who deceive the people (*War* 2.259; 6.288; *Ant.* 8.232; 20.167). The two terms (or words from these two roots) are twinned elsewhere by Josephus, and form a *hendiadys* (*Ant.* 20.167; *Life* 40).

In the context of specific ritual acts, or the performance of “wonders,” the terms could designate a “quack-magician” (γόης is used of Jesus as miracle-worker by Celsus, *apud* Origen, *Cels.* 1.6, 71; 2.32, etc.), but in different contexts other sorts of chicanery are in view (see Bloch 1999, with further literature). Josephus’ response indicates that he takes it here primarily in a political sense, of someone who gains power by false or illegitimate pretense (see 2.158-61), but there are hints in his discussion of Moses’ acquisition of power (through “great deeds,” 2.160) that the miraculous foundations of Moses’ authority are also in view. In his account of Moses’ miracles in the court of Pharaoh (*Ant.* 2.284-87), Josephus depicts the king as suspecting Moses of “deceit” (ἀπάτη) in his “wonder-working” (τερατουργία) and “magic” (μαγεία, 2.284). Moses replies that his miracles derive from God’s providence and power, not from γοητεία (“charlatanry”) or πλάνη (“deceit,” 2.286). That passage shows that these terms could be brought into connection with charges of “magic” (itself a highly complex and slanted term; cf. Graf 1997; Faraone 1999), but by themselves denote

not “magician” but “trickster,” someone making fraudulent claims.

As Bloch argues, it is unlikely that Apollonius or others considered Moses specifically a “magician.” Although Moses’ name is often invoked in “magical” papyri (Gager 1972: 134-61), those operate in a different cultural world from that inhabited by Apollonius. While Moses is elsewhere listed among prophets, diviners, and others with esoteric knowledge (Strabo 16.2.39), and among *magices* by Pliny (*Nat.* 30.2.11) and Apuleius (*Apol.* 90-91), these statements convey no negative nuance. In general, the association of Judeans with magic is comparatively rare (Bloch 1999: 145-47; see Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.542-46; Lucian, *Jup. trag.* 171-73). However, Apollonius appears to have known Judean tradition quite well (see Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.19.1-3) and probably gave an account of the exodus (*Apion* 2.16). He may have recounted miracles associated with the departure from Egypt or the crossing of the desert, and could have represented these as fraudulent “wonder-working,” through which Moses gained power over his gullible people. We may compare Pompeius Trogus, who has Moses inherit from Joseph skill in the performance of “prodigies” (*apud* Justin 36.2.7-11, without negative nuance); cf. Tacitus’ comment that Moses led the people to expect some “heavenly guide” (identified in a herd of asses, *Hist.* 5.3.1), and Apion’s suggestion that Moses “hid” on Mount Sinai for 40 days (*Apion* 2.25). At a later date, Celsus made such accusations against Moses, that he had deluded his people by “clumsy deceits,” and falsely acquired a name for divine power (*apud* Origen, *Cels.* 1.20-26). Thus, although Bloch rightly resists the importation of “magic” into our text (in either the translation or the background), it is quite possible that Apollonius accused Moses of some form of religious trickery. Since the same charge is raised, unattributed, in *Hypoth.* 6.2-4, it is possible that this had become a stock accusation against Moses (cf. 2.161, an anonymous charge); on the relationship between *Apion* and *Hypothetica*, see Appendix 5.

<sup>531</sup> Some details are given in 2.148, where Apollonius’ exaggerated tone is again clear (“the most untalented of barbarians”; cf. 2.236 “the most despicable human beings”). Cf. the accusation against Moses’ laws in *Ant.* 4.147. It suits Josephus to have Apollonius deny to Judeans a single virtue, as he will immediately list 6 in reply (2.146), before specifying the content of Apollonius’ criticism (2.148).

<sup>532</sup> The claim to be brief looks odd before a segment

structure of our constitution<sup>534</sup> and about its individual parts.<sup>535</sup> **146** For I think it will become clear that we possess laws that are extremely well designed<sup>536</sup> with a view to piety,<sup>537</sup> fellowship with one another,<sup>538</sup> and universal benevolence,<sup>539</sup> as well

*The virtues  
inculcated by  
the laws*

that runs from 2.151-286. But as his conclusion indicates (2.287, 291), Josephus is conscious of how much more he could have said on this subject, and has said in his *Antiquities*. He is required to select his material, as he does *not* presume that his audience is familiar with his earlier work.

<sup>533</sup> The modesty may be no more than a rhetorical gesture, but it may indicate the intellectual problems Josephus senses in interpreting Judean Torah-based culture in terms comparable to the Greco-Roman tradition of political theory.

<sup>534</sup> Greek: *περὶ τῆς ὅλης ἡμῶν καταστάσεως τοῦ πολιτεύματος*. The phrase is found again in 2.184; cf. the apparently synonymous *τάξις τοῦ πολιτεύματος* in 2.250 (for similar language, Plutarch, *Mor.* 826d-e). The semantic range of *πολίτευμα* includes: i) political state, or political community within a state/city; ii) form of government; iii) administration of a state (government in action); and iv) constitution. Besides the phrases noted above, the noun is found in *Apion* in 2.164 (sense iii), 165 (sense ii), and 257 (sense i or iv). The term is convenient for Josephus, since Judeans did not form a *πόλις* (city-state), but the political language derived from that context could be applied to the Judean people in this looser form. Here, as in 2.184, 250, the term is best translated “constitution” (cf. *Ant.* 1.5 in parallel to 1.10). Elsewhere, Josephus speaks of the “order” (*κόσμος*) or “structure” (*σχῆμα*) of the *πολιτεία* (*Ant.* 1.121; 3.84; 4.184; 4.312, etc.; *σχῆμα* in 18.53). The term *πολιτεία* is found in *Apion* in the sense of “citizenship” (2.32, 39, 41, 256, 260) or “constitution” (1.189, 220, 265; 2.188, 222, 226, 264, 273, 287). Josephus had portrayed the Judean laws as the Mosaic “constitution” in *Antiquities* book 4, but here returns to that task with different emphases (see Rajak 2002: 195-218), having learned much from Judean predecessors (see Appendix 5). On the uses of *πολιτεία* and *πολίτευμα* in this segment, see Gerber 1997: 345-53.

<sup>535</sup> See the selection of particular laws in 2.190-218.

<sup>536</sup> The superlative (*ἄριστα κειμένους*) may be understood so, or in the stronger sense “best designed.” The same ambiguity is present in other superlatives, e.g., 2.183 (*κάλλιστα*, “extremely well” or “best”), 2.278 (*κράτιστος*, “extremely good” or “very best”), and 2.293 (*κάλλιστα*, “extremely fine” or “finest”). Although Josephus constantly hints that the Judean constitution is second to none, his boldest claims are often couched in the form of rhetorical questions (2.184-88, 293-94).

<sup>537</sup> Greek: *εὐσέβεια*. It is no accident that this comes at the head of the qualities promoted by the laws; cf. its prominence in 2.170 and its primary placement in the summaries of 2.291, 293. The same emphasis is found in the introduction to *Antiquities* (1.6, 21; cf. *Apion* 1.60; *War* 2.139). It matches, by contrast, the first of Apollonius’ accusations, concerning Judean “atheism” (2.148). *εὐσέβεια* will be central to Josephus’ description of the constitution (2.151-89), the noun or cognate verb occurring 6 times (2.159, 170, 171, 181, 184, 188; cf. 1.60); see Gerber 1997: 286-95. Its centrality will be documented by: a) the Judean form of government as “theocracy” (1.165, 185, 188); b) Moses’ teaching about God, especially God’s omniscience and providence (2.160, 163, 166-69, 179, 180-81); c) the Judean conviction that the law accords with the will of God (2.160-62, 184); d) the reference of all action to God (2.171, 181); and e) the role of priests at the head of the state (2.185-87). The law-summary is also headed by laws relating to God and the temple (2.190-98).

<sup>538</sup> Greek: *κοινωνία ἡ μετ’ ἀλλήλων*. Although, in the conclusion, *κοινωνία* covers both internal and external relations (contrasted with “misanthropy,” 2.291), here and elsewhere in this segment it is restricted to relations among Judeans; the next virtue concerns relations with outsiders (Berthelot 2003: 356-59). Josephus knows that “fellowship” with non-Judeans is problematic, since it would involve mutuality in all important spheres of life (2.174, 258). But the law properly regulates relations of fellowship among Judeans (2.196, 207-8, 281). The theme is readily transmuted into that of “harmony” (*ὁμόνοια* or *συμφωνία*; see 2.179-81, 283, 194; 2.170; cf. *concordia* in 2.68), since Judeans have both common beliefs and common practices (*κοινὰ ἔργα*, 2.181). “Fellowship” is identified (in 2.208) as the common theme in the second part of the law-summary (2.199-208); see Gerber 1997: 135-36, 188-89 on the relation of these virtues to the summary.

<sup>539</sup> Greek: *ἡ καθόλου φιλανθρωπία*. Central to Apollonius’ critique of Judeans was their alleged “misanthropy” (*μισανθρωπία*, 2.148; cf. 2.258); cf. Lysimachus (1.309) and *Apion* (2.121). Although Judean *φιλανθρωπία* was not given much prominence in *Antiquities* (perhaps in 1.24; on the rarity of the term, see Berthelot 2003: 340-55), it here plays a key role in Josephus’ response. The third part of the law-summary is associated with this virtue (2.213, covering 2.209-14) and it is prominent in 2.260-66; see Gerber 1997: 367-79; Berthelot 2003: 355-83.



as justice,<sup>540</sup> endurance in labors<sup>541</sup> and contempt for death.<sup>542</sup> **147** I appeal to those who will peruse this text to conduct their reading without envy.<sup>543</sup> For I did not choose to write an encomium of ourselves,<sup>544</sup> but I consider this to be the most just form of defense against the many false accusations against us<sup>545</sup>—a defense derived

<sup>540</sup> Greek: δικαιοσύνη, a term naturally associated with law, and prominent in the Greek constitutional tradition. It will feature again in 2.170 and in the conclusion (2.291). Josephus will emphasize the enforcement of the laws (2.185-87), and the strict application of punishment (2.215-17, 292), but the term is given little explicit elaboration (Gerber 1997: 237-38). The attachment of this second trio of virtues to the first by “as well as” (ἔτι δέ) might signal its secondary rank (Rajak 2002: 204), or could suggest that the first was part of Josephus’ literary inheritance, the second his own addition.

<sup>541</sup> Greek: ἡ ἐν τοῖς πόνοις καρτερία. The term καρτερία was identified as a Judean characteristic in 1.182; 2.123; it will reappear in the list of virtues at 2.170. In connection with the threat of death, Josephus uses this word to indicate Judean courage and willingness to die for the sake of the laws (2.272: our ἀνδρεία [“courage”] is in “holding out” [ἐγκαρτερέω] for the laws until the bitter end; cf. 2.225-35, 283; *War* 1.148; 2.580; 3.396; 5.306 [innate to Judeans]; 6.13-14; 7.417). But here the next phrase concerns courage in the face of death, and καρτερία denotes Judean “toughness” in two respects: i) the discipline of observing the laws (2.228-29, with πόνοι and πονέω); and ii) frugality and devotion to hard work (φιλόπονοι, 2.291; cf. 2.281, 283, 291, 294). Cf. its place in the list of Mosaic virtues in Philo, *Mos.* 1.154. Cicero highlights its significance for Romans as *fortitudo in laboribus et periculis* (*Resp.* 2.2); cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.28.1: καρτερία ἢ παρὰ τοὺς πόνους (of the training of Roman citizens).

<sup>542</sup> Greek: θανάτου περιφρόνησις. This theme was previously highlighted in 1.42-43, 190-91, 212, and plays a significant role in what follows, in answer to Apollonius’ charges of “cowardice” and “rashness” (2.148). Judean willingness to die for the laws is emphasized immediately after the law-summary (2.219), and is compared with the Spartans’ in 2.232-35. “Contempt for death” can be regarded as mere recklessness if it is perceived to be pointless or motivated by despair (cf. *War* 3.475; 5.365), but if part of a rational strategy can seem admirable. In his account of the Revolt, Josephus highlights this as a characteristic of Judean fighters, admired by the Romans (*War* 3.356; 5.315, 458; 6.42; 7.388, 406), and practiced by the Romans themselves (*War* 6.33). Although the theme of “noble death” has deep roots in the Greek tradition, and was particularly admired by philosophers (van Henten and

Avemarie 2002), the Romans considered themselves exemplars of this virtue (e.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.3.30 *contemptum doloris ac mortis*; cf. Cicero, *Resp.* 5.9; Bowersock 1995; Barton 2001: 41-47). Roman authors expressly admire other nations who display this virtue: see, e.g., *Bell. Alex.* 15.1 (a Cretan as brave as a Roman); Tacitus, *Germ.* 3, 6, 14 (German bravery in warfare); *Ann.* 2.21; 13.54 (Germans again, on whom see also Josephus in *War* 2.377). In light of this, Tacitus’ comment on the Judeans’ contempt for death (*moriendi contemptus*, *Hist.* 5.5.3) can only be regarded as praise; he connects it to Judean belief in the immortality of souls (as does Josephus, *Apion* 2.218-19). On the Judean tradition of martyrdom, see van Henten 1997; Boyarin 1999.

<sup>543</sup> This is the only direct appeal to readers in *Apion*; it uses the same formula as *Ant.* 1.15. Such an appeal forms an aside to the main discourse, which is resumed in 2.151, although some of the intervening material (especially 2.148) is very important to the segment. This statement constructs the readers of *Apion* as liable to be annoyed by Judean self-praise, and thus, presumably, as non-Judeans (on implied and intended audiences, see Introduction, § 7). Josephus’ fear of “envy” or “begrudging” (φθόνος; cf. 1.213, 222-24) arises from the danger in presenting one’s self or one’s achievements as excellent, and thus invidiously superior (see note to “irksome” at 2.4; cf. *Ant.* 20.266). Rhetoricians developed various ways of deflecting this reaction on the occasions when self-praise was expedient. One of the favorite means, adopted by Josephus, is to blame (real or fictitious) opponents, who forced the speaker into self-defense; cf. Demosthenes, *Cor.* 3-4; Isocrates, *Antid.* 8-13; Plutarch, *Mor.* 539a-540f.

<sup>544</sup> This just about concedes that what follows *does* constitute an encomium (ἐγκώμιον), or at least has many components in that vein; cf. the matching statement in 2.287. Josephus is in no doubt that the Judean tradition is worthy of praise (it is worthy of many encomia, 1.212), but he is conscious of the rhetorical risk in boasting, and presents this as a policy imposed upon him.

<sup>545</sup> The legal metaphor of a defense against charges (an ἀπολογία against κατηγορία) continues to govern Josephus’ discourse, though this is the first use of the term ἀπολογία in this treatise (cf. 2.275). On encomium and apology as twin rhetorical strategies, cf. *Ant.* 16.183-86. On the genre of “apologetic,” see Introduction, § 5.

from the laws<sup>546</sup> in accordance with which we continue to live.<sup>547</sup> **148** Apart from anything else,<sup>548</sup> Apollonius has not arranged his accusations grouped together, like Apion,<sup>549</sup> but in a scattered fashion;<sup>550</sup> in fact he first insults us<sup>551</sup> as atheists<sup>552</sup> and

<sup>546</sup> This is carefully chosen defensive terrain (rather than, for instance, history or philosophy). Josephus is justified in placing law at the center of Judean culture, and is on strong ground in his claim that Judeans are resolutely faithful to their laws.

<sup>547</sup> Greek: καθ' οὗς ζῶντες διατελοῦμεν. The point here is not just faithfulness in general (see 2.150 below), but the preservation of the ancient Mosaic laws to the present day (cf. 2.221). Some observers, with mixed opinions of Judeans, imagined that the original Mosaic laws had been corrupted by later changes or additions: see, e.g., Strabo 16.2.37 (echoing Posidonius?); Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1. For Josephus, however, it is essential to emphasize unchanging continuity through 2,000 years (2.225-28).

<sup>548</sup> Greek: ἄλλως τε καὶ. Josephus uses this elsewhere in the sense “above all” (*War* 2.324; 4.374; 6.200).

<sup>549</sup> On Apion’s arrangement of his material, see note to “up” at 2.6.

<sup>550</sup> Greek: σποράδην (used of Moses’ legacy in *Ant.* 4.197). This justifies the tactic announced in 2.147: Josephus will not respond to Apollonius point by point, as he did with Apion, but must arrange his material in his own way. Our evidence is too slight to be able to determine the context and purpose of Apollonius’ criticism of Judeans. Apart from what Josephus reports in this treatise, we have only a single excerpt in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.19.1-3, an account of Judean origins by reference to Abraham and his offspring. In introducing this, Eusebius speaks of “Molon, who composed the invective (συσκευη) against the Judeans.” But this (non-literary) term does not help determine the genre of the work, which Eusebius knew only second-hand, via Alexander Polyhistor. Eusebius’ extract looks like the *origo* section of an ethnographical account, and is not negative in its assessment of Judeans (see Bar-Kochva 1999-2000a). But it is unlikely that Apollonius would write a complete ethnographic treatise about Judeans if he considered them worthless (2.148), and there are clues that his work compared different nations and their customs (2. 150, 270, regarding the Persians). The context for his statements about Judeans may have been a comparative treatment of the origins and customs of “eastern” nations, judged by the criteria of the Greek intellectual tradition. His comments about Judeans need not have been driven by any specific “anti-Judean” bias, and if the work was arranged by topic, rather than nation, they would have been scattered, as Josephus says, not gathered in a sepa-

rate section or book (see Stern 1.148-49).

<sup>551</sup> In L, followed by Münster, the Greek (up to “misanthropes”) reads: καὶ δὴ εἶπας ποτὲ μὲν ὡς ἄθεοι καὶ μισανθρώπους λοιδορεῖ. The εἶπας (“having spoken”) appears redundant and/or corrupt. Niese suggests that a phrase is missing (something to contrast with “atheists,” as cowardice later stands in contrast to rashness). Ed. princ. supplements differently, reading διὰ πάσης τῆς συγγραφῆς (“through the whole composition”) in place of δὴ εἶπας (followed tentatively by Thackeray). Reinach emends εἶπας to ἡμᾶς (“us”). λοιδορέω (“insult”) will recur in 2.236 (cf. 2.290, 295).

<sup>552</sup> Greek: ἄθεοι. In Apollonius’ critique, the term (if it is his) probably denotes not an intellectual conviction (on the non-existence of God/Gods; cf. 2.180; Philo, *Spec.* 1.32) but a practical orientation (paying the Gods no regard, or disrespecting them in conspicuous ways; cf. Josephus on John of Gischala, *War* 5.566). From elsewhere we can deduce that Apollonius was outraged by the non-participation of Judeans in common religious cult (“we do not worship the same Gods as other people,” 2.79, cf. 2.117) and by their religious exclusivity (2.258). He apparently contrasted Judeans with the Persians who, despite their wars against the Greeks, at least shared with them a common piety (2.270). The label thus represents, in an extreme form, the charge of “impiety,” of which Josephus shows sensitivity elsewhere (*War* 4.414; *Ant.* 3.179-80; 12.125); it constitutes one of the most serious charges in antiquity (cf. Judeans as θεομισεῖς in Philo, *Legat.* 353). “Atheism” had particular resonance in Josephus’ own context in Rome. According to Dio (68.1.2), in Domitian’s reign charges of “impiety” and adopting the Judean lifestyle were leveled against prominent figures; Flavius Clemens and Domitilla were specifically accused of “atheism” (ἀθεότης) and drifting into Judean ways (67.14.12; see Smallwood 1956; Williams 1990; Barclay 1996a: 311-12; Introduction § 6). Tacitus is offended by proselytes who, in adopting Judean culture, learn to “despise the Gods” (*Hist.* 5.5.2), though the charge is not leveled at Judeans themselves (5.5.4). For Apollonius, the Judeans’ refusal to participate in common social and civic cults characterized their culture as inherently impious, as offensive to the Gods as to humans. The charge would later be deployed against Christians (e.g., *Mart. Pol.* 3.2; Justin, *1 Apol.* 6.1; Lucian, *Alex.* 38; see Harnack 1905; Fascher 1963). Josephus has already begun to defuse it by stressing Judean piety (2.146).

misanthropes,<sup>553</sup> and then reproaches us for cowardice,<sup>554</sup> and elsewhere, by contrast, accuses us of rashness and recklessness.<sup>555</sup> He says we are also the most untalented of barbarians<sup>556</sup> and for this reason the only ones to have contributed no invention of use to human life.<sup>557</sup> **149** All this I consider will be clearly and thor-

<sup>553</sup> Greek: μισάνθρωποι. The charge is expressed more specifically in 2.258, where it concerns both religious exclusivity and general inhospitality to non-Judeans. Josephus has already opposed this with a claim to Judean benevolence (φιλιανθρωπία, 2.146), and will devote 2.236-86 to this awkward issue. On the spread and cultural significance of the charge, see note to “Greeks” at 2.121; for further analysis of Apollonius’ accusation, see notes to 2.258 and Berthelot 2003: 144-50.

<sup>554</sup> Greek: δειλία. Josephus has already acclaimed Judean endurance and contempt for death (2.146) and provides no explanatory context for Apollonius’ charge. Troiani (179) connects this to the Judean sabbath rest which allowed the capture of Jerusalem (cf. 1.209-11), but that is more likely to evoke charges of laziness or superstition. Bar Kochva 2000: 29-31 (cf. the longer version, Bar Kochva 1999-2000a) suggests that Apollonius turns Posidonius’ account of Moses’ pacific constitution (*apud* Strabo 16.2.36) into an illustration of military cowardice. But the connection with Posidonius is uncertain, and the hypothesis of rivalry between the two authors is insecure (Berthelot 2003: 148-50). It is more likely that Apollonius drew an inference from the fact that the Judeans had made no significant territorial conquests, but were subject to a succession of empires (cf. Apion in 2.125). He apparently contrasted Judean cowardice with Persian courage (2.270), and may have argued that, when they did fight, Judeans were too reckless to turn warfare into conquest (see below). Josephus in reply (2.219-35, 272) argues that courage in warfare is as nothing compared to Judean bravery under torture, a bravery devoted to the preservation of the law (2.272, 292).

<sup>555</sup> Greek: τόλμαν κατηγορεῖ καὶ ἀπόνοιαν. Josephus suggests that Apollonius’ charges are self-contradictory (cf. 1.4). τόλμα can mean, in a good sense, “daring,” “audacity,” or “valor.” Josephus sometimes uses it in this positive sense in his *War* (e.g., 3.149, 176, 228, 452, 498; 4.504, 558; 6.17—as a Judean characteristic); cf. the unambiguous εὐτολμία (*War* 3.25; 5.324). But it can also have the derogatory sense of mere bravado, a pointless and undisciplined rashness, especially if associated with fear, despair or recklessness (e.g., *War* 3.22; 4.133; 6.143, 152; the latter term, ἀπόνοια, is found in this connection in *War* 5.121, 316; 6.350; 7.213, 417, etc.). A common trope in Josephus’ *War* is the contrast between Judean reck-

lessness in warfare and the Roman characteristics of experience, control, and discipline: see, e.g., *War* 3.152-53, 475-79; 4.424-25; 5.285 (a rare exception); cf. 3.14-15, 209-12. At one point Josephus indicates that this is the typical Roman perception of “barbarians” (*War* 4.45-47). Since Romans could rarely bring themselves to admit that others could be as “courageous” as themselves, they typically explained others’ daring as mere recklessness, and attributed their own success to superiority in *real* courage. Tacitus often demonstrates this Roman disdain of others’ fighting methods, and not infrequently comments that native fighters show initial bravado, but back away in timidity once they encounter Roman arms, or start to lose the battle: the Chatti thus display speed in mounted attacks, but timidity in engagement (*Germ.* 30), the Gauls show *audacia* in seeking out danger, *formido* in facing it (*Agr.* 11; cf. *Ann.* 1.68; 2.14; Josephus, *War* 3.479). Apollonius’ accusations may reflect a presumption of “barbarian” inferiority in warfare, supplemented by accounts of Judean self-sacrifice for the law (cf. 1.209-11). Josephus will reply that Judeans are not only brave, but also rational and disciplined: their courage has a specific aim in the defense of Judean laws (2.219-35, 272, 292). Cf. Philo’s insistence that Judeans’ willingness to die for the law is not, as some allege, the effect of a “barbarian mindset” but the product of a free and noble choice (*Legat.* 215).

<sup>556</sup> Greek: ἀφύεστατοι τῶν βαρβάρων. The adjective appears only here in Josephus and the whole phrase may derive from Apollonius. The term βάρβαρος here conveys cultural disdain and presumes Greek superiority (see note to “Greeks” at 1.58).

<sup>557</sup> Apion’s similar accusation (2.135) may have been drawn from Apollonius; on the cultural import of this charge, see note to “intellectuals” at 2.135, with Thraede 1962a and 1962b. Josephus offers several forms of reply: a) an appeal to the Judean heroes described in *Antiquities* (*Apion* 2.136); b) an argument that a lack of inventiveness/change is a virtue, not a cultural weakness (2.182-83); c) a general claim, never fully defended, that Moses was in fact the first to create legislation, and the first to introduce “philosophical” ideas about God (2.154-56, 168, 257, 279-86). This last leads to the grand conclusion that the first invention (πρώτη εὑρεσις) of the central virtues can be attributed to Judeans (2.295). Thus Josephus can have it both ways: Judeans invented/discovered nearly everything

oughly refuted if both what is commanded by our laws<sup>558</sup> and what we practice with all scrupulosity<sup>559</sup> are shown to be the opposite of his claims.<sup>560</sup> **150** Now if I am forced to mention other peoples' laws of a contrary kind,<sup>561</sup> it would be fair to lay the blame for this on those who see fit to compare ours as inferior.<sup>562</sup> Two claims will, I think, be denied them: either that we do not have these laws, of which I will cite the most essential,<sup>563</sup> or that we do not, above all others,<sup>564</sup> remain faithful to our own laws.<sup>565</sup>

*Josephus' procedure*

**(2.15) 151** To resume my discourse from a little way back,<sup>566</sup> I would say this first of all.<sup>567</sup> In comparison with those who live a lawless and disordered life, those who have become enthusiasts for order and social law,<sup>568</sup> and were the first to begin on

*The value of a lawful life*

others count good, but are not known as “inventors” because, once established, they kept their constitution unchanged.

<sup>558</sup> This argument can only work if, as Josephus claims, the Judeans' laws covered, comprehensively, all aspects of their lives (2.171).

<sup>559</sup> This is an important supplement, since it is crucial to claim that Judeans both have good laws and keep them (see at 2.150). “Scrupulosity” translates ἀκριβεία, an important term in this treatise, with a range of nuance. In connection with history and historiography, it means accuracy in fact-finding and truth-telling (1.15, 18, 29, 32, 36, 41, 53, 67, 92, 112, 230; 2.15, 17, 287). In connection with the law, it is used to describe its scrupulous or meticulous observance (apart from here, 2.144, 227), close supervision (2.187), and detailed learning (2.175, 257).

<sup>560</sup> Although only some of what follows is *structured* by the charges of 2.148, they are all met either directly or indirectly in the encomium of 2.151-286: “atheists” by demonstration of Judean piety (2.157-89, 190-98); “misanthropes” by proof of Judean benevolence (2.209-14; all of 2.236-86 is related to the charge of 2.258); “cowardice” and “recklessness” by reference to Judean rational courage (2.219-35, 271-78); and “lack of invention” by the double claim of Judean conservatism and Mosaic originality (2.182-83; 2.156, 168, 257, 279-86).

<sup>561</sup> Comparisons recur throughout this segment (2.151-286), as is traditional in the Greek discussion of constitutions. Even in the least polemical section (2.151-89), almost every paragraph contains some point of comparison, designed to show Judean superiority. The most sustained comparison is with the Spartan constitution (2.225-35, 273-75).

<sup>562</sup> As again later (2.238, 287), Josephus deflects potential criticism for his numerous negative judgments, placing the responsibility on his critics (cf. 2.147; Demosthenes, *Cor.* 4). Apollonius is particularly in mind, since he compared Judeans negatively with other “barbarian” peoples (2.148), including the Persians (2.270). But this is also rhetorically convenient.

The use of comparison (σύγκρισις) is standard in encomia, and is not always motivated by counter examples (see, e.g., 2.163).

<sup>563</sup> Greek: τοὺς κεφαλαιωδεστάτους. This is Josephus' only use of the adjective κεφαλαιώδης. Elsewhere, the adverb κεφαλαιωδῶς means “in summary form” (1.183; 2.164; *War* 4.496; *Ant.* 12.245), but the adjective denotes something “chief” or “principal” and here, in the superlative, means the most essential, or the most important, laws. The reference is primarily to the selection of laws in 2.190-218.

<sup>564</sup> The phrase (μάλιστα πάντων) recurs in 2.295. The alteration or abandonment of laws is attributed to others in 2.182, 225-31 (Spartans), 273-75.

<sup>565</sup> Remaining faithful (ἐμμένω) is a leitmotiv of this treatise: 1.42; 2.123, 144, 150, 153, 182, 221, 257, 278. The theme is developed in 2.219-35, as soon as Josephus has completed his selection of the laws.

<sup>566</sup> Presumably from the end of 2.146, taking 2.147-50 as a digression, with its appeal to readers for tolerance. Müller (289) takes the whole of 2.145-50 as the digression; cf. Gerber 1997: 137.

<sup>567</sup> Josephus begins this paragraph with general principles concerning the value of law and order, the merits of temporal priority, and the virtues of legislators and their subjects (2.151-53). None of these points is argued for, but they are taken for granted as common cultural assumptions. The abstract, ahistorical tone gives the following discussion the air of a properly theoretical treatment.

<sup>568</sup> Law is immediately associated with “order” (τάξις), since one of Josephus' main themes will be the comprehensive *control* of Judean life (2.173-74). “Social law” (νόμος κοινωνίας) echoes the emphasis on “fellowship” (κοινωνία) in 2.146. It was common in the Greek and Roman tradition to trace the birth of civilization in the emergence of humanity from its wild and bestial past, through the development of speech, law, justice, religion, and social compact: see, e.g., Isocrates, *Bus.* 24-25; Diodorus 1.8.1; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.148. The narrative could contain ambivalent elements, however, if the primitive state is also one of innocence, before



that course,<sup>569</sup> may reasonably be acknowledged to excel in cultured behavior<sup>570</sup> and natural virtue.<sup>571</sup> **152** Of course, each attempts to trace their legislation back to the most ancient point in time,<sup>572</sup> so as to appear not to imitate others<sup>573</sup> but themselves to have instructed others how to live in a lawful manner.<sup>574</sup> **153** Such being the case, it is the virtue of a legislator to recognize what is best<sup>575</sup> and to win consent to the laws he lays down from those who will make use of them;<sup>576</sup> and it is the virtue of the people to remain faithful<sup>577</sup> to all that has been approved and to make no alterations,<sup>578</sup> either in favorable or in adverse circumstances. **154** Well, I maintain that our legislator exceeds in antiquity the legislators referred to anywhere else.<sup>579</sup> The

the corruption of wealth, competition, and war (cf. Plato, *Leg.* 676a–679e). Josephus does not expound this theme in narrative terms: that might imply that the period of the patriarchs, before Moses, was lawless or uncivilized.

<sup>569</sup> The question of priority will emerge as the dominant theme of this paragraph (2.152, 154–56); it relates to Apollonius' claim that Judeans had contributed no useful invention to humanity (2.148).

<sup>570</sup> Greek: ἡμερότης. The term can be used of “domesticated” animals (cf. 2.137–38) and “cultivated” trees (2.212). With regard to humanity, it means the friendliness of “civilized” or “cultured” society (cf. 2.213; *War* 7.70, 264). The cognate verb is used of Osiris in Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 356a–b: he freed Egyptians from their brutish life, introducing agriculture, law, and religion, before similarly “civilizing” the rest of the world.

<sup>571</sup> Greek: φύσεως ἀρετή. The phrase is somewhat obscure: “nature” is undefined, but presumably refers to human nature. One could disagree about whether humans were “naturally” inclined to savagery or sociable good-order. The phrase may echo Plato's dispute with Pindar over whether lawful behavior (Plato) or the rule of might (Pindar) is “according to nature” (*Leg.* 690c, 890a).

<sup>572</sup> “Of course” (ἀμέλει) recognizes the existence of multiple claims, but hints that some may be self-interested and spurious. Moses' priority, however, is said to be universally acknowledged (2.156). Josephus does not discuss the relative dating of the claimants to the status of “first legislator.” He is content to make his claim here with relatively slight argumentation (2.154–55), then leaves it hovering over the following discussion (cf. 2.168, 226), until its climactic restatement at the end (2.279–81, 293–95). Greeks claimed Demeter, and Egyptians Isis, to be the first “bringer of laws” (Diodorus 1.14.3).

<sup>573</sup> L and Latin curiously have this the other way around (“so as to appear to imitate others and not themselves to have instructed ...”), but S rightly corrects the text and all modern editors follow suit. Imitation is taken to signal a recognition of cultural inferiority:

those who copy acknowledge the superior value of another's tradition (cf. Josephus on Greeks imitating Judean culture, 1.162–66; 2.168, 279–86). In some cases cultural pride could be preserved if the template was universally esteemed (e.g., Greek borrowing from Egypt), or if one could claim to have *improved* what one borrowed (Cicero, *Resp.* 2.30). But the presumption that first is best drives the ancient obsession with proving that one's own were the first inventors (see Pilhofer 1990; note to “intellectuals” at 2.135).

<sup>574</sup> The matter is put in general terms, but by the end Josephus will claim this specifically of Judeans: not only have their individual laws been widely influential (2.282–86), but they have taught others the ideal of “obeying laws” (2.293–94).

<sup>575</sup> Not all can be first, but they can at least exercise this other virtue, to detect and select what is best in others' systems; cf. the failure of Greek legislators in this regard, 2.250. On Moses' realization of what is best see 2.159–60, though he learns this from God and from his own experience, not from others' constitutions.

<sup>576</sup> “Win consent” translates the Greek verb πείθω, indicating persuasion (rather than force). The verb will be repeated in connection with Moses' policy and success in 2.156, 160 (first he persuades himself), 166, 169, and, in the passive, of the people being persuaded (2.158, 184) and obedient (2.226, 293). Where other legislators are the subject of the same verb, they use dubious means (2.162) or produce deleterious results (2.248). The question of how legislators should commend and impose their laws was integral to the Greek discussion on constitutions; see, e.g., Plato, *Leg.* 663b–c.

<sup>577</sup> Greek: ἐμμένω; see note to “laws” at 2.150.

<sup>578</sup> Greek: μηδὲν μεταβάλλειν. Josephus uses a set of closely related terms concerning change or alteration, in all cases hailing Judeans as paragons of conservatism: μεταβάλλω and cognates (apart from here, 2.221, 227–28); μετατίθημι and cognates (1.42; 2.155, 189, 225); μετακινέω and cognates (2.169, 184, 234, 254, 272). On the principle of conservatism, with Platonic echoes, see 2.182–84 with notes.

<sup>579</sup> Although the claim looks universal, only Greek

Lycurgus,<sup>580</sup> and Solons,<sup>581</sup> and Zaleukos, the legislator of the Locrians,<sup>582</sup> and all those admired by the Greeks<sup>583</sup> seem to have been but “yesterday or the day before”<sup>584</sup> compared to him, which is why not even the term “law” was known among the Greeks of old.<sup>585</sup> **155** Homer is witness to this, since he nowhere uses the term in his poem.<sup>586</sup> For there was no such thing in his day:<sup>587</sup> the masses were governed

legislators will be listed (cf. Cicero, *Leg.* 1.57). Elsewhere Josephus insists on the far greater antiquity of Egyptian, Chaldean, and Phoenician records (1.8, 28), but never refers to their legislative traditions. Greeks regularly spoke of their legislators learning from Egyptian prototypes (e.g., Herodotus 2.177; Diodorus 1.77, 79), and Egyptians traced their laws back to Mneves (Diodorus 1.94.1) or even Osiris (Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 356a). Other nations also claimed ancient legal codes (e.g., Zalmoxis, the fabled legislator of the Getae, Diodorus 1.94.2; the Roman Twelve Tables) which go unmentioned here, and like all his contemporaries, Josephus was unaware of the legal codes of Mesopotamia (e.g., the laws of Hammurabi), which stretch back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE. It was not particularly controversial to place Moses alongside other ancient legislators (cf. Strabo 16.2.35-38; Diodorus 1.94.1-2), though only Judeans would promote him as the *most* ancient. That claim depends, of course, on the “pre-critical” assumption that the biblical laws go back to Moses, and that his era was that of an exodus event 2,000 years before Josephus’ day (*Ant.* 1.16; *Apion* 2.226).

<sup>580</sup> The plural here, and for Solon, indicates the inclusion of others of his sort (cf. Draco in 1.21; Minos in 2.161; cf. *War* 2.156 for the plural of mythical figures). Lycurgus (cf. 2.225) is a shadowy historical figure (perhaps of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE), to whom Spartans attributed their distinctive constitution (according to some, brought from Crete, Herodotus 1.65-66), and around whom the whole corpus of Spartan laws, and many legends, were gathered (see Plutarch, *Lycurgus*). His date was a matter of uncertainty in antiquity (Cicero, *Resp.* 2.18; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 1), but was generally considered to lie in the 9<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE (cf. MacDowell 1986: 1-2).

<sup>581</sup> The poet and (in 594 BCE) archon of Athens whose wide-ranging reforms of Athenian law established him in later memory as the founding father of Athenian democracy (see Raaflaub 2000: 39-42 with literature). Josephus knew that Draco was an earlier Athenian legislator (1.21), but omits him here. Since Solon’s laws were inscribed on pillars, they became the public reference point for the Athenian constitution; his legacy, highly contested, was manipulated and invented for competing political programs in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE.

<sup>582</sup> Zaleukos was reputed to have provided a legal

code for the Locrian colony in Locri Epizephyrii (south Italy, modern Gerace) in the mid-7<sup>th</sup> century BCE. His laws were famously strict (including the *lex talionis*), but much admired in some quarters (Plato, *Leg.* 638b; Diodorus 12.19-21; Seneca, *Ep.* 90.6). For doubt on his existence, see Cicero, *Leg.* 2.14-15.

<sup>583</sup> The habit of attributing laws to a brilliant figure in antiquity boosted civic pride and supported conservative tendencies: the more famous the legislator, the more fixed were his laws in tradition and practice.

<sup>584</sup> For the expression, cf. 2.14, comparing Pythagoras with Moses, and 1.7, with note to “before.” It is one of many echoes in this segment of Plato’s *Laws* (here 677d): in the history of laws and constitutions, Greek contributions date back less than 1,000 years, that is, to only “yesterday or the day before.”

<sup>585</sup> On its absence from Homer, see next note. It is first found in Hesiod (7<sup>th</sup> century BCE), e.g., *Theog.* 66, 417 (cf. Pindar in Herodotus 3.38: “νόμος is the king of all”), but the early usage covers the senses “convention,” “custom,” and “practice,” as well as “law” in its technical meaning. In Athens, Draco’s laws were known by another term (θεσμοί, *pace* Josephus in 1.21), while Solon’s were called νόμοι (for the emergence and use of the term, see Ostwald 1969). Josephus commits a classic error, confusing the absence of a term with the absence of the phenomenon it is later used to describe.

<sup>586</sup> For Homer as the earliest Greek author, and thus best witness to earliest Greek usage, see 1.12. Homer has another word for laws, θέμιστες (e.g., *Od.* 9.112), but the absence of the word νόμος was probably noted before Josephus. Plato did not conclude that there were no laws in the world Homer described: while citing Homer’s depiction of the savage, lawless Cyclops, he depicts Troy as a city that had advanced to the third stage in the emergence of law (*Leg.* 680a-682d). Josephus finds νόμος in the writings of Moses only because he knows the Greek translation of the Pentateuch.

<sup>587</sup> For the logical fallacy, see note to “old” at 2.154. Josephus never precisely defines the phenomenon of “law,” but from the following description of alternatives it seems to denote rules that are precise, written (and thus, on both counts, fixed), and collectively recognized (not simply imposed). His perception is broadly parallel to that of Plato and other theorists on the essence of laws: the following comments paral-

by imprecise maxims and the dictates of kings,<sup>588</sup> and continued thereafter for a long period<sup>589</sup> employing unwritten customs, and altered many of these continuously according to circumstance.<sup>590</sup> **156** But our legislator, who was most ancient<sup>591</sup>—for such, I suppose, is admitted even by those who say wholly negative things about us<sup>592</sup>—showed himself to be the best governor and adviser for the masses<sup>593</sup> and, having encompassed<sup>594</sup> the whole structure of their life with the law,<sup>595</sup> won their consent to accept it,<sup>596</sup> and made provision that it should be maintained very securely for ever.<sup>597</sup>

lel in theme (though not in vocabulary) Plato’s depiction of society before written laws, as governed by customs and “ancestral laws” (*Leg.* 680a). Homer’s poems probably describe conditions in the late 9<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE (see Raaflaub 2000).

<sup>588</sup> Greek: γνώμαις ἀορίστοις ... καὶ προσταγμάσι τῶν βασιλέων. Maxims are generalized and un-specific, and even less valuable if they are imprecise (contrast Moses’ laws, 2.171). The royal dictates are, presumably, imposed arbitrarily, and thus cannot compare with the work of a legislator who requires public consent. In what follows Moses has no regal characteristics, and seeks only the good of the masses (2.157-59).

<sup>589</sup> Cf. the imprecision in dating in 1.103-4. Josephus has no secure dating, and no chronological framework in which to place Homer and the earliest Greek legislators.

<sup>590</sup> The language resembles, in reverse, the virtue of the people, in 2.153. The matter could be understood otherwise: the unwritten laws (e.g., the duty to bury the dead) are divinely ordained and fixed, while the written laws are necessarily revised as historical circumstances change (cf. Plutarch, *Lyc.* 13.3).

<sup>591</sup> Greek: ὁ δ’ ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης ἀρχαιότατος γεγονώς. This can be taken in a weaker sense (“who was extremely ancient”), or a stronger (“who was the most ancient”). The ambiguity may be deliberate, to avoid overstating the consensus; it is preserved in this translation.

<sup>592</sup> Josephus half-asserts and half-presumes a consensus on this matter, and thus excuses himself from having to prove the point (see note to “time” at 2.152). The claim is at odds with the complaint that critics doubt whether the Judean nation is ancient (1.3), a doubt against which the first Part of this treatise is directed (1.6-218). In fact, most writers did place Moses in the relatively distant past. Of those mentioned in this treatise, Manetho’s first story has no reference to Moses, though Josephus took him to refer to the exodus, and thus to date Moses to the time of Tethmosis, and 1,000 years before the Trojan War (1.103-4; 2.16). Manetho’s second tale has Osarsiph/Moses in the time of Amenophis (undated by Josephus; on our reckoning

in the 14<sup>th</sup> century BCE). Chaeremon has Tisithen/Moses in the same reign. Lysimachus puts Moses in the reign of Bocchoris, which Josephus takes to be 1,700 years before his era (2.16), but is better placed in the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Apion follows suit, and dates the exodus more precisely to 752 BCE (2.17). Molon’s dating is not recorded (2.16), although it would have been the most relevant to this context. Other authors, not mentioned by Josephus, similarly date Moses to the distant, and sometimes very distant, past. Hecataeus places him in the archaic period, contemporary with Cadmus and Danaus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3). Diodorus elsewhere puts Moses alongside other ancient legislators (1.94.1-2; cf. Strabo 16.2.36-39). Ptolemy of Mendes (*apud* Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 38) appears to have dated Moses to the reign of Amosis and Inachus (the earliest figure in Greek legend), and Polemo of Ilium (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10.15) to the time of Apis, grandson of Inachus. Tacitus follows Lysimachus and Apion in aligning Moses with the reign of Bocchoris (*Hist.* 5.3.1), and these three thus constitute the latest dating of Moses, the mid-8<sup>th</sup> century BCE. That would place him alongside Lycurgus and Zaleukos (as traditionally dated). Josephus ignores here the variety in dates he had himself highlighted in 2.16-17.

<sup>593</sup> In rounding off this paragraph, Josephus introduces the themes of the next. These titles will recur in 2.158-59, and emphasize that Moses’ rule was not tyrannical, but directed towards the welfare of the masses.

<sup>594</sup> Reading περιλαβών (cf. Latin *constringens*), the emendation of Bekker adopted by all modern editors.

<sup>595</sup> The comprehensiveness of the law will be an important theme: cf. 2.166 (God surveys everything) and 2.171-74 (the law covers every aspect of life).

<sup>596</sup> The virtue of the legislator (2.153); on winning consent see note to “them” at 2.153.

<sup>597</sup> Reading εἰς αἰί with Excerpta and all modern editors; this is the virtue of the people (2.153). On Moses’ means to ensure this, see 2.169-71. The verb here translated “maintain” (φυλάττω) is found in this and compound form (διαφυλάττω) throughout the treatise, as one of the central terms for Judean conservatism: 1.60, 212; 2.156, 184, 189, 194, 218, 227, 237,

(2.16) 157 Let us consider the first display of greatness among his deeds.<sup>598</sup> When our ancestors decided, on leaving Egypt, to return to their native land,<sup>599</sup> he took charge of them in all their myriads and brought them through many impossible situations to safety.<sup>600</sup> For they had to travel through a waterless and extensive desert,<sup>601</sup> to defeat their enemies,<sup>602</sup> and to save their children, their wives, and their plunder all together, while fighting.<sup>603</sup> 158 In all this he was an excellent general,<sup>604</sup> an extremely prudent adviser,<sup>605</sup> and a most reliable guardian of every person.<sup>606</sup> He ren-

Moses' achievements

254, 272, 278, 281 (of Greeks, in appearance only), 295. Its semantic range also includes “preserve,” “observe,” and “safeguard.”

<sup>598</sup> The Greek is awkward to translate: ἴδωμεν δὲ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ τὸ πρῶτον μεγαλεῖον. This paragraph (2.157-63) will describe the character and achievements of Moses, in order to refute the charge cited in 2.145 (echoed in 2.161). It will focus especially on his *deeds* (his achievements in leadership) and his *convictions* (regarding law and God). The deeds will be noted in 2.157 (cf. 2.160, “great deeds”), his plans and convictions in 2.158-59. In the Greek tradition a great legislator hardly needed great military achievements to his credit, but Josephus is drawing on a Judean tradition extolling Moses for his military, political, and legislative roles; for his depiction of Moses in general see Feldman 1988a: 374-442. He had earlier supplemented the biblical narrative with a Judean legend of Moses’ campaign in Ethiopia (*Ant.* 2.238-53); other Judean sources indicate the extent of this legendary tradition (e.g. Ezekiel, *Exagoge*; Artapanus; Philo, *Vita Mosis*). Josephus will here repeat some themes from his narrative in *Ant.* bks 2-4 (for specific encomia see *Ant.* 2.205, 216, 229-31, 268; 3.73-74; 4.327-31), though without explicit reference to miracles (see Gerber 1997: 263). There are also parallels with *Hypoth.* 6.2-9: that text gives an apologetic account of Moses’ leadership, refuting the charge of “charlatan” (γόης, cf. *Apion* 2.145, 161), stressing his care for the people, and concluding with comment on their obedience to his laws. On the relationship between these two texts, see Appendix 5; individual verbal parallels are noted below.

<sup>599</sup> The departure from Egypt is their own decision, not a matter of expulsion (cf. 2.289; *Hypoth.* 6.1, offering variant accounts). Judea is emphatically their native land (ἡ πατριος γῆ; cf. 2.289: ἡ οἰκεῖα γῆ; 1.212; 2.277: ἡ πατρις; *Hypoth.* 6.1: ἡ πατριος καὶ ἀρχαία γῆ). On Josephus’ depiction of the “land,” see note to “possess” at 1.1.

<sup>600</sup> On the numbers (about 600,000) see *Ant.* 2.317; 3.288; 4.11. The “many impossible situations” (πολλὰ καὶ ἀμήχανα; cf. *Hypoth.* 6.4: τσαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα ἄτοπα) include crossing the Red Sea, and the lack of water and food in the desert (*Ant.* 2.320-3.62; ἀμήχανος is used in *Ant.* 2.332). Josephus uses the adject-

ive πολὺς three times in this section (“all their myriads,” “many impossible situations,” “extensive desert”), as Moses’ achievements are generalized and praised in the highest terms. The theme of safety/salvation (σωτηρία; σώζειν) is prominent in *Ant.* bks 3-4 (see note to “security” at 2.159); the verb used here (διασώζειν) is also found in *Hypoth.* 6.2.

<sup>601</sup> The aridity of the desert is also emphasized in 1.277; 2.25; cf. *Ant.* 3.1-10, 33 (and *Hypoth.* 6.2). Josephus does not indicate how long the desert journey took, since that might suggest Moses’ incompetence (or, with explanation, God’s anger with the Israelites).

<sup>602</sup> Reading πολεμῖους, Froben’s emendation of L (πολέμους), accepted by all modern editors. On the wars in the desert see note to “them” at 2.23.

<sup>603</sup> For the women and children see, e.g., *Ant.* 3.5, 50, 78. The plunder (λεῖα) is probably not the spoils from Egypt (*pace* Reinach, 85, n.1; despite Philo, *Mos.* 1.140-42); Josephus considers that properly gifts, not spoils (*Ant.* 2.314). There was plenty of plunder gained in subsequent battles (e.g., *Ant.* 4.99, 162-64). The final phrase (hanging at the end of the sentence; cf. 2.23) emphasizes the difficulty of the task: it was hard enough to survive, let alone in such hostile circumstances.

<sup>604</sup> As is frequently emphasized in *Ant.* bk 3 (cf. 2.238-53). Josephus could have developed this point considerably, from his own experience of generalship, but it is less relevant to his argument than the next two roles, which stress Moses’ concern for the people.

<sup>605</sup> Greek: σύμβουλος συνετώτατος. The noun is not used of Moses in *Antiquities.*, but is prominent here (2.156; cf. God as Moses’ adviser in 2.160); the cognate verb was used in the paraphrase of Lysimachus (1.309). Wisdom is frequently attributed to Moses in *Ant.* bks 3-4 (e.g., 3.12; 4.328; cf. *Hypoth.* 6.4).

<sup>606</sup> Greek: πάντων κηδεμῶν ἀληθέστατος. The noun is used of Moses in *Ant.* 3.98; 4.321 (cf. Philo, *Mos.* 2.166, 291); the same noun and cognate verb are applied to God in *Ant.* 3.190; 4.2; 7.380. Josephus lays stress on Moses’ unselfish commitment to the people, a theme frequently emphasized in *Ant.* bks 3-4 (e.g., 3.188-90, 298; 4.177-78, 194, 316) and now developed in the following sentences.



dered the whole mass [of the people] dependent upon himself<sup>607</sup> and, winning their consent on every matter,<sup>608</sup> did not use this for any self-aggrandizement,<sup>609</sup> but, in precisely that situation where leaders assume powers and tyrannies, and accustom the masses to a life of complete lawlessness,<sup>610</sup> **159** although established in such a powerful position, he, by contrast, considered it his duty to display piety<sup>611</sup> and to provide for the peoples<sup>612</sup> a complete system of good laws.<sup>613</sup> In this way he thought he would best demonstrate his own excellence<sup>614</sup> and provide the safest form of security<sup>615</sup> for those who had made him their leader.<sup>616</sup> **160** With such a fine decision,<sup>617</sup> and after the successful outcome of some great deeds,<sup>618</sup> he naturally concluded that

<sup>607</sup> For Josephus this is a good quality, as it means the people will follow his excellent advice; cf. the comments on Moses' authority in *Ant.* 3.317-22 and *Hypoth.* 6.8. As he goes on to say, this is a position Moses could have abused, but did not. From another perspective, the Judeans' unflinching loyalty to Moses (and his laws) could be criticized as a form of servility or irrationality. Hecataeus' depiction of Judeans prostrating themselves at the reading of the law (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.6) is, in a Greek framework, uncomplimentary (rightly, Gruen 1998: 51-52); cf. Agatharchides in *Apion* 1.209-11. Moses' special authority over Judeans is also the subject of cynical comment by Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.4.1), while Juvenal is not impressed by the "fear" and "slavery" practiced by Judeans in relation to Moses' book (*Sat.* 14.101-2). Josephus can hardly apologize for Judean obedience to Moses' laws, but he will insist that Moses had the people's interests at heart, not his own.

<sup>608</sup> L has an additional phrase, "instead of ordering," which is absent from Latin and best omitted (so Niese and subsequent editors). For the consent theme (here πείθω in the passive), see note to "them" at 2.153. For examples where Moses wins over the (angry) masses, see *Ant.* 3.13, 316; 4.25; their proper attitude is to commit themselves to him (*Ant.* 4.10). Josephus omits mention of the doubts and complaints in the biblical account, and the rebellions against Moses' authority, although these had been amply recorded in *Ant.* bks 3-4.

<sup>609</sup> Greek: πλεονεξία, also eschewed by Judeans as a nation (2.272, 292). This distinguished Moses from the figure of the "charlatan" (2.145, 161). *Ant.* bks 3-4 repeatedly note Moses' integrity and unselfishness: he gave due credit to others (*Ant.* 3.73-74; 4.157-58), allowed Aaron to be high-priest (3.190-91), and remained a commoner, exceptional only in his care for the people (3.212-13). Korah's rebellion provides an opportunity to stress these virtues (4.40-46).

<sup>610</sup> Greek: ἀνομία, whose opposite will be noted in the next section. For the lawless character of tyrants see *Ant.* 19.172-74; Herodotus 3.80; Plato, *Leg.* 697c-d. The imposition of their will is the opposite of publicly ac-

cepted legislation. Moses was charged with attempting "tyranny" (*Ant.* 4.3, 16, 22, 146, 149), but was always vindicated by God. For charges of "tyranny" against Josephus himself see *Life* 260, 302.

<sup>611</sup> Greek: εὐσεβέω. Piety is the first and all-encompassing feature of the constitution (2.146, 170). The point regarding Moses will be demonstrated in 2.160, 163: Moses directed the people's loyalty to God and instilled in them correct views about God.

<sup>612</sup> With L (τοῖς λαοῖς); Latin *aliis* suggests a different Greek original (ἄλλοις), as found in Excerpta. Josephus never elsewhere uses λαός in the plural of the people of Israel (see Gerber 1997: 142, n.32). A parallel use of the plural in the same context in *Hypoth.* 6.3 is strong evidence for some literary relationship (probably indirect) between the two texts (see Appendix 5).

<sup>613</sup> Reading πολλήν εὐνομίαν with Niese and all modern editors (against εὐνοίαν in L, S, and Excerpta). The phrase stands in direct contrast to the "complete lawlessness" of 2.158, and represents the constitutional ideal of good laws properly observed (cf. *War* 1.403; *Ant.* 11.216).

<sup>614</sup> Greek: ἀρετή ("excellence" or "virtue"); cf. 2.153, 279, 290. The term is used often of Moses in *Ant.* bks 3-4.

<sup>615</sup> Greek: σωτηρία βεβαισιότατη. The adjective echoes 2.156 ("securely"), and the noun (in the sense of welfare, security, or salvation) is very frequent in *Ant.* bks 3-4 (e.g., 3.68, 190, 297; 4.42, 194). Here the safety in view is not just physical, but social and spiritual: their minds will be securely established in the truth, and their society in good order, by adhering to Moses' legislation.

<sup>616</sup> The implication is that, as a good legislator, he had not imposed himself upon them, but was accorded authority by the people.

<sup>617</sup> The text is uncertain: the clause hangs loosely in the Greek, and is missing in Latin. Moses' decision is to use his power to create a constitution (2.159).

<sup>618</sup> The train of thought in this section is: Moses' thought (decision) and acts (great deeds) were such that he concluded that God was his governor (for his acts) and adviser (for his decisions). He was thus convinced

he had God as *his* governor and adviser.<sup>619</sup> Having first come to the conviction that everything he did and thought was in accordance with God's will,<sup>620</sup> he considered it his prime duty to impress this notion on the masses;<sup>621</sup> for those who believe that God watches over their lives do not allow themselves to commit any sin.<sup>622</sup> **161** Such was the character of our legislator, not a charlatan or fraudster as they say, insulting

that everything he did (acts) and thought (decided) was in accordance with God's will.

<sup>619</sup> The language (ἡγεμῶν καὶ σύμβουλος) echoes that used of Moses in 2.156, 158-59. This may indicate Moses' mediatorial role: what God was to Moses, Moses was to the people (Gerber 1997: 143). In *Ant.* bks 2-4 God assists, strengthens, and supports Moses (e.g., *Ant.* 2.268, 272, 276; 3.316), who is God's minister and second-in-command (*Ant.* 4.316-17). Two statements in particular anticipate this section: that Moses did everything in accord with God's commands (*Ant.* 2.274), and that God hid nothing from him (*Ant.* 4.41; cf. 4.180).

<sup>620</sup> In 1.42 Josephus had declared that Judeans regard their scriptures as "decrees of God" (θεοῦ δόγματα), but in this context no direct claim is made for the divine authorship of the laws. This statement, that all Moses' work was in accord with the will of God, is the only gesture Josephus makes in this direction (echoed in 2.184), and is comparatively weak (cf. much later 2.279, 286). In *Ant.* bks 3-4 the biblical claims for the divine origin of the law are represented in full. At Sinai the decalogue was dictated by God and even written by God's hand (*Ant.* 3.88-101). The law was given by God (*Ant.* 3.222-23; 4.295, 318-19), came from God (παρὰ θεοῦ, *Ant.* 3.93, 222, 286; 4.197), and was provided at his "suggestion" (ὑπαγόρευσις, *Ant.* 3.84, 213; 4.183, 193). In short, the law was "of God" (*Ant.* 3.320; cf. 4.319) and "established by God" through Moses (*Ant.* 3.322, this being recognized even by "our enemies"; cf. 4.45, 130). This belief is associated with God's providence for the Hebrews and their special status as his people (e.g., *Ant.* 2.329-37; 3.13-21, 298, 302, 313; 4.2, 47, 60, 106, 114-17, 122). But such a claim could not fit a strictly philosophical discourse about religion and law. As Greeks would see it, to speak of the law as authored by God would fit a poetic (or "mythical") form of speech, perfectly acceptable in its own sphere, but incongruous (and thus either marginal or displaced) in the context of "history" or "philosophy" (see further, note to "acceptance" at 2.162). Such discourse tended to focus on the human lawgiver and his virtues, or the virtues of the laws themselves. Alongside direct claims about divine authorship of the law in *Ant.* bks 3-4 are frequent references to the virtue of Moses (e.g., *Ant.* 3.322; 4.196, 331), but little attempt to prove the value inherent in the laws in terms that non-Judeans could share (there are gestures in 3.85; 4.180-83).

In the introduction to *Antiquities*, however, Josephus attempted to introduce Moses and the law in terms more in tune with "philosophical" discourse. Here the laws are not said to be given or dictated by God, only "well enacted" (καλῶς νομοθετηθέντα), so that those who observe them follow the "will of God" (θεοῦ γνώμη, 1.14), and are rewarded by God (1.20). Greater stress lies on the virtue of Moses (1.6, 15); indeed, everything in the laws is dependent on the wisdom of the lawgiver (1.18). The laws are proved valuable in inculcating virtue, especially piety (1.6, 21), and in offering a worthy conception of God (1.15-16). Moses studied the nature of God and concluded "with the mind" how to copy that (1.19), thus teaching that God is sovereign, observing all things (1.20). Instilling this view into his fellow-citizens, he led their thoughts up to God (1.21), so they should strive to participate in the virtue of God, and punish those who did not hold correct beliefs about him (1.23).

The present description of the constitution (2.151-189) bears many similarities to the introduction to *Antiquities*, in theme and approach. Here nothing is said directly about the divine origin of the law (despite 1.42), only that the products of Moses' work were in accordance with God's will (κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνου βούλησιν, here and at 2.184). The virtues of Moses are stressed (1.157-60), but the greatest attention will be given to the value of the laws themselves, in both structure and content. As 2.161-62 shows, Josephus knows of claims in the Greek tradition comparable to the Judean belief that the law was God-given; he also knows the difficulty of maintaining such claims in the sphere of history or philosophy. Thus he switches attention to the structure and contents of the law (2.163), with emphasis on piety and correct theological belief. The difference in focus may reflect the use here and in the *Antiquities* introduction of an apologetic tradition also utilized (and developed) in *Hypoth.* 6.2-9. There it is left open whether Moses' laws were the product of his reason or the instruction of a δαίμων, though the people attribute his writings to God (6.9).

<sup>621</sup> For Moses' unique engagement of the masses, see 2.169.

<sup>622</sup> If there is a logical train of thought (cf. Gerber 1997: 142-43) it is this: if Moses' laws accord with the will of God, the deity will attend to their observance, even in the absence of the legislator. In shifting his

him unjustly,<sup>623</sup> but of such a kind that Greeks boast Minos to have been, and the other subsequent legislators.<sup>624</sup> **162** For some of them attribute their laws to Zeus,<sup>625</sup> while others traced them to Apollo and his Delphic Oracle,<sup>626</sup> whether they thought this was the truth or supposed that it would be easier to win their acceptance.<sup>627</sup> **163** But which of them best established their laws<sup>628</sup> and attained the most correct belief about God,<sup>629</sup> one can perceive from the laws themselves by comparing

discourse into philosophical mode, Josephus transmutes the traditional claim about the divine origin of the law into the value of its truths about God, specifically God's universal rule and transcendence (2.164-67); these combine in the notion that God watches over everything. The theme will be repeated in 2.166, 181, 294, with similar emphasis on this sanction against sin (cf. *Ant.* 1.18-21; 2.23-24; 3.320-21; 6.263; 8.107-8, 227, 314; 9.3).

<sup>623</sup> For the charge, see note to "fraudster" at 2.145. There it was attributed to Apollonius Molon and Lysimachus, here it is unattributed. The use of very similar language in *Hypoth.* 6.2-4 (both γόης and λοιδορέω) suggests a common apologetic tradition.

<sup>624</sup> Minos (not mentioned in 2.154) was reputedly the king of Crete 3 generations before the Trojan War, and (with Rhadamanthys) the oldest legislator in the Greek tradition ([Plato], *Min.* 318d). In myth Minos is a son of Zeus (Homer, *Il.* 13.449; *Od.* 11.568), who consulted Zeus every 9<sup>th</sup> year for instruction in the law (Homer, *Od.* 19.178-79; Plato, *Leg.* 624a-b; Strabo 16.2.38). For Greek "boasting" (αὐχέω), cf. 1.22. As the next section indicates, the comparison here is between Moses and others who claim some divine source for their laws. Of these "others," the only famous parallel in the Greek tradition is Lycurgus (see note to "Oracle" at 2.162); cf. the list in Diodorus 1.94.1-2, which includes Moses. Josephus' comparison shows that a claim to the law's divine origin is not unparalleled, although such a claim is not, in fact, pressed in this context (see note to "will" at 2.160).

<sup>625</sup> L's Greek is clearly corrupt here, as is Latin. I translate Niese's conjecture (οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν τοὺς νόμους ὑποτίθενται Δί), which is followed by all modern editors, including Münster. Minos is especially in view here (see previous note); Strabo 16.2.38 alludes to others who consulted the oracle of Zeus at Dodona.

<sup>626</sup> Niese provides minor emendation of L: οἱ δ' εἰς τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὸ Δελφικὸν αὐτοῦ μαντεῖον ἀνέφερον. After Zeus, Apollo is the other divine source of legislation (Strabo 16.2.38), and the allusion here is to Lycurgus (see 2.154); for the legend, see, e.g., Herodotus 1.65; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 5-6. Minos and Lycurgus form a stock pair in this regard (Plato, *Leg.* 624a-b, 632d, 634a; Ps.-Xenophon, *Laced. Pol.* 8; Diodorus 1.94.1).

<sup>627</sup> Josephus first suggests a gap between their be-

lief and his ("whether *they* thought this was the truth"), but then adds a cynical suggestion that their "belief" was concocted for political convenience. The Greek historiographical and philosophical traditions signal their distance from poetic or mythical claims in similar ways. Herodotus offers two accounts of the source of Lycurgus' legislation: "some say" that he obtained it from Delphi, but the Spartans themselves say that he brought it from Crete (1.65). Plato reproduces the traditional Delphic claim (*Leg.* 634a), but asserts the right to criticize the laws, though the young should believe they are "established by the Gods" (θέντων θεῶν, 634e). Aelian (*Var. hist.* 14.34) reports that Egyptians attribute their laws to Hermes, but thinks that every nation claims superiority for its customs in this way (cf., on Lycurgus, Cicero, *Nat. d.* 3.91; Pompeius Trogus *apud* Justin, *Epitome* 3.2-3). Strabo, citing the legends of Zeus and Apollo, remarks that "the ancients" regarded laws from the Gods as worthy of greater honor, but distances himself from such belief: "whatever truth there may be in these things, they have at least been believed and sanctioned among humankind" (16.2.38-39). The closest in sentiment to Josephus is Diodorus (1.94.1-2). He notes the traditional beliefs about Mneves, Minos, and Lycurgus, and identifies this sort of device (ἐπίνοια) elsewhere as "the cause of much good to those who believed it." Zathraustes, Zalmoxis, and Moses attributed their laws to Gods "either because they judged that a conception that was to be so helpful to humanity was extraordinary and divine (θείων), or because they thought that the masses would be more likely to obey the laws if they looked to the majesty and power of those (Gods) said to have invented them." Josephus skilfully uses such resources to cast doubt on Greek beliefs, just as he will later use the philosophical tradition to criticize Greek mythology (2.239-54).

<sup>628</sup> As in 2.156, Josephus uses the closing sentence of one paragraph to open up the topics of the next (Gerber 1997: 163 takes this section as the start of the new paragraph). Here he refers to the structure of the constitution, which he will demonstrate to be superior in three respects: i) it makes God, and piety towards God, central; ii) it is comprehensive, embracing all facets of life; iii) it ensures obedience down through the ages.

<sup>629</sup> Greek: καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πίστεως ἐπιτυχῶν. πίστις (or its cognate verb) are

them with each other,<sup>630</sup> and now is the time to speak about these.<sup>631</sup>

**164** There are infinite varieties in individual customs and laws among humanity as a whole, but in summary one may say:<sup>632</sup> some have entrusted the power of government<sup>633</sup> to monarchies, others to the rule of the few, others again to the masses.<sup>634</sup>

*Forms of  
government*

**165** But our legislator took no notice of any of these,<sup>635</sup> but instituted the govern-

used elsewhere in 2.169, 286 (cf. *Ant.* 1.23); cf. Lindsay 1993; Gerber 1997: 302-3. In this treatise it appears to be practically synonymous with the more frequently used δόξα (2.179, 221, 224, 239, 254, 255, 256, 258). The superiority of the Judean constitution in this regard is highlighted in 2.166-68, 190-92.

<sup>630</sup> On the tactic, see 2.150; the following comparisons are not obviously provoked by criticism.

<sup>631</sup> From 2.163 to 2.228 (inclusive) the citation by Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 8.8.1-55) provides our earliest textual witness. This differs quite widely from L in places, and is often to be preferred. At this point, Niese's text, which predates Mras' edition of Eusebius, is now considered unsatisfactory (see Introduction § 10).

<sup>632</sup> The phrase "in summary one may say" is missing in L and Latin, but present in Eusebius, and probably original. Polybius 6.5 uses the same adverb (κεφαλαιωδῶς) when summarizing, like Josephus, the main forms of constitution.

<sup>633</sup> Greek: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ... ἐπέτρεψαν τὴν ἔξουσίαν τῶν πολιτευμάτων. On the meanings of πολιτεῦμα see note to "constitution" at 2.145. Here it seems to mean "government" in the active sense of governing. The term recurs in the next section.

<sup>634</sup> Josephus alludes to the common categorization of constitutional structure, which is first evidenced in Herodotus 3.80-82. He lists the 3 types as neutrally as possible, by reference to the number of people accorded power: one (μοναρχία), a few (δυναστεία ὀλίγων), and the masses (τὰ πλῆθη). The three forms of government were more often labelled by reference to the people in power: kings (βασιλεία), "the best" (ἀριστοκρατία), or the people (δημοκρατία), labels used by Josephus elsewhere (see next note). These latter terms were loaded with historical association and moral evaluation. Herodotus' debate on the value of the 3 types (3.80-82) reached its fullest expression in the discussions by Plato (*Resp.* 543a-576d; cf. *Pol.* 291c-d, 302c-303c) and Aristotle (*Pol.* bks 4-6). As a result, it became common to twin the 3 main forms with 3 corrupt variants: kingship with tyranny, aristocracy with oligarchy (or some pejorative equivalent), democracy with "mobocracy" (ὄχλοκρατία). Further theories were developed of the cycle of all 6 forms (e.g., Polybius 6.2-18; Cicero, *Resp.* 1.42-53, 61-69; Plutarch, *Mor.* 826b-27c), evaluated by the stability of the constitution and the success it induced (Polybius 6.2; Cicero, *Resp.* 3.34, 41). Josephus does not share another common view, that the best form

of government was a *mixture* of the 3 main types (e.g., Plato, *Leg.* 712d; Polybius 6.10-18; Cicero, *Resp.* 1.69-70; 2.41, 57); for the ancient debates see Rowe and Schofield 2000.

<sup>635</sup> Although there is no negative valuation of the 3 types mentioned, Moses' alternative was quite distinct, not a pure form of one nor a mixture (see previous note). At least on the surface, the depiction of the Judean constitution is here quite different from the descriptions in Josephus' earlier works. There, despite references to the rule of God (see below, note to "theocracy"), Josephus applied the normal labels to the fluctuating forms of constitution. In his fullest survey (*Ant.* 20.224-51), the original constitution was an "aristocracy" (under Moses and Joshua), followed by a period of "monarchy" (the judges), then the rule of kings; after the captivity, the high-priests governed "democratically," before a period of Hasmonean and Herodian kings, whose dismissal led to the restoration of "aristocracy." (The terminology is not always consistent; cf. *Ant.* 11.111-12 with 20.234). In general, "aristocracy" is Josephus' preferred form of government (*Ant.* 4.223-24; it is even dubbed "divine," *Ant.* 6.36), but it is never given either political or philosophical analysis, and sometimes appears to mean any form of government with plural leadership (e.g., *War* 1.169-70). As the survey in *Ant.* 20 shows, the succession of high-priests continued whatever the changes in constitution, though their "leadership" (προστασία) appears most compatible (though not identical) with "aristocracy" (*Ant.* 20.251). See Schwartz 1983-84; Troiani 1994; Mason in Feldman 2000: xxiv-xxix; Rajak 2002: 195-218.

There are a number of possible explanations for the different approach here (assuming Josephus is not just slavishly following a source). First, Josephus here offers a generalized depiction of the constitution. *Antiquities* had shown (even advertized, 1.13) its *fluctuations* through history, such that no single term (not even "aristocracy") could be used to define the essence of Judean governance. To claim that Moses instituted an aristocracy would have been to admit that the kings, including David and Solomon (mentioned above, 2.132), were an aberration. Secondly, Josephus is here idealizing, stressing the superiority of the Judean constitution and the faithfulness of Judeans. To concede that the constitution changed over time could have suggested its inadequacy, and to identify Moses' ideal with any single form would have entailed Judean dis-



loyalty through long periods of history. Thirdly, and more positively, Josephus wishes to shift the focus from political structure to theological foundation. Plato sought to supersede the 6 forms of government by suggesting an ideal seventh, the rule of the perfectly wise and just statesman (*Pol.* 302c-303e). Josephus follows a different but partially parallel tack, trumping politics with metaphysics and thus conveniently trumping *all* Greek constitutional forms in a single move (see Gerber 1997: 152-53, and below, on “theocracy”).

<sup>636</sup> Greek: ἀπέδειξε τὸ πολίτευμα. The verb is frequently used by Josephus in political contexts, to mean “appoint” or “institute” (e.g., *Ant.* 5.135; 6.25; 7.382). The noun appears to mean here “form of government” (see note to “constitution” at 2.145).

<sup>637</sup> The Greek discussion of politics produced many neologisms: Plato tries out τιμοκρατία and τιμαρχία in one context (*Resp.* 545b), θεατροκρατία in another (*Leg.* 701a). As far as we know, Josephus coins the following term.

<sup>638</sup> Greek: θεοκρατία, a compound of the word for God (θεός) with a common term for “power” (κράτος, employed in the following phrase). Because of its subsequent usage (see Webster 1976; Taubes 1987), where “theocracy” has come to mean, in practice, the rule of religious personnel, the term is normally taken to refer to (or imply) the government of priests (cf. 2.184-88, 193-94). Thus Cancik declares that “‘Theokratie’ meint bei Josephus die Herrschaft der zentral und hierarchisch organisierten Priesterschaft über das gesamte Leben des Volkes” (1987: 72; cf. Rajak 2002: 201-4, 208-11; Sanders 1992: 171). But there are 3 good reasons to think otherwise (see also Müller 296-97; Schäublin 1982: 340; Amir 1985-88; Tosato 1987; Amir 1994; Gerber 1997: 148-53, 338-59). i) In the immediate context of this term, there is no reference to priests. Rather, the word is glossed by the phrase “ascribing to God the rule and power,” a notion then developed in theological or metaphysical terms (2.166-67). ii) Josephus had an adequate set of other terms with which to describe the role of the priests within the Judean constitution (e.g., “aristocracy”; see note to “these” above). His purpose here is not to coin a new term for the same phenomenon (an empty gesture), but to shift the discourse from the political structure of states to the metaphysical structure of the universe. iii) When he later mentions the leading role of priests (2.184-88), he does not refer to their leadership as “theocracy,” but juxtaposes the rule of God over all things (his definition of theocracy) with the role of priests in managing “the most important things” (2.185); the two are clearly distinct, even if fully compatible. Thus to import priests into this defi-

nition of “theocracy” is to disregard the first rule of semantics: terms take their meaning from their context.

Josephus is here propounding a “theological” statement about God’s governance of the universe. In his earlier work, he had Moses declare that “there is but one source of good, a gracious God,” who is both powerful and provident (*Ant.* 4.180; cf. 4.185). That echoes statements in his introduction to *Antiquities*, which stress Moses’ achievement in representing God as “the universal Father and Master, who observes all things” and metes out reward and punishment (1.20; cf. 1.15, 22-23). These are precisely the themes emphasized in this context (*Apion* 2.166-67). In relation to political governance, Josephus adopted from 1 Sam 8:7 the suggestion that the rule of kings somehow challenges the rule of God. At *Ant.* 6.38 he interprets Israel’s request for a king as her refusal to allow God to rule alone, and in *Ant.* 4.223-24 he attributes this notion to Moses (cf. Deuteronomy 17), aligning “aristocracy,” and the rule of God’s laws, with God’s sufficiency as Israel’s governor (ἡγεμῶν). Thus the idea of divine rulership is suggested in Josephus’ earlier work, though its relationship to human governance is not analyzed in depth.

There were also significant gestures in Greek and Roman political theory that placed human governance of individual states (politics) in the context of divine governance of the world (metaphysics, or theology). In his *Laws* (which emphasize piety and divine providence), Plato notes the inadequacies of the usual constitutions, whose labels show that those in power rule for their own benefit (712b-e). He suggests that the state should be “named after the God who rules over those who possess reason” (713a). The subsequent discussion indicates that he refers to the rule of Law, since the closest humans can attain to the ideal (the conditions of the age of Cronos) is to let their lives be ruled by the element of immortality (reason, νοῦς); and one may call this “dispensation” of reason “Law” (713a-714a; cf. Amir 1985-88: 93-97). Plato thus comes close to coining “theocracy,” while offering a precise definition of the “God” who rules (reason instantiated in law). In a later, Stoic, context philosophers also turned discourse about the structures of states into analysis of the universal Law of Reason, under which the universe constitutes a single state. In this context, it was natural to speak of the rule of God, or Reason, in quasi-political terms. Cicero, discussing constitutions, insists that *unus communis quasi magister et imperator omnium deus, ille huius legis inventor, disceptator, lator* (*Resp.* 3.33; “there is one, God, like a universal master and ruler of all people, and he is author, promulgator, and judge of this law”). Elsewhere, in a preamble to his laws, he hails

ing to God the rule and power<sup>639</sup> 166 and, persuading everyone to look to him as the cause of all good things,<sup>640</sup> both those that are common to all humanity and those that they themselves received when they prayed in difficulties,<sup>641</sup> and that neither any deed nor anything that anyone thought in private could escape his attention,<sup>642</sup> 167 he represented him as single<sup>643</sup> and uncreated and immutable through all eternity,<sup>644</sup> more beautiful than any mortal form,<sup>645</sup> known to us by his power, but as to

the Gods as *domini et moderatores* (“masters and rulers”) of all things (*Leg.* 2.15-16; cf. 1.21-24, 58-62; 2.8-11).

Thus Josephus, while developing a Judean tradition, is in tune with a philosophical strand of political theory. On this basis he can present the Judean constitution in elevated theological terms, rhetorically (but artificially) distinguished from the usual types of human governance (2.164). Once more, he joins a well-developed debate in the Greek and Roman tradition, but turns it to the advantage of Judeans.

<sup>639</sup> Greek: θεῶ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸ κράτος ἀναθείς. Power is not “entrusted” to God (cf. 2.164), but ascribed or accredited (for this use of ἀνατίθημι, cf. *Ant.* 1.15; 19.111; Gerber 1997: 305, n.29; Amir 1985-88: 97 wrongly finds here a token of Josephus’ “secular” approach). The phrase defines what is meant by “theocracy” (κράτος echoing θεοκρατία). ἀρχή, here translated “rule” (cf. μοναρχία, 2.164), can also mean “origin” and “cause” (cf. God as αἴτιον in 2.166, and αἰτία in *Ant.* 4.180). When this phrase is unpacked in 2.166-67, God’s sovereignty is interpreted to encompass his providence (2.166), omniscience (2.166), and transcendence (2.167); cf. 2.190-92 and *Ant.* 1.14-26. Josephus has nothing in common here with the “fourth philosophy,” who took God’s sovereignty to challenge the legitimacy of Roman rule (*War* 2.117-18; 7.323, 410, 418; *Ant.* 18.23). Whatever his initial attitude to the ideology of the Revolt (see McLaren 2004), in his subsequent writings Josephus distances himself from such radicalism. Here he has moved the discussion onto different terrain: the terms are now metaphysical (divine governance) and universal (governance of all humanity, not of Israel alone).

<sup>640</sup> The universal language is notable (“everyone ... all good things”; cf. 2.190, 197): Moses declared God’s providence to be applicable to all humanity, not just Judeans (*pace* Gerber 1997: 304; cf. 306). The language echoes *Ant.* 4.180 (μία πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθῶν κτήσεως αἰτία ὁ θεός, “for all humanity there is one cause of the possession of good things, God”), which universalizes the *Shema* (Deut 6:4). For the significance of providence in Judean theology, see 2.180. Diodorus also speaks of legislators encouraging the masses to “look to God” (1.94.2).

<sup>641</sup> God’s universal benevolence is balanced with his particular care for those (Israel?) in difficulty. God’s answers to Israel’s prayers in difficulty (ἐν ἀμηχανοῖς, cf. 2.157) are often evidenced in the wilderness stories (e.g., *Ant.* 3.12, 14-20, 84-88, 191; cf. 4.241-43).

<sup>642</sup> From providence, Josephus moves to omniscience, another aspect of God’s “rule and power.” The theme has already been highlighted in 2.160 (cf. *Aristeas* 210, in the definition of piety), though γνώμη (“attention”) here may refer to God’s sovereign will, as well as his knowledge (Gerber 1997: 306).

<sup>643</sup> Greek: ἓνα γοῦν αὐτὸν ἀπέφηνε. Eusebius’ text lacks ἓνα (it reads ἀλλ’ αὐτὸν ἀπέφηνε) and this might be a scribal addition; L contains much additional material, scribal glosses, at points throughout 2.167-68. But Josephus would be likely to include a monotheistic note in this philosophical depiction of God (cf. 2.193; *Ant.* 4.180), especially as he now describes the transcendence of God in terms that evoke the Judean aniconic tradition (cf. 2.190-92). His definition of the nature of God (2.166-67, 190-92) prepares the ground for the later ridicule of Greek mythology (2.236-54); cf. *Ant.* 1.15, 22-23.

<sup>644</sup> Greek: καὶ ἀγένητον καὶ πρὸς τὸν αἰδίου χρόνον ἀναλλοίωτον. With ἄγνωστον at the end of this section, Josephus compiles a triplet of matching negatives. If God is not created (i.e., has no beginning) and is immutable (subject to no change), he must also be eternal, transcendent in relation to created matter and time. Josephus reaches for philosophical terms, which had been utilized in Judean theology in Alexandria and elsewhere since the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE. Cf. Philo’s summary of Judean theology in *Opif.* 170-72, 3 of whose points match Josephus’ emphases here. ἀναλλοίωτος is used only here in the Josephan corpus, and only once by Philo (*Somn.* 1.188, of the unseen world). On the inferior notion of Gods being born (γινόμενοι), see 2.240; *Ant.* 1.15.

<sup>645</sup> Josephus alludes to the Judean aniconic tradition (cf. 2.190-92), supported by the conviction of God’s transcendent beauty. The philosophical tradition supported such a “pure” notion of God, but co-existed with an artistic and poetic tradition heavily invested in anthropomorphism; cf. 2.75, 239, with notes ad loc.

what he is like in essence, unknown.<sup>646</sup> **168** That the wisest among the Greeks<sup>647</sup> were taught these ideas about God, after he [Moses] provided their original expression,<sup>648</sup> I refrain from speaking about now,<sup>649</sup> but that they are excellent and fitting in relation to the nature and majesty of God<sup>650</sup> they have abundantly testified. For Pythagoras,<sup>651</sup> Anaxagoras,<sup>652</sup> Plato,<sup>653</sup> and, after him, the Stoic philosophers<sup>654</sup> prac-

<sup>646</sup> This is the third aspect of divine transcendence (in relation to time, beauty, and now knowledge). On God's essence (οὐσία), cf. *Ant.* 10.278; 20.268 (a topic in the projected work); Philo also insists on the impossibility of knowing this (*Virt.* 215). The contrast between God's knowable power and unknowable essence is found elsewhere (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.36-50) and will recur in 2.190 (see note to "else"; cf. Gerber 1997: 308, n.39). The point is relevant to aniconic practice: if God's essence is unknown, it cannot be represented (cf. 2.190). From a philosophical perspective, Judean religion could gain credit in this regard. Strabo speaks warmly of Moses' notion of a transcendent God, who encompasses the universe and cannot be represented in images (16.2.35; cf. Hecataeus *apud* Diodorus 40.3.4). Similarly, Tacitus notes, without disapproval, that Judeans *mente sola unumque numen intellegunt*, and regard as impious those who represent the Gods in human form: their God is *sumum ... et aeternum neque imitabile neque interiturum* (*Hist.* 5.5.4).

<sup>647</sup> Greek: οἱ σοφώτατοι παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. There are similar phrases about Greek philosophers in 1.175; 2.239, 255, 281, and a high evaluation of Greek σοφία in 1.51, 162, 181. The philosophical tradition is a useful, but not indispensable, ally of Judean religion.

<sup>648</sup> On honor and power in teaching or being taught, see 1.37; 2.152, 295. *Contra Apion* (2.135) and Apollonius Molon (2.148), Moses is, for Josephus, not only the first legislator (2.151-56) but also the first philosopher (cf. 2.255, 281), though the latter label is never directly applied. In a parallel passage, Josephus used the work of Aristobulus (see note to "philosophy" at 1.165), and he probably draws on him again here. Aristobulus claimed that Plato, Pythagoras, Socrates, Orpheus, and Aratus all drew their main ideas from Moses (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.6.6-8; 13.12.1-7); he also referred to topics prominent in this context, such as cosmic order and divine omnipotence (see Holladay 1995). The claim was recycled by later Judean intellectuals (e.g., Philo, *Prob.* 57; *Aet.* 19) and early Christians (see Droge 1989). It was important for Judean cultural politics, since it enabled Judean intellectuals to make use of Greek philosophy while simultaneously maintaining the higher authority of Moses. Josephus can thus have it both ways: where it suits he can call on Greek philosophers to support Mosaic truth, but Mosaic authority is never dependent on theirs.

<sup>649</sup> As in 2.154-56, Josephus is content to make a claim for priority, but leave it largely or wholly unsupported; for other examples of such *praeteritio*, see 1.8, 28; 2.223, 231. The "now" suggests that Josephus *could* expand on this theme, and in future would, but he will merely repeat it (cf. 2.280-81).

<sup>650</sup> On God's nature (φύσις) and majesty (μεγαλειότης), cf. *Ant.* 1.15, 19, 24; this paragraph finds its closest Josephan parallels in *Antiquities'* introduction. Josephus' interest in the "extremely philosophical" character of Judean belief was to be pursued in his work on "Reasons" (αἰτίαι, 1.24-25), but is at least partially explored here; see Introduction, § 2. μεγαλειότης is a comparatively rare term in Josephus (cf. *Ant.* 1.24; 8.111) and may be derived from Aristobulus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8.10.17).

<sup>651</sup> Pythagoras was named in this connection by Aristobulus (see above, note to "expression"), and the Pythagorean philosopher, Philolaos, asserted that "there is a ruler and governor of all things, God, ever one, alone, immoveable, alike (only) to himself, different from all others" (*apud* Philo, *Opif.* 100). For Pythagoras and the Judean laws, see 1.162-65.

<sup>652</sup> Anaxagoras of Clazomenae (ca. 500-428 BCE), was a notorious visitor to Athens (cf. 2.265); for the fragments of his work see *DK* 59; for discussion, see Schofield 1980. What is here in view may be his thesis that an invisible and immaterial "Mind" or "Reason" (νοῦς) caused and arranged the universe; see, e.g., Plato, *Phaed.* 97b-c; Aristotle, *Metaph.* 984b 15-19. Later Josephus implies quite a different verdict on his views regarding the sun (2.265).

<sup>653</sup> Also named by Aristobulus (see note above to "expression"), and later claimed by Josephus to have followed Moses in devising his constitution (2.255-57). All the themes in 2.167 can be paralleled in (or traced to) Platonic philosophy, including a philosophical version of monotheism. Plato's exposition of the transcendence of the forms provided one of the foundations of Philo's theology.

<sup>654</sup> The Greek is slightly uncertain in text and sense: Eusebius (followed by Niese, Thackeray, and Münster) has οἱ τε μετ' ἐκείνον ἀπὸ τῆς στοᾶς φιλόσοφοι ("the philosophers from the Stoa after him"). Josephus was hardly so ignorant as to think that Plato was the founder of the Stoic school (cf. 2.135), and if the Eusebian reading is correct it need imply only that the Stoics were chronologically later than Plato. Aristobulus

tically all<sup>655</sup> seem to have thought in this way about the nature of God.

169 These, however, confined their philosophy to a few and did not dare to disclose the truth of their doctrine to the masses,<sup>656</sup> who were in the grip of opinions.<sup>657</sup> But our legislator, by putting deeds in harmony with words,<sup>658</sup> not only won consent

*Accessibility to the masses*

cited the opening of Aratus' poem (slightly modified) as proof of Stoic dependence on Moses, showing that "the power of God permeates all things" (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.6-7). Divine providence was a central tenet of Stoicism, as of Judean theology.

<sup>655</sup> The text is again uncertain. Münster follows Excerpta in reading here no καί, so that "practically all" is attached to Stoic philosophers alone; Niese minor and Reinach bracket the word. If this is the correct reading, "practically all" may indicate Josephus' awareness that some aspects of the Stoic tradition were incompatible with his views about God. However, L, S, Latin, and Eusebius agree in inserting an "and" before "practically all," so that a wider category is created, "practically all" of "the wisest among the Greeks." Even so, the claim is conveniently vague: a philosophical critic would want to know precisely which philosophers were being aligned with which of the notions advanced in 2.166-67.

<sup>656</sup> Josephus now describes how "theocracy" shapes the rest of the constitutional structure. The present paragraph (2.169-71a) introduces in summary form most of the themes to be developed in 2.171b-83. The present point, criticizing the limited range of philosophy, will be repeated with special reference to Plato in 2.224 (see note to "masses," and Plato, *Tim.* 28c); it is implied that it would be dangerous to reveal the truth to the ignorant and misguided masses, who would only corrupt it (or use it blasphemously). The implied contrast with Judean practice (cf. 2.153, 156, 158, 160) is hardly fair. In Greek and Roman traditions, "philosophical" discourse about the Gods (or God) operated alongside, and sometimes in tension with, traditions of myth, poetry, theatre, and art, and was largely independent of religious cult (see Feeney 1988: 14-18, 92-97; Beard, North & Price 1998: 1.30-41, 211-44; cf. note to "legislators" at 2.239). As a discursive practice, philosophy required a specialized training, limited to those with sufficient wealth to undergo a long education (rationalized as "proper" breeding and social status). Only those familiar with the intellectual tradition could enter into the "philosophical" debates about religion. Plato's ideal legislation began with a religious preamble, addressed to the masses (*Leg.* 715e-718a). He considered it crucial that the constitution taught the existence of the Gods, their providence, and their immunity to bribery, since otherwise the citizens had little motiva-

tion to be moral (*Leg.* book 10). But such basic exhortation was a far cry from the intellectual enquiry that constituted "philosophy," and philosophers generally recognized its inaccessibility to the masses (e.g., Cleanthes, frag. 559 [*SVF* 1.127-28]; from the above list, Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy was notoriously difficult to penetrate). Thus, Josephus' claim that "Greek" philosophy operated within restricted circles is largely correct, though the reason for this limitation is hardly lack of courage ("did not dare"), but the competencies required by the nature of the discourse.

To suggest that Moses devised a more democratic form of "philosophy" (cf. 2.175-81) is to confuse philosophical *content* with philosophical *method*. Josephus may be right to claim that Judean practice (e.g., prayer and synagogue instruction) inculcated in ordinary Judeans a set of beliefs about God (as one and all-powerful) that would have been shared by philosophers. But very few Judeans could have articulated or defended these beliefs in recognizably "philosophical" terms, and the Judeans who did operate in this mode (e.g., Aristobulus, Philo) were a tiny, educated elite. Josephus claims that his tradition embeds this "philosophy" in the whole of life. In truth, because there is comparatively little disjuncture between the "statements" about God made in the Judean cultic, artistic, and credal traditions, it might all appear "philosophical". But as a discursive practice, "philosophy" was found no more widely among Judeans than elsewhere.

<sup>657</sup> Greek: δόξαι. Whenever the term stands in the plural, it has the negative connotation of mere, and erroneous, opinion (e.g., 1.6; 2.239, 258; the one exception is from Theophrastus, 1.165). In the singular, with or without an epithet, it means simply "idea" or "conception" (2.179, 221, 224, 254, 255, 256).

<sup>658</sup> Eusebius reads here νόμοις ("laws"), but most editors follow L, Latin, and Excerpta in reading λόγοις (words). (Eusebius may be right, however: "laws" is the unexpected, but correct, reading at 2.172.) The combination of words and deeds is the theme of 2.171-74. By embedding the truth about God in practice ("deeds"), Moses made it accessible to all his contemporaries (not just a few), and durable through time (in "ancestral customs," loyally maintained). Philo found in biblical references to heart, hand, and mouth a similar integration of thoughts, deeds, and words (*Virt.* 183-84; *Praem.* 80-84).



*Piety as the overall goal*

from<sup>659</sup> his contemporaries but also implanted this belief about God in their descendants of all future generations, [such that it is] unchangeable.<sup>660</sup> **170** The reason is that, by the very shape of the legislation, it is always employable by everyone,<sup>661</sup> and has lasted long.<sup>662</sup> For he did not make piety a part of virtue,<sup>663</sup> but recognized and established<sup>664</sup> the others as parts of it<sup>665</sup>—that is, justice,<sup>666</sup> moderation,<sup>667</sup> endurance,<sup>668</sup> and harmony among citizens in relation to one another in all matters.<sup>669</sup> **171** For all practices and occupations, and all speech, have reference to our piety

<sup>659</sup> Another use of *πίθω*, the legislator's virtue; see note to "them" at 2.153.

<sup>660</sup> The adjective, *ἀμετακίνητον*, is kept last in the sentence, for emphasis. Cf. other uses of the adjective in 2.234, 254, and cognate verbs in 2.184, 272; on the theme, see note to "alterations" at 2.153. The following sections describe how this is so.

<sup>661</sup> Greek: *πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον πάντων ἀεί*. The last word is omitted by Eusebius; it appears to go with the preceding phrase. For *χρήσιμον*, cf. the cognate verb *χράομαι* in 2.47, 125, 153. The sense is that everyone (not just a few) can access this belief ("it"), because it permeates all dimensions of life (cf. Philo, *Virt.* 65). The "shape" (*τρόπος*) of the constitution is about to be explained: its central focus is piety.

<sup>662</sup> The Greek is somewhat obscure, but *πολὺ διήνεγκεν* appears to mean "lasted long," rather than "was greatly superior."

<sup>663</sup> *εὐσέβεια* was listed first in 2.146. Plato referred to the "parts" of virtue in *Leg.* 633a (though he found the expression awkward; cf. *Prot.* 329c); more often he referred to various virtues.

<sup>664</sup> Following the longer text of Eusebius, *συνεῖδε καὶ κατέστησεν* (omitted by Niese).

<sup>665</sup> Piety is not just one of the virtues, or even just its first: it encompasses all the others (though it is not always clear how; see Gerber 1997: 290-93). Josephus consistently emphasizes that piety stands at the center, or goal, of Judean life (2.171, 181, 188; cf. *Ant.* 1.20-21; 4.181-82). There is reason to think that this had become a standard Judean trope. Ps.-Aristeas often highlights this Judean characteristic (e.g., *Aristeas* 131, 234-35). Aristobulus claims that, compared to other schools, Judeans excel in holding "holy convictions about God," since "the whole structure of our law has been arranged out of concern for piety, justice, self-control, and the other qualities that are truly good" (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.8). Philo calls piety (or holiness) the "queen" of the virtues (*Decal.* 52, 119; *Praem.* 53; *Spec.* 4.134-35, etc.), and discusses the first two commandments under this heading (*Spec.* 1.66-325).

A similar prioritization can sometimes be traced in both Greek and Roman philosophy. Plato's *Laws* is full of reference to the Gods, who control human affairs,

punish wrongdoers, and reward the virtuous. The constitution must instill correct beliefs about God, and regulate temples, priests, and sacrifice. It is also prefaced by a religious appeal to the citizens, urging them to hit their target, piety (*τυγχάνειν τοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας σκοποῦ*, 717a). Cicero begins his discussion of theology (*De natura deorum*) by making *pietas* the lynchpin of virtue: without it loyalty, human sociability, and justice would fall (1.3-4). Elsewhere, he claims that *religio* (cultic practice) has made Rome superior to other nations (2.8). In the philosophical tradition, constitutions were evaluated by the virtues (individual and social) that they inculcated (see, e.g., Plato, *Republic*). Following Judean predecessors, Josephus identifies "piety" as the central virtue of the Judean constitution, and links it to the theological truths of 2.165-67. Although neither theocracy nor piety represent a truly original conception, their combination gives the Judean constitution a special character, attractive to both Judean and Roman readers.

<sup>666</sup> The 4 Platonic virtues were *δικαιοσύνη* ("justice"), *σωφροσύνη* ("moderation"), *ἀνδρεία* ("courage"), and *φρόνησις* (or *σοφία*, "wisdom"). Josephus' list starts with a Platonic pair before diverging, but virtue lists were always adaptable to philosophical and rhetorical need. Justice was part of a list of 6 in 2.146, but is given rather little exposition in this treatise (Gerber 1997: 292-93).

<sup>667</sup> This Platonic virtue was the subject of admiration in 1.182, but was absent from the longer list in 2.146. It will be echoed in 2.186, 195, 204, and is allied to the claim that Judeans eschew luxury and extravagance (2.234, 291).

<sup>668</sup> In place of *ἀνδρεία*, Josephus lists *καρτερία* (cf. 2.146), which could be displayed in warfare but also designates other forms of "endurance" on behalf of the law; see note to "labors" at 2.146.

<sup>669</sup> In place of the Platonic "wisdom," Josephus lists a social virtue, echoing the stress on "fellowship" in 2.146; Müller (300) suggests that this is meant to indicate Judean superiority. Harmony (*συμφωνία*), often highlighted in political analysis (cf. Cicero, *Resp.* 2.42, 69), will be made a Judean point of excellence in 2.179-81.

towards God;<sup>670</sup> he did not leave any of these unscrutinized or imprecise.<sup>671</sup>

All education and custom-construction<sup>672</sup> is of two kinds: one instructs by means of words, the other through training in character.<sup>673</sup> **172** Other legislators were divided in their opinions, choosing one kind and omitting the other, as each saw fit:<sup>674</sup> thus, the Lacedaemonians and Cretans used to conduct their education through customs, not words,<sup>675</sup> whereas the Athenians and almost all the rest of the Greeks used to issue instruction on what should or should not be done through laws,<sup>676</sup> but neglected to accustom people to these through deeds.<sup>677</sup> **(2.17) 173** But our legislator combined both forms with great care:<sup>678</sup> he neither left character-training mute<sup>679</sup> nor

*Moses' combination of deeds and words/laws*

<sup>670</sup> The combination of words and deeds echoes 2.169 and leads into the following paragraph (2.171b-174). The sentiment is impressive, but highly generalized. Does this mean that all action and speech is governed by the law, obedience to which is a form of piety? Or that all practice is accompanied by prayer? Or that religion acts as a sanction underpinning all morality (cf. Plato, *Leg.* 838c-d)? The emphasis is on the comprehensive reach of piety, an all-embracing phenomenon (2.170).

<sup>671</sup> Contrast the imprecise maxims of 2.155; the point will recur in 2.173-74. Even idealized bodies of legislation (such as Plato's *Laws*) refrain from the attempt to cover every eventuality, since new situations will require new laws, or new application to particular cases. Josephus does not consider this issue; for him the Mosaic constitution is almost a timeless phenomenon.

<sup>672</sup> Education (παίδεια) is elsewhere associated with the Greek tradition (e.g., 1.21, 73, 129, 181; 2.46; see Marrou 1956), but is here a universal category; cf. the παίδευμα of the law in 2.175, 257. Elsewhere, Josephus speaks of Judeans being educated (παιδευθέντες) by Moses in piety and trained in virtue (*Ant.* 1.6). "Custom-construction" translates ἡ περὶ τὰ ἔθνη κατασκευὴ. ἔθνη, found in some Eusebian codd., and in Excerpta, is probably to be preferred to ἡθῆ ("character," in L and other Eusebian codd.). The latter will appear at the end of this sentence (cf. 2.173) in relation to *one* kind of formation (via "character-training"), while in this opening statement Josephus is speaking in general terms applicable to both kinds of constitutional emphasis. For the law as *creating* customs, cf. 2.174-75. Since the two terms (ἔθνη and ἡθῆ) were orally indistinguishable, errors in copying could easily arise.

<sup>673</sup> Josephus evokes a standard Greek antithesis between words and deeds, fitting the contrast in culture and political formation between Athens and Sparta (see below). For Josephus' purposes, the verbal (λόγος) is here connected not with rhetoric or political debate, but with written law, and training (ἄσκησις) not with military preparation or athletic exercise, but with practice and established custom (2.173-74). Aristotle stressed the necessity of both (*Pol.* 1334b), but the trope was

highly adaptable: Lucian contrasts the Greek reputation for words with the Scythian prowess in deeds (*Tox.* 9), while Romans could spin the theme to their own advantage (see below). Epictetus (4.7.6) will complain that what Christians and Judeans learn from practices (ἔθνη) is better learned from reason (λόγος).

<sup>674</sup> Josephus attributes the difference in culture to a choice that is deliberate but arbitrary (contrast Moses' care, 2.173). Cf. the arbitrariness of Greek historiography, 1.19-27.

<sup>675</sup> Sparta and Crete were often twinned in this regard; in some versions Lycurgus derived his constitutional system from Crete (Herodotus 1.65; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 4). The famous system of Spartan training emphasized the military training of young men, who policed the helots and ate meals in common (see Plutarch, *Lyc.* 10-12; below, 2.225-31). At the same time, Lycurgus is said to have preferred to leave his laws unwritten, since they would remain more secure if embedded in character and training (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 13.1-2; 16.6). Another aspect of this contrast was the Spartan reputation as people of few words (Plato, *Leg.* 641e; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 19-20). "Laconic" speech was already proverbial in antiquity (Plutarch, *Cleom.* 13.3).

<sup>676</sup> We might expect here "words" (Niese emends accordingly), but Josephus subtly switches the focus since he is interested not in prolixity, rhetoric, or assembly debates (cf. 2.292), but in written laws, parallel to those of Moses.

<sup>677</sup> The verb (ἐθίζειν, "to accustom") matches the noun, "customs" (ἔθνη). Josephus widens the focus from Athenians to Greeks in general, playing on their reputation as clever speakers, but ill-disciplined and impractical. Quintilian evidences Roman stereotypes in this regard: *quantum Graeci praeceptis valent, tantum Romani, quod est maius, exemplis* (*Inst.* 12.2.30; cf. Cicero, *Scaur.* 3-4; Livy 8.22.8 [the Greeks as *gens lingua magis strenua quam factis*]; 9.14; 31.44; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.28 [Roman virtue is learned οὐ λόγων διδασχῆ ... ἀλλ' ἔργων ἐθισμοῖς]).

<sup>678</sup> Moses has double superiority in avoiding one-sidedness and taking great care (the same noun ἐπιμέλεια occurs in different contexts in 1.29; 2.46-47, 187-

allowed the words from the law to go unpracticed.<sup>680</sup> Rather, starting right from the beginning of their nurture<sup>681</sup> and from the mode of life practiced by each individual in the household,<sup>682</sup> he did not leave anything, even the minutest detail, free to be determined by the wishes of those who would make use of [the laws],<sup>683</sup> 174 but even in relation to food, what they should refrain from and what they should eat,<sup>684</sup> the company they keep in their daily lives,<sup>685</sup> as well as their intensity in work and, conversely, rest,<sup>686</sup> he set the law as their boundary and rule,<sup>687</sup> so that, living under this as a father and master,<sup>688</sup> we might commit no sin either wilfully or from ignorance.<sup>689</sup>

88). For the ideal combination of deeds and words, cf. Philo, *Praem.* 82-84; *Mos.* 1.29; 2.48, 140; Cicero, *Resp.* 1.3, 13; 3.4-6; 4.3.

<sup>679</sup> For character-training as one side of education, cf. 2.171. “Mute” here means “unexpressed in law.”

<sup>680</sup> Words are again tied to law (cf. 2.172), since what Josephus prizes is not oral instruction but the written text of Moses’ law.

<sup>681</sup> τροφή can mean food in other contexts (e.g., 1.247, 305; 2.211), but here denotes nurture, both physical and social (cf. 2.204); food will be specified in the next section. For parallel phrases with the adverb “right from” (εὐθύς), cf. 1.42; 2.178, 204. Just as other legislators regulated marriage, conception, and child-rearing, so the Judean constitution is effective “from the cradle to the grave” (cf. Philo, *Legat.* 115); it affects “the whole structure of life” (2.156).

<sup>682</sup> δίαίτια here means “mode of life” (cf. 1.182; 2.174, 235, 240), not diet. The household is the crucible of citizen-formation (cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* book 1), and thus requires constitutional control.

<sup>683</sup> Liberty of choice (here αὐτεξούσιον) is for Josephus a dangerous condition, antithetical to both Roman discipline (*War* 3.86) and Judean religion (*Apion* 1.37). Zambrias’ speech in *Ant.* 4.145-49 dramatizes the contrast between such freedom (τὸ κατὰ τὸν βίον αὐτεξούσιον) and the disciplined life of obedience to the laws of Moses. The inclusion of “the minutest detail” is not, for Josephus, a mark of unnecessary fussiness (*pace* Plato, *Leg.* 788a-c): attention to detail will safeguard the principles of the constitution (*Ant.* 4.229-30).

<sup>684</sup> In this treatise Josephus says rather little directly about the Judean food laws. The ban on pork is raised in reply to Apion (2.137), and food is a topic relevant to Judean discipline (2.234) and imitation by non-Judeans (2.282), but is not included in the summary of laws (2.190-218). Similarly, while food laws are alluded to in historical narratives (e.g., *War* 2.591; 6.419; 7.264; *Life* 14; *Ant.* 10.190), Josephus makes little comment in *Ant.* bks 3-4, but promises explanation in his projected work on “Reasons” (*Ant.* 3.259-60). Without that explanatory framework, he appears disinclined to

expose food laws to scrutiny.

<sup>685</sup> Greek: περὶ τῶν κοινωνησόντων τῆς διαίτης (for this last term see note to “household” at 2.173). While the other two topics include both command and prohibition (what they may and may not eat; when they may or may not work), Josephus refrains from indicating that the rules on company are exclusionary (the company *not* permitted). The topic is highly sensitive (2.148, 258) and will be discussed later in full (2.236-86). The Judean rules against exogamy, Gentile table-fellowship, and “idolatry” are surely in mind, as banned forms of intimacy (2.210).

<sup>686</sup> The Greek is as cumbersome as this translation. The reference to rest (ἀνάπαυσις) concerns the sabbath (the same term is used in 2.27; cf. 1.209-12). It will reappear as the occasion for Judean instruction (2.175-78) and a mark of Judean discipline (2.234). Josephus knows that it could be taken to represent Judean indolence (see 1.209, with note at “day”) and here juxtaposes with “rest” Judean intensity in work. (“Intensity,” συντονία, is found in S, Eusebius, and the margin of L, and adopted by all modern editors; see Schreckenberg 1997: 165.) The same double emphasis, that Judeans are capable of both action and inaction, is found in Philo, *Spec.* 2.60; *Hypoth.* 7.11, and may reflect a common tradition (cf. Exod 23:10-11; Lev 25: 3-4). Josephus later expands the positive emphasis on work (2.234, 283, 291, 294).

<sup>687</sup> “Boundary” (ὄρος) suggests a negative limitation (as a metaphor, cf. *War* 4.182), “rule” (κανὼν) a positive measure (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 3.164).

<sup>688</sup> The metaphors depict the household authority of father over son, and master (δεσπότης) over slave; cf. the laws as δεσπότης in *Ant.* 4.223. The authority of the law could be described in similar terms in the Greek tradition; see, e.g., Herodotus 7.104; Plato, *Leg.* 715d, 762e. Paul took Judean existence “under the law” (ὑπὸ νόμον) to be form of slavery (e.g., Galatians 3-5); for the Judean motif see Marcus 2000.

<sup>689</sup> Cf. Philo, *Legat.* 210. It is not made clear how the law controls the will, except by ruling out liberty of choice (2.173). The reference to ignorance (cf. *Ant.* 11.130) provides a link to the following paragraph.

175 He left no pretext for ignorance,<sup>690</sup> but instituted the law as the finest and most essential teaching-material;<sup>691</sup> so that it would be heard not just once or twice or a number of times,<sup>692</sup> he ordered that every seven days they should abandon their other activities and gather to hear the law, and to learn it thoroughly and in detail.<sup>693</sup> That is something that all [other] legislators seem to have neglected.<sup>694</sup> (2.18) 176 Most people are so far from living in accordance with their own laws that they hardly even know them; it is only when they do wrong that they learn, from others, that they have transgressed the law.<sup>695</sup> 177 Even those who hold their most impor-

*Knowledge of  
the law:  
sabbath  
instruction*

<sup>690</sup> The sentence is linked to the preceding paragraph, but opens a new discussion of Judean knowledge of the law (2.175-78). (The traditional paragraphing [2.173-75; 176-78] makes less sense, though the flow of the discourse makes division difficult.) The new paragraph draws from two sources. 1. *Ant.* 4.209-11: Josephus had there paraphrased Deut 31:10-13, on the septennial reading of the law. Although he now speaks of its reading every 7 days, rather than 7 years, many of the same themes, and some of the same vocabulary, recur: no ignorance, keeping from sin, engraving on the heart, and punishment of transgression (for verbal parallels, see notes below). There is an additional echo at 2.181 (the social range of knowledgeable people). 2. *Hypoth.* 7.10-14, a passage with a remarkably similar set of themes: the sabbath recurring every 7 days; gaining knowledge of the law; gathering to hear the law; no ignorance; not needing to resort to legal experts; not transgressing out of ignorance; Judeans answering questions readily (for verbal parallels, see notes below). The *Hypoth.* passage is not identical in focus (and very different in style): it includes details on the reading of the law, and indicates how the knowledge of the law is passed on from men to others. But the passages are close enough in theme, focus, and (sometimes) vocabulary to suggest some literary connection (probably indirect; see Appendix 5).

<sup>691</sup> For the verb (ἀπέδειξε), see 2.165, note at “government.” παιδευμα (“teaching-material”) echoes the discussion of παιδεία (“education”) in 2.171-74. Cf. μάθησις (“study”) in *Ant.* 16.43 (Josephus’ only other discussion of sabbath-instruction), and κάλλιστον μάθημα (“the finest lesson”) in *Ant.* 2.211 (κάλλιστον is echoed here). Philo also emphasizes the educational value of the sabbath, and describes Judean synagogues as διδασκαλεία (“schools”; *Legat.* 312-13; *Mos.* 2.216; *Spec.* 2.62-63).

<sup>692</sup> The emphasis in *Hypoth.* 7.10 is slightly different: they keep from sinning for a whole day, indeed for many days, though these are at intervals and interspersed with secular activities. But the same verb ἀκροάομαι (“to hear”) occurs both here and in *Hypoth.* 7.12.

<sup>693</sup> Greek: καὶ τοῦτον ἀκριβῶς ἐκμανθάνειν. The verb means not just to learn, but to learn thoroughly (cf.

2.178, 257, the latter also supplemented by ἀκριβῶς). ἀκριβῶς is here translated “in detail”; the adverb and cognate noun have slightly varying nuance in connection with different activities (see note to “scrupulosity” at 2.149). Besides Josephus (here and at *Ant.* 16.43) and *Hypoth.* 7.10-14, there is other good evidence that it was common in synagogues (at least in Galilee and the Diaspora) that the Torah be read at sabbath gatherings. Philo bears abundant witness to this: *Legat.* 156-57 (Rome), 312-13 (Asia); *Somn.* 2.127 (Alexandria); *Mos.* 2.216; *Spec.* 2.62-63; *Prob.* 81-82 (Essenes); *Contempl.* 30-33 (Therapeutae). For the New Testament, see, e.g., Mark 1:21-22; Luke 4:16-19; Acts 13:42; 15:21; 17:2; 18:4; rabbinic references include *m. Meg.* 3.6; 4.1. Josephus gives no indication here of where these sabbath readings took place, nor who was responsible for choosing, reading, or expounding the scriptural passages.

<sup>694</sup> Josephus later concedes that Plato *did* make provision for a thorough learning of the laws (though not a weekly gathering for the process); but that was only because he imitated Moses (2.257). If one is speaking of philosopher-legislators (e.g., Plato and Aristotle), education is hardly a neglected topic. Plato spends a large section of the *Republic* discussing the education of the Guardians, and opens his *Laws* discussing the best context for educating citizens (bks 1-2; cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* 1331-1342). But there is an important difference in the understanding of “education.” For Josephus, what is required is full and detailed knowledge of the contents of the laws, for Plato and Aristotle a moral training in the virtues inculcated by the laws, in order to form the citizens’ characters and moral commitment. Amir 1985-88: 103-5 makes too much of a partial parallel between Josephus and Plato at this point (rightly, Gerber 1997: 231-32). Josephus is right that there is nothing quite parallel to the weekly public reading of the law in other legislative traditions. But the philosophical tradition would urge the importance of training in virtue, not just memory.

<sup>695</sup> The charge is vague and merely offers a pejorative point of contrast (cf. 2.150). Josephus’ ideal, to live in accordance with the laws (cf. 2.144, 149, 150, 153), is assumed to be possible only if one knows them fully.



tant and most powerful political offices admit their ignorance,<sup>696</sup> for they appoint as overseers for the administration of affairs<sup>697</sup> those who profess expertise in the laws.<sup>698</sup> **178** Were anyone of us to be asked about the laws, he would recount them all more easily than his own name.<sup>699</sup> So, learning them thoroughly from the very first moment of consciousness,<sup>700</sup> we have them, as it were, engraved on our souls;<sup>701</sup> it is rare to find a transgressor,<sup>702</sup> and impossible to gain exemption from punishment.<sup>703</sup>

Judean  
concord

**(2.19) 179** It is this above all that has created our remarkable concord.<sup>704</sup> For

For others, moral exhortation will be as important as formal laws and sanctions, and “unwritten laws” (customs and traditions) as influential as written legislation (see Plato, *Leg.* 822d-823c; *Pol.* 295a; 298c).

<sup>696</sup> If *they* don’t know the laws, how much less will ordinary citizens! But the higher the office the greater the scope and complexity of the law to be mastered, and Josephus admits elsewhere that Alexandra consulted experts (the Pharisees) for exposition of the law (*War* 1.110-11). Cicero bemoans a phenomenon that is partly parallel: magistrates don’t know their own powers, except as their clerks inform them (*Leg.* 3.48).

<sup>697</sup> The vocabulary is non-specific. Thackeray (365) thinks of the legal assessors (πάρεδροι) who assisted Athenian archons; in Egypt one could cite the office of the “Idios Logos,” in Roman provinces the governors’ legal advisers, and in Rome itself the jurists who taught the legal tradition and were consulted by magistrates (Cicero, *Leg.* 2.47-48). Schäublin 1982: 336 takes Josephus to refer to Plato’s “Guardians of the laws” (*Leg.* 752e-755b).

<sup>698</sup> “Expertise” (ἐμπειρίαν ἔχειν) is closely parallel to the language used in *Hypoth.* 7.11, 14 for Judean “expertise” (ἐμπειρώως ἔχειν) in ancestral laws and customs (cf. *Ant.* 12.49 of priests). The Judean tradition had its own experts (scribes, Pharisees, and later, rabbis): it is one thing to know the basic contents of the law, another to interpret, apply, and supplement as needs arise.

<sup>699</sup> Cf. *Hypoth.* 7.14: “they do not go to people learned in the law asking what they should or should not do, nor misbehave, by themselves, out of ignorance of the laws; but any of them you provoke to find out about their ancestral customs can answer readily and easily” (ῥαδίως; cf. Josephus’ ῥῶον). The parallels are too close to be accidental (cf. Gerber 1997: 106 and below, Appendix 5).

<sup>700</sup> For “learn thoroughly” (ἐκμανθάνω), see 2.175. “From the first moment of consciousness” (ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης εὐθύς αἰσθήσεως) is a favorite Josephan style of expression; cf. the identical phrase in *War* 7.343 (also regarding education in “ancestral and divine commands”), and closely similar expressions in *Apion* 1.42; 2.173, 204. Plato speaks of citizens gaining a taste of

the laws while they are still children (*Leg.* 752c). Presumably this takes place initially in a domestic context (cf. 2.204), somewhat different from the sabbath gatherings described in 2.175; cf. *Hypoth.* 7.14 on fathers passing on sabbath instruction to their children, wives, and slaves.

<sup>701</sup> Greek: ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὥσπερ ἐγκεχαράγμενους. For a similar expression (using ἐγγράφω) see *Ant.* 4.210 (probably influenced by Deut 6:6; 11:18). Philo also speaks of truth/law “engraved” on souls (or minds): *Opif.* 128; *Spec.* 1.30, 59; 4.149; *Contempl.* 76 (error likewise, *Spec.* 1.313). On learning from childhood in this connection, cf. Philo, *Legat.* 310; 2 Tim 3:15. Cicero uses a similar metaphor regarding convictions about the Gods (*Nat. d.* 1.45; 2.12).

<sup>702</sup> Josephus is driven to this idealization by his emphasis on commitment to observe the law (2.153, 174, etc.). Since both his *War* and his *Antiquities* contained numerous examples of “transgression” (see the catalogue in *War* 7.259-74), we sense here the triumph of rhetoric over reality. But *Apion* is not unique: cf. the similar boast in *Ant.* 3.223.

<sup>703</sup> παράιτησις means either “exemption” or a “plea for exemption” (cf. 2.201); the negative ἀπαράιτητος is used in 2.215, 292 (adverb in 2.262; cf. *Ant.* 1.23). As elsewhere (e.g., 2.156, 174), Josephus introduces a new theme at the end of a paragraph; it will be taken up and discussed later (2.215-17, 276-77). A similar emphasis on the inexorability of punishment is found in *Hypoth.* 7.1.

<sup>704</sup> Greek: ὁμόνοια. The term is closely related to συμφωνία (“harmony,” 2.170 and later in this section). This new point (2.179-81) builds on the claim about congruity in word and deed (2.171-74), but highlights the commonality in Judean beliefs about God (cf. 2.165-67). Anyone familiar with Second Temple Judaism, not least from the works of Josephus, will be struck by the idealization in this claim. The boast is clearly exaggerated, but not completely absurd: i) Josephus is speaking here about common beliefs, not political unity; he does not directly contradict what he has reported of civil discord in Judean history (e.g., *War* 4.128-33; *Ant.* 4.140). ii) The only point of comparison here is belief about the existence and provi-

holding one and the same conception of God,<sup>705</sup> and not differing at all in life-style or customs, produces a very beautiful harmony in [people's] characters.<sup>706</sup> **180** Among us alone one will hear no contradictory statements about God, such as is common among others<sup>707</sup>—and not just what is spoken by ordinary people as the emotion grips them individually,<sup>708</sup> but also in what has been boldly pronounced among certain philosophers,<sup>709</sup> some of whom have attempted to do away with the very existence of God by their arguments,<sup>710</sup> while others eliminate his providence on behalf of humankind.<sup>711</sup> **181** Nor will one see any difference in our living-hab-

dence of God (2.180). Compared to the Greek philosophical disagreements on those topics, Judean theological diversity appears minor. iii) Judeans were not famous for internal divisions in belief or practice (in contrast to the Egyptian animal cults, the schools of Greek philosophy, or the Christians, Origen, *Cels.* 5.61). Some outsiders had special information about the “Essenes” (see Vermes & Goodman 1989), and some considered that Judean life had changed over the centuries, but both critics and admirers assumed that, in important respects, contemporary Judeans were of a common mind. This may show that their knowledge of Judean culture was relatively shallow, but it renders Josephus' claim more plausible to the non-Judean audience of his day than to present-day scholars of 1<sup>st</sup>-century Judaism.

<sup>705</sup> Greek: δόξα περὶ θεοῦ. For the content, see 2.165-67 (partly echoed in 2.181). On δόξα in the singular, see note to “opinions” at 2.169; for the connection of harmony and belief, cf. Philo, *Virt.* 35.

<sup>706</sup> For “harmony” (συμφωνία), see 2.170, and the adjective in 2.169. Throughout this paragraph (2.179-81), Josephus twins word/conception (λόγος/δόξα) with customs/habits (ἔθη/ἐπιτηδεύματα; cf. 2.171-74).

<sup>707</sup> The huge claim is followed, and perhaps qualified, by the comparative “such as” (ὅποια): compared to the following major disagreements, Judeans look unanimous. Cf. the parallel tactic in 2.65-67, with reference to Egyptian religion. The existence of God is implied, and divine providence asserted, in the affirmations of 2.165-67; they constitute the first and fifth items in Philo's 5-point summary of Judean beliefs in *Opif.* 170-72. When Josephus describes the differences between the Judean αἱρέσεις (“schools”) or φιλοσοφίαι (“philosophies”), 2 concern the nature of divine sovereignty: i) the conviction of the “fourth philosophy” that God alone is “Master” (*War* 2.140; *Ant.* 18.23); ii) different construals of the relation between “fate” and human will (*War* 2.162, 164-65; *Ant.* 13.171-73; 18.13, 18). These certainly affect the understanding of God's “rule and power” (2.165), but not of God's existence or providence, the topics of this section. For these latter topics as matters of philosophical dispute, see Plato, *Leges*, book 10 and Cicero, *De*

*Natura Deorum*. For the contrast between “barbarian” stability in belief and the Greek penchant for novelty, see Diodorus 2.29.4-6: the Greeks disagree about *the most important* matters.

<sup>708</sup> Josephus shares the elite assumption that “ordinary” people are subject to irrational “passion” (πάθος, here “emotion”). One can excuse their wild or irreverent speech more easily than the shocking statements of supposedly rational philosophers.

<sup>709</sup> On their “boldness,” cf. 2.182 and Philo, *Opif.* 170. In citing philosophical agreement (with Moses), Josephus listed names (2.168); in relation to their disagreements, he does not. Elsewhere he cites Epicurean disbelief in providence (*Ant.* 10.277-80).

<sup>710</sup> The tone is ironic: how can one do away with God by arguments (λόγοι)? “Very existence” translates ὅλη φύσις; the noun is found elsewhere, in 2.168, 250, with the sense “nature,” but “whole nature” here means “existence.” A number of philosophers were said to deny the existence of God(s), such as Diagoras of Melos, Theodorus of Cyrene, and Epicurus. But polemics distort their opinions: Epicurus probably held that the Gods exist, but are unconcerned with the world. The “Skeptic” opinion (stretching from Pyrrhon to the “Academy”) was agnostic rather than atheistic. Plato polemicalizes against those who deny the existence of the Gods (and attribute the world to nature or chance), but it is unclear who his opponents were (*Leg.* 885c-899d). Cicero confronts the same opinion (*Nat. d.* 1.2, 117-19), but this is different from Skeptic doubts (1.61-64) or Epicureanism (1.43-45, 121-24).

<sup>711</sup> Cf. Plato, *Leg.* 899d-905b. By the Roman era, the matter had become central to the dispute between Stoics and Epicureans, with Skeptics questioning the standard Stoic proofs of divine providence (Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.5-7; 2.73-167; 3.65-69). In his Roman context, Josephus is on very respectable ground in affirming God's existence and providence. For his core (Judean) belief in divine providence (and punishment of sin), see *Ant.* 1.14, 20. The point is illustrated throughout *War* (e.g., 3.28; 5.60) and *Antiquities* (e.g., 1.225, 283; 3.19, 23; 4.47, 114-17; 10.277-80), especially with regard to the Judean nation (see Attridge 1976).

its:<sup>712</sup> we all share common practices, and all make the same affirmation about God, in harmony with the law, that he watches over everything.<sup>713</sup> As for the habits of daily life: that everything should have piety as its goal,<sup>714</sup> one could gather even from women and slaves.<sup>715</sup>

Judean  
conservatism

(2.20) 182 In fact, this is the origin of the charge that some have raised against us, that we have produced no inventors of novel deeds or words.<sup>716</sup> Others consider it honorable not to remain faithful to any ancestral customs,<sup>717</sup> and those who most dare to transgress these customs<sup>718</sup> they acknowledge for their “skilful ingenuity.”<sup>719</sup> 183 We, on the contrary, have taken the sole expression of both wisdom and virtue<sup>720</sup> to consist in doing or thinking absolutely nothing contrary to the laws as originally promulgated.<sup>721</sup> It would be reasonable to take that as evidence that the law

<sup>712</sup> Josephus joins deeds (living-habits) to words (statements about God).

<sup>713</sup> κοινὰ ἔργα are paired with εἰς λόγος (cf. deed and word in 2.169, 171-74); the “word” here is coordinated with the law. God’s surveillance implies both existence and providence (cf. 2.160, 166).

<sup>714</sup> The sentiment echoes 2.146, 170, 171. For a parallel notion in Plato, *Leg.* 717a, see note to “it” at 2.170.

<sup>715</sup> If even women and slaves know this, the unanimity applies down to the lowest points on the intellectual and social scales. In *Ant.* 4.209 Josephus includes women, children, and slaves at the septennial reading of the law (cf. Deut 31:11: women, children, and resident aliens); cf. *Ant.* 4.309 at the covenant ceremony. *Hypoth.* 7.14 envisages the transmission of sabbath instruction from husbands to wives, fathers to children, and masters to slaves.

<sup>716</sup> For the charge, see 2.135 (Apion) and 2.148 (Apollonius Molon); this “encomium” has significant undercurrents of apologetic (cf. 2.147). It suits Josephus’ rhetoric to represent the charge in the most generalized form (“no inventors of novel deeds or words”), placing the emphasis on the issue of “novelty” (cf. the different response in 2.135-36). The term “novel” (καινός) already loads the dice, with its connotations of threat to the status quo (cf. 2.252-54: *Ant.* 4.292; 18.9). Josephus shares Plato’s bias towards conservatism: new fashions in children’s games encourage expectations of constitutional change (*Leg.* 797a-c).

<sup>717</sup> The “others” remain nameless (cf. 2.180, 189; cf. “most” in 2.176), and there is no risk of causing offense. The tone is ironic: no one thought it “honorable” (καλόν) to introduce change to “ancestral customs” (see Schröder 1999). In these polarized options, one either changes everything or nothing. For a positive evaluation of change, as constant correction, see Isocrates, *Evag.* 7; for a more measured approach, see Aristotle, *Pol.* 1268b-1269a.

<sup>718</sup> Reading μάλιστα (“most”) before the verb “dare” (τολμῶσι), with Münster (following the best

Eusebius codd.), against Niese. τολμῶω has the negative nuance of shocking effrontery, as often elsewhere (1.318; 2.37; 2.180, etc.). The phrase mirrors *Ant.* 1.14, where God rewards those who do *not* dare to transgress (μὴ τολμῶσι παραβαίνειν) the laws; there are further echoes of *Ant.* 1.14 in 2.183, 187.

<sup>719</sup> The Greek phrase σοφίας δεινότητα μαρτυροῦσιν is especially hard to translate. δεινότης can mean “skilfulness” or “cleverness,” with either positive or negative nuance (e.g., with the latter, of Greek literary skill, 1.27). σοφία can be used in an entirely positive sense (of wisdom; see 2.135 and note to “Greeks” at 2.168), but may also be ambiguous, like the English “ingenuity” (cf. Seneca’s distinction between *sagacitas* [“ingenuity”] and *sapientia* [“wisdom”], *Ep.* 90.11). Thus what others regard entirely positively, as a skilful use of wisdom, Josephus can view negatively as mere “cleverness” and “ingenuity.” The ambiguity is best represented by placing the non-Judean opinion in quotation marks.

<sup>720</sup> Following the ambiguous use of σοφία (2.182), Josephus speaks now of φρόνησις (“practical wisdom”), and ἀρετή. The former was often found in Platonic virtue lists (omitted in 2.170). Once again, virtue consists in faithfulness to the law (cf. 2.153).

<sup>721</sup> For the pair, “doing and thinking,” cf. 2.160, 166. For faithfulness to what was originally promulgated (τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς νομοθετηθέντα), see *Ant.* 1.14; cf. 2.150, 153, 169. Josephus can harness the general presumption that “the oldest is best” (see Pilhofer 1990) and, in constitutional terms, the admiration for Spartan conservatism (Thucydides 1.70.2; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 27.4; cf. 2.225-31). In Plato’s view, after the initial legislation has been polished, it should remain unchanged (*Leg.* 772c, with rare exceptions). Education in the arts should not be subject to innovation (*Leg.* 657b; 816c-d), and the Council is appointed to keep the constitution stable (*Leg.* 960d). Elsewhere, Plato considers that, in the absence of the ideal (the rule of the perfectly wise man), the constitution should be fixed: no citizen should dare (τολμῶω) to do anything contrary to the

was extremely well laid down;<sup>722</sup> for the test of experience shows up those that do not have this quality as needing amendment.<sup>723</sup>

**(2.21) 184** For us, who are convinced that the law was originally laid down in accordance with God's will,<sup>724</sup> it would not be pious to fail to maintain it.<sup>725</sup> What part of it would one change?<sup>726</sup> What finer law could one invent?<sup>727</sup> What could one bring from elsewhere as an improvement?<sup>728</sup> What about the whole structure of the constitution?<sup>729</sup> **185** What could be finer or more just than [a structure]<sup>730</sup> that has made God governor of the universe,<sup>731</sup> that commits to the priests in concert the management of the most important matters,<sup>732</sup> and, in turn, has entrusted to the high

*The virtues of  
the constitution*

laws (*Pol.* 297d-e; see Rowe 2000: 244-51).

<sup>722</sup> On the (circular) reasoning that what is good lasts, and what lasts must be good, see Cicero, *Resp.* 3.34, 41; *Leg.* 2.40, 47. Critics of the Judean laws could never accept this: if the "traditional" laws were bad, they should be abandoned (so Agatharchides in 1.209-11).

<sup>723</sup> Change suggests that the old was inadequate. But such logic could be challenged. Plato acknowledged that no law could be comprehensive: it would require emendation to fill in gaps and keep it in good repair (ἐπανορθόω, *Leg.* 769d-772b; cf. Josephus' διορθώσις, "amendment"). He also analyzed the limitations of a written code, which was inevitably non-specific and not flexible enough to deal with changing conditions; but the ideal, the wise ruler who kept discovering the best policy, was rarely available (*Pol.* 294b-300c). More positively, one could understand political change as a process of evolution: cf. Cicero, *Resp.* 2.2; Polybius 6.10. The real foundation of Josephus' conservatism is revealed in the following sentence.

<sup>724</sup> Greek: κατὰ θεοῦ βούλησιν, echoing Moses' conviction about his acts and thoughts (2.160). This is the closest Josephus gets, in this context, to the claim that the law was divine; see note to "will" at 2.160 and Gerber 1997: 295-97.

<sup>725</sup> The text is slightly uncertain, but the sense is clear: since the laws have divine sanction, the Judean constitution embodies piety. Of course, if the Judean conviction were true, the same law would be the standard of piety for all. For the theme of preservation (φυλάττω), see note to "ever" at 2.156.

<sup>726</sup> For his provisional conclusion, Josephus poses a series of rhetorical questions (2.184-85, 188; cf. the conclusion to the treatise, 2.293-94).

<sup>727</sup> Reading the aorist optative (ἔξεύροι), with S and Münster; others follow Eusebius and L in the indicative (ἔξευρεν: "what finer law has been invented?"). For the theme of invention, see 2.135, 148, 182. It is implied that (despite 2.182-83) Judeans (or, at least, Moses) are inventors, and in fact have invented the very

best law (cf. 2.150-56, 293-95). The rhetorical question avoids the potential offense of a bald claim.

<sup>728</sup> The same textual variation (optative or indicative) is present here, compounded by a change in verb (S: ἐξευέγκοι; Eusebius and L: μετήνεγκεν). To introduce elements from elsewhere would be an admission of inferiority. Judean attitudes to outsiders and their ideas will be discussed in 2.236-86.

<sup>729</sup> Cf. 2.145: the use of an identical phrase forms an *inclusio*. The structure of the constitution here concerns first its central feature, the sovereignty of God (cf. 2.164-65).

<sup>730</sup> Since the adjectives are feminine, the subject must be the "structure" (κατάστασις) in the previous sentence. καλλίων ("finer") echoes a root much used in this context (καλόν, "honorable," in 2.182; comparative also in 2.184; superlative, κάλλιστα, in 2.183); the varying nuances of the term resist consistent English translation. δικαιότερα ("more just") might reflect the general concern with justice (cf. 2.146, 170) or anticipate the particular role of priests (2.187).

<sup>731</sup> The title "governor" (ἡγεμών) was used of God's relation to Moses in 2.160. Here his rule embraces the universe (τὰ ὅλα). The phrase thus reflects the core statement of "theocracy" in 2.165-67. But here there is an additional comment about priests (the two are connected by μέν ... δέ). God's rule is distinguishable from the management of priests, even if combined with it; "theocracy" (a term not repeated here) remains identified *not* with priests, but with the sovereignty of God.

<sup>732</sup> The statement about the priests is itself divided (μέν ... δέ) into a comment on the priests in concert (κοινῇ) and the following statement about the high priest. Priests have not been mentioned before, and it seems strange to add new material in this summarizing conclusion. Josephus has distinguished "theocracy" from the rule of a few, or of one (2.164-65), and has kept the political analysis thus far on the level of metaphysics (the nature of God) and legislation (the laws governing everyday life), without reference to forms of government or the distribution of power.



priest of all the governance of the other priests?<sup>733</sup> **186** These the legislator initially appointed to their office<sup>734</sup> not for their wealth nor because they were superior by any other fortuitous advantage;<sup>735</sup> but whoever of his generation surpassed others in persuasiveness and moderation,<sup>736</sup> these were the people to whom he entrusted, in particular, the worship of God.<sup>737</sup> **187** That involved<sup>738</sup> close supervision<sup>739</sup> of the law and of the other life-habits;<sup>740</sup> for the priests have been appointed as general over-

Why are priests specified as the form of human governance? Two answers are possible, and mutually compatible. 1. The rule of priests, and specifically the high priest, is the only form of government that could be considered typical of the Judean constitution. In his survey of Judean history (*Ant.* 20.224-51), Josephus identified many changes in form of government, but traced an almost continuous succession of high priests, over 2,000 years (cf. *Apion* 1.30-36). Judean kings were sporadic, and there were none after 44 CE. 2. The rule of priests was the ideal constitution, both for Josephus and for some non-Judeans. Josephus' preference for "aristocracy" entailed the rule of the high priest with a council of elders (see note to "these" at 2.164). He highlights the high priest's "leadership" (προστασία) of the nation at several points in his survey (*Ant.* 20.238, 241, 251), and that seems to be his favorite constitutional arrangement (see Schwartz 1983-84). As a priest himself, there was added reason to view politics in this fashion. But the ideal of priestly government was also attractive to others. Ps.-Hecataeus depicts Judean politics this way (*Apion* 1.187-88), perhaps in dependence on the real Hecataeus, whose understanding of Judean priestly government is remarkably close to that of Josephus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3, see notes below). Strabo also considered Judean government priestly (16.2.36-37), and both seem influenced by the presumption that priestly administration of power and justice would guarantee superior government. Cicero evokes this ideal in his depiction of the Roman state, in which "the worship of the Gods and the vital interests of the state [are] entrusted to the direction of the same individuals" (*Dom.* 1.1; cf. *Leg.* 2.19-22; Mason in Feldman 2000: xxiv—xxvii). Pompeius Trogus drew on the same ideal: Judeans appointed priests as kings, thus combining justice with *religio* (*apud* Justin 36.2.16).

<sup>733</sup> The high priest's "governance" (ἡγεμονία) is expressed in terms analogous to the role of God as "governor" (ἡγεμών), but the two are not expressly coordinated or placed in a single chain of command (*pace* Thoma 1989: 202); in any case God's governance is far more comprehensive (Gerber 1997: 168-69). On high priests in Judean history see VanderKam 2004.

<sup>734</sup> 2.186-87 sit somewhat awkwardly in their context. These sections interrupt the rhetorical questions

(2.184-85, 188), introduce new facts, and are loosely attached 2.185 by a relative pronoun (οὗς: literally "whom ...").

<sup>735</sup> It is implied that these would be poor criteria for appointment, since they are unrelated to the real token of worth, character. The vaguely Stoic tone would have serious implications for the selection of priests in Rome (from a few aristocratic families) and is hardly compatible with an hereditary system of priesthood (such as the Judean), unless supported by a strong sense of inherited "nobility." The issue of wealth was raised in the account of Korah's rebellion (*Ant.* 4.14, 19, 25). There Josephus, defensive of Moses, stressed that the selection of Aaron was made by *God* (*Ant.* 3.190-91; 4.24, 28, 66), a criterion not repeated here.

<sup>736</sup> "Persuasiveness" (πειθώ) features in the Korah-dispute (*Ant.* 4.17), but the power to sway the people was associated more with Moses than with Aaron or other priests (cf. here, 2.153 with note to "them"). "Moderation" (σωφροσύνη) is one of the virtues in 2.170 and is applied to sacrifice in 2.195. That such virtues should be required for the priesthood seems to reflect the influence of a Greek tradition; cf. Hecataeus on the virtues of Judean priests (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.4-5: οἱ χαριέστατοι with φρόνησις).

<sup>737</sup> The position of μάλιστα is puzzling (τὴν περὶ τὸν θεὸν μάλιστα θεραπείαν): it probably means that they were responsible, in particular, for worship. But the next sentence is about legal, rather than ritual, duties (cf. 2.193-98).

<sup>738</sup> Reading τοῦτο δ' ἦν. But the text is uncertain, and the following roles may be part of, or additional to, the "worship of God."

<sup>739</sup> Greek: ἀκριβῆς ἐπιμέλεια. For the adjective ἀκριβῆς, see note to "scrupulosity" at 2.149; here the epithet suggests careful supervision. The sense of ἐπιμέλεια varies according to context (cf. *Ant.* 1.14; *Apion* 1.29). Here the supervision entails the interpretation or application of the law.

<sup>740</sup> If the law is comprehensive (2.173), no "other life-habits" (τὰ ἄλλα ἐπιτηδεύματα, cf. 2.181) can form a separate object of supervision (cf. Gerber 1997: 169, n.113). Not all experts in the law were priests (some were Pharisees), and not all priests were equally expert in the law (Josephus was one, but chief priests consulted him, *Life* 9). But Josephus presumes a priestly

seers,<sup>741</sup> as judges in disputes, and with responsibility for punishing those condemned.<sup>742</sup> **(2.22) 188** So, what regime could be more holy than this?<sup>743</sup> What honor could be more fitting to God, where the whole mass [of people] is equipped for piety,<sup>744</sup> the priests are entrusted with special supervision,<sup>745</sup> and the whole constitution is organized like some rite of consecration?<sup>746</sup> **189** The practices that other people are unable to maintain over the space of a few days, under the name of “mysteries” and “rites of consecration,”<sup>747</sup> we maintain with great joy and unalterable determination for all time.<sup>748</sup>

**190** What, then, are the proclamations and prohibitions?<sup>749</sup> They are simple and

*Summary of  
key laws*

concern with knowledge and application of the law (cf. *Life* 196-98), especially in relation to the temple (*War* 2.417; cf. Deut 33:10; Ezek 44:23-24; Mal 2:7; Sir 45:17; Mark 1:40-45; *Hypoth.* 7.13). See Sanders 1992: 170-82.

<sup>741</sup> Greek: ἐπόπται πάντων (overseers of all things or all people). No connection is here made with God’s universal oversight (2.160, 166, 181, 294).

<sup>742</sup> This legal role is repeated below, at 2.194. Deut 16:18-20 and 17:8-13 prescribe that priests in Jerusalem, together with “the judge,” should be the court of appeal for disputes unresolved by ordinary priests in the villages (cf. 2 Chron 19:4-11). Josephus reports this two-tiered legal arrangement in his summary of Moses’ legislation (*Ant.* 4.214-18, 287), listing as the appeal body the high priest, the prophet, and the council of elders (cf. *Ant.* 9.4; Philo, *Spec.* 3.131; 4.183-92). The present statement may reflect this biblical ideal, but the extent to which it (also) reflects social reality, either before or after 70 CE, is uncertain. When Josephus took command of Galilee he appointed local magistrates, but gives no indication that they were priests; and if difficult matters were referred to him, that was because he governed Galilee, not because he was a priest (*War* 2.570-71; *Life* 79). The priestly control of the temple, and influence on the sanhedrin, perhaps created the impression that the most important matters were decided by priests (on the sanhedrin, see Sanders 1992: 472-88). Hecataeus speaks of priests being judges in major cases, and guardians of the law and customs (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.5). The concept, and some of the language, is remarkably close to that of Josephus, and both may reflect the Hellenistic ideal of priests as the guarantors of legal rectitude. We may compare the utopian state in Diodorus 5.45.4; Aelian, *Var. hist.* 14.34 of Egyptian priests; Caesar, *Bell. gall.* 6.13 of Druid priest-judges; and Tacitus, *Germ.* 7 of the German priests’ role in judgment and execution.

<sup>743</sup> The style reverts to rhetorical questions, with strong claims for Judean superiority made more palatable in this form.

<sup>744</sup> Cf. 2.146, 170-71, 181, 184.

<sup>745</sup> Cf. 2.187 (again ἐπιμέλεια), though here their

supervision may be of the people and their piety. By putting the matter in such terms (honor to God, a pious people, and priests in charge), Josephus can propose the following analogy with mystery rites, although sociologically they are very different phenomena.

<sup>746</sup> Greek: τελετή. This term can be used for any religious rite (Blum: ceremonies), but it was specially associated with mystery rites, as the following sentence shows (cf. *Ant.* 19.30, Josephus’ only other use of the noun). Thackeray translates “rite of initiation,” since the special rites of “mysteries” were designed to initiate the worshiper into the secrets of the cult concerned (see Burkert 1987: 8-11). But the element of initiation is not Josephus’ point of analogy (rightly, van Unnik 1979: 260-61), so much as the heightened sense of holiness—the purification of the worshiper and his/her consecration to the service of the deity. Josephus’ point is that Judeans live continually in such a state of holiness, while others struggle to attain it for a matter of days.

<sup>747</sup> The rites of initiation (or consecration) normally required preparatory purification (abstention from various forms of “pollution”), while the mystery rites themselves might include numerous ritual acts and experiences, extending for more than a day (and through the night). Josephus stresses the difficulty of such rites, which were complex, rigorous, expensive, and solemn (Burkert 1987).

<sup>748</sup> The reference to “joy” is surprising, but perhaps reflects the reputation of mystery rites as frightening or humiliating ordeals (van Unnik 1979: 263). The theme of perpetual loyalty has reverberated through this segment (cf. 2.150, 156, 169). As Schäublin notes (1982: 330-31), there may be an echo in this passage of Isocrates’ boast (*Paneg.* 46) that Athens was, to her visitors, a perpetual festival (ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα πόλις ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα τοῖς ἀφικνουμένοις πάνηγυρίς ἐστιν (cf. Josephus’ διὰ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος here). Athens’ superiority to the (occasional and temporary) Panhellenic games is more than matched by the Judeans’ religious superiority to the most elevated and most intense forms of non-Judean piety.

<sup>749</sup> The sense of the latter term (ἀπαγορεύσεις) is

*The nature of  
God*

well-known.<sup>750</sup> The first, at the head, speaks about God,<sup>751</sup> that God encompasses all things, perfect and blessed,<sup>752</sup> self-sufficient and sufficing for all,<sup>753</sup> that he is the

clear, and one would expect, for the former, some word meaning “instructions” or “commands” (e.g., προστάξεις, Philo, *Spec.* 1.299). But Josephus uses προρρήσεις. Normally, in his work, this term has the sense “prediction” (e.g., 1.258; *War* 7.432; *Ant.* 1.258; 4.105; 6.43, etc.); there is some prophetic element in the law (2.218), but nothing in this context would support that sense. In a legal context, the term has the specialized sense of a public announcement, which bans suspected murderers from holy sites (Plato, *Leg.* 871a-c). It may thus have the general sense of “warnings” (cf. *Hypoth.* 7.9), since the following summary of the law concludes with a list of penalties (2.215-17). However, as van Unnik has shown (1979: 264-66), the term was also associated with mystery rites, which were anticipated by a πρόρρησις. This was a public announcement containing elements of information, instruction, and warning (e.g., on eligibility for the rites). All these elements are present here: information (about God, 2.190-92), instructions about worship (2.193-98; Josephus once elsewhere uses the term in this sense, *Ant.* 1.225), and warnings of punishment for sin (2.194, 199, 201, 206, etc.). Coming immediately after 2.188-89, this nuance makes best contextual sense, as a development of the mystery-parallel (for a contrary view, see Gerber 1997: 277-78, n.42). The cultural connection is lost in translation, but I translate “proclamation” to preserve the peculiarity of the term.

Despite this element of continuity with the preceding material, the (non-rhetorical) question suggests a fresh topic (cf. 2.199), and Josephus begins here a summary of laws, continuing to 2.218 (on the status of 2.219, see note to “now” ad loc.). Here Josephus fulfils his promise to describe the “individual parts” of the law (2.145), and the “most essential” laws (2.150). He explicitly provides only a selection of the laws (2.198, 208, 211; cf. 2.287, with reference back to *Antiquities*). There are signs of some effort to select and emphasize laws that illustrate the constitutional virtues. “Piety” (εὐσέβεια) is displayed in the pure conception of God and elevated notions of worship (2.190-98); “fellowship” (κοινωνία) in 2.196, 208; “moderation” (σωφροσύνη) in 2.195, 204 (implicitly in 2.199-203, 205); “justice” (δικαιοσύνη) in just dealings (2.207-8) and strict penalties (2.215-17). Universal “benevolence” (φιλανθρωπία) is described in relation to outsiders (2.209-14), anticipating the full discussion in 2.236-86. Thus, the main themes of this section (2.190-218) are relevant to the context of this treatise, though not all the laws are discussed elsewhere. For evidence that Josephus may have adopted, but edited, an

earlier collection of laws, see Appendix 5.

The mass of biblical laws was not easily summarized or arranged. Josephus’ earlier summaries follow biblical sources: *Ant.* 3.224-86, from Leviticus and Numbers, *Ant.* 4.196-301, largely from Deuteronomy. Philo used the 10 commandments to structure his material, or the virtues inculcated by the laws (*De Decalogo*; *De Specialibus Legibus* bks 1-4; *De Virtutibus*). Here a discussion of God and worship (2.190-98) is followed by laws on marriage/household and Judean society (2.199-208). A third section treats relations with outsiders (2.209-14), illustrating gentleness and benevolence. Gerber (1997: 186-87) suggests these 3 divisions match the first 3 virtues of 2.146 (cf. Kamlah 1974: 222; Vermes 1982: 293). The summary is concluded with a restatement of penalties and rewards (2.215-18). For the relationship between this material and the summary in *Ant.* bk 4, see Castelli 2001.

<sup>750</sup> Greek: ἀπλάι τε καὶ γνώριμοι. The emphasis may continue the contrast with “mysteries,” whose rules were notoriously complex and secret, or reflect a general sense that laws should be easily understood and generally known (Demosthenes, *Timocr.* 68: ἀπλῶς καὶ πᾶσι γνωρίμως, for the sake of the πλῆθος; cited by van Unnik 1979: 276, n.103). The adjective ἀπλοῦς (“simple”) is applied to Judean laws in Philo, *Spec.* 1.299 and *Hypoth.* 7.1, but in different contexts (in the latter, Judean punishments are “simple and clear”). The Judean laws are elsewhere considered well-known, both to Judeans (2.175-78, 204) and to others (2.279-86).

<sup>751</sup> This is neither a command nor a prohibition, but more a “proclamation” in the sense of an announcement. That Judean laws begin with statements about the nature of God is a peculiarity discussed in *Ant.* 1.18-26 (this is the best inducement to virtue). The priority of this statement reflects both the status of the first commandment (cf. *Ant.* 3.91), and the status of God himself, at the head of the universe (2.165-67). The following definition of the nature of God is paralleled in Josephus’ works only in 2.166-67 (partially in *Ant.* 10.278-80; see Schlatter 1970: 65-142; Shutt 1980). On its place in the development of Josephus’ thought, see Introduction, § 2. In this context (2.190-92), theology is focused on the ban on images (2.191), with a philosophical explanation deeper than any found elsewhere (cf. 2.75, 167). For detailed discussion, see also Gerber 1997: 310-16.

<sup>752</sup> The universal dimensions are notable: God encompasses all things (τὰ σύμπαντα), is perfect (παντελής), suffices for all (πᾶσιν), and is the beginning, middle, and end of all things (τῶν πάντων).

beginning, middle, and end of all things;<sup>754</sup> he is evident through his works and acts of grace, and more apparent than anything else,<sup>755</sup> but in form and greatness beyond our description.<sup>756</sup> **191** For every material, however costly, is unworthy to form his image,<sup>757</sup> and skill unskilled in imagining his likeness.<sup>758</sup> We have seen nothing comparable, nor can we imagine it, nor is it holy to represent it.<sup>759</sup> **192** We see his

παντελής is an unusual divine epithet; cf. the following stress on the effortlessness of creation (2.192). μακάριος (“blessed”) was commonly used of God(s) in the ancient world (even by Epicureans, Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.44-45), and is frequently found in Judean theology (cf. *Ant.* 10.278; Philo, *Spec.* 1.329; 2.53; 4.48; *Sacr.* 101; 1 Tim 1:11; 6:15, etc.).

<sup>753</sup> Greek: αὐτὸς αὐτῶ καὶ πᾶσιν αὐτάρκης, with notable 3-fold repetition of αὐτ-. The self-sufficiency of God is a corollary of divine perfection (cf. 2.192). Philo uses αὐτάρκης of God (e.g., *Decal.* 81; *Spec.* 1.227; *Virt.* 9) and the idea is widespread in ancient theology (cf. *Ant.* 8.111; Euripides, *Herc. Fur.* 1345-46; Seneca, *Ep.* 95.47-50; Acts 17:25). Aristobulus (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12) makes the motif Judean by adapting an Orphic poem, and in his wake Judean theology was content to adopt and adapt the terminology of Greek theology. “Sufficing for all” suggests divine providence (cf. 2.166, 180; *Ant.* 10.277-80).

<sup>754</sup> The beginning (ἀρχή) and end (τέλος) could be understood as “source” and “goal” (cf. God in *Ant.* 8.280; Jesus in Rev 1:8; 21:6, alpha and omega), but the presence of all 3 terms suggests the emphasis is both metaphysical (the origin, means, and goal) and chronological (start, middle, and finish). Plato cites as an “ancient saying” the slogan that God “has the beginning, end, and middle of all things” (*Leg.* 715e, as here, at the very beginning of the constitution). The motif is of Orphic origin and, long before Josephus, Aristobulus had claimed it to express Moses’ philosophy (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12; see Holladay 1995: 189-92). Josephus’ source may be Aristobulus, rather than Plato (cf. Gerber 1997: 230-31, 312). The rabbinic parallels cited by Reinach 117-18 (e.g., y. *Sanh.* 18a; cf. Vermes 1982: 296) are more remote. Cf. the full discussion by van Unnik 1976.

<sup>755</sup> The assonance in the Greek (ἐναργής, ἔργοις; cf. earlier αὐτάρκης, ἀρχή) indicates that the passage is linguistically well-honed. That God is invisible, but “seen” through his works (or creation or providence) was already suggested in 2.167 and is a familiar motif in Greek theology: one may compare Ps.-Aristotle, *Mund.* 399b, 14-15 (ἀόρατος τοῖς ἔργοις ὁρᾶται); Wisd 13:1-9; Rom 1:19-20; for knowledge, and non-knowledge, of God, see Norden 1923: 56-124.

<sup>756</sup> This aspect of God’s transcendence is the basis

for the aniconic tradition (2.191, introduced by γάρ; cf. 2.167). The final word (ἄφατος) will be matched by two further privative adjectives in the sentence to follow (ἄτιμος ... ἄτεχνος). Drawing on the Platonic tradition, Philo would speak of God’s invisibility and immateriality (e.g., *Spec.* 1.20); Josephus uses less precise terms, but makes clear that it is both impossible and improper to represent God visually (cf. 2.252).

<sup>757</sup> The Greek word ἄτιμος has a double sense: it means “cheap,” but suggests also something dishonoring (α + τίμη); “unworthy” may convey the same double reference in English. The most one could create with materials would be the “image” (εἰκῶν) of God, but not even this can be adequately made. (Josephus omitted from his paraphrase of Genesis 1 the notion that humanity was made after the image of God, *Ant.* 1.32.) The reference to materials may be influenced by Exod 20:23, with its ban on the construction of images in silver or gold (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.22). Seneca also questioned the adequacy of images made with *materia vilissima* (*apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 6.10). Josephus frequently describes the Judean rule against images (see note to “statues,” at 2.75), but he does not accuse others of making *substitutes* for God (worshiping objects as if they were Gods). The critique suggested here (and in 2.75, 167) is more philosophical: if images attempt to represent God, they are totally inadequate, because they cannot hope to be *similar* (in form, beauty, or material). The materials were considered inadequate in 2.75 because they are inanimate (see 2.75, note to “God”); here they are cheap and thus unworthy of God.

<sup>758</sup> The clause is twinned with what precedes (μὲν ... δέ), with matching adjectives ἄτιμος ... ἄτεχνος (cf. ἄφατος, 2.190), a rhetorical neatness impossible to render adequately in translation. All τέχνη (“skill”) is ἄτεχνος (“incapable” or “unskilled”). “Likeness” (μίμησις; cf. in this section “image” and “comparable”), shows that at issue here is the impossibility of representing God through similarity, not the appropriateness of an image as the object of worship.

<sup>759</sup> The sentence reads: οὐδὲν ὅμοιον οὐτ’ εἶδομεν οὐτ’ ἐπινοοῦμεν οὐτ’ εἰκάζειν ἔστιν ὅσιον, a rhetorical tricolon with multiple examples of assonance. The final clause provides the sting in the tail (cf. Philo, *Legat.* 290, using οὐχ ὅσιον in an identical context); representations of God not only attempt the impossible but are positively sacrilegious. Both Greek and Roman



works:<sup>760</sup> light,<sup>761</sup> heaven, earth, sun and moon, rivers and sea,<sup>762</sup> the birth of animals, the production of crops.<sup>763</sup> These God made without hands, without effort, without needing any assistants,<sup>764</sup> but when he willed beautiful things, they at once beautifully came to be.<sup>765</sup> All must follow him,<sup>766</sup> and worship him by exercising virtue;<sup>767</sup> for this is the form of worship of God that is most holy.<sup>768</sup>

religious art was anthropomorphic, taking its lead from the poetic tradition and entrenched common opinion. Philosophers disputed whether this was appropriate, and if so, why. While Epicureans defended the tradition, Skeptics and Stoics were dubious (see Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.44-49, 76-102; 2.45, 59), but it could be argued that the anthropomorphic tradition showed the divinity of reason (the unique attribute of humans; see Dio Chrysostom, *Dei cogn.* 55-59). Judeans took the philosophical high ground, which Dio Chrysostom considered impossibly austere: it is best to have no images of God at all (see Barclay forthcoming a). For philosophical admiration of the Judean tradition, see Hecataeus, *apud* Diodorus 40.3.4; Strabo 16.2.35; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.4; and Dio Cassius 37.17.2.

<sup>760</sup> God's works are visible, though his essence is not (2.167,190). The point also marks a difference from the Stoics, for whom the universe is identified with God. For what follows, cf. the précis of Genesis 1 in *Ant.* 1.27-33. For God as creator in Josephus. see Schlatter 1932: 1-23.

<sup>761</sup> The next items are in pairs, but light stands first and alone (not twinned with darkness; cf. *Ant.* 1.27-28, echoing Gen 1.2-4); in the philosophical tradition, God is the source of good things, not both good and evil (cf. 2.167, 197).

<sup>762</sup> Cf. *Ant.* 1.29-32, which adds stars. Some Eusebian codd. have only sun and waters, not sun and moon, rivers and sea. Although here and elsewhere Niese followed this shorter textual tradition, I here translate the text established by Münster (on the basis of Mras' superior edition of Eusebius), noting only its most contentious features; see Introduction, § 10.

<sup>763</sup> The Greek is carefully balanced: ζώων γενέσεις καρπῶν ἀναδόσεις (matching endings, 2 + 3 syllables, then 2 + 4). The first phrase could be translated "the increase of animals" (cf. Philo, *Opif.* 58), the second "the provision of crops." Humanity is oddly omitted from the list.

<sup>764</sup> The verb "make" (ποιέω) matches the LXX, while in *Ant.* 1.27 Josephus had used κτίζω. This new tricolon of negatives rules out an anthropomorphic conception of God (hands), any notion of cosmic struggle (effort), and any hint of plurality in creation or divine insufficiency (assistants). Elsewhere Josephus polemicizes against such mythological concepts (2.239-49; *Ant.* 1.22), and the denials defend divine transcendence (cf. 2.190). In explaining the origin of

both good and evil, Plato had spoken of the "demiurge" using assistants in the creation of the world (*Tim.* 41c; 42e). Philo insisted that God needed no assistants (*Opif.* 72: οὐδενὸς ἐδεήθη τοῦ συνεργήσοντος), in language very similar to that used here (οὐδέ τινων συνεργασομένων ἐπιδηθείς). But Philo also thought that the use of "us" in Gen 1:26 ("Let us make man in our image") indicated that, for the creation of humanity, God *had* used assistants (and was not thus responsible for its mixed moral quality, *Opif.* 72-75). It is possible to find here a subtle critique of Philo by Josephus (so Thackeray 370 n.a; Reinach 92, n.4). But Josephus has omitted the creation of humanity, and thus skirts round the Philonic exception. If polemic is implied, it may be directed, with Philo, against Plato, rather than against Philo himself. Cf. Aristobulus' insistence that God uses neither hands nor helpers (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8.10.7-17).

<sup>765</sup> The text is uncertain at several points, but the sense reasonably clear. The "beautiful things" (καλά) match the LXX of God's pronouncements at creation (that each thing was καλόν; cf. *Ant.* 1.21 on humanity as κάλλιστον). They are the immediate product of will, not of hands or effort. To avoid the anthropomorphic danger, Josephus omits reference to God's speech as the medium of creation (also absent in *Ant.* 1.27-33).

<sup>766</sup> The phrase is omitted from some Eusebian codd. (and thus by Niese and Thackeray), but is read by L, Latin, and Eusebius cod. I, and adopted by Münster; cf. its use in *Ant.* 1.19 and Plato, *Leg.* 716b (in the address to new citizens). The "all" is presumably universal, as in 2.190; that following him (and exercising virtue) requires the adoption of the Judean law is not stated, but could be inferred from the context.

<sup>767</sup> Ancient philosophical discourse on the divine often distinguishes itself from cultic practice by insisting that the truest form of worship is virtue. In polemics, cult can be criticized as merely external, an offering of gifts that an all-sufficient deity cannot need (see Wenschkewitz 1932). Philo adopts this stance to critique *mere* cultic acts, unaccompanied by inner virtue (e.g., *Spec.* 1.66-67, 271-80; cf. *Aristeas* 234). The same positive emphasis on virtue is present here (cf. *Ant.* 1.20, 23), though, as in Philo, this does not imply the repudiation of temple worship as such (2.193-98; on Philo see Heinemann 1932: 43-81). But there is a notable effort in what follows to explain sacrifice and purity in moral terms.

(2.23) 193 One temple of the one God<sup>769</sup>—for like is always attracted to like<sup>770</sup>— Temple and sacrifices  
 common to all people as belonging to the common God of all.<sup>771</sup> The priests will

<sup>768</sup> The final word (ὁσιώτατος) is the mirror opposite of the last phrase of 2.191 (οὐτ' ... ὄσιον). A deity so transcendent can hardly be worshiped adequately by images or merely physical acts.

<sup>769</sup> Greek: εἷς ναὸς ἐνὸς θεοῦ (without articles or verb, continuing the lapidary style of 2.190-92). What verb could be supplied? Hardly a past tense (this is a summary of the laws, not a historical report): either “there is” or “let there be” is possible, but either would be awkward, since the one would deny, and the other implicitly admit, the present reality that the temple was currently out of operation. In connection with the temple, Josephus’ verbs vary according to rhetorical need. In 2.75-76 the present tense was used, as it would damage the argument to make explicit that the daily sacrifices for Rome were no longer being offered. In 2.102-9 there is a mixture of present and past tenses, the past tenses (describing the courts) appropriate to an argument against a supposed past event, the (timeless) present describing the rules of priestly activity (cf. 1.36; see note at “like” at 2.102). Here (2.193-94) verbs, where used, are either present or future (at times with textual variants), the latter as a jussive, not a real future (see Gerber 1997: 184, n.4).

Pace Clark 1959-60, there is no firm evidence that the temple sacrifices continued after 70 CE in a reduced form (see Smallwood 1981: 347-48): the Romans would hardly shut down the relatively harmless temple in Leontopolis (*War* 7.420-21) but allow the symbolic focus of the Revolt in Jerusalem to remain (on their policy, see Rives 2005). So Josephus is writing at a time when there is no temple of the one God. Nonetheless, in this treatise, as in *Antiquities*, the Jerusalem temple and its priests play a central role in his depiction of the constitution. This is not just because Josephus was a priest and had a personal interest in portraying matters so, but apparently because for him, as for most of his contemporaries, it was not possible to imagine the Judean tradition without its religious expression, and it was hard to imagine the worship of God without temple, priests, and sacrifice. Elsewhere Josephus placed the recent destruction of the temple in a long historical context: it had been destroyed before, and rebuilt (*War* 6.435-47). He also has Moses predict that the Judeans’ cities would be razed and their temple burnt: “however, God who created you will restore the cities to your citizens, and the temple; and their loss will be not once but often” (*Ant.* 4.314). He thus had no reason to imagine that the recent demolition of the temple would be permanent. If other priests still checked genealogies after the Revolt (1.34-35), they presumably

entertained some hope of continuing in a priestly role (in a temple); cf. *Sib. Or.* 5.418-33 and the Christian expectation in Barn. 16.3-4. More than a century later Origen suggested that he was in a minority in doubting that it would ever be rebuilt (*Cels.* 5.22), and under the emperor Julian (361-63 CE) it very nearly was. The present statement, then, is not then blind to historical reality (or merely a relic from a pre-70 source): it expresses for Josephus a central feature of the constitution, currently in temporary hiatus (Gerber 1997: 332-33). On attitudes to the destruction of the temple see Hahn 2002. On the perspective of the Mishnah, with its detailed rules regarding the non-existent temple, see Neusner 1980: 273-90.

The one temple is that in Jerusalem. Although Josephus knew much about the Leontopolis temple (e.g., *Ant.* 13.62-73; *War* 7.420-32), it could never compete in status. A similar slogan matching “one” with “one” is paralleled elsewhere (2 Bar 48:24: “one law from the One”; for rabbinic parallels see Feldman 2000: 399, n.583), and with regard to God and the temple most closely in Philo, *Spec.* 1.67 (ἐπειδὴ εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, καὶ ἱερὸν ἐν εἶναι μόνον; cf. *Spec.* 4.159; *Virt.* 35). Cf. Josephus’ own statement in *Ant.* 4.200-1: “in no other city let there be altar or temple, for God [is] one and the Hebrew nation one” (also without verb); but here the temple is common to all, not reserved for the “one Hebrew nation.” Philo also offers another justification for the single temple (there should be one temple in the world that is truly aniconic, Philo, *Legat.* 318), but Josephus does not develop the rationale. That God is one was implied but not stressed in 2.190-92 (cf. 2.167). Josephus’ critique of others’ traditions is targeted not at their polytheism, but at their utterly unworthy notions of God (2.236-54).

<sup>770</sup> Greek: φίλον γὰρ αἰεὶ παντὶ τὸ ὅμοιον. The tag is very ancient (cf. Homer, *Od.* 17.218), and adaptable to both philosophical (e.g., Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1165b 16-17) and non-philosophical (Sir 13:15-20) subjects. Plato uses it in the same context as his statements on God as beginning, middle, and end, and on the need to follow God (see notes above), but he applies it quite differently (*Leg.* 716b-c; see Gerber 1997: 231). Here the singularity of God is associated with the “like” singularity of the temple.

<sup>771</sup> Greek: κοινὸς ἀπάντων κοινὸν θεοῦ ἀπάντων. The *particular* temple and deity are also *universal* (for the echo of Pericles’ claim regarding Athens [Thucydides 2.39.1] as a πόλις κοινή, see note to “all” at 2.262). Elsewhere Josephus speaks of the cosmic significance of the temple architecture, its furnishings, and

continuously offer worship to him,<sup>772</sup> and the one who is first by descent will always be at their head.<sup>773</sup> **194** He, together with the other priests,<sup>774</sup> will sacrifice to God, will safeguard the laws,<sup>775</sup> will adjudicate in disputes, and will punish those who are convicted.<sup>776</sup> Whoever disobeys him will pay a penalty as if he were sacrilegious towards God himself.<sup>777</sup> **195** We offer sacrifices not for our gratification or drunkenness<sup>778</sup>—for that is undesirable to God and would be a pretext for violence and lavish expenditure<sup>779</sup>—but such as are sober, orderly, well-behaved,<sup>780</sup> so that, espe-

the high-priest's clothing (*War* 4.324; 5.213; *Ant.* 3.123, 179-87; cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.82-97), with an apologetic concern to show that Judeans do not slight the deity others profess to worship (*Ant.* 3.179-80). Similarly, he insists that the temple and the city of Jerusalem entertain visitors from all over the world (e.g., *War* 4.278, 324; 5.17); Judeans are not unfriendly to foreigners (*Ant.* 8.116-17; 11.87). Cf. Philo on the temple's universal scope (*Spec.* 1.97, 168-69; *Legat.* 306; with apologetic purpose, *Spec.* 2.167). In the light of 2.117, 258, Josephus' stress here on the common God and common temple probably has apologetic intent (*pace* Gerber 1997: 197, n.51). The temple was hardly "common to all" in allowing access to its inner courts, but that matter was finessed in 2.103 (see note to "foreigners").

<sup>772</sup> Although Eusebius, L, S, and Latin are agreed in reading the present tense, Münster follows Niese in emending to the future, to match the future tenses in the following verbs (though textual variants render some uncertain). If the future is to be read, it is jussive (cf. the negative, in 2.208), and is not an expression of future hopes (*pace* Kamlah 1974: 226, n.21; see above, note to "God"). The overlap in content between 2.186-87 and 2.193-94 is striking, and may reflect poor editing of sources.

<sup>773</sup> The future tense is found in L, and followed by Münster, despite the contrary witness of Eusebius, S and Latin (who have the present). For the importance of priestly descent, see 1.30-36; *Life* 1-2.

<sup>774</sup> Niese, Thackeray, and Reinach follow the reading, "with his fellow priests," found in the inferior Eusebian codd.

<sup>775</sup> Here the future tenses are textually secure, expressing the law's commands. Elsewhere, Josephus can describe sacrificial practice in the present (2.108-9; *Ant.* 3.224-57). Its importance is suggested by the question he puts at *War* 6.100: can God be our ally, if he is bereft of sacrifice? On safeguarding the laws (φυλάττω, as in 2.156, but in a different sense), cf. the "supervision" of 2.187.

<sup>776</sup> For the priests' legal roles, see 2.187, with note to "condemned." Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.4-6) describes the Judean state as governed by priests who sacrifice (θύω, as here), judge major cases (δικαστάι;

cf. δικάζω here), safeguard the laws (φυλάκη; cf. φυλάττω here), and honor the high-priest (see next clause). *Pace* Kamlah 1974: 226-27 and Droge 1996: 137-39, it is hard to imagine Josephus using Hecataeus' depiction of his own constitution, but both express the ideal of a priest-governed state.

<sup>777</sup> Penalties will be a recurrent theme in this law-summary, gathered in 2.215-17. Sacrilege (ἄσεβεια) merits death (2.217; cf. Deut 17:12, on disobedience to judges; Philo, *Spec.* 1.54-57). The authority of the high-priest undergirds the constitution (cf. Hecataeus *apud* Diodorus 40.3.6), and his relationship to God is unique. The high-priest's turban bears the very name of God (*Ant.* 3.178), before which even Alexander the Great was in awe (*Ant.* 11.331). For Philo, he stands on the borderline between humanity and God (*Spec.* 1.116). On disrespect of the high-priest, cf. Acts 23:2-5, where appeal is made to Exod 22:28.

<sup>778</sup> Niese et al. follow the shorter, inferior Eusebian codd., which read: "we offer sacrifices not to get drunk—for that is undesirable to God—but in sober moderation." This longer version has better support, at least for the first clause (L, Eusebius cod. I, Latin). The verb switches to the present indicative, and the subject "we" now looks specific to Judeans, not universal as in 2.190-92 (but neither restricted to priests; cf. the first person plural in 2.196-98, 209-10). No description is offered of the content or occasion of the sacrifices (cf. *Ant.* 3.224-57); the emphasis lies on their moral tone and purpose. Ps.-Hecataeus was earlier cited indicating that Judean priests remained sober in the temple (1.199; see note to "temple"), but here all worshipers are in view (cf. 2.108). On the speculative connection between Judeans and the cult of Dionysus, see Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.5, the golden vine in the temple; cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 671c-672c, sabbath wine). Here a positive distinction is implied between Judeans' and others' feasts. We may compare Philo's moral tone (*Spec.* 1.192-93; *Ebr.* 130) and his critique of pagan symposia (*Contempl.* 40-47, including their tendency to violence); cf. Herodotus' description of drunken and violent Egyptian festivals (2.60-64, cited by Müller 315).

<sup>779</sup> ὕβρις here means "violence," and may include sexual aggression. "Lavish expenditure" (πολυτέλεια) is also critiqued elsewhere (2.205; cf. 2.234, 291). Cf.

cially when sacrificing, we may act in sober moderation.<sup>781</sup> **196** And at the sacrifices we must first offer prayers for the common welfare, and then for ourselves;<sup>782</sup> for we were born for communal fellowship,<sup>783</sup> and the person who sets greater store by this than by his own personal concerns would be especially pleasing to God.<sup>784</sup> **197** And let appeal be made to God through prayer, and request,<sup>785</sup> not that he might give good things—for he has given them of his own accord and made them available to everyone<sup>786</sup>—but that we might be able to receive them, and when we have them, to keep them.<sup>787</sup> **198** In view of the sacrifices, the law has decreed purifications<sup>788</sup> after a funeral,<sup>789</sup> after childbirth,<sup>790</sup> after sexual union with a woman,<sup>791</sup> and

Philo, *Spec.* 1.172-76 on simplicity and self-control in sacrifice; Cicero, *Leg.* 2.25, against expense in sacrifice; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.23 on the ancient Roman ideal of simple, cheap sacrifices.

<sup>780</sup> Reading εὐσταλείς (Eusebius, cod. I) with Münster; L has εὐγενεῖς (“noble”) but Niese’s conjecture εὐτελεῖς (“thrifty”) is attractive (cf. εὐτέλεια in 2.281).

<sup>781</sup> Translating Münster’s text, which is supported by L and Eusebius cod. I, but not fully by Latin; glosses may have crept into the text. The general emphasis on “sober moderation” (σωφροσύνη) is textually secure, and matches 2.170 (cf. 2.204, below; *Ant.* 4.184); the noun suggests both sobriety and moderation. If virtue is the proper form of worship (2.192), it is practiced in sacrifice.

<sup>782</sup> In *Ant.* 3, Josephus had divided Judean sacrifices into two categories, those offered by individuals or by the people as a whole (3.224, 233); cf. *Ant.* 4.243 on praying for oneself and, communally (κοινῇ), for all Hebrews. There was no suggestion of the moral priority of one over the other (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.168, with the same division). Troiani (188) compares Herodotus’ claim that the Persians sacrifice not at all for themselves, but for the king and for all Persians (1.132). Josephus finds another moral lesson in the Judean style of sacrifice (cf. Plato, *Leg.* 875a).

<sup>783</sup> Prayers for “common welfare” (κοινὴ σωτηρία) symbolize the priority of “communal fellowship” (κοινωνία); cf. the “common” temple (2.193) and “fellowship” in 2.146. The “we” might be universal or specifically Judean. The sentiment is a distant echo of Aristotle’s dictum that human beings are political animals (e.g., *Eth. Nic.* 1169b 16).

<sup>784</sup> Again moral virtue (here selflessness) is related to God (cf. 2.192); cf. Josephus’ praise of Ananus (*War* 4.320). The subordination of individuals’ interests to the needs of the community was considered a characteristic of Sparta (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 24), and was deeply engrained in the Roman system of honor, especially in military and political affairs (see Barton 2001).

<sup>785</sup> Again Münster adopts the longer text, questioned by Niese, but supported by L and Eusebius cod.

I. But the Greek is awkward, and the use of 3 terms for prayer (παράκλησις, εὐχή, and δέησις) looks excessive.

<sup>786</sup> For God as beneficent to *all*, cf. 2.166, 190, 193 (common to all). That God is the perfect giver, who gives spontaneously and loves to give (φιλόδορος) is a constant theme in Philo (e.g., *Mos.* 2.5). If God is morally perfect one cannot imagine him giving in any other way (cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 95.47-50).

<sup>787</sup> This and the previous section are the fruit of philosophical reflection on prayer. Is it selfish? Not if one prays first for others, 2.196. Is it necessary? Only for oneself, not to cajole God into giving, 2.197. The latter depends on a fine distinction between asking God to give, and asking that we be capable of receiving, but the distinction is philosophically necessary if one wishes to dispel the notion of imploring a reluctant giver. Cf. Horace, *Carm.* 1.31.17-20 and the treatise on prayer by Maximus of Tyre (εἰ δὲ εὐχέσθαι); the motif is discussed by Hahn 1950 and Jonquière 2001. Josephus shows no sign of this lofty philosophical stance elsewhere, but generally shares the common-sense opinion that one prays in order to obtain good things (2.167; cf. *Ant.* 4.203, 212, 243). It is surprising that there is no reference to thanksgiving. An emphasis on God’s unstinting generosity has also influenced statements about prayer in the gospels (e.g., Matt 6:7-8; 7:7-11), though the point is here differently applied.

<sup>788</sup> Purifications (ἀγνεῖαι) are given a ritual explanation, in relation to sacrifice. But the 3 cases cited will all be discussed below (2.202-3, 205) from a different viewpoint, where purity is defined in moral terms. The two explanatory frameworks sit side by side, since worship of God can be understood as a matter of both ritual and virtue (2.192). Philo also allows both modes to co-exist, though philosophy always draws him towards the moral explanation, the sanctification of the soul (see, e.g., *Deus* 7-9; *Spec.* 1.257-61, 269-72; 3.208-9, with Leonhardt 2001: 256-72; cf. *Aristeas* 234; Ps.-Phocylides 228, with van der Horst 1978: 258-60). The fact that Josephus adds nothing on the ritual, but much on the moral, significance of purity (2.202-3, 205) indicates further the congruence of this summary with the philosophical mode of thought. Ritual purification was



from many other causes,<sup>792</sup> which it would take a long time to describe.<sup>793</sup> Such is our doctrine concerning God and his worship, and the law is one and the same.<sup>794</sup>

*Laws on  
marriage and  
sex*

(2.24) 199 What are the [statements] concerning marriage?<sup>795</sup> The only sexual intercourse recognized by the law is the natural intercourse with a woman,<sup>796</sup> and

clearly a matter of importance among Judeans in the homeland, as archaeology confirms (see Sanders 1990: 214-27). It is less clear how it was practiced in the Diaspora, though there are indications of hand-washing before prayer, in common with other traditions (Sanders 1990: 258-71). On the relationship between impurity and sin in ancient Judaism see Klawans 2000.

<sup>789</sup> The notion of corpse-impurity is based on Num 19:10-22 (cf. 31:19-20); it affected in particular access to the temple and to sacrifice (Num 19.13, 20), and for this reason the high-priest operated under very severe restrictions (Lev 21:10-11). The subject is touched on in *Ant.* 3.262 (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.261; 3.205-7), and will be further discussed below (2.203, 205). For first-century practice and interpretation see note to “rites” at 2.205; Sanders 1990: 184-92; 1992: 217-19.

<sup>790</sup> The Greek could mean either “marriage-bed” (accented λέχους, from λέχος), and thus sexual intercourse (?); or “childbirth” (accented λεχοῦς, from λεχώ). The former would overlap with the following category (see Gerber 1997: 403, n.27). According to Lev 12:2-8, a woman is impure for 40 days after the birth of a son, 60 days after the birth of a daughter; she is forbidden to enter the sanctuary or touch holy things (see note to “impurity” at 2.104). Cf. *Ant.* 3.269 and *m. Kelim* 1.8.

<sup>791</sup> Greek: ἀπὸ κοινωνίας τῆς πρὸς γυναῖκα (γυνή is general, but in view of 2.201 could be translated here “wife”). The law is seen from a male perspective, although the impurity affected both parties (cf. *Ant.* 3.78, 263). Lev 15:16-18 locates impurity in any discharge of semen, including sex with a woman (15:18): since anything touched by the semen is unclean, both man and woman must wash and wait till the evening when they are clean again. Philo, *Spec.* 3.63 suggests a simple rite of sprinkling (cf. Justin, *Dial.* 46; Sanders 1990: 267). The notion of impurity through sex was (and is) widespread; Josephus offers a physiological explanation below (2.203).

<sup>792</sup> Such could include: nocturnal emission of semen (Lev 15:16; *Ant.* 3.263); menstruation (Lev 15:19-24; *Ant.* 3.261; *Apion* 2.103); other kinds of emission from male or female genitals (Lev 15:1-15, 25-30); and “leprosy” (Lev 13-14; *Ant.* 3.261). Josephus has selected only those 3 on which he will comment below.

<sup>793</sup> This phrase and the following sentence are omitted by some Eusebius codd., and bracketed by Niese, Thackeray, and Reinach. They seem unnecessary and

the comment on the law is puzzling (see below). Münster includes the material as it is witnessed by L, Latin, and Eusebius cod. I.

<sup>794</sup> Why does Josephus state the agreement of the law with this “doctrine” (λόγος) concerning God, when the whole passage is a summary of the most essential laws (2.150)? Gerber argues (1997: 185) that he is concerned to turn theological doctrine into law, but the comment may be a gloss added when the passage was read independently of its context.

<sup>795</sup> Greek: τίνες δ’ οἱ περὶ γάμων; Although some Eusebius codd. add νόμοι (“laws”) as the subject (adopted by Niese, Thackeray, and Reinach), it is missing in L and Eusebius cod. I, and so omitted by Münster. The implied subject is either “laws” (for the plural, see 2.204) or “statements” (λόγοι; cf. λόγος as “doctrine” in 2.198). The question opens a new section of the summary (cf. 2.190). Its extent is not immediately obvious, but it is traditional for discussion of “household” matters to include sex, marriage, children, slaves (missing here), and relations between parents and children, young and old (see, e.g., Aristotle, *Pol.* book 1; Ps.-Phocylides 175-227). Since these topics are discussed in 2.199-206, we should take the new unit to continue at least till then. But the concluding statement in 2.208 suggests we should understand 2.207-8 as an extension of the same horizon to the community as a whole. For marriage laws standing near the head of a legislative program, see Plato, *Leg.* 720a-721a.

<sup>796</sup> Again, γυνή might be translated “wife” (cf. 2.198, 201), but the context suggests that the focus here is on gender, not marital status. “Natural” (κατὰ φύσιν) intercourse is highlighted to contrast with that between males, which is thus implicitly “unnatural” (παρὰ φύσιν; explicitly in 2.273, 275). Following the biblical ban (an “abomination,” Lev 18:22; cf. 20:13, with the death penalty), the Judean tradition was unanimous in condemning homoerotic practice, but adopted Hellenistic modes of explanation. Here Josephus does not explain the rule, and in 2.215 indicates only that the death penalty applies to both partners. Later he will dub the practice “unnatural,” the indulgence of bizarre pleasures (2.273-75). Elsewhere he speaks of “lawless pleasures” evoked by the beauty of young boys (*Ant.* 1.200; 3.275; 15.28-29), and the “feminine” passions of the passive partner (*War.* 4.561-62). The same motifs are employed elsewhere, as a mark of Judean difference: see, e.g., *Aristeas* 152; Ps.-Phocylides 3, 190-91, 213-

that only if it is with the intention of procreation.<sup>797</sup> It abhorred male intercourse with males, and the penalty is death if anyone were to attempt such.<sup>798</sup> **200** It gives instruction to marry<sup>799</sup> not paying heed to the dowry,<sup>800</sup> nor by violent seizure,<sup>801</sup> nor again seducing through guile or deceit;<sup>802</sup> but to betroth [a woman] from the man

14 (with van der Horst 1978: 111, 238-39; Wilson 2005: 196-98); *Sib. Or.* 3.185-86, 596-600, 764; 4.34; 5.430; *Hypoth.* 7.1; Philo, *Abr.* 135-36; *Contempl.* 59-62; *Spec.* 2.50; 3.37-42; cf., in the New Testament, Rom 1:26-27; 1 Cor 6:9; 1 Tim 1:10. Where the taboo is explained (it is often not), it condemns homoerotic intercourse as a) feminizing the passive partner; b) indulging an excess of passion; or c) failing to issue in offspring. See Nissinen 1998: 89-102, with further literature. All of these are common in ancient debates on male homoeroticism (e.g., Plato, *Leg.* 636c-d; 835b-842a); see Martin 1995, with warning against use of the modern label “homosexual.” In the Roman era special emphasis was placed on the fact that the passive partner took the role of the “woman,” and was thus stigmatized as inferior, unmanly, and weak, in contrast to the virility and authority of the penetrating man (see Moore 2001: 133-72, with reference to the dynamics of power). The Greek tradition of paederasty was well-known in Rome, but was open to criticism if young free-born males were placed in the role “rightly” occupied by social inferiors (women, slaves, “unRoman” men). Thus homoeroticism could be castigated as unnatural, womanly, and Greek (Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.70; Plutarch, *Mor.* 751b-752c, 990d-f). For discussions of this ideological matrix and its Roman expression, see Lilja 1983; Winkler 1990; Richlin 1993; Gleason 1995.

<sup>797</sup> This requirement is not found in the biblical laws, but could be understood as implied when the tradition was interpreted through the lens of philosophical idealism. Thus, the rule against intercourse with a menstruating woman (Lev 18:19; 20:18; cf. *Ant.* 3.275) could be heard as an injunction not to waste seed in a “field” where it will be “washed away” (Philo, *Spec.* 3.32-33). By extension, intercourse with a sterile, or pregnant, woman could be understood as a wastage of seed, an indication that “pleasure” had become the sole aim. Thus Josephus interprets the Essene ban on sex during pregnancy as a sign that their motive for marriage was procreation not pleasure (*War.* 2.161; cf. Ps.-Phocylides 186?). Similarly, Philo condemns sex with a sterile woman as mere frenzy, an intentional destruction of seed (*Spec.* 3.34-36; cf. 3.113, on child-exposure). Cf. the Mishnaic laws on marriage with a sterile woman (*m. Yebam.* 6.5-6), the ten-year limit matching Plato, *Leg.* 784b. Elsewhere, Josephus expresses the ideal that one should seek marriage, and sexual intercourse, for procreation and not for pleasure (*Ant.* 4.261;

cf. 4.290); other Judean texts express the same (Philo, *Jos.* 43; *Mos.* 1.28; T. Iss. 2.3; Tobit 8.7; cf. Philo, *Spec.* 3.9; Ps.-Phocylides 189). This echoes the Stoic ideal that passion should be rigidly controlled: sexual intercourse should serve only its natural purpose, the bearing of children (e.g., Musonius Rufus, frags. 12-13 [ed. O. Hense, 63-70]); see Heinemann 1932: 262-73. Both Martial (7.30.5) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.5.2) associate Judeans with sexual promiscuity.

<sup>798</sup> The language of abhorrence is exceptionally strong (ἐστύγηκεν; cf. Lev 20:13) and not paralleled in this summary of the law. For the attitude to homoerotic practice, see above, note to “woman.” The reference to a penalty anticipates 2.215; there the death penalty is specified for *both* partners (so Lev 20:13; cf. Lev 18:29; *Ant.* 3.275; *m. Sanh.* 7.4, stoning).

<sup>799</sup> The instruction could be taken as absolute (cf. Ps.-Phocylides 175), but is more likely qualified by what follows. For rabbinic views on the necessity of marriage and procreation, see, e.g., *m. Gitt.* 4.5; on women and wives in Palestine, see Ilan 1996. A fuller set of instructions was offered in *Ant.* 4.244-59, based on Deuteronomic laws; Josephus here omits reference to bigamy, levirate marriage, and divorce.

<sup>800</sup> Josephus presupposes that Judeans had adopted the custom of a dowry given by the wife’s family to the husband (but returnable on divorce); at upper levels of society the sums involved could be huge (e.g., *War.* 1.483). The temptation for men to marry for wealth, and the resulting complications in marital power-relationships, were well-known. Plato devised legislation against large dowries (*Leg.* 742e; 774c-e; cf. Lycurgus according to Plutarch, *Mor.* 227f), for fear of “slavery” to the wealthy wife; cf. Ps.-Phocylides 199-200 (with van der Horst 1978: 243-44; Wilson 2005: 204). Josephus offers no explanation for the rule, but it fits his emphasis on moderation and simplicity in lifestyle (2.195, 234, 291).

<sup>801</sup> Greek: μηδὲ βιαίοις ἀρπαγαίς. The biblical source is Deut 22:28-29, concerning the rape of an unbetrothed girl (LXX uses βιάζω); cf. *Ant.* 4.251-52; Philo, *Spec.* 3.69-71; Ps.-Phocylides 198; *Sib. Or.* 2.28. “Seizure” (ἀρπαγή) was a notorious feature of Spartan marriage customs (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 15.4-9). Roman readers might hear a critical allusion to the “rape of the Sabine women”; Judean readers would recall the rape of Dinah (Gen 34).

<sup>802</sup> Seducing (the verb, πείθω) is the non-violent

with authority to give her,<sup>803</sup> and in accordance with suitable kinship.<sup>804</sup> **201** A woman, it says, is inferior to a man in all respects.<sup>805</sup> So, let her obey, not that she may be abused, but that she may be ruled; for God has given power to the man.<sup>806</sup> The husband should have intercourse with her alone; it is unholy to make an attempt on a woman who belongs to another man.<sup>807</sup> If anyone were to do this, there would

but still dishonorable means of achieving sexual conquest; the two means are juxtaposed again in 2.201 and in *Ant.* 4.251-52. Here the biblical base is Exod 22:16-17 (LXX uses ἀπατάω; cf. ἀπάτη [“deceit”] here); cf. Philo, *Spec.* 3.72. Contrast the women tricked by Zeus, 2.245.

<sup>803</sup> Betrothal in Judean, as in Greek and Roman tradition, was sometimes an informal, sometimes a formal agreement (Philo, *Spec.* 3.72 speaks of documents) between the bridegroom and whoever had the legal right to “give” her (for the verb, see Exod 22:17). This “man with authority” (Josephus uses κύριος [“owner,” or “master”], the normal Greek term in this context) was usually her father, failing whom it could be the girl’s brother, other adult male relatives, or a guardian; cf. *Ant.* 4.246, 252; 12.187; Philo, *Spec.* 3.66-68 (parents, brothers, guardians, or other κύριοι); Plato, *Leg.* 774c.

<sup>804</sup> Reading κατὰ συγγένειαν ἐπιτήδειον. Inferior Eusebian codd. (B O N) read the last word as ἐπιτηδείου, agreeing with κυρίου, the man with authority, thus giving the sense “from the man who has authority to give her and (is) suitable according to kinship.” This is the text followed by Niese, Reinach, and Münster, although the latter otherwise departs from this Eusebian textual tradition. The alternative text, followed here, is supported by Eusebius cod. I (the better textual tradition), by L and S (who add the article τῆν, before ἐπιτήδειον), and by Latin (*per cognationem opportunam*). The phrase thus specifies not the qualifications of the man but the limits within which betrothal is permitted. This is not only the best supported reading, but also makes the best sense. There would be little point in insisting that the man be of suitable kinship to give the girl away: if he had authority to do so, he was, by definition, a male relative or, in the absence of these, the nearest equivalent (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 2.125-26).

That the betrothal/marriage be “in accordance with suitable kinship” could mean one of two things, both of which fit the context. 1. It could allude to the laws of “forbidden degrees” (Lev 18:6-18; 20:11-14; cf. *Ant.* 3.274; Ps.-Phocylides 179-83; Philo, *Spec.* 3.12-28) put in positive terms; cf. the critique of sibling marriage in 2.275. 2. It could refer to the ban on exogamy, to which Josephus makes reference more than once in his *Antiquities* (e.g., 4.129-55; 8.191-92; 12.187; 18.340-52; 20.141-43; cf. 1.192 on the role of circumcision in this regard). In this apologetic context it would be awkward

to make this point explicit; cf. the delicacy with which the topic of relations with outsiders is handled in 2.209-10, in the light of Apollonius’ criticism (2.148, 258). “Kinship” (συγγένεια) would be a natural way to allude to this matter (cf. γένος in 2.210, and the return of a Gentile wife to her συγγενεῖς in *Ant.* 18.351). The phrase may be sufficiently ambiguous to refer to *both* these points at once.

<sup>805</sup> Niese suspected the first two sentences of this section to be later glosses, because of their similarity to passages in the New Testament household codes (see below); Thackeray follows him in bracketing them. However, the parallels with the Christian material are no stronger than with common sentiments in antiquity, while the second sentence is closely paralleled in a Judean source (*Hypoth.* 7.3). Since no texts omit the sentences, there is no good reason to doubt that Josephus wrote them. The woman’s inferiority is expressed in blanket terms (“in all respects”; cf. the demand for her obedience “in all things” in *Hypoth.* 7.3; Eph 5:24). Physiologically, women were widely considered less perfect than males, wetter, weaker, colder, softer, more changeable, and unbalanced (generating excess fluid). Intellectually and morally, they were considered less rational, more emotional, unstable, and prone to lose control. Thus women could be considered both dangerous and endangered, a view that justified their need for male control (see Carson 1990). Although he knows of powerful women (e.g., in the Herodian family), Josephus shows signs of many of these stereotypes (e.g., *Ant.* 1.49; 4.219), which he sometimes attributes to the Essenes (e.g., *Ant.* 18.21; *War* 2.121; cf. Mayer-Schärtel 1995 and, on Philo, Baer 1970).

<sup>806</sup> The ancient discussion of the household insisted on its proper governance by the male head (see Balch 1981). *Hypoth.* 7.3 speaks of wives serving their husbands, a slavery “not imposed by abuse (ὑβρις), but for the sake of obedience in all things.” Similar motifs are found in early Christian texts (Col 3:18-19; Eph 5:22-24; 1 Pet 3:1-6; 1 Tim 2:11); for the concern about “abuse” (ὑβρις), cf. 2.212 and the contrast with Apollonius in 2.270 (Mayer-Schärtel 1995: 260-66). Tracing male rulership to the will of God may reflect the influence of Gen 3:16; cf. the reference to the law in this connection in 1 Cor 14:34.

<sup>807</sup> This covers the 2 cases about to be discussed: a married woman and a betrothed girl (both discussed in

be no exemption from the death penalty,<sup>808</sup> neither if he were to rape a virgin betrothed to another man,<sup>809</sup> nor if he were to seduce a married woman.<sup>810</sup> **202** It [the law] gave orders to nurture all children,<sup>811</sup> and prohibited women from causing the seed to miscarry and from destroying it.<sup>812</sup> But if it were to become evident,<sup>813</sup> she

the Deuteronomic law). There is no mention of other possible sexual partners: slaves (forbidden in *Ant.* 4.244), prostitutes (forbidden in *Ant.* 4.245), or widows. The unmarried and unbetrothed virgin have just been discussed (cf. *Ant.* 4.252). But if the first part of this sentence is absolute, all the above cases would be ruled out by the restriction to a single sexual partner.

<sup>808</sup> As in 2.199, the death penalty is highlighted, in preparation for 2.215-17. On the theme of “exemption” (παρὰίτησις), see note to “punishment” at 2.178. Josephus does not specify whether the death-penalty applies to both partners or only one; in the case of the betrothed, this depended on the circumstances (see next note).

<sup>809</sup> The betrothal is taken to represent the conveyance of the woman even before the marriage ceremony, so the offense is as great as adultery. Deut 22:23-27 legislates for two circumstances, where the offense takes place in the town (both are guilty and punished by death), or in the country (only the man suffers death: she may have cried out but none would have heard her). Josephus elsewhere modifies this to distinguish between seduction with assent (both guilty) and rape, when the woman was isolated (only the man dies), *Ant.* 4.251-52. Philo adapts it along similar lines (*Spec.* 3.72-78). But he too insists that the punishment allows no exemption (ἀπαρὰίτητος, *Spec.* 3.76). On the rape of an unbetrothed girl, see note to “seizure” at 2.200; on the punishment, see 2.215 and note to “marriage” at 2.276.

<sup>810</sup> The case of adultery with a married woman is discussed in Lev 20:10 and Deut 22:22 (cf. the 7<sup>th</sup> commandment, Exod 20:14). In both passages, both partners are condemned to death; cf. *Ant.* 3.274; 4.244. Josephus illustrates the crime from the biblical narrative on several occasions (e.g., *Ant.* 1.164-65, 207-9; 2.41-44). Philo bemoans the ruin of family integrity (*Spec.* 3.11). Josephus’ high moral tone is paralleled elsewhere (for Egypt, see Diodorus 1.78.4), and resonates with anxieties in Rome concerning adultery among the elite (see Appendix 6). Josephus will later condemn Greek mythology (2.244-46) and others’ legal laxity (2.276) on this topic.

<sup>811</sup> Cf. note to “children” at 1.60. This is apparently directed against the disposal of unwanted children, an extremely widespread practice in the ancient world, especially if the infant was defective in any way, or in poorer households overcrowded with offspring; see

Musonius Rufus, frag. 15 (ed. O. Hense, 77-81); Tertullian, *Apol.* 9; Pomeroy 1985; Boswell 1988. Although the Judean taboo on exposure is not expressly biblical, it is found in a variety of sources as a mark of Judean difference: see, e.g., Ps.-Phocylides 185; *Sib. Or.* 3.765-66; Philo, *Virt.* 131-32; *Spec.* 3.110-19 (based on Exod 21:22). It was noticed by observers as diverse as Hecataeus (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.8) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.5.3), both finding here an explanation for the size of the Judean population. The practice of exposure was a sensitive moral issue. Tacitus admires the German tribes for nurturing all their offspring (a sign of their good morals, *Germ.* 19) and moral disapproval could lead observers to fault the Greeks (Polybius 36.17.5-12) or to play down its prevalence in Rome (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.15.2; cf. the discussion by Musonius Rufus, frag. 15 [Hense, 77-81]). Christians would later parade their opposition to exposure of infants as a sign of moral superiority (Didache 2.2; Tertullian, *Apol.* 9.8; Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 30.2; Origen, *Cels.* 8.55), often combined, as here, with the ban on abortion. See further Heinemann 1932: 390-98; Cameron 1932; Stern 1.33; van der Horst 1978: 232-34.

<sup>812</sup> Contraception (by barrier or medicine) was common in the ancient world, often followed by abortion when it proved inefficient; for methods and means, see Riddle 1992; Kapparis 2002. Judean unease with this practice could claim a biblical base in Exod 21:22-23 (see *Ant.* 4.278; Philo, *Spec.* 3.108-9; *Virt.* 137-39); cf. Ps.-Phocylides 184; *Sib. Or.* 2.281-82; *Hypoth.* 7.7; see Lindemann 1995; D. Feldman 1968. But moral disapproval can be found outside the Judean tradition as well; see, e.g., the ban on contraception, abortion, and the disposal of babies in *SIG* 3.985, 20-21 (the rules of an association in Philadelphia; discussed in Barton and Horsley 1981). For criticism of abortion in Roman authors, see, e.g., Ovid, *Am.* 2.14; Pliny, *Nat.* 10.172; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.595-97.

<sup>813</sup> The text is uncertain. Eusebius (followed by Niese, Thackeray, and Münster) reads: ἀλλ’ ἦν (=ἐάν) φανεῖν, a slightly odd phrase that seems to mean “if it were to become evident (that an abortion has taken place).” This may reflect the fact that in many circumstances that would *not* be evident, or if it was, the responsibility unclear (e.g., for a miscarriage). L (followed by Reinach) reads quite differently, with reference to a “device” (μηχανή; cf. Latin *machinatio*), a motif also



would be an infanticide, obliterating a soul and diminishing the [human] race.<sup>814</sup> Thus, not even if someone were to approach a stillborn fetus at childbirth would he be fit to be pure at that time.<sup>815</sup> **203** It gave instruction to wash also after the lawful intercourse of a man and woman;<sup>816</sup> for it supposed that this constitutes a division of the soul (as it passes) into another place.<sup>817</sup> For the soul suffers when it is implanted

found in *Hypoth.* 7.7. The rest of the sentence presumes that the woman is responsible (cf. Ps.-Phocylides 184); Ps.-Phocylides 186 might refer to male violence causing a miscarriage (cf. Exod 21:22-23).

<sup>814</sup> The γένος diminished is probably the human race, not specifically the Judean people. There is a similar ambiguity in *Ant.* 4.278 (with πλῆθος); cf. *Ant.* 4.290; Philo, *Spec.* 3.118. Josephus implies a double crime: a dereliction of parental duty, and a crime against humanity (in an era when moralists feared population decline and the collapse of civilization; see Brown 1988). The reference to the soul (ψυχή) is important for the following reasoning, which parallels conception and death (2.203).

<sup>815</sup> Greek: τοιγαροῦν οὐδ' εἴ τις ἐπὶ λέχους [or λεχοῦς] φθορὰν παρέλθοι, καθαρὸς εἶναι τότε προσήκει. This is awkward, but well attested in the Eusebian texts. L reads the negative at the end of the sentence, with a different main verb (οὐ δύναται, “he is not able” [to remain pure]); it also reads λέχος ἢ φθορὰν as two objects (cf. Latin, *concupitum corruptionemque*). The Latin translators took προσήκει as the start of the following sentence (*oportet autem* ...). Editors have questioned other elements in the sentence, but it makes tolerable sense if translated as above. The problems lie in the phrase ἐπὶ λεχοῦς φθορὰν παρέλθοι. Blum took this to refer to intercourse with a woman who has just given birth (“une accouchée”); Thackeray to intercourse with a woman who is “with child” (cf. Gerber 1997: 404); Rengstorf’s *Concordance* (1978-83) to *coitus interruptus* (cf. Calabi 1993: 259, avoiding the consummation of marriage). None of these convince. λεχοῦς, if accented so, is the genitive of λεχώ, a woman in childbirth, or childbirth itself (as in 2.198); if accented λέχους, it is the genitive of λέχος, meaning “marriage-bed,” “marriage” (or possibly, “sexual intercourse”). In neither case can the sentence refer to a pregnant woman. φθορά means destruction (cf. διαφθείρω, earlier in this section, for destroying the seed). In relation to a female virgin, it can denote sexual intercourse, as the “destruction” of her virginity (e.g., 2.276; *Ant.* 17.309). But it has this connotation only in that particular case, and certainly not in relation to a woman who is pregnant or has just given birth. Here the term appears to mean an abortion, in the sense of either “the act of aborting” or the result of an abortion (cf. Soranus, *Gyn.* 1.56), in this case a

miscarriage or stillbirth (cf. Didache 2.2: οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ); cf. the cognate verb in Ps.-Phocylides 184, and the terms φθόριον or φθορεῖον, commonly used for mechanisms to effect abortion. The verb παρέλθοι probably means “approach,” that is, come within sufficient proximity to contact corpse impurity. Thus, if we read ἐπὶ λεχοῦς φθορὰν, the sentence refers to approaching a stillborn child/fetus (φθορὰν) at childbirth (λεχοῦς). There is a parallel in Theophrastus, *Char.* 16.7, where the “superstitious” man is accused of excessive concern with purity: he is not willing to approach either a corpse or a childbirth (οὐτ' ἐπὶ νεκρὸν οὐτ' ἐπὶ λεχῶ ἐλθεῖν ἐθελήσα).

This interpretation makes good sense of all the terms in the sentence, and it explains, as others cannot, the presence of τοιγαροῦν [“thus”] at its start; this clause follows logically from the preceding ban on abortion. The point is relatively simple: an abortion or stillbirth is a human death (not the loss of lifeless matter), so even proximity to an aborted fetus entails corpse impurity. The rule may be extrapolated from laws regarding corpse impurity (see note to “funeral” at 2.198) or from Lev 15: 25-30, on women with a discharge other than menstruation; such a “discharge” defiles the bed and those who touch it (cf. *m. Nid.* 7.4). The sentence then links 2.202 with 2.203: impurity is contracted both through sex and through death (including abortion or miscarriage), since both entail the suffering of the soul.

<sup>816</sup> Post-coital ablution had already been mentioned in 2.198, but now an attempt is made to explain sex- and corpse-impurity together, in physiological terms. The adjective “lawful” indicates that the impurity at issue here is not moral (cf. the parallel statement in *Ant.* 3.263); it must, therefore, have a different explanation. If the emphasis falls on this point, the καί (“also”) could be translated “even,” but the main point is to connect the impurity of death (just discussed, in the case of stillbirth) with that of sexual intercourse.

<sup>817</sup> Reading μερισμός (“division”), with Eusebius (in preference to L’s μολυσμός), as argued by Schreckenberg 1977: 166-68, though the sentence is still awkward in Greek. It is presumed that the (male) seed carries the “soul” (ψυχή), a part of the father’s soul, splintered or split off. This accords with the scientific theory of the 5<sup>th</sup>-century BCE philosopher, Democritus (*DK* 2.152, 6-7, using μεριζόμενος; see Schreckenberg 1977: 167). The soul is thus painfully divided, as a part

in bodies and again when it is separated from them at death.<sup>818</sup> Hence it ordered purifications in all such cases.<sup>819</sup>

**(2.25) 204** Indeed, not even on the occasion of the birth of children did it permit laying on feasts and making pretexts for drunkenness, but it ordered that from the very beginning their upbringing should be in sober moderation.<sup>820</sup> And it gave instruction to teach reading,<sup>821</sup> in relation to the laws,<sup>822</sup> and that they know about the exploits of their forebears,<sup>823</sup> in order that they imitate the latter and, being brought up with the former, neither transgress nor have an excuse for ignorance.<sup>824</sup>

*Children*

**(2.26) 205** It made provision for piety towards the dead,<sup>825</sup> not with expensive

*Burials*

of it enters the body of the embryo. Cf. Philo's comment on children as "parts" (μέρη) of their parents (*Spec.* 1.137).

<sup>818</sup> The dualism of soul and body was common philosophical parlance. Josephus attributes to the Essenes belief in an immortal soul, entangled and imprisoned in the body, but to be released at death (*War* 2.154-58; cf., in his own voice, 3.372-75). Similarly, Eleazar speaks of the soul as trapped in the body, but liberated at death, coming and going unseen (*War* 7.341-57); the Indians, he asserts, have the purest means of dealing with this "departure" at death, through fire (7.347). Here both conception and death are painful events for the soul, the one in separation from the parental soul, the other through separation from the body; this is why sexual intercourse and death are treated alike (both requiring purification).

<sup>819</sup> The statement summarizes 2.202-03: purification is needed for miscarriage/stillbirth, as forms of death, as it is for sexual intercourse. In fact, Josephus has shown only that sexual intercourse and death are similar events (in pain for the soul), not why either is inherently defiling. Cf. Philo, on the impurity of the decaying corpse (*Spec.* 3.207). Later, Josephus will try a moral explanation for corpse-impurity (2.205, as a warning against murder), but his reasoning there would not apply to lawful intercourse. He had apparently learned several modes by which purity rules could be explained (see Introduction, § 2).

<sup>820</sup> Birth was traditionally an occasion for familial celebration, but Josephus sets a high moral tone, urging moderation (here the adjective σώφρων; cf. σώφροσύνη, 2.170); cf. the parallel stricture regarding sacrifice (2.195). The biblical law required "redemption" of the first-born (Exod 22:29; Num 18: 15-16; Philo, *Spec.* 1.137-40), but Josephus does not specify how birth (or male circumcision) are to be marked. His concern for moral control is broadly parallel to Plato's condemnation of drunkenness at conception (*Leg.* 775a-e). The interest in a child's life "from the very beginning" is a characteristic of this treatise (cf. 2.173, 178).

<sup>821</sup> Literally, "letters" (γράμματα); cf. 1.10. The

ideal reflects Josephus' elite status and priestly education. It is hard to estimate literacy rates in the ancient world (and "literacy" itself covers a broad range of ability), but the vast majority of the population was either illiterate, or literate only at the very simplest level (Harris 1989; Beard et al. 1991). Even with their emphasis on a written law, it is doubtful that Judean literacy levels were abnormally high (see Hezser 2001 on Roman Palestine). In Egypt, where documentation was common, the poorest segments of the population were illiterate (cf. Diodorus 1.81.1, 7).

<sup>822</sup> Textual uncertainty makes it difficult to determine whether this clause goes with the preceding statement on reading (Münster), or with the following comment on knowledge (Niese, followed by Thackeray and Reinach). The concern that children know the law is present in the law itself (Deut 6:7; 11:19), and echoed by Josephus elsewhere (*Ant.* 4.211); cf. *Apion* 1.60; 2.173-74. For the Judean concern, see Viviano 1978.

<sup>823</sup> The laws (words) are twinned with exploits (deeds), as in 2.171-74; cf. the use of Judean history as teaching material in *War* 6.103-5; 7.343.

<sup>824</sup> On children brought up with the law, cf. 2.173-74, 178 (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.314). On guarding against transgression, or excuses of ignorance, cf. 2.174-75 (and *Ant.* 4.210). Such verbal and thematic connections to Josephus' earlier discourse suggest that this summary of the laws (2.190-218) is at least edited by Josephus, even if its content is partly derived from sources (see Appendix 5).

<sup>825</sup> Since burial is primarily a household matter (so expressly below), this topic is closely connected to the preceding family rules. But in widening the circle to other members of the community, it allows for an expansion of the discussion to "fellowship" in general (2.207-8). The text of L here diverges on many points from that found in the best Eusebian codex, I: Eusebius has more verbs of instruction, but lacks some phrases found in L. I again follow Münster (against Niese) in its evaluation of the Eusebian texts, and in their priority over L. Burial is also a topic in *Hypoth.* 7.7, which uses the same term for "piety" as Josephus (οσία); but *Hypoth.* forbids the removal of graves and monuments,

burial rites or the construction of striking monuments;<sup>826</sup> rather, it ordered that the nearest relatives conduct the funeral, and it made a regulation that all those who pass by when someone is being buried are to join them and share in the mourning.<sup>827</sup> It gives instruction that both the house and its residents are to be purified after the funerary rites,<sup>828</sup> so that anyone who has committed murder might be far from seeming to be pure.<sup>829</sup> **(2.27) 206** It ordered honor of parents, second to honoring God,<sup>830</sup>

*Honor of  
parents*

not their expensive construction. The duty to bury one's dead, especially one's own family, was an unwritten law in all ancient cultures (see Hengel 1981: 3-15).

<sup>826</sup> As in 2.204, Josephus starts with a negative point that suggests moderation (on expense, see 2.195, 234, 291). Burial rites (processions, prayers, and grave-side banquets) were a means to signal the significance of the deceased, while monuments (stipulated in wills, or constructed by grateful dependents) could be lavish in size, material, and decoration, to ensure the continuation of the honor achieved by the dead. Expense on such matters was open to moral and philosophical critique. Plato urges "moderate" burials, in line with the status of the deceased (*Leg.* 717d; 958c-959e), while Tacitus admires the German tribes for their simple burial rites and graves (*Germ.* 27; cf. Cicero, *Leg.* 2.59, 62-66; see Levison 2002: 247-50). Josephus draws from this tradition (he has no biblical base) as another means of claiming virtue in contemporary philosophical terms; but elsewhere he notes that *expensive* funerary rites are a Judean custom, reducing many to penury (*War* 2.1). For later rabbinic rules, see Vermes 1982: 198, n.26.

<sup>827</sup> In this sentence and the next verbs of instruction are present in L, Latin, and Eusebius cod. I (and thus in Münster), while absent from Niese and Thackeray. The relatives are to be expected, though Judean tradition prevented priests from attending the burials of all but their immediate blood-relatives (Lev 21:1-4), and the high-priest even those (Lev 21:10-11). The addition of passers-by was a common social courtesy, since a funeral was a public event involving all the social ties contracted by the deceased: cf. Tobit 4:17; Sir 7:33-34; Rom 12:15; *b. Ber.* 18a.

<sup>828</sup> Cf. 2.198. Num 19:1-22 describes the ritual of the red heifer, whose ashes, mixed with water, are sprinkled on those with corpse-impurity on the third and seventh days; the rite is familiar to Josephus (*Ant.* 4.78-81; cf. 18.38). It is not clear what equivalent was practiced in the Diaspora. Josephus elsewhere refers to purification after 7 days (*Ant.* 3.262), and Philo (*Spec.* 3.205-9; cf. 1.256-66) suggests a simple sprinkling with water (cf. Sanders 1990: 264-67). The biblical law requires purification for all who enter the "tent," and for all its furnishings and unstopped vessels (Num 19:15, 18-19). Accordingly, Josephus speaks of both

people and house needing purification, though he makes no reference to the time required or the method, nor is there any trace of the Pharisaic extension to cases of "overshadowing" (Sanders 1990: 184-92).

<sup>829</sup> Herwerden (followed by Reinach and Thackeray) bracketed this final clause, but without textual warrant. It provides a moral explanation for the rite of purification after a funeral, another attempt to place the laws within a moral/philosophical framework. The line of thought is overly compressed, but is illuminated by Philo: "With such forethought did he [Moses] guard against someone being responsible for causing another's death that he thought it necessary that even those who touch a corpse that has met a natural death should not be clean at once until they have been purified through sprinkling and washing" (*Spec.* 3.205). Corpse-impurity is thus explained as a means to demonstrate the *moral* impurity in causing another's death: to reinforce the fact that *murder* is impure, Moses made even a natural, ordinary death a cause of impurity. It was assumed in antiquity that killing another human rendered the perpetrator impure (cf. Plato, *Leg.* 865a-874a). The tradition shared by Josephus and Philo represents an attempt to make *moral* impurity the primary phenomenon, and ritual, physical impurity derivative from it. Thus even such laws are derived from moral principles.

<sup>830</sup> The topic is a natural extension from 2.204-5; this is another aspect of good order in the household. The command to honor father and mother stands fifth in the 10 commandments (Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16; cf. Lev 19:3). Its position following commandments about God, and before other laws on human relations, encouraged reflection on its special status (see Philo, *Decal.* 51, 106-7; see Heinemann 1932: 252-59). Honoring God and honoring parents could be connected in many ways. The 2 could be placed in order (Ps.-Phocylides 8: honor first God, then parents; cf. *Sib. Or.* 3.593-94; *Hypoth.* 7.2; Philo, *Spec.* 2.235); parents could be termed servants of God (Philo, *Decal.* 119); or God could be named the ultimate Father (Josephus, *Ant.* 4.262; cf. *Aristeas* 228; Sir. 3.1-6). The 2 commands are frequently twinned and ranked in the Greek tradition as well (see van der Horst 1978: 116, to which add Plato, *Leg.* 717b-e in context); indeed some Stoics went so far as to describe parents as second Gods (Philo, *Decal.*

and if anyone does not reciprocate the gifts he has received from them—however little he may fall short<sup>831</sup>—it hands him over to be stoned.<sup>832</sup> It gives instruction that the young should honor everyone who is older,<sup>833</sup> since God is oldest.<sup>834</sup>

207 It [the law] does not permit us to hide anything from our friends, for there is no friendship if there is not total trust;<sup>835</sup> and if some hostility ensues, it has forbidden us to tell secrets.<sup>836</sup> If a judge accepts bribes, the punishment is death.<sup>837</sup> Ignor-

*Further laws  
on fellowship*

119-20, with note by Colson). It suits Josephus' emphasis on piety to relate moral obligations to God.

<sup>831</sup> The obligation of reciprocity towards a benefactor was everywhere assumed in antiquity; see Seneca, *De Beneficiis passim* and Harrison 2003. It was also common to describe parents as benefactors, whose gifts to their children should be returned in honor and reciprocal care (e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 1.231; 4.261-62; Philo, *Decal.* 111-18; *Spec.* 2.229-30). The emphasis on even minor failure in this regard (cf. *Hypoth.* 7.1-2: even words, perhaps from Exod 21:17) matches Josephus' desire to underline the strictness of the law (cf. 2.215-17, 276-77). In fact, death by stoning was required only in the case of a "stubborn and rebellious son" (Deut 21:18; see following note); elsewhere Josephus emphasizes that it is a measure of last resort (*Ant.* 4.260-65). Josephus' strictness in this context may be traced to his sources (see Appendix 5) or to a desire to match Roman ideals (see Appendix 6).

<sup>832</sup> The death penalty has already been specified in 2 other cases (2.199, 201). Exod 21:15, 17 requires the death penalty (means unspecified) for striking or cursing either parent. Stoning is the punishment for the rebellious son, a draconian law that was generally qualified or limited in application. Josephus paraphrases it elsewhere, adding a parental plea (*Ant.* 4.260-65; see Feldman 2000: 431-35); he also has Herod appeal to the law, without applying it (*Ant.* 16.365). There are other reductions and qualifications in Ps.-Phocylides 208-9; Philo, *Spec.* 2.232; *m. Sanh.* 8.1-5.

<sup>833</sup> The instruction extends beyond the borders of the household, but respect for elders was often twinned with respect for parents (Philo, *Spec.* 2.237-38; Ps.-Phocylides 220-22). A specifically scriptural root may be identified in Lev 19:32 (cf. Sir. 8:6), but the expectation was common across all ancient cultures (see van der Horst 1978: 254). On respect for elders, see Campbell 1994.

<sup>834</sup> The explanation is brief to the point of obscurity (ἐπεὶ πρεσβύτατον ὁ θεός). Reinach (followed by Thackeray and Troiani) detected an echo of the "Ancient of Days" in Dan 7:9, but there is no verbal connection. The comment could arise from exegesis of Lev 19:32 LXX, where fearing God and honoring "the face of the old (πρεσβυτέρου)" are placed in tandem, so "the old" can be read as a reference to God. But the source

of the idea is more likely philosophical. Since what is older is the origin of what is younger, and since God is the cause and maker of all things, God must be the oldest reality of all (the adjective here is neuter, not masculine; for the logic, see Philo, *Spec.* 2.228; *Decal.* 69).

<sup>835</sup> The horizon widens further to relationships beyond the household (cf. *Aristeas* 228: after honor due to parents comes that due to friends). The themes of friendship and trust (cf. Ps.-Phocylides 218) are characteristic of the Judean wisdom tradition, rather than its law. In the Greek definition of friendship "everything is common between friends" (πάντα κοινὰ φίλων), and since many relationships could be characterized as "friendship," the motif defines close social bonds of various kinds: Luke uses it in idealizing the early church (Acts 2.44; 4.32), just as Josephus idealizes the Essenes (*War* 2.122-23). Since information held in common is an important social bond, the sharing and keeping of secrets is crucial in maintaining such friendship (cf. *War* 2.141).

<sup>836</sup> The text appears corrupt in all versions, but slight emendation (to τὰ πόρρητα ["secrets"], by Niese, followed by all subsequent editors) renders good sense. For friends becoming enemies, cf. Sir. 6:8-12; 22:22; 27:16-21 (betraying secrets); such a regulation mars the image of Judean *concordia* (2.68) and συμφωνία (2.170). The sentiment and its terms are closely paralleled in *Hypoth.* 7.8: μὴ φίλων ἀπόρρητα ἐν ἐχθρῶ φαίνειν ("do not divulge the secrets of friends in hostility"). The rule is more compressed in *Hypothetica*, and placed in a different context (among maxims against injustice), but the parallel is sufficiently close (and the subject sufficiently rare) to suggest some connection between them (see Appendix 5). Both also reflect the influence of the Greek tradition, with its maxims forbidding betraying the secrets of a friend in anger; see the *sententiae* of Menander, cited by Küchler 1979: 232.

<sup>837</sup> The focus has now broadened to communal justice (for the virtue, see 2.146, 170), though its treatment is extremely brief (cf. 2.216 for the law on weights and measures). The law prohibits judges taking bribes (Exod 23:8; Deut 16:19) but cites no penalty (cf. *Ant.* 4.216; 9.3; *m. Bikk.* 4.6), though this injustice is the subject of a Deuteronomic curse (Deut 27:25). For Plato, even if the judge gives the right verdict, his acceptance



ing a suppliant, when able to help, makes one liable.<sup>838</sup> **208** What someone has not put down he shall not pick up;<sup>839</sup> he shall touch nothing belonging to others;<sup>840</sup> when he has made a loan he shall not extract interest.<sup>841</sup> These [rules] and many like them cement our fellowship with one another.<sup>842</sup>

*Laws on kindness to foreigners*

**(2.28) 209** The consideration that our legislator gave to the kindness to be shown to foreigners is also worth noting.<sup>843</sup> For he may be seen to have made the very best

of bribes requires putting him to death (*Leg.* 955 c-d). This discussion has certainly influenced Philo (*Spec.* 4.62-67). Josephus may also be influenced by Plato (directly or at one remove), though his strictness may simply reflect his predilection for the death penalty (cf. 2.199, 201, 206). His phrase θάνατος ἢ ζημία (“the punishment is death”) is matched precisely in *Hypoth.* 7.1, though in a different context. Josephus elsewhere claims innocence in this regard (*Life* 80).

<sup>838</sup> Greek: ὑπεύθυνος. Elsewhere Josephus uses this term to mean “liable” to a penalty (specified in the context, *Ant.* 2.146; 7.39; 14.258). Here no penalty is set, and, used on its own, the adjective might be rendered “accountable”; but from the context the death penalty seems implied. The suppliant may be a beggar (cf. *Hypoth.* 7.6), but might also represent other kinds of need (Josephus uses a related verb of animals, 2.213), and the sentiment has its closest parallel in the general rule of Prov 3:27 (LXX uses the same verb, βοηθέω [“give help”]).

<sup>839</sup> The 3 prohibitions in this section have no connecting particles, and each finishes with a matching verb (ἀναιρήσεται ... ἄψεται ... λήψεται). They are united in banning greed; cf. the critique of πλεονεξία in 2.158, 186, 272, 292. This first of the 3 (ὁ μὴ κατέθηκέ τις οὐκ ἀναιρήσεται) is drawn from the Greek tradition. Although the Torah contains laws about returning a deposit (Exod 22:7-15; cf. *Ant.* 4.285; Ps.-Phocylides 13; Philo, *Spec.* 4.30-38) and extracting a loan (Deut 24:10-11; cf. *Ant.* 4.268-69), this rule concerns taking property whose ownership is uncertain (lost property or treasure trove). There are some biblical materials on this topic (Lev 5:22; Deut 22:1-3; cf. *m. B. Mesi'a* 1-2), but the principle expressed here (and repeated in 2.216) is more or less exactly that known in the Greek tradition as a rule of Solon (Diogenes Laertius 1.57). It is cited as such by Plato (*Leg.* 913a-914d, at 913c: ἂ μὴ κατέθου, μὴ ἀνέλη); cf. Aelian, *Var. hist.* 3.46; 4.1; Luke 19:21; Bernays 1885: 272-74; Küchler 1979: 229. The rule is found also in *Hypoth.* 7.6 (ἂ μὴ κατέθηκεν, μηδ' ἀναρεῖσθαι), with additional particulars; see further Appendix 5.

<sup>840</sup> Here the ownership is clear (what belongs to others), so the phenomenon is clearly theft (mentioned again, 2.216). The eighth commandment, against stealing (Exod 20:15; Deut 5:19; cf. Lev 19:11), is ex-

panded in other biblical laws (Deut 24:7; Exod 21:16; 22:1-3; 23:4; cf. *Ant.* 4.271-72; Ps.-Phocylides 6; Philo, *Virt.* 96). It is a basic law of property with numerous parallels in ancient cultures (see van der Horst 1978: 114).

<sup>841</sup> δανείσας (“when he has made a loan”) is missing in some Eusebian codd., but rightly restored by Münster. There are several biblical sources for this law: Exod 22:25 (LXX 22:24), against imposing interest on a “brother”; Lev 25:35-37 (LXX wording close to Josephus), regarding a “brother”; Deut 23:19-20 (LXX 23:20-21), allowing interest from a foreigner, but not from an Israelite; cf. Ps 15:5; Ezek 18: 8, 13, 17. In *Ant.* 4.266 Josephus had cited this law as applying only to Israelites, and only in relation to food (mentioned alongside money in Lev 25:37; Deut 23:19-20); cf. the exegesis of this law in Philo, *Spec.* 2.74-78; *Virt.* 82-87; 4 Macc. 2:8; *m. B. Mesi'a* 5.1-11. It is perhaps alluded to in Ps.-Phocylides 83 (see van der Horst 1978: 171-72, noting the evidence of *CPJ* 20, 24, that some Judeans in Egypt made loans to fellow Judeans at standard rates of interest). Josephus does not make explicit that the law applies only to relations among Judeans (the context is sensitive, 2.148), though the following statement indicates that all these rules concern “fellowship” within the Judean community. The prohibition of interest was not unique to Judeans; cf. Plato, *Leg.* 742c.

<sup>842</sup> Niese wrongly bracketed this statement, which is supported by the best Eusebian codd.; it concludes the collection of laws from 2.199 to 2.208, and stands in parallel to 2.198. Philo found the law against interest an instructor in many virtues (including fellowship, as here, *Virt.* 84); on “fellowship” [κοινωνία] and its primary application to relations among Judeans, see note to “another” at 2.146.

<sup>843</sup> This new paragraph (2.209-10) is different in style and content from its surrounding context. On either side are third-person verbs without explicit subject, giving pithy instruction or prohibition. Here the subject is “our legislator,” who has not been mentioned within the law-summary and will not reappear until the end (2.218). Josephus steps back to comment on the contents of the law (as in 2.198, 208), and draws attention to the fact that he is doing so (“... is also worth noting”). In contrast to the rules summarized in 2.199-

provision that we should neither corrupt our own habits<sup>844</sup> nor begrudge those who choose to share our ways.<sup>845</sup> **210** To those who wish to come and live under the same laws as us he gives a friendly welcome,<sup>846</sup> reckoning that affinity is not only a matter of birth but also of choice in life style.<sup>847</sup> But he did not want those who approach

208, 211-14, the material in 2.209-10 is general, more a comment about the tone and purpose of the legislation than a summary of laws themselves.

In fact, the ideas and much of the vocabulary are closely paralleled in other parts of this treatise, especially in 2.255-61 (cf. Gerber 1997: 197). The following are the most obvious examples: *προνοέω* (“make provision”), 2.209 and 2.257; *φθείρω* (“destroy”), 2.209 and 2.259 (*διαφθόρα*); *προαίρέομαι* (“choose”), 2.209 and 2.258; *μετέχω* (“share”), 2.209 and 2.261; *δέχομαι* (“welcome”), 2.210 and 2.256, 258, 261 (*παραδέχομαι*, “accept”); *ἀναμίγνυμι* (“mix”), 2.210 and 2.257 (*ἐπιμίγνυμι*); *συνηθείαι* (“intimate ways”), 2.210, 258. In short, the content and tenor of 2.209-10 seem designed to support the later, apologetic discussion of Judean attitudes to “foreigners” (2.236-86, with 2.257-61 at its heart). Whatever the origin of the surrounding material (2.190-218), Josephus’ hand is evident here.

This first sentence signals the shift of topic to “foreigners” (in contrast to fellowship “with one another”, 2.208), and the new section, which runs to 2.214, is held together by reference to “kindness” (*ἐπιείκεια*) at its beginning, middle (2.111, the adjective *ἐπιεικῆς*), and end (2.214). If Josephus has particular laws in mind, it might be those which forbid oppressing the “alien” (e.g., Exod 22:21; Lev 19:33-34; Deut 10:11). Philo had already taken these to inculcate a general attitude of friendliness to proselytes (see below), and Josephus similarly discusses attitudes towards precisely such a “foreigner.” Although the headline virtue is “kindness,” the paragraph strikes a balance between welcome and exclusion, mirroring the stance of 2.236-86.

<sup>844</sup> The balance between restriction and welcome is evident in the chiasmic arrangement of 2.209-10: restriction (here), welcome (next clause), welcome (2.210a), restriction (2.210b). The fear of corruption is vividly illustrated elsewhere in the story of the Midianite women (*Ant.* 4.129-55), where exogamy introduces idolatry, and threatens to destroy the Judean way of life (4.140).

<sup>845</sup> The notion of “choice” is crucial (repeated in 2.210; cf. “agreement” in 2.123). To “share our ways” entails greater commitment than mere imitation of Judean customs (discussed in 2.280-86, with different terms). Josephus is here speaking of (what we call) “proselytes,” whose adoption of Judean culture he describes with a variety of terms (see note to “laws” at

2.123). When Philo discusses this phenomenon, he stresses their religious change and its social cost (e.g., *Spec.* 1.51-53; 4.178; *Virt.* 102-8, 182, 212-19), and thus emphasizes the need for Judeans to practice “goodwill” (*εὐνοία*) and “benevolence” (*φιλανθρωπία*); he considers “kindness” (*ἐπιείκεια*) in this context too mild a term (*Virt.* 106). On “not begrudging” (*μῆτε φθονήσωμεν*), cf. *Ant.* 1.11, in relation to Ptolemy II.

<sup>846</sup> For the theme of welcome (*δέχομαι*) or admittance (*παραδέχομαι*), see 2.256, 258, 261. Judean communities rarely if ever engaged in active proselytization, if that is defined (like Christian “mission”) as a systematic policy to “save” Gentiles (see Goodman 1994a). But “friendly welcome” (active support) for those who wished to become proselytes may be presupposed by the fact that the phenomenon occurred at all, and with enough frequency (in Rome) to elicit hostile remarks from Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.5.1) and Juvenal (*Sat.* 14.96-106). Josephus has an extended account of the assistance given to Izates, king of Adiabene (*Ant.* 20.17-96). For the suggestion that this treatise is itself protreptic (designed to encourage proselytism, Mason 1996), see Introduction, § 7.2.

<sup>847</sup> The term “affinity” (*οἰκειότης*) is carefully chosen. It evokes a close relationship (cf. “our own habits,” τὰ οἰκέα, in 2.209), and normally relates to the household or members of the wider family (e.g., Philo, *Mos.* 1.241, 324; 2.176, 278). But it could be expanded to include other types of affinity (cf. *Apion* 1.272), and Josephus here mirrors Philo’s redefinition of the term. In relation to proselytes, Philo insists that the truest affinity lies in common virtue, a phenomenon broader and deeper than physical kinship (e.g., *Spec.* 1.52, 316-17; 2.73; 4.159; *Virt.* 179, 218-19; *Praem.* 152). Josephus stretches “affinity” beyond relations of “birth” (*γένος*), with which he juxtaposes (not opposes) “choice” (*προαίρεσις*). The latter played a central role in Stoicism, and the Stoic notion of a form of belonging crossing boundaries of family, city, and nation may have influenced this conception of proselytes (cf. Berthelot 2003: 365, n.138). Josephus does not explain whether or how the ethnicity of the proselyte might be redefined (cf. *Ant.* 20.37 on Izates’ desire to become “securely Judean”); the matter was sensitive in Rome, where proselytes could be accused of abandoning their Romanness (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1). But it is notable that choice is an aspect of affinity *supplementary* to birth,

Other laws on kindness: to enemies and animals

on a casual basis to be mixed with our intimate ways.<sup>848</sup>

(2.29) 211 He prescribed other measures,<sup>849</sup> of which a sample is necessary:<sup>850</sup> to give fire, water, and food to all who request them,<sup>851</sup> to point the way,<sup>852</sup> not to ignore an unburied corpse,<sup>853</sup> and that the decisions made even towards enemies

not its *antithesis*. Arguments that, with the influx of proselytes, “Judaism” was becoming a “religion” rather than an ethnic tradition (Schwartz 1992: 5-15) receive no support here; see Cohen 1999: 69-139 and Mason forthcoming b.

<sup>848</sup> The plural *συνῆθειαι* is better attested textually (L, Eusebius cod. I; cf. Latin *solemnitatibus*), even though Josephus elsewhere probably only uses the singular *συνῆθεια* (there is a textual variant at 2.224). In the singular, the word means either “close company” (e.g., *Ant.* 4.131, 133) or “customary way of life” (e.g., *Ant.* 10.72; 11.9; 12.285, 303). Here, in the plural, it seems to mean “intimate ways of life.” It is striking that Josephus ends the paragraph with this negative point, though “did not want” is a mild prohibition, and “on a casual basis” (*ἐκ παρέργου*) makes this form of association seem frivolous (cf. 2.257). But a concern with “mixing” is characteristic of this treatise (see note to “us” at 1.229), and Josephus here anticipates the argument of 2.236-86. The forms of forbidden mixing might include Gentile participation in domestic rites (e.g., Passover, Exod 12:43, so Reinach), temple-access (cf. 2.104; *Ant.* 3.318-19), table fellowship (2.174, 258), and intermarriage (see note to “kinship” at 2.200).

<sup>849</sup> The verb (here and throughout 2.111-14) has no expressed subject. In 2.190-208 it has been translated “it” (implying “the law”), but after 2.209-10, where “the legislator” has been mentioned, it seems best to imply a personal subject, “he.” “Other measures” (*τῶλλα*) is a catch-all and imprecise title (also used in *Hypothetica*, e.g., 7.3, 6, 8, 9). The topics to be discussed are of universal scope (including treatment of enemies), and thus continue the theme of relations with “foreigners” (2.209). The references to kindness in 2.211, 214 also connect these diverse materials to the heading of 2.209.

<sup>850</sup> Greek: *ὧν ἔστιν ἡ μετάδοσις ἀναγκαία*. Josephus uses *μετάδοσις* to mean a “share” or “hand-out” (*War* 2.134; *Ant.* 18.150)—i.e., what is given, not the act of giving. So this phrase is not about “the duty of sharing with others” (Thackeray), but the necessity of giving a sample (of the other laws). For the notion of (apologetic) necessity here, see 2.287.

<sup>851</sup> Cf. 2.207 on not ignoring a suppliant; Prov 25:21 specifies giving food and water to enemies. The universal scope helps refute the impression that Judeans are misanthropic (2.148). In *Hypoth.* 7.6 we find the same rule: not begrudging fire to one who needs it, nor closing off running water, but giving food to the poor

and crippled. Although the vocabulary is different, the same 3 items are found in the same order. In fact both texts draw from a common tradition, a stock of Greek precepts traditionally known as “the curses of Bouzyges” (cf. *Hypoth.* 7.8; Bouzyges was a priest of Zeus Teleios who pronounced curses against social crimes). This flexible tradition inculcated the basic rules of civility, including this and the next 2 items in this section; see Bernays 1885: 277-82; T. Williams 1962. This tradition was known in Rome (Cicero, *Off.* 1.52; 3.54-55) and Josephus draws from it (rather than the law) to insist that Judeans are as civilized as any in their social relations (see Kuchler 1979: 229-30).

<sup>852</sup> There are biblical laws against misleading a blind person (Deut 27: 18), or placing a stumbling-block in their path (Lev 19:14); cf. *Ant.* 4.276 (“point out the road to those who are ignorant”). But this rule is also influenced by the Bouzygian tradition, where aiding the lost was a fundamental duty (cf. Cicero, *Off.* 1.52; 3.54-55; Seneca, *Ben.* 4.29.1; *Ep.* 95.51. Juvenal scorns Judeans in Rome as a clannish, antisocial group, and complains that they do not point the way to any but those who practice the same rites (*non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti*, *Sat.* 14.103). There is no direct link between Josephus and Juvenal, but the common topic is intriguing: if Juvenal voices a Roman impression, that Judeans flout the rules of common civility, Josephus is eager to claim an exemplary humanity.

<sup>853</sup> The duty to bury the dead was noted in 2.205, with regard to the household, but is here universal. The biblical law *presumes* this duty, and applies it even to criminals (Deut 21:22-23; cf. *War* 3.377; 4.317; *Ant.* 4.265). The duty to bury the dead was regarded in antiquity as one of the unwritten or “natural” laws, and it was included in the Bouzyges code (Bernays 1885: 279; Kuchler 1979: 230-31). *Hypoth.* 7.7 adds this rule immediately after those about fire, water, and food. Josephus is horrified by failure to observe this duty even in time of war (*War* 4.317 [Idumaeans]; 4.381-82 [Zealots, a crime against the laws of nature and country]; 6.2-3), and takes for granted that everyone would want to cover the dead with at least a sprinkling of soil (*War* 4.332; 5.514). In the biblical tradition, it is regarded as terrible to die, like an animal, unburied (e.g., Jer 16:4; 22:19), and the theme is particularly prominent in Tobit (e.g., 1:17-18; 2:7; 4:3; 12:12-13); cf. Ps.-Phocylides 99 (with van der Horst 1978: 180-81, citing parallels in both Greek and Roman traditions).

should be kind.<sup>854</sup> **212** For he does not permit setting their country on fire,<sup>855</sup> nor did he allow cutting down cultivated trees;<sup>856</sup> he has even forbidden us to strip those who have fallen in battle,<sup>857</sup> and made provision for prisoners of war, that they should be free from abuse, especially women.<sup>858</sup> **213** He took care to teach us<sup>859</sup> civility and benevolence<sup>860</sup> indirectly,<sup>861</sup> such that he did not disregard even brute animals,<sup>862</sup> but permitted only their lawful use and disallowed all others.<sup>863</sup> Those that

<sup>854</sup> The text is uncertain, but there is reason to follow L (with support from Latin) against Eusebius (so also Mras and Münster): ἐπιεικῆ δὲ καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους εἶναι κριθέντα. This introduces the rules of 2.212, the adjective echoing “kindness” (ἐπιεικεία) in 2.209.

<sup>855</sup> There is no biblical law on this topic, though there is on the next (cutting down trees), and the two are related features of a “scorched earth” policy. Josephus had considerable experience of houses and villages being set on fire during the Revolt (e.g., *War*. 4.443-48 [by Vespasian]; 4.488 [L. Annius]; 4.536-37 [Simon]), not to mention the burning of Jerusalem (*War* 6.407). There is an implied criticism of Roman military policy.

<sup>856</sup> Deut 20:19-20 allows taking the fruit from fruit-trees, but not cutting them down; but if they do not produce fruit, the timber can be used for siege works. It was (and is) customary to destroy the enemy’s orchards of fruit and olive trees, not only for the sake of wood but also to render life unsustainable (cf. Philo, *Spec*. 4.23). Indeed, the Bible records this as practiced against the Moabites (2 Kgs 3:19, 25; *Ant*. 9.36, 41), at the instigation of Elisha, while Josephus notes the Roman devastation of trees around Jerusalem, at the time of the siege (*War* 5.107, 523; 6.5-7; cf. later, 7.211). The Deuteronomic ban is echoed in Judean literature, with imaginative comment on its rationale (*Ant*. 4.299; Philo, *Spec*. 4.226-29; *Virt*. 150-54; 4 Macc. 2.14; cf. Ps.-Phocylides 38?). But it was not only Judeans who criticized this military tactic. Plato thought that Greeks, when fighting fellow Greeks, should refrain from ravaging their land, and take only one year’s harvest (*Resp*. 470a-471c). Diodorus admired the Indians for declining to burn their enemies’ land or cut down their trees (Diodorus 2.36.7).

<sup>857</sup> It was normal in war to take captives as slaves and to strip the dead of their weapons or anything else of value (e.g., their clothes). The law has no comment on this practice (cf. Exod 23:4, on returning an enemy’s livestock), but the biblical narratives suggest to Josephus that Judean soldiers stripped their enemies in the usual way (Moses even ordered this, *Ant*. 3.59; cf. 4.93; 7.309, 315; 9.14-15; 12.309, 328). This ban (cf. *Life* 128) thus seems dependent more on the Greek than on the biblical tradition. Plato’s discussion of this topic

(*Resp*. 469c-e) allowed stripping off weapons, but nothing else. Josephus uses the same term (σκυλεύω), without indicating if weapons may be taken; he thus presents Judeans as exceptionally generous to their enemies.

<sup>858</sup> Enslavement is not prohibited, only “abuse” (ὑβρις), a term that, in connection with women, had sexual connotations (cf. 2.201, 270). It was normal to rape captive women, married or unmarried, as Josephus presumes elsewhere (1.35 [see note at “foreigners”]; *War* 7.334, 377, 385; *Ant*. 3.276; 13.292). The biblical law allows sexual intercourse with a captive woman, after a month’s interval, on the condition that she is either kept thereafter as a wife or allowed to go free (Deut 21:10-14). Elsewhere, Josephus paraphrases this closely (*Ant*. 4.257-59), though it was modified in other traditions (Philo, *Spec*. 4.223-25; *Virt*. 110-15; *Hypoth*. 7.8). Here he implies a total ban on the sexual use of captives, stretching to an ideal above the law; cf. his claim that he left every woman unmolested, ἀνυβριστον, *Life* 80, 259 (see Mason 2001: 66-67).

<sup>859</sup> Reading the longer text (διδάσκειν ἡμᾶς ἐσπούδασεν), with Münster (following L, Latin and Eusebius cod. I). Cf. the charge that Moses’ laws teach vice and not a single virtue (2.146).

<sup>860</sup> Greek: ἡμερότης and φιλανθρωπία. For the former, see note to “behavior” at 2.151; for the latter, note to “benevolence” at 2.146. The laws concerning enemies could be put under several headings, such as kindness (Philo, *Virt*. 116-20, with a further list of virtues at 119), self-restraint (Philo, *Virt*. 125-27), or the triumph of reason (4 Macc. 2.14). It may seem strange to illustrate φιλανθρωπία (literally, “love of humanity”) by reference to animals; but Philo does the same (*Virt*. 140-41), in a passage also directed against charges of misanthropy (see Terrian 1985). For the relationship between this summary and Philo’s *De Virtutibus* see Berthelot 2003: 374-76.

<sup>861</sup> Greek: πόρρωθεν, used by Philo in speaking of laws that “implicitly” or “indirectly” teach a broader lesson (e.g., *Spec*. 3.63, 117; 4.203; *Virt*. 21, 116, 160).

<sup>862</sup> In the hierarchy of nature, animals are so much lower than humans (they are “brute” [ἄλογα], without reason), that it can occasion surprise that the law should even consider them (cf. Paul at 1 Cor. 9:9-10). Their inclusion here seems justified *a fortiori*: if we are



take refuge in homes, like suppliants, he prohibited killing.<sup>864</sup> He did not allow the parents to be killed together with their nestlings,<sup>865</sup> but [instructed us] to spare animals that work, even in enemy territory, and not to slaughter them.<sup>866</sup> **214** So in every way he considered carefully what would constitute kindness,<sup>867</sup> employing the laws cited above as teachers,<sup>868</sup> and fixing punitive legislation to deal with transgressors, with no excuses.<sup>869</sup>

*Severity of  
punishments*

**(2.30) 215** The penalty for most transgressors is death,<sup>870</sup> whether a man commits

to be kind to them, how much more to humans (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 4.196; *Virt.* 140, 160). *Hypoth.* 7.9 regards laws on animals (including those here cited) as “little things” that may seem worthless. It was rare in the Greek tradition to legislate on the treatment of animals. In the rabbinic tradition such laws were known as the “least weighty” laws, still to be observed as seriously as the “weighty” (e.g., *m. Hul.* 12.5).

<sup>863</sup> The application is not immediately clear (asses may be beaten, 2.87). Some find an allusion to including animals in sabbath rest (Deut 5:14, so Reinach) or the ban on muzzling the ox (Deut 25:4). *Hypoth.* 7.7 prohibits gelding. However, the reference to “use” (χρησις) suggests either food laws (Lev 11; Deut 14), or the ban on sexual contact (Exod 22:19; Lev 18:23; 20:15-16; Deut 27:21; Ps.-Phocylides 188; so also Niebuhr 1987: 35, n.125). On the sexual connotations of χρησις, cf. Rom 1:26).

<sup>864</sup> Greek: ἃ δ' ὡς περ ἰκετεύοντα προσφεύγει ταῖς οἰκίαις ἀπὲν ἀνελεῖν. This and the rest of this section is used by Porphyry, *Abst.* 4.14, a sign that this text intrigued a scholar in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE. There is no biblical warrant for this law, but we find it, with very similar vocabulary, in *Hypoth.* 7.9: μὴ ζώων ἰκεσίαν οἷα ἔσθ' ὅτε προσφευγόντων ἀνατρεῖν (“do not destroy the appeal of animals, such as they make whenever they flee to you”); see Appendix 5. Terrian suggests the rule is an extension of the law against eating unclean birds (1985: 143-44); Belkin connects it with the law on the fugitive slave (1936-37: 6). There is a remote parallel in Plutarch, *Mor.* 984d and, like others in this context, the law may adapt a Greek maxim.

<sup>865</sup> The noun νεοττοί (translated “nestlings”) could be used for any young animal (so Blum), and it is possible to find an allusion to the law against sacrificing young animals less than 7 days old, or on the same day as their mother (Exod 22:30; Lev 22:27-28; cf. *Ant.* 3.236; Philo, *Virt.* 125-30, 142). But Josephus’ language is extremely close to Deut 22:6-7 LXX, which concerns nestlings and their parents. The same law is cited in a similar context in *Hypoth.* 7.9 (in mostly different terms) and alluded to in Ps.-Phocylides 84-85; cf. *m. Hul.* 12.1-5. In rabbinic law it became known as “the

least weighty” of the commandments (see Crouch 1972: 86, n.7).

<sup>866</sup> This may be related to the biblical law about returning an enemy’s lost animals, and helping his donkey that has fallen under its load (Exod 23:4-5; *Ant.* 4.275). Those laws had become paradigms of virtue in other Judean traditions; cf. Ps.-Phocylides 140; 4 Macc. 2:14; Philo, *Virt.* 116-20.

<sup>867</sup> Greek: ἐπιείκεια; the term brackets the material in 2.209-14 (cf. the adjective in 2.111). This statement, like those in 2.198, 208, concludes a category of laws. It was easiest to group this final category by the virtue they inculcate, although they mostly concerned “foreigners.”

<sup>868</sup> Again an allusion to the critique cited in 2.145 (cf. “teach” in 2.213).

<sup>869</sup> Josephus again uses the end of one paragraph to open up the topic of the next (here, punishments, 2.215-17; cf. 2.150, 156, 163). The refusal to allow an excuse (πρόφασις, translated “pretext” at 2.195, 204) is a sign of Judean severity, to which Josephus will return (2.276); cf. 2.178 (no exemptions) and 2.174, 204 (no excuse of ignorance).

<sup>870</sup> The death penalty has been mentioned 4 times (2.199, 201, 206, 207), with additional, unspecified punishments in 2.194, 207. Josephus now gathers, repeats, and amplifies those notices in 2.215-217a. Since this list begins and ends with reference to the death penalty (2.215, 217a) it supports the impression that “most” transgression is punished in this way, though sandwiched between these are crimes whose punishment is not specified (2.216). The emphasis implies that strict penalties indicate a high morality (cf. Diodorus’ admiration of Egyptians on this score, 1.77). It concurs with a traditional Roman sense of discipline and morality (see Appendix 6), though not with what Josephus records elsewhere as Pharisaic leniency (*Ant.* 13.294). Again, Josephus’ point is closely paralleled in *Hypothetica*, with a similar emphasis on the death penalty and a refusal to allow extenuation or reduction in punishment (7.1-2; cf. Josephus at 2.276). *Hypothetica* also focuses on the same types of transgression (sexual sins and impiety towards God and parents), while including other topics. It is unclear whether the death penalty

adultery,<sup>871</sup> or rapes a girl,<sup>872</sup> or dares to make a sexual assault on a male, or submits to the assault as the passive partner.<sup>873</sup> Even in the case of slaves, the law is similarly inexorable.<sup>874</sup> **216** If anyone is fraudulent even in measures or weights, or in a sale that is unjust and deceitfully conducted,<sup>875</sup> or if he steals another's property,<sup>876</sup> or picks up what he did not put down,<sup>877</sup> the punishments in all these cases are not commensurate with others', but greater.<sup>878</sup> **217** For in the case of a crime against parents or sacrilege against God,<sup>879</sup> even if someone [merely] intends it, he dies instantly.<sup>880</sup> For those, on the other hand, who do everything in accordance with the laws,<sup>881</sup> the reward is not silver or gold,<sup>882</sup> nor indeed a crown made of olive or pars-

*Afterlife reward*

could be applied by Judean communities in the Diaspora or in the homeland after 70 CE (or under Roman rule before that date), except by lynching; for discussion, see Oppenheimer 1998. As with the rules on temple sacrifice, Josephus is describing an ideal. Gerber finds the repetition of earlier material in 2.215-17 a clear sign that Josephus here uses an earlier source (1997: 107-9); but the repetition may be for rhetorical emphasis (on sources and redaction, see Appendix 5).

<sup>871</sup> Cf. 2.201, where the death penalty was specified.

<sup>872</sup> The "girl" (κόρη) could be either unbetrothed (see 2.200, with note to "seizure") or betrothed (see 2.201, with note to "betrothed to another man"). Josephus had noted the death penalty in the latter case (2.201). For the biblical law in the former case (requiring marriage, not death), see note to "marriage" at 2.276.

<sup>873</sup> The Greek πειράω is better translated "assault" than "tempt" (Thackeray); the active partner in sexual intercourse was often taken to be an "aggressor." The law against homoerotic practice was noted in 2.199, with the death penalty. Here the passive partner is assumed to be equally at fault, for allowing himself to be "feminized" (by being penetrated). *Hypoth.* 7.1 claims that this sin is too obvious to require mention.

<sup>874</sup> Reinach thought the text corrupt, and Giangrande suggested an emendation (1962: 116-17, reading ἐπιβούλοις for ἐπὶ δούλοις), but the text makes good sense as it stands. Slaves fit this context well, since they were regularly used (by both male and female owners) for sexual purposes. It is not clear whether the slaves are here held equally liable to the death penalty, or whether the death penalty is here taken to apply (to the perpetrator) even if the sexual partner is a slave (rather than a free man or woman); the parallel in *Hypoth.* 7.2 would suggest the latter (ὑβρίζειν there has a sexual meaning). On the law as "inexorable" (ἀπαράιτητος) see note to "punishment" at 2.178.

<sup>875</sup> The rules in this section (2.216) do not explicitly carry the death penalty, but their severity is implied by the context. The law against unjust scales was not mentioned before; the others were. The biblical laws on this

topic (Lev 19:35-36; Deut 25:13-16) are echoed throughout the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Prov 11:1; 16:11; Ezek 45:10-12; Amos 8:5), and were common in ancient cultures (cf. Diodorus 1.78.3 on Egypt). Philo gives brief comment (*Her.* 162; *Spec.* 4.193-94), and they are echoed in other Judean literature (e.g., *Sir.* 42.4; *Sib. Or.* 3.237; *Ps.-Phocylides* 14-15; *Hypoth.* 7.8).

<sup>876</sup> On theft, see 2.208, with note to "others." *Hypoth.* 7.6 uses the same verb (ὑφαίρεομαι), but the rule is otherwise differently expressed.

<sup>877</sup> For the phrase, see note to "down" at 2.208.

<sup>878</sup> No punishments are specified here, or in the biblical texts relevant to the first 2 cases (the third is non-biblical). This is the only point within the summary of the law (2.190-218) where a comparison is made with other legislation (cf. 2.276; *Hypoth.* 7.1)

<sup>879</sup> For crime against parents, see 2.208. Josephus now makes the death penalty (Deut 21:18-21) applicable to any "crime" (ἀδικία). As in 2.208, parents are bracketed with God; cf. *Hypoth.* 7.2, which runs together "sacrilege" (ἀσέβεια) against God, parents, and benefactors.

<sup>880</sup> On intention, contrast *Ant.* 12.358. The dramatic conclusion heightens the sense of severity. With regard to blasphemy against God, Josephus' source text is Lev 24:13-16, where there is no allowance for a trial. The extension of the definition of crime from act to intention represents an ethical interest in interiority, common in both Hellenistic and later rabbinic ethics (cf. *Ps.-Phocylides* 52; *Matt* 6:21-48). But it is not clear how these crimes, if they took shape only in intention, could be publicly proven and punished; on the theme in early Judean law, see Jackson 1975: 202-34. The text is silent on post-mortem punishment, though not on afterlife reward (2.218).

<sup>881</sup> Some Eusebian codd. (followed by Niese) have a milder version, "for those who live lawfully" (τοῖς ... νομιμῶς βιοῦσι). But this version of the text (τοῖς ... κατὰ τοὺς νόμους πάντα πράττουσι) is better attested (L, Latin, Eusebius cod. I). This need not imply perfection, merely utter commitment to the law (cf. Deut 27:26, cited by Paul in Gal 3:10); in the follow-

ley,<sup>883</sup> and a public proclamation of that sort,<sup>884</sup> **218** but each individual, having the internal witness of the conscience,<sup>885</sup> has come to believe<sup>886</sup>—as the legislator prophesied<sup>887</sup> and as God provided firm assurance<sup>888</sup>—that to those who keep the laws and should it be necessary to die for them, meet death eagerly,<sup>889</sup> God has granted renewed existence and receipt of a better life<sup>890</sup> at the turn [of the ages].<sup>891</sup>

ing section the same people are “those who keep the laws.”

<sup>882</sup> Josephus switches from “penalty” (ζημία, “loss,” 2.215) to “reward” (γέρας, also “prize”). Given the importance of contests in antiquity (e.g., competitions in athletics, musical performance, horse- and chariot-racing), the notion of a prize or reward was readily available as a metaphor and open to philosophical elaboration: material and transient rewards could be contrasted with the promise of a more valuable “reward” for the soul. Josephus, like Paul, uses this antithesis within an eschatological framework (cf. 1 Cor 9:25), but Josephus starts with monetary reward to underline the Judean resistance to the lure of material wealth (cf. 2.195, 205). Silver cups and golden crowns are attested as prizes at ancient contests, and the victor’s city could reward its hero with financial benefits.

<sup>883</sup> A crown of olive leaves was given to victors at the Olympic games; a kind of parsley (σέλινος, or “celery”) was used for crowns at the Nemean and Isthmian games.

<sup>884</sup> Greek: καὶ τοιαύτη τις ἀνακήρυξις (“of that sort” presumably means: another purely temporal and transient reward). The noun (hapax in Josephus; cf. the cognate verb in *War* 7.46) denotes the public proclamation of a victory, at the games or in the home city at the victor’s triumphant return (cf. Philo, *Praem.* 6). It stands in contrast to the private and inaudible, but more reliable, attestation of the conscience (2.218).

<sup>885</sup> The conscience (τὸ συνειδός) is the first of three witnesses: conscience, Moses, and God; for its role in witness, cf. *Ant.* 1.209; 4.286 (also supported by God). Josephus knows the effects of a bad conscience (*Ant.* 1.45-47; 2.25, etc.), but here alludes to the power of a good or pure conscience to give confidence to face both life and death (cf. *War* 1.453; 2.582; *Ant.* 2.52).

<sup>886</sup> The potentially simple statement (“the reward is not X but Y”) has become complicated by reference to each individual’s belief. This may reflect the fact that these intangible and future rewards can only be a matter of belief (cf. Gerber 1997: 194-95). Or it may circumvent the problem that, as reported in *Antiquities*, not all Judeans were in agreement on this matter (see below); rather than overstate unanimity with a claim about “us” (cf. 2.179), Josephus refers to this as a matter of individual belief. The verb πεπίστευκεν (“has come to believe”) matches other references to Judean belief (2.160, 169), as well as the following statement

about God’s “assurance” (πίστις).

<sup>887</sup> As in 2.209, Josephus steps outside the content of the laws to comment on the legislator, Moses. For the verb, cf. 2.286 (in the sense of “forthtelling”) and 2.75 (*prophetans*, predicting, but not, as here, with eschatological reference). Josephus here takes the Pharisaic position that life beyond death is a Mosaic doctrine, a claim vigorously opposed by Sadducees. For their different views see *War* 2.153, 165; *Ant.* 18.14, 16; Acts 23:6-10; cf. Essenes on afterlife in *War* 2.151-58; *Ant.* 18.18. The Mishnah excludes from the world to come “those who say there is no resurrection of the dead prescribed in the Law” (*m. Sanh.* 10.1), and rabbinic texts make strenuous efforts to find Mosaic proof for the belief (*b. Sanh.* 90b-92a, including Exod 6:4; Deut 6:4; 11:21; 31:16). Similarly, the gospels record Jesus in dispute with Sadducees (Mark 12:18-27 // Matt 22:23-33 // Luke 20:27-38); Jesus claims that they know “neither the scriptures nor the power of God” and cites Exod 3:6 in proof.

<sup>888</sup> If this is a category separate from Mosaic prophesies, it may allude to other scriptural passages taken to be proofs of a better eschatological existence in store for the righteous (e.g., Isa 26:19; Ezek 37:1-14; Dan 12: 2-3, and numerous passages in the LXX psalms; see Wright 2003: 85-128).

<sup>889</sup> This additional comment seems gratuitous: the reward is presumably for all who keep the laws, not only for those die for them. But the addition serves a number of functions. First, it highlights the Judean “contempt for death” (2.146) and simultaneously helps refute Apollonius’ double charge of cowardice and recklessness (2.148): Judeans are prepared to die, but for a noble cause (for the laws), not in sheer stupidity. Secondly, it repeats a theme already announced in 1.42-43, 191-92 (the language here very closely matches that of 1.42) and sets up the full-scale discussion of this topic in 2.219-35; again Josephus uses a phrase at the end of one paragraph to announce the theme of the next. On dying for the law, see note to “law” at 2.219. “Eager” death for this cause is emphasized in 1.42 and by Philo, *Legat.* 208-9, 308, 369; cf. the Essenes in *War* 2.153 (εὐθυμοί; here προθύμως).

<sup>890</sup> Greek: ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς γενέσθαι τε πάλιν καὶ βίον ἀμείνω λαβεῖν. In his description of the 3 Judean “philosophies,” Josephus noted their varying beliefs on the afterlife. Essenes believed in an immortal soul, gladly released from the prison of the body, and, for the

219 I would have hesitated to write this now,<sup>892</sup> were it not evident to all from the facts<sup>893</sup> that, to date, many of our people on many occasions<sup>894</sup> have nobly under-

*Judean  
endurance for  
the laws*

righteous, a life of eternal blessedness (*War* 2.151-58; *Ant.* 18.18). Sadducees thought the soul had no further life beyond death (*War* 2.165; *Ant.* 18.16). Pharisees believed that the soul was immortal: the wicked would be eternally punished, while the good would “transfer into another body” (*War* 2.163) or enjoy the “rest of a new life” (ῥοστώνη τοῦ ἀναβιοῦν, *Ant.* 18.14). Josephus’ only other statement of his own beliefs is in *War* 3.372-75 (arguing against suicide): our souls are immortal, and when we die we repay the loan of the soul, given by God; holy and obedient souls go the most holy, heavenly place, thence “at the turn of the ages” (see next note) to take up alternative residence again in holy bodies (ἀγνοῖς πάλιν ἀντενοικίζονται σώμασιν, *War* 3.374). Elsewhere, he reports others’ more general sense of an afterlife: the teachers in *War* 1.650, 653 (toned down in *Ant.* 17.152-53, 158-59), and Eleazar in *War* 7.341-57. See the full discussion in Elledge 2006; Mason 1991: 156-70, 297-308 (also Sievers 1998; Wright 2003: 175-81).

Josephus’ vocabulary here only partially overlaps with that of his earlier statements. “Renewed existence” (πάλιν γένεσθαι) recalls Plato (e.g., *Phaed.* 70c, 72a; see Mason 1991: 162-64). The present statement suggests a new beginning, not just a continued life of the soul, and it may therefore imply some sort of resurrected (i.e., newly embodied) existence (cf. πάλιν in *War* 3.374). But there is no explicit reference to “bodies” (nor in the passages in *Antiquities*; in this respect, *War* 3.374 is unique). This may be out of sensitivity to non-Judean readers (rather than the adoption of an Alexandrian source, *pace* Belkin 1936-37: 25, 28), but the text is notably imprecise about what the renewed existence will be, and also when, where, and how it will come to pass. It is possible that Josephus is now less willing to commit himself to a bodily renewal than when he wrote *War*, some 20 years earlier.

<sup>891</sup> Greek: ἐκ περιτροπῆς. The parallel in *War* 3.374 (ἐκ περιτροπῆς αἰώνων) suggests the addition of the words in brackets; the phrase is otherwise obscure. περιτροπή is either the turn of a wheel (suggesting a cyclical movement of time) or any other sort of turn, change, or upheaval (see Mason 1991: 167-68, suggesting the translation “succession” or “change”). Thus the phrase could be heard to be congruent with the Stoic notion of perpetual world-cycles, but Josephus probably shared the Pharisaic belief in a single decisive change, the dawn of “the age to come.” It may seem surprising to finish a summary of the laws with this eschatological expectation, but there was good precedent: both Plato’s *Republic* and Cicero’s

*Republic* finish in this way (respectively, the myth of Er and the dream of Scipio).

<sup>892</sup> Some Eusebian codd. (followed by Niese) omit “now” (νῦν), but it is present in the best authorities (L, Latin, Eusebius cod. I). This section has normally been taken as the conclusion to the summary of the laws (e.g., Gerber 1997: 186), but there are 3 reasons to regard it instead as the opening of a new paragraph (running from 2.219 to 2.235). i) Josephus here uses a first-person authorial voice, which he had never employed within the law-summary; he steps back to comment on what he has done, from outside the frame of the summary itself. ii) 2.218 forms a fitting climax to the summary, with its eschatological reward for the righteous. In discussing this reward, Josephus had inserted a reference to willing embrace of death on behalf of the laws. This provided the hook by which he could attach the summary (2.190-218) to the following paragraph (2.219-35) about Judean faithfulness and endurance. We have already seen many cases in which he places in the last sentence of one paragraph a phrase which anticipates the next (e.g., 2.156, 163, 174, 189). Now he is commenting on that insertion (his “hesitation” concerns the claim about willingness to die), using it to launch a new topic. This stitching technique sometimes makes it difficult to identify the seams in his argument, but this one seems clear enough. iii) The subject of this section (2.219) is immediately developed in 2.220-21 (Judeans as famously faithful to the law), and their utter obedience to the strenuous demands of the law is the theme that unites the following discussion, up to 2.235. The adverb “nobly” (γενναίως) in this section is even matched by the final phrase of 2.235, τὸ γενναῖον (“nobility”), forming an *inclusio*. The new discussion is necessary to fulfil 2.150, where Josephus promised to show that Judeans not only have excellent laws, but also practice them and are, above all others, faithful to them. The comparisons, with Plato and the Spartans, substantiate that claim: Plato’s great constitution was never realized in practice, while the Spartans allowed theirs to lapse.

<sup>893</sup> Greek: ἔργα (also “deeds”), taken to be more reliable proof than mere words (cf. 2.292). It is not clear what historical “facts” Josephus would use in illustration of the following point, which in this paragraph is supported only by general comments about Judean faithfulness under a succession of “kings of Asia” (2.228) and under “conquerors” who have used torture (2.233). But to follow up the probable allusions here and elsewhere, we may guess he could compile a dossier of evidence on Judean self-sacrifice from the Per-



taken<sup>895</sup> to suffer anything rather than utter even a single word in contravention of the law.<sup>896</sup> **(2.31) 220** Indeed, if it were not the case that our nation was well known to everyone and our willing conformity to the laws fully evident,<sup>897</sup> **221** but if someone either read [such a description] to the Greeks,<sup>898</sup> admitting he wrote it himself,<sup>899</sup>

sian period (cf. Daniel in *Ant.* 10; the witness of Ps.-Hecataeus in *Apion* 1.190-91), during the Ptolemaic invasions (1.209-12), under Seleucid rule (the Maccabean martyrs—see below), and in the Roman era, especially during the Revolt (cf. *War* 2.151-53 on Essenes) and its aftermath (*Apion* 1.43).

<sup>894</sup> Greek: πολλοὶ καὶ πολλόκις, as in 1.43 (with the addition of καί). Josephus is content to make this sweeping claim, and might wish to avoid illustration of such “nobility” under Roman punishment (cf. note to “theaters” at 1.43).

<sup>895</sup> Reading ὑπέστησαν with L and Eusebius cod. I (followed by Münster); cf. the near synonym ὑπομένω, used twice in 2.234. The verb and accompanying adverb (γενναίως) dispel the notion that these deaths were either rash or reckless (2.148). “Nobility” is often attributed to Judean deaths in the Maccabean literature (e.g., 2 Macc. 6.28, 31; 7.5) and is a motif common also in the Greek tradition (see van Henten and Avemarie 2002).

<sup>896</sup> Josephus reuses the highly exaggerated language of book 1, on suffering anything (cf. 1.190) and not uttering a word against the law (cf. 1.43). As a more distant parallel, *Hypoth.* 6.9 speaks of not changing a single word of what Moses wrote, and willingness to endure 1,000 deaths rather than do anything contrary to his laws. If Judeans will not utter a single word in contravention of the laws (e.g., in blasphemy against Moses, *War* 2.152), they are far from performing any disobedient acts. Josephus had earlier noted Judean heroism for the law in narrative contexts (e.g., in relation to the Maccabees, *War* 1.34-35; the teachers of the law under Herod, *War* 1.648-50; the Essenes during the war, *War* 2.150-53; even, with some ambivalence, the partisans of Eleazar at Masada, *War* 7.252-406). He was undoubtedly influenced by the Maccabean tradition, where suffering for the law under persecution became a hallmark of Judean resilience, and was developed by literary sources in graphic detail (1 Macc. 1-2; 2 Macc. 6-7; 4 Macc. *passim*). At later points of crisis, such as Gaius’ threat to the temple, this tradition was evoked to stiffen resistance, as noble self-sacrifice for a higher ideal (e.g., Philo, *Legat.* 117, 192, 208-10, 215, 233-36, 308, 369).

Although he deserted the Revolt, Josephus did not abandon this ideal, but emphasizes it here (2.219-35) for a number of reasons: i) it exemplifies the Judean virtues of “endurance in labors” and “contempt for

death” (2.146), which he has not had opportunity to illustrate in the summary of the laws (2.190-218); ii) the proper presentation of these martyr-deaths is necessary to refute the suspicion that Judeans simply threw their lives away (2.148); cf. Philo’s concern in the same context to refute slander that Judeans have a “barbarian mindset” (*Legat.* 215). iii) this courage, constancy, and noble self-sacrifice would be readily applauded by Roman readers familiar with traditional militaristic values (*dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*); see Appendix 6. If the Spartans were admired for their bravery (see below), the Judeans should be admired still more.

<sup>897</sup> This whole section (2.220) is omitted from some Eusebian codd. and is bracketed by Niese, but is otherwise well supported (L, Latin, Eusebius cod. I), and should be retained. Having stated that Judean faithfulness is evident to all (2.219), Josephus creates a hypothetical scenario where someone reveals or imagines this fact, to induce a sense of amazement (2.220-21). A skeptic might ask why this has to be rhetorically *created*: why could not Josephus provide evidence of real people expressing amazement or admiration? The closest he gets is in 2.233, which depends on supposition. But the theme of amazement (a leitmotif of 2.219-35) is valuable for the contrasts with Plato (2.222-24) and Sparta (2.225-35). Dying for the law (2.219) is here reduced to “willing conformity” (ἑθελούσιος ἀκολουθία); it is only later that the subject of death will re-emerge (2.232-35).

<sup>898</sup> Why the Greeks, rather than other nations, or the whole contemporary world? Greeks are, in fact, the main point of comparison for Josephus throughout the treatise, and in the present paragraph are represented specifically by Plato (2.222-24) and Lycurgus/Sparta (2.225-35). Other nations (e.g., Scythians and Persians, 2.269) remain on the periphery. There are a number of possible explanations: i) Josephus here joins a tradition of debate about constitutions that was fashioned in the Greek tradition, and was continued in his day by reference to Greek examples, even in Rome; he can assume his audience’s familiarity with the topics and the examples discussed. ii) As with Greek historiography (1.6-27), examples from the Greek tradition were both venerable and vulnerable. To be compared to Athens or Sparta was a point of honor, but their differences, and a long history of critical debate, made it easy to find points of superiority over one or the other, or both. iii) With hindsight, it was possible to identify the faults

or claimed that he had encountered people somewhere beyond the known world<sup>900</sup> who had such a dignified conception of God<sup>901</sup> and who had remained consistently faithful to such laws for long ages,<sup>902</sup> I think they would all have been amazed<sup>903</sup>—because of the constant changes among themselves.<sup>904</sup> **222** In fact, those who have attempted to compose something similar for their constitution and laws<sup>905</sup> they accuse of concocting fantasies,<sup>906</sup> claiming that they start from impossible premises.<sup>907</sup> I pass over other philosophers who have dealt with such matters in their treatises,<sup>908</sup>

that caused the failure of Greek constitutions (e.g., for the Spartans, 2.227), and Josephus could utilize stereotypes (e.g., Greek fickleness) to aid his argument. iv) So long as the argument was directed against Greeks, there would be no danger of offending a Roman(ized) audience (cf. 2.74).

<sup>899</sup> The text is uncertain, but the general meaning clear. Eusebius, followed by Münster, reads: ἀλλά τις ... συγγράψαι λέγων αὐτός. Niese and Reinach emend variously. Josephus creates two hypothetical scenes: a work of self-confessed fiction and a claimed discovery of real people, beyond the known world. These are the two most obvious ways of bringing a social phenomenon newly into public consciousness.

<sup>900</sup> It was a literary trope, within travelogue or ethnography, to announce some previously unknown people in utopian terms. The roots of this trope reach as far back as the *Odyssey*, with its land of Phaeacians, but it became entrenched in ethnography through Hecataeus' famous "Hyperboreans," Euhemerus' "Panchaea," and Iambulus' "Island of Sun." Lucian was to parody this in his *True History*, and Josephus alludes to the prevalent skepticism with his "claimed" (cf. Plato, *Resp.* 499c-d). In depicting these "discovered" societies, authors could project their own philosophical and social ideals. Josephus imagines such a scenario, except that in this case the ideal would be *real*.

<sup>901</sup> For δόξα as "conception," see note to "opinions" at 2.169. "Dignified" (σεμνός) matches the "dignity" of Judean theology (1.225); cf. also Plato's life in 2.223. Josephus refers back to 2.165-68 and 2.190-92, and the mention of this motif is crucial for the comparison with Plato (2.222-24), who cannot be faulted for failure to maintain his laws, or for the quality of his conception of God (cf. 2.168, 256), but did not divulge theological truth beyond the circle of the elite (2.224).

<sup>902</sup> For remaining faithful (ἔμμένω), see note to "laws" at 2.150. This is the first point of contrast with the Spartans (2.225-27); for the durability of the Judean law, cf. 2.189, 226 (2,000 years).

<sup>903</sup> The verb θαυμάζω was much used in relation to Apion, with sarcasm (see note to "scholar" at 2.12). The verb (besides here, at 2.223, 225, 226, 234) and cognate adjective (2.222, 233) are repeatedly used in this paragraph, though their varying nuance (of "amaze-

ment" and "admiration") makes consistent translation impossible.

<sup>904</sup> The history of change in Greek political structures was acknowledged by Greeks themselves (cf. Plato's narrative in *Leg.* 676a-689e; Polybius 6.3-9), starting with the upheavals caused by cataclysms (cf. *Apion* 1.9-10). Laying this charge specifically against Greeks evokes the Roman impression of a people inherently fickle and inconstant, ever "adaptable," but for that reason unfaithful; see, e.g., Cicero, *Flac.* 9, 16-19, 24, 57; *Sest.* 141 (Greek *levitas* vs. Roman *gravitas* and *dignitas*); Lucan, *Phars.* 3.302.

<sup>905</sup> "Attempt" (ἐπιχειρέω) again implies failure, and the most they can attempt is something "similar," not something equally good. "Constitution" and "laws" (for the conjunction, cf. *Ant.* 1.10; 3.213; 4.45, etc.) are the titles of 2 works by Plato (*Republic* and *Laws*), and a matching duo by Cicero (Gerber 1997: 228, n.9).

<sup>906</sup> Greek: θαυμαστά, an adjective cognate with θαυμάζω ("be amazed") in 2.221, but given a negative nuance by its context. It was often used for "miraculous" events that were impressive but liable to skepticism.

<sup>907</sup> Josephus already has Plato in mind (2.223-24). Plato was often accused of constructing a utopian state that was simply impossible (e.g., founded on virgin territory, with too few inhabitants and an unrealistic dream of common ownership) or remained purely theoretical; see Aristotle, *Pol.* 1260a-1266a; Polybius 6.47.7-10; Cicero, *Resp.* 2.21-22, 52; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 31; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 508a-c (noting the assault on Plato by Theopompus of Chios). Plato himself acknowledged that his laws were difficult for the common person (*Leg.* 779e; 839c; 841c). Josephus wants to claim that Plato's constitution was *easier* than that of the Judeans (2.224), while the Judeans have both enacted and sustained their even more "impossible" ideal.

<sup>908</sup> The philosophical tradition of political science had developed considerably since Plato (see Rowe and Schofield 2000), but continued to use his work as a point of reference. It is not clear whether Josephus was familiar with other figures in this tradition, but it was convenient to focus on Plato since he was often admired (see next note), and could be seen as comparable to Moses on some points (2.168, 256-57), yet deficient

223 but Plato, who is admired by the Greeks<sup>909</sup> as surpassing all those engaged in philosophy by the dignity of his life,<sup>910</sup> the power of his words, and his persuasiveness,<sup>911</sup> continues to be practically mocked and satirized by those who claim to be experts in politics.<sup>912</sup> 224 Yet, looking at his ideas,<sup>913</sup> one would frequently find them easier and closer to the way of life of the common people;<sup>914</sup> and Plato himself confessed that it was not safe to disclose<sup>915</sup> the true conception of God<sup>916</sup> to the ignorance<sup>917</sup> of the masses.<sup>918</sup>

*Supposed  
Spartan  
bravery*

225 But there are some who think that Plato's works are empty verbiage, written in a florid style and with great arrogance;<sup>919</sup> of the legislators, they most admire

in crucial respects (2.224); see further Gerber 1997: 226-43. For the *praeteritio*, cf. 2.168, 231.

<sup>909</sup> "Admired" (θαυμαζόμενος; cf. 2.225, 226, 239, 252) turns the θαυμαζ- root in another direction. Plato's philosophical stature was universally recognized, even in Rome. Cicero, who drew much inspiration from him, refers to him as *sapientissimus Graeciae, doctissimus vir* and *princeps* (e.g., *Leg.* 2.14, 39; 3.1; *Resp.* 2.21); cf. Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.2.

<sup>910</sup> Greek: σεμνότης βίου; for the adjective (σεμνός), cf. 2.221. Cicero dubs him *gravissimus* (*Leg.* 2.14). Plato's dignity may lie in his renunciation of marriage and politics for the sake of philosophy, or his principled attempts to ameliorate Sicilian politics. But his character was also attacked, as malicious and jealous (Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 507b-d).

<sup>911</sup> Plato's rhetoric was open to criticism for its complexity, "frigid" style, and artificial points of debate (Lucian, *Icar.* 24; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 505e; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem.* 5-7, 23-30; cf. below, 2.225). But for rhetorical purposes the image here is one-sided: even where his life and rhetoric are admired, his ideas are ridiculed. For admiration of his style, see Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.79; cf. Müller 333.

<sup>912</sup> Josephus distances himself from these so-called "experts," as he does not want Plato's image badly tarnished (cf. 2.256-57). The context implies that his ideas were mocked as overly utopian ("impossible premises," 2.222). "Satirized" (κωμωδούμενος) might allude to the comic poet Ephippus, who satirized Plato (κωμωδῆκεν, Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 509b-c; see frag. 14 in *PCG* 5.142-43).

<sup>913</sup> The Greek is imprecise (τὰ κείνου); if it echoes τὰ πολιτικά of the previous section, it could be translated "his politics" or "his political ideas."

<sup>914</sup> Plato's constitution is more accessible to ordinary people at the practical level, although it is far removed from their intellectual grasp (see below). "Easier" contrasts with their reputation as "impossible" (2.222) and the theme of ease/difficulty runs through this paragraph (2.219-35; cf. its use in 2.232, 234) in 2 senses: i) what is accessible to ordinary Greeks (here, in their customs); ii) what is physically demanding (in

2.232-35, in facing the rigors of death or daily discipline). The Judean constitution is harder on all counts, more rigorous intellectually, morally, and physically—and yet both attainable and attained by ordinary Judeans.

<sup>915</sup> Greek: ἐκφέρω, as in 2.169, where a similar point is made. The verb is found in some other versions of the Platonic tag to which allusion is now made (van Unnik 1979: 269-71).

<sup>916</sup> Cf. the "dignified conception" (δόξα) of 2.221. Josephus never challenges Plato's theology (cf. 2.168, 256, 281), only his intellectual elitism.

<sup>917</sup> Eusebius reads ἄνοια ("folly", followed by Niese and Reinach), but here the reading of L (ἄγνοια, supported by Latin *ignorantia*) seems preferable (so Münster).

<sup>918</sup> In *Tim.* 28c, Plato notes that it is a task to discover the Father and Maker of all (the invisible cause behind the sensible cosmos), and having discovered him, it is impossible to speak of him to all (καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν). This text was known among philosophers in Rome, especially since Cicero translated it into Latin. Plato's logic is simple: one can apprehend the Existent Being (τὸ ὄν) only by thought (νόησις) and with the aid of reason (λόγος, *Tim.* 27d-28a), and one cannot expect many people to have the necessary character and training to be able to share that knowledge (see note to "masses" at 2.169). What Plato represented as impossible, Cicero took to be impious (he translated Plato's ἀδύνατον as *nefas*). For Josephus, Plato hesitated not because the task was impossible or impious, but because it was dangerous (as van Unnik notes [1979: 269], Albinus, the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE Platonist, also understood it so): the truth could be corrupted by ignorant minds and unholy mouths (cf. 2.169 on not "daring"). This is the one point on which Josephus thinks Judeans trump Plato: what he did not dare to disseminate, Judeans do, because it is a truth taught, understood, and practiced even by ordinary Judeans (2.169-78). If Plato thought his theology was too high a peak for the masses to climb, every Judean reaches that summit every day of their lives!

<sup>919</sup> Greek: κατὰ πολλὴν ἐξουσίαν κεκαλλι-

Lycurgus,<sup>920</sup> and everyone sings the praises of Sparta,<sup>921</sup> since she stuck to his laws for the longest time.<sup>922</sup> **226** So, let this be granted, that obedience to the laws is proof of virtue.<sup>923</sup> But let those who admire the Lacedaemonians compare their time-span with the more than two thousand years of our constitution,<sup>924</sup> **227** and let them consider, in addition, that for as long as they had their freedom the Lacedaemonians were of a mind to keep the laws scrupulously, but when changes of fortune came to affect them, they completely forgot almost all the laws!<sup>925</sup> **228** As for us, although

γρᾶφημένους. In juxtaposition with the preceding “empty verbiage” (λόγους κενούς) the judgment must be negative. Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses καλλιπέομαι in criticism of Plato (*Pomp.* 2), as Plato does of Socrates’ opponents (*Apol.* 17b); cf. the ironic use of καλός at Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 506f, 509b.

<sup>920</sup> Josephus shifts from Plato to Lycurgus, but his interest is more in Sparta and Spartans than in the legislator himself; on Lycurgus see note to “Lycurguses” at 2.154.

<sup>921</sup> Although Sparta had been criticized by Athens, her rival in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and although philosophers found fault in her legislation (e.g., Plato, *Leg.*, book 1; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1296a-1271b), the Spartan constitution had become the stock example of stability, discipline, and austerity, the standard reference point for moralists with such ideals. During the Roman republic, political commentators praised its supposedly “mixed” constitution, and compared it with that developed in the history of Rome (e.g. Polybius 6.10; Cicero, *Resp.* 2.15, 42, 50). Under the principate, this comparison was less valid, but moralists and philosophers (e.g., the Stoics) idealized its refusal to allow differentials of wealth, its austerity, harmony, and training in courage. Plutarch’s *Lives* of Spartan kings and of Lycurgus exemplify this trope, while the city of Sparta had become a “theme park” for Roman tourists. See the full treatments of the Spartan myth by Ollier 1972; Tigerstedt 1965-78; Rawson 1969: 99-115 (the Roman reception). But, as Ps.-Xenophon, *Lac.* 10, wryly notes, despite the universal praise no city was willing to copy Spartan codes.

<sup>922</sup> Reading third-person singular ἐνεκαρτέρησεν (as emended by Hudson, and followed by Münster): the Eusebian codd. have the third-person plural (“they stuck to his laws”) while L and S seem corrupt. The καρτερ- root is important (cf. καρτερία, 229), and covers 2 points: that Sparta *stuck with* her ancient legislation, and that Spartans *endured* its demands. The endurance of the Lycurgan constitution “for the longest time” (ἐπὶ πλεῖστον; alternatively: “for a very long time”), was a crucial indicator of its value, on the presumption that good things prove their value by long usage and stable continuity. Polybius thus compares Sparta very favorably with Thebes and Athens (6.10-11,

43-48), though he thought the constitution had finally lapsed (at the time of Cleomenes III, 235–222 BCE, 2.47.3; 4.81.12-14). In a rhetorical flourish, Cicero hails Sparta as having kept a single set of customs unaltered for 700 years (i.e., from Lycurgus to his own day, *Flac.* 63; on Roman “preservation” of Spartan laws, see *Mur.* 74). Plutarch regarded the constitution as “unchanged” for 500 years (from Lycurgus to Agis, in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE; *Lyc.* 29.1, 6) after which it was corrupted by wealth. Opinions thus differed as to whether Lycurgus’ constitution was, or was not, still in use (Ps.-Plutarch, *Mor.* 239f-240a; cf. Ps.-Xenophon, *Lac.* 15: no-one keeps it now).

<sup>923</sup> The principle of 2.153 is repeated, and its remark about faithfulness in good and bad circumstances echoed in the following statements (2.227-28). This strengthens the force of the following comparison in longevity between the Spartan and Judean constitutions. Sparta had become a classic example of εὐνομία (“good order under the law”). Plutarch cites an anecdote attributed to the Spartan king, Theopompus: when someone commented that Sparta had been preserved by her kings’ talent for command, he replied: “No, by her citizens’ readiness to obey” (*Lyc.* 30.3).

<sup>924</sup> For the invitation to compare, see 2.150. Josephus does not define the duration of the Spartan constitution (on the ancient debate, see note to “time” at 2.225), but the next section suggests it has lapsed. Even if it was considered still operative, he could be confident that the Judeans’ was older, since Moses predated Lycurgus (2.154). Earlier in this work, he had implied that Moses’ constitution was 2,000 years old: the beginning of time was 5,000 years ago (1.1), and there were 3,000 years before Moses (1.39; cf. the 2,000 years of high-priests, 1.39). But he had declined to make this explicit in his comparative datings (1.103-4; 2.156). He makes the same 2,000-year claim in *Ant.* 1.16, and the presence of the same figure in *Hypoth.* 6.9 suggests it was a common Judean contention.

<sup>925</sup> The reference to “changes of fortune” sets up the point of contrast with Judeans (2.228; cf. 2.153), but the comparison of two such different historical records is only possible if couched in these vague terms. Spartan hegemony was broken at the battle of Leuctra in 371 BCE, and her loss of independence (“freedom”)



we have undergone countless different fortunes, thanks to the changes among the kings who ruled Asia,<sup>926</sup> we have not betrayed the laws even in the most extreme crises,<sup>927</sup> fostering them not for the sake of idleness or luxury<sup>928</sup> but, if anyone would care to examine, [he would find] imposed on us ordeals and labors far greater than the endurance supposedly required of the Lacedaemonians.<sup>929</sup> **229** They neither worked the land nor labored in a craft, but were released from all work<sup>930</sup> and used to spend their time about the city looking sleek<sup>931</sup> and exercising their bodies for the sake of beauty,<sup>932</sup> **230** using others as servants for all the business of daily life and

might be associated with that event, or with her absorption into the “Achaean League” (195 BCE), although she later broke away and was recognized by Rome as an ally and “free” city (from 146 BCE); see Cartledge and Spawforth 2002. Although Spartan laws were changed over time (e.g., regarding currency and the dual kingship), they were also “revived” periodically (e.g., by Cleomenes III [235-222 BCE], and after 146 BCE), so there was no single point at which they were “forgotten” (on Spartan law, see MacDowell 1986).

<sup>926</sup> In the case of Judeans, Josephus speaks not of “freedom” (and its loss) but merely of changes in fortune (cf. 2.125-34). Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, and Macedonians (Seleucids) might be considered kings of “Asia” (if that region is loosely defined); cf. 2.128, 133.

<sup>927</sup> The reference to “betrayal” makes any change wholly negative (cf. Apion’s “desertion,” 2.144). The “crises” are unnamed, but the reference to torture in 2.233 (cf. 1.43) might suggest the “persecution” by Antiochus IV and/or Judean suffering during and after the recent Revolt. Eusebius finishes his citation of Josephus at this point, mid-sentence, rightly sensing that hereafter a new sub-topic is begun, on Spartan softness in contrast to Judean powers of endurance.

<sup>928</sup> Greek: οὐκ ἀργίας οὐδὲ τρυφῆς ... χάριον (τρυφῆς is Dindorf’s conjecture rightly followed by modern editors). There may be an apologetic purpose in this statement (so Troiani 196), especially in relation to ἀργία; cf. Agatharchides on the sabbath (1.209 with note to “day”), and Josephus’ earlier comment on this theme, 2.174. But more important here is the contrast between Spartans (2.229-31) and Judeans (2.232-35). The Spartan work-shy lifestyle (2.229-30) and failure in warfare (2.231) stands in contrast to Judean courage in war/torture (2.232-33) and disciplined austerity (2.234; the arrangement is chiasmic, and the themes held together by the catchword “endurance,” καρτερία). Idleness is thus a Spartan characteristic (2.229; cf. the Judean regime of ἀργία, 2.234), as is luxury (2.229-30; cf. Judean frugality, 2.234).

<sup>929</sup> There are some uncertainties in the text (Niese posits a lacuna); the words in brackets are required for the sense, but not present in the Greek. “Endurance”

(καρτερία) is Cotélier’s conjecture (for μαρτυρία in L and S), followed by all editors. This makes excellent sense in the context (cf. ἐγκαρτερέω in 2.225) and reflects the most famous characteristic of Spartans, their toughness. This was manifested in their frugal way of life (modest food, bare furniture), the discouragement of wealth, the endurance tests in the training of youths (the ἀγωγὴ), the famous flogging rituals, and undaunted courage in warfare; see Plutarch, *Lyc. passim*; *Agis* 14.3; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.49.5; Philo, *Prob.* 114; the legend of the 300 at Thermopylae, etc. Josephus inserts a qualification, “supposedly,” to be expanded in 2.229-30; for Judean καρτερία, see note to “labors” at 2.146.

<sup>930</sup> Josephus emphasizes their lack of work (in 3 phrases), without noting that its substitute was military training. Thus they are prime examples of ἀργία (2.228, “idleness”; the related ἐργ- root is used twice here), while Judeans will be presented as the opposite (2.234; cf. 2.283, 291, 294). The rhetoric succeeds in making the famously tough Spartans appear soft! For the use of helots as agricultural slaves, see note to “prepared” at 2.230. Ancient commentators noted that the Spartiates (citizen soldiers) were neither farmers nor craftsmen (e.g., Aelian, *Var. hist.* 6.6; Nicolas of Damascus, frag. 103; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 24; Ps.-Xenophon, *Lac.* 7), but this was generally regarded as an oddity, not a point of criticism (cf., however, Isocrates, *Bus.* 19-20; *Panath.* 46). However, the Roman ideal was of farmer-soldiers (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.28.2), and Tacitus had strong words of criticism for Germans who were good fighters but otherwise lazy and agriculturally inept (*Germ.* 14.4; 15.1-3); see further Appendix 6.

<sup>931</sup> Greek: λιπαροί. The adjective can be used in a positive sense for a healthy body, but in this context suggests a dandified appearance. Plutarch notes that Lycurgus encouraged the Spartiates to grow their hair long, and in time of war to groom it so that it looked sleek (λιπαρός, *Lyc.* 22.1-2). Josephus may know that tradition, but turns it in a quite different direction, hinting at a code of masculinity by which such behavior looks “soft” and suspiciously effeminate.

<sup>932</sup> Exercise (ἀσκέω; cf. 2.171) is normally associated with toughness, especially in the case of the

getting their food from them, ready prepared,<sup>933</sup> exercising endurance in doing and suffering anything purely for this one fine and benevolent task:<sup>934</sup> to conquer everyone against whom they went to war.<sup>935</sup> **231** I pass over the fact that they did not succeed even in this;<sup>936</sup> for not only singly, but many of them on many occasions and en masse ignored the commands of the law and surrendered, with their weapons, to the enemy.<sup>937</sup>

Spartans (cf. Polybius 6.48.2-5; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 16.6-7, on the training of boys). But Josephus interprets this as a concern for beauty, and thus represents the Spartiates as devoted to an unmanly purpose; the rhetorical twist is bold, but well executed. In Plutarch's depiction, when they were not at war, the Spartiates' time was taken up with "choral dances, festivals, feasts, hunting expeditions, physical exercise, and conversation" (*Lyc.* 24.4). Josephus, who has mentioned no such occupations, suggests that they merely lazed around the city, a location associated with luxury and moral decadence.

<sup>933</sup> The "servants" are the helot population of Laconia and Messenia, conquered and enslaved en masse (between the 10<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE), and owned as the common property of the Spartan state. The arrangement was peculiar in ancient Greece, and famous, as were also a series of helot revolts, brutally suppressed. The helots worked the land to provide produce for the Spartiates, who were members of common messes (συσσίτια, Plutarch, *Lyc.* 8; 24.2). These messes (also known as φειδίτια) each contained about 15 members, and were the institution through which males were inducted into both citizenship and military training. Each member provided a fixed monthly contribution of food (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 12.1-2), and their fare was famously frugal. Moralists found here a model of equality, community, and self-discipline, and Plutarch offers many points of contrast with the luxury, excess, and decadence of his own day (*Lyc.* 10, 12). Josephus turns this tradition completely on its head: the Spartans are here work-shy spongers off others' labor; they neither produce nor prepare their own food—in contrast to the Judeans who exemplify "working for one's self" (ἀπτουργία, 2.234).

<sup>934</sup> "One" (έν) is Holwerda's emendation of ἥν (in L and S), followed by all subsequent editors. Josephus' tone is heavily ironic (the phrase was unnecessarily questioned by Niese). "Exercising endurance" (ὑπομένοντες) hints at the Spartan reputation for toughness (cf. the "supposed" καρτερία of 2.228), but instead of glorifying the Spartan military machine for its noble tradition of warfare, Josephus suggests its purpose is merely hostile and aggressive. Such a "benevolent" (φιλόανθρωπον) ambition contrasts with the real φιλοανθρωπία of the Judean tradition (2.146, 213, etc.); cf. 2.259 on Spartan treatment of foreigners. Josephus thus exploits the ambiguous reputation of warfare. He

will later insist that Judeans fight only for self-protection, not from aggression or greed (2.272, 292).

<sup>935</sup> Sparta was widely regarded as a state geared entirely for warfare, and thus excelling in manliness, discipline, and contempt for death (e.g., Plutarch, *Lyc.* 16.10; Ps.-Xenophon, *Lac.* 13; Nicolas of Damascus, frag. 103.1). This was open to criticism as a one-sided constitution (inculcating only the single virtue of "courage," Plato, *Leg.* book 1), but Josephus finds no virtue here at all, only a hostile will to power. Cf. the Athenian critique of Sparta on this score (Isocrates, *Panath.* 46, 98, 241; Thucydides 2.39).

<sup>936</sup> The *praeteritio* (cf. 1.8, 28; 2.168, 223) slips in a devastating judgment: Sparta failed in the sole purpose of its constitution. For the extreme Spartan code of honor, and the concern to die nobly, see Plutarch, *Lyc.* 25; *Cleom.* 4.5; Ps.-Xenophon, *Lac.* 9.

<sup>937</sup> Josephus piles up the points of blame: surrender of a single, isolated, soldier might have been excusable, not en masse; if this had happened just once, it might have been a freak event, but not if it took place often (the Greek πολλοὶ πολλὰκις ironically echoes the boast regarding Judean endurance in 2.219); if the troops had surrendered unarmed, they had no means of defense, but if armed they should have carried on fighting. Josephus knows the Roman disdain of cowardice and surrender, but also that the Spartan ethos was supposed to foster total commitment in battle, and regarded retreat or surrender as the greatest disgrace. The stand of Leonidas and the 300 at Thermopylae was legendary, as was the anecdote about the Spartan boy who died rather than reveal the stolen fox hidden under his cloak (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 18.1), or the Spartan mother who refused to honor the body of her son with wounds on its back (Aelian, *Var. hist.* 12.21). Josephus does not identify examples of Spartan surrender, but at least 2 were well-known. During the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians had captured nearly 300 Spartans on the island of Sphacteria, and imprisoned them for a number of years (425-421 BCE; Thucydides 4.38: they surrendered themselves and their weapons). In a different context, at the battle of Leuctra (371 BCE), the Spartans were defeated by the Boeotians, and their dominance of Greece destroyed; centuries later Dionysius of Halicarnassus still casts this up against them (*Ant. rom.* 2.17), and contrasts their failure with the advance of Roman power. Writing in Rome, a city saturated with

*Judean heroism  
and endurance*

(2.32) 232 As for us, then, has anyone known—not to pitch the number so high—even two or three who have been traitors to the laws or afraid of death,<sup>938</sup> and I mean not that easiest of deaths, which comes to those in battle, but that accompanied by physical torture, which seems to be the most hideous of all?<sup>939</sup> 233 I myself think that some of our conquerors have applied this to those in their power<sup>940</sup> not out of hatred but because they wanted to see, as an amazing spectacle,<sup>941</sup> if there were any people who believed that the only evil they faced was to be forced either to do something contrary to their laws or to say a word in contravention of them.<sup>942</sup> 234 One should not be amazed if we face death on behalf of the laws more courageously than everyone else.<sup>943</sup> For others cannot easily endure even what seem the easiest of our customs:<sup>944</sup> I mean working for oneself,<sup>945</sup> a simple diet,<sup>946</sup> not eating or drinking anything thoughtlessly or according to the whims of individual desire,<sup>947</sup> nor in

symbols of military achievement, Josephus can afford to sneer at Sparta as a state that failed at the one point where it should have succeeded.

<sup>938</sup> Josephus now paints a stark and blatantly exaggerated contrast, depicting Judeans as far braver and tougher than Spartans. This is not the place to mention the supposed alliance between Judeans and Spartans, which he had learned from 1 Macc. 12.5-23 and reproduced in *Ant.* 12.225-27; 13.265-70. He begins with the subject of death in battle (for the chiasmic structure see note to “luxury” at 2.228), but since he can hardly deny that Judeans have surrendered in war (e.g., the numerous prisoners after the Revolt), he shifts the topic to fear of death and betrayal of the law. “Fear of death” allows inclusion of the topic of torture, broadening the focus from death in battle. The claim to Judean bravery is advanced in the form of a rhetorical question, which avoids the need for evidence but trades on the perception that Judeans were fanatical in loyalty to their laws (cf. 1.209-11).

<sup>939</sup> Death in battle is cleverly belittled: it just “comes” (or “happens,” συμβαίνω). Judeans face a far harder challenge in submitting to torture (which was voluntary, more demeaning, and liable to last for much longer; cf. *Ant.* 13.4). For the Judean ideology of “manliness” under torture (which attempted to crush the dignity of its victims), see 4 Maccabees.

<sup>940</sup> Josephus again admits a history of defeats, but turns it to Judean honor (cf. 2.84, 125-34); no examples are given, but he elsewhere refers to torture in relation to Persians (1.191), Macedonians (i.e., Seleucids, *Ant.* 12.255-56), and Romans (*War* 2.152-53; 7.417-19). As in 1.42-43, Josephus avoids direct reference to Romans: that would portray Judeans as defying Roman demands, or the Romans as sadistic torturers.

<sup>941</sup> For hatred as a motive, cf. 1.224; but here it is rhetorically replaced by a desire (imputed by Josephus) to see a human spectacle: for the adjective (θαυμαστός), see note to “amazed” at 2.221. For the “spectacle” (θέαμα), cf. θέατρον (“theater,” 1.43).

<sup>942</sup> There is a hint here of the Stoic redefinition of “evil,” not as sickness, poverty, or death (the common-sense view), but as moral turpitude or loss of integrity. Acting contrary to the laws might include acts of idolatry, the omission of circumcision (*Ant.* 12.253-56), or the consumption of pork (2 Macc. 6-7; 4 Maccabees). Speaking a word in contravention of it (cf. 1.42; 2.219) might include blasphemy against God or Moses (*War* 2.152), or declaring allegiance to the imperial cult (hailing Caesar as δεσπότης, *War* 7.418-19).

<sup>943</sup> Josephus has it both ways: the previous spectacle is amazing, but also is not, if one considers what else Judeans regularly endure. For the theme of courage (here, ἀνδρείως), cf. 2.272, 292 (the virtue is practically synonymous with “endurance,” καρτερία, 2.146, 170, etc.). The comparison certainly includes the Spartans, but is generalized to suggest that Judean superiority is universal (in relation to “everyone else”).

<sup>944</sup> For the theme of ease, cf. 2.224, 232. The claim that these rules are disciplines to be endured (ὑπομένω) is used twice in this section; cf. 2.230) portrays the Judean tradition as a culture of toughness. In 2.123 he had spoken of Greek proselytes who were too soft to endure (also ὑπομένω) its demands; the same people may be here in mind, or the point may be unspecific. In a different context, the imitation of Judean customs does not seem a particularly arduous task (2.282-86).

<sup>945</sup> Greek: αὐτουργία, foregrounded to contrast with work-shy Spartans (2.229-30); on Judean attitudes to work in *Apion*, see note to “thoroughly” at 1.60.

<sup>946</sup> This is in contrast to “luxury” (τρυφή) in 2.228, as the previous comment contrasts “idleness.” Josephus could not claim that Spartans enjoyed luxurious food, only that they were lazy in its means of acquisition. But he can play here on Roman moralizing, which disapproved of modern “luxury” in Rome and feigned admiration for the frugal and simple past (see Appendix 6).

<sup>947</sup> The phrase contains some textual uncertainty (ἐπιτεθυμηκῶς is Hudson’s conjecture, followed by all modern editors), but is clearly about the control of de-

connection with sexual relations<sup>948</sup> or extravagance,<sup>949</sup> and, on the other hand, enduring an unchangeable regime in abstention from work.<sup>950</sup> **235** But those who fight with swords, hand to hand, and rout the enemy by their attack could not face the rules about daily life.<sup>951</sup> In our case, by contrast, from our glad obedience to the law in these matters issues our display of nobility there also.<sup>952</sup>

**(2.33) 236** Then the Lysimachus and Molons, and other writers of that sort<sup>953</sup>—

*Insults against  
Judeans  
(regarding  
religion)*

sire. That the Judean laws inculcate such control over the passions was already suggested by the LXX translation of the tenth commandment (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) and is developed in 4 Macc. 2.6-14. The theme, and the 3 examples chosen (food, company, and work), match *Apion* 2.173-74. On food laws as teaching restraint, cf. Philo, *Spec.* 4.100-102, 124.

<sup>948</sup> Greek: συνουσίᾳ προσελθεῖν. This is a particular kind of “company” (2.174), sexual relations (cf. sexual συνεῖναι in 2.201); Josephus has outlined relevant laws in 2.199-203.

<sup>949</sup> The dative (πολυτελείᾳ) hangs loosely here; the text may be corrupt (see next note), or the phrasing clumsy. On the theme of extravagance, see 2.195, 205, 291; it is naturally associated with food and sex.

<sup>950</sup> Greek: καὶ πάλιν ἀργίας ὑπομῆναι τάξιν ἀμετακίνητον. ἀργία can have the negative sense of “idleness” (2.228; cf. 1.209 and note to “day”), but also, as here, the neutral or even positive meaning of abstention from work in order to rest, especially on the sabbath; for the noun in this connection, see *Ant.* 18.319, 354; for the verb, *Ant.* 12.274; 14.63. One would expect the “unchangeable regime” to concern both work and rest (as it does in 2.174), and it may be that something has dropped out of the text (ἐργασίας?) or that the previous word (πολυτελείᾳ) is a corruption for some term for “work” (see Niese and Reinach ad loc.; Cobet’s emendation, ἀγνείας for ἀργίας, is less likely). Alternatively, Josephus is attempting to make the sabbath rest a token of rigid Judean discipline, a sign not of idleness but of unswerving commitment to a tough regime.

<sup>951</sup> The text is uncertain. L (followed by Münster) reads εἰ at the start, as if it were the beginning of a conditional clause, but after 2 plural participles there is no main verb in the protasis, while the apodosis reads οὐκ ἄν τις βλέψειεν (“no-one would see”). It is hard to make any sense of this. The Latin goes in a completely different direction (“this is to be noticed: if, using swords ... we never infringe the precepts of the law concerning foods”). It seems best to follow S and read οἱ at the beginning (so all other modern editors) and to follow Grotius in emending the final clause to οὐκ ἀντέβλεψαν (so Niese, Naber, Reinach) or οὐκ (ἀν) ἀντιβλέψειαν (Bekker, Thackeray). The point seems to be that even those who engage in the most courageous

forms of fighting, face to face with the enemy, cannot endure the demands of the law in everyday life: our laws are tougher than warfare, and too tough for the bravest soldiers! The implication is that if other peoples do not keep Judean laws, that is not because they are bad laws, or simply alien to them, but because they find them too demanding.

<sup>952</sup> Others might succeed in warfare but fail in keeping Judean laws; Judeans are sufficiently tough to handle their laws, and therefore brave in the military context (“there”) also. Josephus will not concede that Judeans are poor fighters (cf. the charges of 2.148), but will always insist that their courage is primarily displayed elsewhere (cf. 2.272; Philo, *Virt.* 1-4). For “glad” obedience, cf. 1.42; 2.189, 218, with note at “eagerly.” The reference to “nobility” (τὸ γενναῖον) echoes the opening statement of 2.219, and brings the paragraph to its conclusion, linking its 2 themes, bravery in the face of death and endurance under the regime of law. Josephus has shown that Judeans not only keep their (good) laws (cf. 2.150), but that in doing so they display the virtues of courage, frugality, and toughness. The last 2 virtues in the list of 2.146 have now been amply demonstrated.

<sup>953</sup> The naming of critics, even in this pluralized (and thus generalized) form, signals a new stage in the argument, and is parallel to its opening at 2.145. The two names are twinned, as in 2.145, because of their common critique of Judeans as antisocial (see note to “Lysimachus” at 2.145), the issue that will dominate this following discussion. In fact, Lysimachus receives no further mention, but Apollonius Molon will reappear several times (2.255, 258, 262, 270).

The new paragraph extends to 2.286, that is, to the end of the main body of this treatise. At its heart is the accusation of 2.258, of intolerance towards those with different views of the divine or different social customs. The accusation is here only vaguely glimpsed (see 2.239), but stands behind the discussion of erroneous opinions about the Gods (2.239-54): having established how wrong such theologies can be, it is easier to explain why Judeans do not welcome them. The charge itself (2.258) is then embedded among parallel cases of religious or social intolerance, including Plato, the Spartans, the Athenians, and others (2.255-69). Having given good reason for refusing others’ beliefs or cus-



fake sophists, who dupe the young<sup>954</sup>—insult us as the most despicable human beings.<sup>955</sup> **237** For my part, I would have preferred not to conduct an inquiry into other people's rules:<sup>956</sup> it is our tradition to observe our own and not to criticize others'.<sup>957</sup> And our legislator expressly prohibited us from mocking or slandering the Gods recognized by others, for the sake of the very name "God."<sup>958</sup> **238** But since our

toms, Josephus again affirms the Judeans' loyalty to their own customs (2.270-78), and confounds criticism by citing how much others emulate Judean ways (2.279-86): why should Judeans emulate others' customs, when others emulate theirs? The space allotted to this discussion indicates the seriousness of the charge. Judean religious exclusivism offended deeply felt convictions regarding religious propriety; that Judeans were socially unassimilated in other respects also compounded the sense that they were uncivilized and unsupportive members of the community (cf. 2.148 and notes to 2.258). If Josephus can refute these prejudices he can clear away the last remaining items on the charge sheet of 2.145, 148 and dismantle a significant obstacle to the appreciation of Judean culture.

<sup>954</sup> Josephus renews an ethos-attack on his opponents, not used since the extended assault on Apion (2.1-144; cf. below, 2.255, 270). The term σοφισταί can have a positive sense of "learned men" (e.g., *War* 1.648; perhaps ambiguous in that context), but here catches the negative nuance that had surrounded the term since the time of Plato, suggesting cash-hungry teachers of "philosophy," who would use their rhetorical skills without concern for truth or justice (cf. *War* 2.118, 433). The adjective "fake" (ἄδοκιμοί; alternatively, "morally depraved") makes the pejorative nuance clear and strengthens the scorn. Duping the young (Josephus reuses ἀπατεῶν, "fraudster," returning the insult levelled at Moses, 2.145) was a frequent charge against rival philosophers, whose pupils were impressionable youths (cf. the charge against Socrates, 2.264). On Apollonius' teaching, and his famous pupils, see note to "Molon" at 2.79. If F. Gerber (1991) is right that Plutarch's positive comment on Apollonius' character (*Caes.* 3.1) is apologetic, Josephus may not have been the only one to view Apollonius negatively, though the suggestion that Plutarch is responding specifically to this treatise is unwarranted.

<sup>955</sup> The adjective (φαυλότατος) conveys both social and moral disdain (as elsewhere, I translate "despicable" where its moral tone seems strong); cf. its use in 1.53; 2.3, 285, and its application to Judeans at 1.210; 2.278, 290 (Moses). Correspondingly, Apollonius spoke of Judeans as the least talented "barbarians" (2.148). Josephus keeps the charge at this point extremely general. It is only after an extended depiction of valueless opinions about the divine (2.240-54) that he will specify the issue of religious intolerance (2.258).

In that context it will seem entirely reasonable for Judeans to be inhospitable to others' opinions about "God."

<sup>956</sup> Greek: νόμιμα; cf. note to "rules" at 2.7, though what follows will discuss beliefs as well as customs. The apology here (2.237-38) closely parallels that of 2.150: Josephus portrays himself as *compelled* to engage in unsavory criticism, since the tactic had first been used by others. This reflects the elite pretense that self-praise and noisy criticism of others were low-brow activities (cf. 1.219-22; 2.4, 147); people of real worth should not need such defense, since their moral superiority was self-evident. But it was legitimate to use such tactics in response, when others had already lowered the tone of the discourse (cf. Paul in 2 Cor 12:11-12). Since *religious* criticisms were a particularly dangerous tactic, Josephus takes care to guard himself by claiming necessity.

<sup>957</sup> Cf. the criticism of Apion on this score, 2.144. In the background is the impression that Judeans were contemptuous of others' religious practices and beliefs (see note to "God" at 2.258); in a similar context, Philo insists that the Judean law does not "break down others' customs" (*QE* 2.5).

<sup>958</sup> See the LXX version of Exod 22:27: θεοὺς οὐ κακολογήσεις, unusually taking the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים as a reference to (pagan) Gods. This (mis)translation may reflect concerns about religious invective in its Alexandrian context, but was noted and echoed elsewhere not only by Josephus (*Ant.* 4.207; see Feldman 2000 ad loc.), but also by Philo (*Spec.* 1.53; *Mos.* 2.205; *QE* 2.5). Philo uses much the same language as Josephus. Among other reasons for this law (that it reduces religious friction; that the opposite would encourage blasphemous retaliation) he uses the same rationale: that the name of God should be preserved in honor (*Mos.* 2.205). If Josephus does not derive this point from Philo, he certainly shares with him a common tradition (see Delling 1965; van der Horst 1993; Goldenberg 1997). Origen would later appeal to the same law to counter Celsus' claim that Christians abuse the Gods and their statues (*Cels.* 8.38). Josephus might claim that the following torrent of abuse (2.240-49) is directed only against those who spin such mythological tales, and does not constitute slander of the Gods themselves. But if so, the distinction was fine, since for him such Gods existed *only* as portrayed in myth.

critics think that they can convict us by means of comparison, it is not possible to stay silent,<sup>959</sup> all the more since the argument about to be made now was not concocted by ourselves,<sup>960</sup> but has been propounded by many extremely illustrious people.<sup>961</sup> **239** For who of those among the Greeks admired for their wisdom<sup>962</sup> has not censured the most famous poets and the most trusted legislators<sup>963</sup> for originally sowing such opinions about the Gods among the masses,<sup>964</sup> **240** declaring them [the Gods] to be as numerous as they wish,<sup>965</sup> coming into existence from one another

*Absurdity in  
Greek myths*

<sup>959</sup> Cf. 2.150, whose context suggests that Apollonius is most in mind (see note to “inferior” at 2.150). Here the point is general, and induces suspicion that the critical comparisons have been invented to justify the following invective; for the tactic, see Introduction, § 5.

<sup>960</sup> The text is uncertain here at several points; Münster largely follows the reconstruction offered by Niese. “Ourselves” here are Judeans, not Josephus personally (*pace* the translations by Blum and Thackeray). Drawing on non-Judean resources, Josephus both shelters behind them (lest his method seem harsh) and borrows their authority. The “argument” is the collection of critical remarks about myth and popular religion in 2.240-54.

<sup>961</sup> The category is extremely broad (cf. 1.175; 2.259), and suggests an uncontested recognition of fame and worth. The next section will specify the wise as Greeks, but the “illustrious” could include Roman philosophers (such as Varro or Cicero) who inherited or developed the Greek critique of myth (e.g., Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.42-43; 2.70-72; 3.60, 77). Although Romans, arguably, had their own mythological tradition (see Beard, North & Price 1998: 1.171-81), Roman religion could be contrasted with the “Greek” tradition of myth (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.18-20); so the following assault on Homeric myths need cause no offense in Rome.

<sup>962</sup> As in 1.175 and 2.168, Josephus aligns himself with the Greek philosophical tradition (though the category is imprecise). He continues to reinforce this alignment in 2.242, 247, 255, 281, and in the specific agreement with Plato at 2.255-57.

<sup>963</sup> The poets (most obviously Homer and Hesiod) are again censured in 2.247, 251, 256; the legislators in 2.250-54. There is a strong echo of the *theologia tripartita*, the threefold analysis of religious discourse as “poetic” (mythological and dramatic), “natural” (i.e. philosophical, relating the Gods to the nature of the universe), and “civic” (religion as practiced in the state, particularly in festival and sacrifice). The distinction between these 3 modes, and observation on the tensions between them, is first found in Varro (*apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 4.27, 31; 6.5-6) and is probably of Stoic origin (see Lieberg 1973; Cardauns 1978); for its im-

portance in Roman discourse see Feeney 1988: 14-18, 92-97; Beard, North & Price 1998: 1.30-41, 211-44. Josephus thus attacks Greek mythology not as an outsider, speaking from a different cultural location. Rather, he insinuates himself into debates among Greeks and Romans, wedging open the gaps that lay between one system of religion and another, and linking the Judean tradition to its “philosophical” mode (see Barclay forthcoming a).

<sup>964</sup> For δόξαῖ in the sense of “opinions,” see 2.169; the reference to the “masses” hints at elite disdain of the uneducated and superstitious common people. Josephus had earlier voiced criticism of “unseemly” mythology, admitted by legislators who let divine behavior provide an excuse for immorality (*Ant.* 1.15, 22; cf. *Apion* 2.175); but here he develops the point at length. The philosophical critique of Homer and the myths can be traced back to the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Xenophanes criticized representation of the Gods in anthropomorphic and immoral terms; Hecataeus of Miletus thought the Greek tales were “absurd,” and rationalized them as references to historical events, exaggerated or misunderstood; Theagenes of Rhegium explained divine strife as a symbol of conflict among the natural elements. By the time of Plato the critique was well-entrenched, and he could presuppose agreement that myths should be allowed only if they represent the Gods acting “worthily,” in accordance with their absolute goodness (*Resp.* 376e-392c; cf. Euripides, frag. 292: if the Gods do something disgraceful, they are not Gods). The Stoic tradition developed this critique, with a system of allegory by which the authority of the tradition could be maintained, but its faults corrected (see Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.39-41; 2.63). Alternatively, one could distinguish between “noble” and scurrilous myths (Plutarch, *Mor.* 358e-f); for full discussion, see Decharme 1904; Pépin 1958. Christian apologists used this tradition for their own purposes, rebutting charges of atheism with scornful critique of impious and immoral myths (e.g., Tertullian, *Apol.* 14; Ps.-Clement, *Hom.* 4-5). Origen thus agrees with the philosopher Celsus on this point (*Cels.* 5.14, 23-24), as does Josephus with the Greek savants.

<sup>965</sup> For Josephus’ monotheism, see 2.168, 193. This is the only statement against polytheism, though the

and by all sorts of births,<sup>966</sup> and distinguishing them by location and manner of life,<sup>967</sup> like animal species,<sup>968</sup> placing some underground,<sup>969</sup> others in the sea,<sup>970</sup> the most ancient of them bound in Tartarus,<sup>971</sup> **241** and for those assigned to heaven<sup>972</sup> appointing one who is nominally a “father,” but in his behavior a tyrant and despot,<sup>973</sup> fabricating<sup>974</sup> for this reason a plot concocted against him by his wife, brother, and daughter<sup>975</sup> (to whom he gave birth from his own head),<sup>976</sup> whose scheme was to capture and imprison him, as he himself had done to his own father?<sup>977</sup>

*Criticisms of mythology*

**(2.34) 242** Those with superior intelligence rightly regard such things as utterly reprehensible<sup>978</sup> and, in addition, they are scornful<sup>979</sup> if one must suppose that some

accent is less on the number of Gods than on the license to invent them at will (for Greek license, cf. 1.15; 2.16, 252). Throughout this discussion, Josephus places the blame on the myth-makers (cf. 2.240, 241, 247), but the opprobrium also attaches to the deities described.

<sup>966</sup> Or “means of conception” (γενέσεις), e.g., through adultery or incest. For a bizarre form of birth, see 2.241. The phrase immediately highlights the anthropomorphisms: like humans, the Gods are born and have family relations with one another.

<sup>967</sup> Location is illustrated here (2.240-41), manner of life in 2.242. Distributed like this, they certainly cannot “encompass all things, self-sufficient and sufficing for all” (2.190).

<sup>968</sup> In the ontological hierarchy, Gods should be well above humanity, not beneath them like animals; this is almost Egyptian (cf. 1.224-25).

<sup>969</sup> The Greek ὑπὸ γῆν suggests animals that live under the soil, but could also mean “under the earth” in the sense of “the underworld” (normally in Greek καταχθόνιος or ὑποχθόνιος). The chief Gods of the underworld were Hades (for Romans, Pluto or Dis) and his wife Persephone (Roman Proserpina). (For these and other deities see March 1998, with lists of primary texts.) Josephus names none of the deities in the following diatribe, but depends on his readers’ familiarity with myths, especially as told by Homer. This serves to draw the reader into complicity with his knowledge, and thereby also into his judgment: he assumes the reader both knows these stories and disapproves of them. It is less likely that he feels bound by the law of Exod 23:13 against mentioning the names of others’ Gods (*pace* Troiani 198); he shows no such scruple elsewhere (e.g., 1.255, 294; 2.117).

<sup>970</sup> Most obviously Poseidon (for Romans, Neptune), but also Oceanus, Phorcys, Nereus, and the sea-nymphs (Neirids) such as Amphitrate, Poseidon’s wife.

<sup>971</sup> Tartarus is a gloomy place, far beneath the earth, where Cronos and the other Titans (the pre-Olympian Gods) were eternally imprisoned, after losing the war with Zeus (cf. 2.241, 247). That Gods should be “bound” (their power limited) is shocking in itself.

<sup>972</sup> The Olympian Gods, considered to dwell on

Mount Olympus or in the sky. Zeus was particularly associated with the sky as the weather-God, responsible for rain, snow, hail, and thunderstorms.

<sup>973</sup> Zeus (for Romans, Jupiter) was traditionally known as “Father of Gods and men.” But his superior power enabled him to intimidate the other Gods (e.g., Homer, *Il.* 8.19-27), and he is frequently represented in myth as angry and capricious. Josephus plays on the expectation that a father should wield power benevolently, and suggests that the mythical image is unworthy of God.

<sup>974</sup> Niese conjectures a missing participle (πλάττοντες) on the basis of the Latin (*figunt*); Münster follows suit.

<sup>975</sup> Respectively, Hera, Poseidon, and Athena. The plot is referred to (though not explained) in Homer, *Il.* 1.396-406; Zeus was rescued by Thetis, with the aid of a monster Briareus/Aegneon. Josephus assumes the plot was hatched because of Zeus’ tyrannical behavior. It provides a fine example of family strife, with wife and children failing to respect the head of the household (cf. 2.201, 206).

<sup>976</sup> Athena (identified by Romans with Minerva) was born in this bizarre way (Josephus enjoys its absurdity) after her pregnant mother, Metis, had been swallowed by Zeus. Hephaestus split open Zeus’ head with an axe, and Athena sprang forth (Hesiod, *Theog.* 924-25).

<sup>977</sup> Zeus had captured and imprisoned Cronos (for Romans, Saturn), with his fellow Titans, in Tartarus (cf. 2.240); the family discord, and filial impiety, stretched back generations. Such stories could be given allegorical meaning (cf. Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.63-64), but Josephus will discount all such attempts to redeem the myths (2.255).

<sup>978</sup> Josephus repeats the authority with which he speaks, “intelligence” (φρόνησις) echoing “wisdom” (σοφία) in 2.239. For philosophers, the Gods are purely and perfectly good, and their scurrilous behavior in the myths is a matter of obvious censure (Plato, *Resp.* 379a-380c).

<sup>979</sup> Greek: καταγελάω, inviting laughter at the absurdly anthropomorphic depictions to follow.

Gods are beardless youths, others bearded old men,<sup>980</sup> and others assigned to crafts—one working as a smith,<sup>981</sup> another weaving,<sup>982</sup> another making war and fighting alongside humans,<sup>983</sup> others playing the cithara<sup>984</sup> or taking pleasure in archery<sup>985</sup>—**243** and then that hostile factions form among them and disputes about human beings,<sup>986</sup> to the extent that they not only come to blows with one another but also weep and suffer when they get wounded by human beings.<sup>987</sup> **244** But the most immoral feature of all:<sup>988</sup> is it not monstrous<sup>989</sup> to attribute loss of self-control<sup>990</sup> in sex and love affairs to practically all the Gods, both male and female?<sup>991</sup> **245** Then the noblest<sup>992</sup> and supreme God, the “Father” himself,<sup>993</sup> disregards the women he

<sup>980</sup> Apollo was generally depicted as a beardless paragon of youthful beauty, Zeus as a dignified, bearded old man (cf. Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.83). The comment reveals the importance of the arts (painting, statuary, etc.) in reinforcing and embellishing the poetic tradition (cf. 2.252).

<sup>981</sup> Hephaestus (for Romans, Vulcan), the (lame) God of fire and metal-working (see the famous description in Homer, *Il.* 18.368-617).

<sup>982</sup> Athena (in Rome, Minerva), the Goddess of (war and) crafts, and thus for women of spinning and weaving.

<sup>983</sup> Ares, the God of war (for Romans, Mars), delighting in bloodlust and chaos, and with a large role to play in the Trojan War (on the side of the Trojans). If Gods are morally perfect, Plato argued, they should not be depicted causing harm (*Resp.* 379a-e).

<sup>984</sup> Apollo, the God of music and the arts, is often portrayed holding a cithara (7-stringed lyre or lute).

<sup>985</sup> Apollo is often equipped with a bow, and Artemis, the Goddess of hunting, with bow and arrows. Since their arrows always hit the mark, their “pleasure” is in causing death.

<sup>986</sup> The Gods are so reduced to human level that they have disputes amongst themselves, not only like human beings, but even about them; cf. Plato, *Resp.* 378c-d, 379e. Zeus and Hera were perpetually at odds over Zeus’ serial infidelities; if his conquests did not suffer the consequences of Hera’s wrath (e.g., Semele), their offspring did (e.g., Heracles). Aphrodite, Hera, and Athena also famously fell out over the judgment of a mortal, Paris, that Aphrodite was the most beautiful of the three. In the resulting Trojan War, Aphrodite, Ares, Leto, Apollo, and Artemis took the side of the Trojans; Athena, Hera, and Poseidon, that of the Greeks (Homer, *Il.* 20.1-74; 21.385-513). Tertullian (*Apol.* 14.2) ridicules the phenomenon and compares it to gladiators fighting in teams.

<sup>987</sup> The Gods, absurdly, are not only physically vulnerable (to blows struck by humans!), but also suffer human emotions. Two famous incidents in bk 5 of the *Iliad* are in view: Aphrodite is wounded on the wrist by a blow from Diomedes, and rushes back to Olympus to

be comforted by Dione (5.335-80); Ares is struck in the abdomen by the same Diomedes, howls like an army of thousands of men, and flees in pain to Olympus (5.842-906). Parallel incidents are briefly described by Dione in 5.381-404.

<sup>988</sup> Reading superlative ἀσελγέστατον, according to Cobet’s emendation, followed by Niese minor, Reinach, and Münster (L and S have the comparative, ἀσελγέστερον, followed by Thackeray). The adjective means “dissolute” or “outrageous,” often with reference to sexual relations: the English “immoral” similarly has both broad and particular connotations. This functions as the heading for all of 2.244-46.

<sup>989</sup> Greek: ἄτοπον, which can mean simply “out of place” or “absurd,” but also, as here, what is morally unseemly, unnatural, or monstrous.

<sup>990</sup> Greek: ἀκρασία (cf. 1.319), a shameful loss of moral control, evidenced here in promiscuous love-affairs (2.244-46) and excessive libido (2.246). That Gods should be themselves governed by their passions is a contradiction of divine power.

<sup>991</sup> Many of the male Gods had notorious affairs (on Ares, see below, 2.246), but none more than Zeus, who himself lists 7 in a declaration of passion for his wife, Hera (Homer, *Il.* 14.312-28)! It is more shocking that women, for whom the standards of chastity were higher, should be equally promiscuous. In fact, some of the Olympian Gods were of impeccable virtue, such as Hera (as protector of marriage), and Artemis and Athena, who were perpetual virgins. Aphrodite, as the Goddess of love, was the chief sinner: after her affair with Ares (see 2.246) she is described as not in control of her passions (Homer, *Od.* 8.320). Indeed, love is often depicted in myth as an uncontrollable and irresistible force, often inflicted on humans by the power of the Gods (esp. by Aphrodite and her son, Eros). This all contrasts sharply with Josephus’ sexual code, 2.199-203.

<sup>992</sup> Reading γενναϊότητα (singular, with S, supported by Latin; L has the plural). A note of sarcasm enters the text, and will remain till 2.249.

<sup>993</sup> For Zeus’ title, see 2.241; he is a poor father who cannot save his own children.



has tricked and made pregnant when they are confined or thrown into the sea,<sup>994</sup> and cannot either save his children (since he is overruled by Fate) or endure their deaths without tears.<sup>995</sup> **246** Fine tales are these,<sup>996</sup> and others that follow them, that the Gods watched adultery in heaven so shamelessly that some admitted they were even jealous of those bound in it.<sup>997</sup> And why not, when even the eldest, the king, could not restrain his urge for sex with his wife long enough to get into the bedroom?<sup>998</sup> **247** The Gods who are slaves of human beings,<sup>999</sup> now working as builders for pay,<sup>1000</sup> now tending the herds,<sup>1001</sup> and others bound like criminals in a bronze prison<sup>1002</sup>—what person of good sense would not be provoked by these both to castigate those who concocted these stories and to condemn those who accepted them for their utter stupidity?<sup>1003</sup> **248** Some have recast Terror and Fear,<sup>1004</sup> even Frenzy<sup>1005</sup>

<sup>994</sup> On trickery in pursuit of a woman, see 2.200. In the course of Zeus' many liaisons, deceit was especially prominent in his appearance to Leda (as a swan), to Antiope (as a satyr), to Danaë (as a shower of gold), to Europe (as a bull), and to Alcmene (as her husband, Amphitryon). Antiope was subsequently captured and enslaved by Dirce, and Io trapped in the form of a cow by Hera, but the reference here is particularly to Danaë, who was shut up by her father in a wooden casket, together with her son Perseus, and thrown into the sea. They were subsequently saved (καταποντιζόμενας here means cast into the sea, not drowned, *pace* Thackeray and Blum). Zeus is not only sexually irresponsible, but also cruel.

<sup>995</sup> The allusion is to the story of Sarpedon (son of Zeus and Laodameia), who dies outside Troy at the hands of Patroclus (*Iliad* book 16). Zeus is upset at the prospect, and contemplates saving him, but acknowledges the power of Fate (μοῖρα, 16.433-34), while Hera reminds him that Sarpedon's death is already decreed (16.441; cf. Hector, 22.179-80). Zeus' grief is symbolized by the falling of bloody raindrops to earth (16.458-60), while an observer complains that Zeus could not protect his own son (16.522; cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 10.466-72; Plato's criticism, *Resp.* 388c-d). In Homeric tradition, Zeus normally governs Fate, except when it comes to the deaths of human beings, which the Gods cannot prevent; see Dietrich 1967. Here Josephus portrays Zeus, supposedly supreme, as subject to a force stronger than himself, and succumbing to emotion in circumstances he could not endure (ὑπομένω, cf. 2.234).

<sup>996</sup> Greek: καλὰ γε ταῦτα (alternatively, "fine deeds are these"; but the emphasis probably remains on the stories and story-tellers). The following stories continue on the theme of sexual passions.

<sup>997</sup> In Homer's *Odyssey* bk 8, Demodocus tells of the time when Hephaestus devised a trap for his wife Aphrodite, to catch her *in flagrante* with Ares: the two were caught in a net that fell on them as they lay together, and some of the male Gods (Poseidon, Hermes, and Apollo) came to look, Hermes joking that he would

not mind being bound there, by the side of the beautiful Aphrodite (8.266-366). "Bound" here alludes to Hephaestus' net. For Josephus, the story illustrates the moral depravity to which the Gods had sunk, that they not only committed adultery but openly desired to do so (cf. Plato's criticism, *Resp.* 390c).

<sup>998</sup> In *Il.* 14.312-51, Zeus is overcome with lust for his wife, Hera (who has dressed seductively), when they meet on Mount Ida. Hera suggests they retire to their bedroom, but Zeus takes her there and then (though in the privacy of a golden cloud). One might expect the "eldest" God to have the greatest dignity and self-control, but he is overpowered by his passion (cf. *Il.* 14.353: after coitus, Zeus was overcome by sleep and love; cf. Plato's critique, *Resp.* 390c).

<sup>999</sup> They have slid so far down the scale of status as to be not masters over humans, but their slaves (cf. Paul on Christ, Phil 2:7); examples now follow.

<sup>1000</sup> So Poseidon in *Il.* 21.446-47, recounting the time he was hired to build walls around Troy by the king, Laomedon; in fact, he never received his pay, so his work amounted to slave-labor.

<sup>1001</sup> Greek: ποιμαίνοντες: the animals tended could be sheep or cattle. In the same episode as above, Apollo worked for Laomedon, looking after cattle on Mount Ida (*Il.* 21.448-49). At another time, he was punished by Zeus and required to spend a year in slavery to Admetus, looking after his cattle (Euripides, *Alc.* 1-3). Tertullian also ridicules these stories (*Apol.* 14.4).

<sup>1002</sup> The theme of constraint continues, but the additional suggestion of evil-doing (κακοῦργοι) will be picked up in 2.248-49 in the charge that the Gods worshiped are not just occasionally deficient in their morals, but positively evil. The reference is to Cronos and the Titans, incarcerated behind bronze walls in Tartarus (cf. 2.240, 241).

<sup>1003</sup> For the assumed standard of good sense, cf. 2.239, 242. The criticism is directed not at the deities themselves, but at the story-tellers and those stupid enough to believe them (for the masses and their "ignorance," cf. 2.224, 239).

and Deceit<sup>1006</sup>—and which of the worst passions have they omitted?<sup>1007</sup>—into the nature and form of a God;<sup>1008</sup> and they have persuaded cities even to sacrifice to the more auspicious among them.<sup>1009</sup> **249** Thus they find it absolutely necessary to recognize some of the Gods as givers of good things,<sup>1010</sup> but to call others “apotropaic,”<sup>1011</sup> and then they shake them off, like the most pernicious kind of people, with presents and gifts,<sup>1012</sup> since they expect to come to some terrible harm if they do not give them their pay!<sup>1013</sup>

**(2.35) 250** Now, what is the reason for such great inconsistency and error concerning the deity?<sup>1014</sup> I suppose it is because their legislators did not originally rec-

*The causes of religious error*

<sup>1004</sup> Greek: δαίμων and φόβος. To readers of Homer these are a familiar pair, the panic and terror that afflict soldiers in battle, personified as the children of Ares, the God of war (e.g., *Il.* 4.440; 11.37; 13.299; 15.119; cf. Hesiod, *Theog.* 934-36). As powers that overwhelm the human mind and control the body, they were naturally divinized. Plutarch, *Cleom.* 9 reports that the Spartans erected a shrine to Fear, though he takes this in a different sense, as the awe that keeps the people respectful.

<sup>1005</sup> Greek: λύσσα. The term is used by Homer for the rage or frenzy of soldiers in the heat of battle (e.g., *Il.* 9.239, 305; 21.542), but is found in other contexts for other types of frenzy. A personification of this all-consuming fury is found in Euripides, *Herc. fur.* 822-23, 843-45.

<sup>1006</sup> Greek: ἀπάτη (cf. Zeus’ trickery of women, 2.245). The only known personification is in Hesiod, *Theog.* 223-24, in the midst of a poetic depiction of the children of Night (including Death, Sleep, sad Age, and strong-willed Strife, 221ff.). But Cicero knows of the presence of “Fraud” in the old genealogical lists (*Nat. d.* 3.44), while Lucian treats it with satirical amusement (*Merc. cond.* 42).

<sup>1007</sup> Josephus has selected a string of negative phenomena, which he considers self-evidently evil passions (κάκιστα πάθη). Religious personifications were a controversial topic in Roman philosophy, especially with regard to the dedication of temples to figures such as “Honor” and “Victoria” (Beard, North & Price 1998: 1.62). According to Cicero, Stoics put up a stout defense of this tradition since such phenomena were powerful and derived from the Gods (*Nat. d.* 2.61-62, 79). Skeptics countered that these were human qualities and simply abstractions (*Nat. d.* 3.47, 61, 88). Moreover, they strongly opposed the worship of anything that was potentially or actually harmful (Fortuna, Febris [fever], etc.): these were clearly unworthy of the immortal Gods (3.63-64; cf. Cicero, *Leg.* 2.28). Josephus follows the same assumption that God(s) must by definition be unambiguously good.

<sup>1008</sup> The true nature of God has already been described in 2.166-67, 190-92, and God’s form (μορφή)

considered indescribable. In the present case, Josephus implies, they are simply *creating* “Gods.”

<sup>1009</sup> Since none of the above are beneficial, “auspicious” (εὐφημος) is heavily ironic. Sacrifice proves that they are regarded as divine.

<sup>1010</sup> Following the philosophical tradition, this is the only proper way to conceive of deity: God is the cause of all good things (2.166) and gives willingly to everyone (2.197). The Greeks are so confused that they have to distinguish the good Gods from the bad, the benevolent from the malicious.

<sup>1011</sup> Greek: ἀποτρόπαιοι. The adjective normally applies to something that averts evil (“apotropaic”; cf. Josephus’ use of related terms in *Ant.* 1.93 [talismans] and 3.241 [the scapegoat]). It was regularly used of Greek deities who were called upon to turn away evil (e.g., Plato, *Leg.* 854b). If he is using it in the standard sense, Josephus is commenting on the need to “pay off” such apotropaic Gods, lest they fail to avert evil. But the following phrase might suggest that Josephus takes the term here in the opposite sense, for entities *to be averted* (hence the statement about shaking them off). The adjective is elsewhere evidenced in Greek literature in this sense (“ill-omened” or “abominable”; see *LSJ*), but *never* in reference to Gods. In this case Josephus manipulates an ambiguous term and provides a fitting climax to his depiction of the mythological deities: a lot of them are thoroughly unpleasant characters whom one would want nothing to do with.

<sup>1012</sup> This is a striking image of deities as beggars or parasites, a social nuisance and the lowest on the social scale (cf. the comparison with animals, 2.240, and slaves, 2.247).

<sup>1013</sup> “Harm” (κακόν) is the very opposite of the “good” (ἀγαθόν) one expects from the other kind of Gods (above). Josephus may allude to the philosophical critique of sacrifice as an unnecessary offering of gifts to an all-sufficient Deity, or an attempt to bribe a reluctant Power, or, worse, an exercise in buying off a divine Bully. For his own purified conception of sacrifice, see 2.196-97.

<sup>1014</sup> The inconsistency (ἀνωμαλία, hapax in Josephus) is in treating some deities as good, others as

ognize the true nature of God,<sup>1015</sup> nor, when they had distinguished whatever accurate knowledge they were able to grasp,<sup>1016</sup> relate to this the rest of the structure of the constitution,<sup>1017</sup> **251** but, as if it were something completely insignificant, allowed the poets to introduce whatever Gods they wished, suffering all kinds of things,<sup>1018</sup> and the orators to give citizenship, by decree, to any useful foreign God.<sup>1019</sup> **252** Painters, also, and sculptors enjoyed considerable license in this matter among the Greeks,<sup>1020</sup> each himself devising a particular form, one molding it from clay, the

evil (2.249). It is convenient for the present argument to allow that there may be *some* elements of truth within the Greek tradition concerning “the deity” (τὸ θεῖον, a term carefully chosen to provide common ground between Greeks and Judeans; cf. 1.162). While castigating their “error” he also wants to suggest that they should have stuck to the truth they knew (2.250, 254). While Egyptian religious error can be attributed to their national character (1.223-26), the fault on the Greek side lies with their legislators, who collectively stand as the foil to Moses’ superior organization of the state.

<sup>1015</sup> Philosophers are not to blame (cf. 2.168, 239), nor even poets, except insofar as they are given license by legislators. If it is the virtue of legislators to recognize what is best (2.150), these signally failed. Since Moses predates them all (2.154-56), the “true nature of God” (for the language, cf. 2.168, 180, 224; for the content, cf. 2.165-67, 190-92) was available to them. Since the error was original (ἐξ ἀρχῆς, cf. 2.239), they had no basis on which to resist the introduction of new errors (2.251-54).

<sup>1016</sup> This seems to credit the legislators (in general) with some grasp of the truth, and the ability to distinguish (διορίζω) truth from error; cf. the philosophers in 2.168, 224, 225-27, some of whom were also legislators.

<sup>1017</sup> For the phrase (τάξις τοῦ πολιτεύματος), see note to “constitution” at 2.145. By contrast, Moses succeeded in making “piety” (based on truth about God) integral to every aspect of the constitution (2.170-74).

<sup>1018</sup> Greek: πάντα πάσχοντας, suggesting the absurdity of Gods in passive roles, when they should be the active agents. The phrase could include physical suffering and control by the passions (both illustrated in 2.240-47). If the poets are given license (the theme is prominent throughout 2.251-54), the blame rests on the legislators for granting them this freedom—the foil to the proper attitude of control displayed by Plato (2.256) and Moses (cf. *Ant.* 1.15, 22). The threat lies in “introducing” (εἰσάγω) these Gods. The verb is repeated in 2.254, 267 and suggests the corruption of an original purity by bringing in new or foreign imports. This is the fault that Josephus will argue is rightly avoided in the Judean constitution (2.255-69).

<sup>1019</sup> The metaphor suggests enlisting Gods as citi-

zens (πολιτογραφέω, hapax in Josephus), by a decree (ψηφισμα, literally “vote”), with orators persuading the decision-makers (assembly or Council) to admit such Gods to the citizen roll, where they could wield a significant and deleterious influence (cf. 2.256). But the criterion is not whether they are true or moral, only whether they are “useful” (επιτήδειος). The reference to admitting *foreign* Gods, which is hardly relevant to 2.240-49, is introduced here to prepare the way for the central theme of 2.255-69 (e.g., 2.257, 259, 267), the refusal of Judeans to accommodate foreign conceptions of the divine. Admitting the cult of “foreign” deities was a politically sensitive matter in Greek city states and in Rome, since religion was integral to the identity of the community. Josephus will later cite examples where Athenians refused to allow foreign cults (2.262-68), and can hardly be unaware of the significance of this topic in Rome. Roman religion was much influenced by the spread of Roman power, its contact with foreign deities, and the arrival of immigrant populations in Rome (see Beard, North & Price 1998: 1.62-98). Foreign cults were admitted (e.g., Cybele or Magna Mater in 205 BCE), but were occasionally treated with suspicion, as an underlying Roman traditionalism provided a reservoir of distrust. Roman unease could result in sporadic efforts by image-conscious emperors to purge Rome of its “alien” cults (e.g., the expulsion of Egyptian priests and some Judeans in 19 and 41 CE; see Gruen 2002: 29-41), or the assurance that real Romans would not take part in the exotic and “pompous” cults celebrated by foreigners in Rome (see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.19, and Tacitus’ anger when Romans did adopt Judean ways, *Hist.* 5.5.1-2). Even in the midst of change, Romans liked to believe that they were continuing ancient traditions (see Appendix 6). But they adopted foreign deities far more readily than did the Greeks, and Josephus’ criticism could be heard to refer, indirectly, to Rome itself.

<sup>1020</sup> “License” (ἐξουσία) is a characteristic of Greeks (cf. 1.20, re Greek historiography), in contrast to Judeans (2.173). The artistic tradition was alluded to in 2.242: it played an extremely important role in impressing myth on the popular imagination. Painters and sculptors enjoyed equal license among Romans, but, as in 2.74, Josephus notably associates this tradition with

other painting;<sup>1021</sup> the artists who are most admired use ivory and gold as the material for their constant innovations.<sup>1022</sup> **253** Then,<sup>1023</sup> some Gods who were once at their peak in honors have grown old (that is the more reverent way to put it),<sup>1024</sup> **254** while other new Gods have been introduced and acquire worship.<sup>1025</sup> Some temples are deserted, while everyone erects new ones according to human whim<sup>1026</sup>—whereas they should, on the contrary, preserve unchangeable their conception of God and the honor they pay him.<sup>1027</sup>

**(2.36) 255** Apollonius Molon, then, was one of the puffed-up fools,<sup>1028</sup> but nothing of what I have just said escaped the attention of those among the Greeks whose philosophy was in line with truth;<sup>1029</sup> nor were they unaware of the artificial expla-

*Apollonius’  
stupidity*

“Greeks” (see note to “statues” at 2.74).

<sup>1021</sup> There is a suggestion here of individual caprice (cf. 2.254), inventing the “form” of God—an enterprise already declared both impossible and impious (2.190-91). This is the closest Josephus gets to the charge that others *make* Gods (the error of substitution; cf. Wis. 13-15). But even here, the issue seems to be inappropriate *representation* of God (cf. 2.74-75), and Josephus does not indulge in satire on the material objects being treated as Gods.

<sup>1022</sup> On the inadequacy of materials to represent God, however costly (ivory and gold were the most expensive), see 2.191. The final phrase (τῆς ἀεὶ καινουργίας) contains a sting, with its implication that the Greeks have no regard for tradition, but embrace the novel for its own sake: the point is expanded in the following sections and echoes the general principle of 2.182-83. Although the noun καινουργία can mean, more positively, originality in workmanship (Josephus uses it so in *Ant.* 12.70, 77, though the craftsmanship is not Judean), its pejorative nuance is clear in this context.

<sup>1023</sup> A number of glosses have crept into the text of L, 2 in this section and 1 in the next. They are absent from the Latin, break the grammatical flow, and are rightly bracketed or omitted by editors.

<sup>1024</sup> Greek: οὕτω γὰρ εὐφημότερον λέγειν. In connection with religion, the εὐφημ- root has the sense of avoiding saying something unfortunate or irreligious, by silence or deliberate circumlocution. Josephus draws attention to the fact that he is restraining himself in his language, but still enjoys the anthropomorphic notion of deities declining through age (i.e., cults falling into disuse, 2.254). The advertized restraint harks back to the law of 2.237.

<sup>1025</sup> “New” (καινοί) echoes the theme of innovation (2.252), while the notion of “introducing” Gods (εἰσαγόμενοι) echoes 2.251 (cf. 2.267), suggesting alien imports. Change and corruption from outside influence are the twin themes permeating 2.255-69, variously deployed to fit the argument.

<sup>1026</sup> “Human” (τῶν ἀνθρώπων) is read in L (and

followed by Münster); Niese conjectures αὐτῶν (“their”), on the basis of Latin, *eorum*. Once again, novelty is criticized as arbitrary (cf. 2.252; contrast Judean culture, 2.183). Roman religious conservatism professed shock at the decline of old traditions, or the neglect of old temples, especially after Augustus’ “revival” of ancient cults. But the phenomenon Josephus describes here—old temples abandoned and new ones continually erected—was very familiar in Rome. Cf. Pliny’s assurance to the emperor Trajan that once-deserted temples were being revived (*Ep.* 10.96).

<sup>1027</sup> This final remark is the hinge to the next stage of the argument. It enunciates a principle that hardly fits Greeks (since their original conception of God was wrong, and *needed* to be changed, 2.250), but is precisely the Judean ideology that Josephus will now defend (cf. 2.169, 189). Two key words form the end of the sentence in Greek: ἀμετακίνητον (“unchangeable”; cf. 2.169 and note to “alterations” at 2.153), and διαφυλάττειν (“preserve”; see note to “ever” at 2.156). By this principle Apollonius’ charge (2.258) is ridiculous: if Judeans have their own conception of God (which is true and proper, 2.255), why should they admit people with opinions such as those described in 2.240-49? If their unwillingness to associate with others signals a refusal to change, what Apollonius considers a fault is in fact the Judeans’ greatest virtue.

<sup>1028</sup> Apollonius has not been mentioned since 2.236, but the statement of his accusation in 2.258 will reveal that his criticism of Judeans has been the central issue driving the discussion since 2.236. He is among the “puffed-up” (τετυφωμένοι, cf. 1.15) because he is a fool who thinks himself wise. By characterizing him so, Josephus places him among the ignorant masses (cf. 2.224, 239), in contrast to the philosophers of truth (2.239, 242, 255-57), so that by the time we hear his complaint (2.258) we are predisposed to dismiss it.

<sup>1029</sup> Josephus continues to align himself with Greek philosophers (cf. 2.239, 242, 247), as purveyors of “truth,” in preparation for the parade example, Plato (2.256-57). In 2.238-39 it was implied that they had articulated Josephus’ critique of mythology first, but



nations offered by allegories.<sup>1030</sup> Hence they quite reasonably despised the latter, but agreed with us on the true and proper conception of God.<sup>1031</sup> **256** Starting from this, Plato says that no other poet should be admitted into citizenship,<sup>1032</sup> and he dismisses Homer in laudatory terms,<sup>1033</sup> once he has crowned him and anointed him with perfume,<sup>1034</sup> lest he obscure the correct conception of God with myths.<sup>1035</sup> **257** Plato in

now Josephus will imply that the Judean critique was independent and even prior (“they agreed with us ...”; cf. 2.167-68, 257, 281). Apollonius was a critic of Plato (Diogenes Laertius 3.34), so the contrast here is particularly fitting.

<sup>1030</sup> Josephus thus indicates that he knows the allegorical tradition (one obvious answer to his critique), but is unimpressed; for “artificial” (ψύχρατος), see 2.3 (ψυχρῶς), with note to “manner.” Allegorical interpretation of Homer and Hesiod may have begun as early as the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Diogenes Laertius 2.11 cites Favorinus’ claim that Anaxagoras and Metrodorus discovered (respectively) moral and scientific truth in the myths, through allegorical exegesis. Stoics developed sophisticated systems of allegorical interpretation, based on the names of the deities and their exploits (see Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.63-64, 70-72), but were vulnerable to the charge that the stories were too stupid to be worth the effort, or the allegorical explanations too forced (cf. *Nat. d.* 3.62-63). Josephus gives the impression of rejecting allegorical explanation *tout court*, but elsewhere indicates that Moses wrapped some truths in allegory (*Ant.* 1.24). He had discovered Judean examples of allegorical exegesis from Alexandria (e.g., Aristaeas, Aristobulus, and Philo), and was sufficiently interested to plan a book on “customs and causes” (see Introduction, § 2). But one could always dismiss *others’* allegorical efforts and defend one’s own. In response to Celsus’ rubbishing of biblical allegories, Origen castigates the Greek myths and dismisses Chrysippus’ attempts at allegory, but treats the Judean allegorical tradition (Aristobulus and Philo) with great respect (*Cels.* 4.48-51). See further Dawson 1992.

<sup>1031</sup> This is certainly not true with regard to the Stoics (listed among truth-telling philosophers in 2.168). Zeno, Chrysippus, Cleanthes, and (in the first century) Cornutus invested heavily in allegorical explanation of myths, precisely because they had an elevated view of the nature of God(s) and were concerned to defend the classic poems against charges of naivety or impiety and to use them to advance their own doctrines. But the remark prepares the way for mention of Plato who, despite composing myths of his own, made disparaging remarks about the allegorical tradition (e.g., *Phaedr.* 229e; *Resp.* 378d: the young are not equipped to see the deeper meaning).

<sup>1032</sup> Greek: εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν παραδέχεσθαι. The

noun is best taken to refer to “citizenship” (cf. 2.251, 260), but since it stands here in place of Plato’s πόλις it could be translated “state.” Josephus alludes to the long discussion of the content and performance of myth in *Resp.* 376c-398b. On the content, Plato criticizes the poor moral image of the Gods in myth (citing some of the same examples utilized by Josephus, as noted above): if they are to be used in the education of the Guardians, Homer and “the other poets” (387b, 388a) must be heavily censored (cf. *Leg.* 719a-b). Regarding performance, he discusses what should be admitted (παραδέχομαι) into the city-state (πόλις) and criticizes the deception and malleability entailed in the actor’s profession. On the proper treatment of an actor who arrives in the city, see below. Josephus has clearly been influenced by this passage, or a paraphrase of it. It fits his argument to make Plato’s position even more draconian than it was (Homer was in fact censored, not banned), and the alteration of πόλις to πολιτεία makes the policy adaptable to situations other than the Greek city-state (cf. the same change in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Pomp.* 1).

<sup>1033</sup> Greek: εὐφῆμῶς (cf. 2.248, though here with the more positive sense of “speaking well”). While insisting that many of Homer’s lines must be erased, Plato accords Homer some praise (*Resp.* 383a, 391a). The dismissal in the following terms (crowning and anointing) is actually applied to a foreign actor/playwright, not to Homer (see next note), but the same elision is made in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Pomp.* 1. For Josephus this is an important feature, since it suggests the maintenance of clear social boundaries, based on religious difference.

<sup>1034</sup> The language is derived from the scenario of Plato, *Resp.* 398a where a foreign and cleverly adaptable actor arrives in the city: he is to be treated with the highest respect (bowed down to and regarded as “holy”), but dismissed to another city “after pouring perfume (μύρον) on his head and crowning him with wool.” The exaggerated tokens of respect soften the brutal fact that he is not allowed to remain in the city.

<sup>1035</sup> Plato is again assumed to have the right conception of God (cf. 2.168, 224, 255), and to share the Judeans’ concern that it be protected from “myth” (cf. *Ant.* 1.15, 24). In fact, Plato thought myths were quite acceptable, so long as their contents conveyed a proper image of the Gods (*Resp.* 398a-b).

particular imitated our legislator<sup>1036</sup> both in prescribing for citizens no education on a par with universal learning of the laws, thoroughly and in detail,<sup>1037</sup> and further in prohibiting outsiders from mixing with them on a casual basis;<sup>1038</sup> rather, he took care that the state should be pure, consisting of those who remain faithful to the laws.<sup>1039</sup> **258** Without taking any of this into account,<sup>1040</sup> Molon Apollonius accused us of not admitting those who are in the grip of other opinions about God,<sup>1041</sup> and of

*Apollonius' accusation of Judeans*

<sup>1036</sup> On the priority of Moses, cf. 2.168 and Aristobulus *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.6.6-8; 13.12.4. Origen attempts to explain how Plato encountered Moses' work (*Cels.* 4.39; 6.19). Josephus makes no such attempt, but presumes imitation from the fact of Moses' greater antiquity (cf. 2.279-81).

<sup>1037</sup> Or, possibly, "with learning all the laws thoroughly and in detail." The language (ἐκμανθάνω ἀκριβῶς) echoes 2.175 exactly, though there it was claimed that Moses was unique in making this provision. Plato's concern with education (e.g., of the Guardians) is sometimes expressed in similar terms: he refers to learning (μανθάνω) the laws, and living according to them (*Prot.* 326c). In the *Laws*, he promotes his own text as an object of teaching and praise, but only as a template, on the assumption that comparable works will be added (*Leg.* 810e-811e; see Schaublin 1982: 336, n.130; Gerber 1997: 229).

<sup>1038</sup> Greek: ὡς ἔτυχεν ἐπιμίγνυσθαι. The sentiment is identical to the Mosaic prohibition in 2.210, and the language of "mixing" is closely matched in 1.60-61, 68 (cf. note to "us" at 1.229); for the ban on casual practice, cf. 2.234. If "mixing" suggests corruption, the only serious social interaction to be allowed is when outsiders become entirely like insiders (as in proselytism, 2.123, 209-10, 261). Plato did, indeed, limit contact with foreigners in his ideal state: recognizing the potential harm of "mixing" (ἐπιμιξία), as imported customs spoil good laws, he eschewed the severity of the Spartan deportations (see below, 2.259) but placed restrictions on foreign travel (only for citizens over 40 and for limited purposes). He also allowed only certain kinds of foreign visitor (traders, tourists, state-delegates, and scholars), each category to be received hospitably but at a social distance from the mass of the population, or for a limited time (*Leg.* 949e-953e; cf. 850a-c). Josephus' paraphrase makes Plato's policy match Judean practice, as described in 2.209-10.

<sup>1039</sup> The concern for the purity of the "state" (πολίτευμα, possibly "constitution"; see note to "constitution" at 2.145) matches Josephus' statement about Judeans in 2.69 (cf. 1.1); "remaining faithful" (ἐμμένω) repeats a favorite Josephan verb (see note to "laws" at 2.150). The concept will be expanded in relation to Judeans in 2.270-78. Plato was concerned at the danger of "corruption" (*Leg.* 952c) but did not express matters in quite these terms.

<sup>1040</sup> Placing Apollonius' judgment in this context makes it appear both ignorant and foolish (2.255). Since Plato carried such superior prestige, the alignment of his policy with that of Judeans makes Apollonius appear to attack a virtue, not a vice. The double accusation to follow fills out the twin charge of "atheism" and "misanthropy" of 2.148. It stands at the centre of the whole discussion from 2.236 to 2.286.

<sup>1041</sup> Although the charge originates from Apollonius, its expression here is Josephan and may be turned to his own rhetorical advantage. Being in the grip of opinions (δόξαί in the plural) is Josephus' description of the state of the masses in 2.169 (cf. 2.239), a victimhood to be expected of those with inferior reason. Since Judeans (like Plato) have the correct conception (δόξα in the singular) of God (2.255), others' views must, by definition, be wrong; they have already been described, and ridiculed, in 2.240-49. Not admitting (παράδεχομαι) is Platonic language, echoed in 2.256 (see note to "citizenship"), though Josephus leaves unclear what people are not admitted into (neither "city" nor "land" would fit; the Judean community?). Beneath this Josephan redescription, Apollonius' charge is not altogether clear, but if we may judge by 2.79 and 2.148, its target was the Judean refusal to share in the religious practices of other peoples, a policy represented as antisocial and godless. Josephus is aware of the unpopularity of Judean religious difference (e.g., *Ant.* 4.137-38; 11.212, 217). He reports a specific example of this charge in relation to Alexandria (2.65, from Apion) and describes an appeal by Claudius that Judeans should not despise the religiosity of other nations (*Ant.* 19.290; cf. 16.175 and Pliny, *Nat.* 13.46: *gens contumelia numinum insignis*). Few could complain if Judeans kept their own religious traditions, but it could cause deep offense if they disparaged others' customs. Refusal to participate in the religious rites that defined social solidarity could cause friction (e.g., in Alexandria; 2.65), raising suspicions that they did not support the local city or the larger Roman empire (cf. 2.73). If that is the force of the accusation, Josephus turns the issue of Judean *non-participation* in others' rites into that of *non-admittance* of others into their own. He thus makes a purportedly "antisocial" and "irreligious" policy look like quite proper defense of the truth.

not wishing to share fellowship with those who choose to live according to a different way of life.<sup>1042</sup> **259** But even this practice is not unique to us, but generally com-

<sup>1042</sup> Greek: μηδὲ κοινωνεῖν ἐθέλομεν τοῖς καθ' ἑτέραν συνήθειαν βίου ζῆν προαιρουμένοις. Again, the language is clearly Josephan: “not wishing” puts the matter as mildly as possible (cf. 2.210), and “choosing a way of life” echoes the language used in 2.209-10 (προαιρέομαι, βίος, συνήθεια). Josephus thus manages to portray others’ faithfulness to their own ancestral customs as a matter of (bad) choice. As far as we can tell (cf. 2.148: μισανθρωπία), Apollonius accused Judeans of following an inherently anti-social tradition. Such a charge first appears in Hecataeus’ comment on their “somewhat unsociable and inhospitable way of life” (*apud* Diodorus 40.3.4) and was given its fullest known expression in Diodorus 34-35.1.1-5 (probably derived from Posidonius, a contemporary of Apollonius): there Judeans are vilified as unsociable people who refuse to mix with others, and, worse, harbor hatred of others (μῖσος, μισοξενία, μισανθρωπία). The charge of Judean separatism or hostility thereafter reverberates through a range of literature (e.g., Lysimachus in *Apion* 1.309; Apion in *Apion* 2.121; Pompeius Trogus, *apud* Justin 36.2.15; Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.7.21; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1-2; Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.103-4; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 5.33-34) with particular reference to table-fellowship (Diodorus, Tacitus, Philostratus; see the full analysis in Berthelot 2003: 79-184). Josephus is highly conscious of this charge (cf. *Ant.* 4.137-38; 8.117; 11.212; 13.245; 16.42) and its adoption by Paul in a letter to Gentile Christians (1 Thess 2:14-15) suggests that it was a complaint widely recycled.

In the ancient Greek tradition, hospitality to strangers (travelers) had become a mark of Greek (and therefore “civilized”) behavior: the fabled inhospitality of the Egyptians was a sign of their feral character (Plato, *Leg.* 953e). Naturally, the city state had its social and moral boundaries, and there was scope for political and ideological debate about the right degree of openness to foreigners, or restriction on their influence (see above, note to “basis” in 2.257; and below, note to “repeatedly” at 2.259). In the Hellenistic era, greatly increased social movement and ethnic interchange favored ideologies that eased social intercourse. Mutual respect and reciprocal hospitality became social virtues, especially when supported by Stoic notions of a universal humanity (see Berthelot 2003: 174-79). As Josephus himself shows, in this context unfriendly attitudes appear simply “irrational” (perpetrated by ἀλόγιστοι), while respect for others’ customs is a mark of “gentlemanly” virtue (καλοκαγαθία, *Ant.* 16.174-78;

cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.41, retrojecting this ethos to the time of Heracles). If Judeans were perceived to flout basic rules of social reciprocity (by rules against commensality, intermarriage, or religious participation) they could be resented as (uniquely) failing to support a community ethos; and, as Diodorus indicates, “tolerance” is particularly violent in its reaction to those perceived to refuse its demands (Antiochus’ advisers urge him to wipe out this “antisocial” people). In the Roman era, this Hellenistic tradition was absorbed within Rome’s imperial ideology: under Roman patronage (“benevolence”), it was necessary to require peaceful relations among the many ethnic groups within the empire, and any that caused friction could invite special Roman ire. The separatist elements in Judean culture might be resented, but Judeans were generally permitted to follow their own customs under a policy of ethnic integration, which made fewer demands than the older Greek notions of civic participation (see Gauthier 1981; Honigman 1997). But when Judeans in Rome induced others (Romans) to adopt the same tokens of social “exclusivism,” Roman authors expressed strong disapproval (Tacitus; Juvenal).

Josephus’ response to Apollonius’ charge is double, almost but not quite self-contradictory. On the one hand, he accepts the charge (phrased in his own terms) as true, and celebrates it as a virtue, not a vice. Judeans are right not to share intimate fellowship with people imbued with erroneous opinions. They have good Platonic precedent for a policy of restricted social intercourse (2.256-57), and honorable parallels in both Sparta and Athens (2.259-69). In behaving so, they are simply remaining faithful to their own traditions (2.270-76), and the superiority of their own customs is evidenced by the fact that others emulate them (2.280-86). On the other hand, he denies that the policy is extreme: Judeans are not as antisocial as the Spartans used to be (2.260-61, 273), and they warmly welcome others who wish to join them and adopt *Judean* customs (2.261; cf. 2.209-10). In fact, he adopts a stance very like the self-understanding of some contemporary Roman authors: Rome’s own traditions are to be maintained, undiluted by foreigners, but Rome should regard herself as an “open” city, generously offering citizenship to those willing to adopt her laws (see Berthelot 2003: 361-66, and below, notes on 2.260-61). On the question whether either non-Judean or Judean cultic activity was “exclusive” in antiquity, see Krauter 2004.

mon, not just to Greeks, but to the most illustrious among Greeks:<sup>1043</sup> the Lacedaemonians used to conduct “deportations of foreigners” repeatedly,<sup>1044</sup> and also did not allow their own citizens to go abroad,<sup>1045</sup> suspecting in both cases that their laws would be corrupted.<sup>1046</sup> **260** They perhaps might reasonably be criticized for their churlishness:<sup>1047</sup> for they would not grant anyone the right of citizenship or of residence among them.<sup>1048</sup> **261** We, on the other hand, are not inclined to emulate other people’s customs,<sup>1049</sup> but gladly welcome<sup>1050</sup> those who wish to share ours;<sup>1051</sup> and

*Spartan  
attitude to  
foreigners*

*Judean  
attitudes to  
foreigners*

<sup>1043</sup> Josephus’ initial reaction is to cite good parallels: to emphasize that Judeans compare well with Greeks refutes the charge that they are “barbarian” (2.148), and suggests, by contrast, that Apollonius’ opinion is unGreek (cf. 2.270). “Most illustrious” (εὐδοκιμώτατοι) was an epithet previously used for philosophers (2.238), but here embraces the famous cities of Sparta (2.259-60) and Athens (2.262-68). Where he aligns Judeans with Greeks, Josephus always insists that he selects Greeks of the best sort (cf. 1.162, 176; 2.238). The following Spartan tradition is hardly parallel to the Judean maintenance of social boundaries: controlling entrance into, or exit from, geographical boundaries is hardly comparable to the social barriers erected by Judean communities, especially in the Diaspora. The parallel works only on a very general level, and is chosen partly because it is extreme. Josephus can use its mixed reputation to portray Judean policy as a good, but less severe, version of the same.

<sup>1044</sup> The famous Spartan ξενηλασία (a *terminus technicus*) occurred frequently enough in the fifth century BCE (with what frequency we cannot tell) to become part of its image, fixed in later tradition and variously assessed. Herodotus approves Spartan resistance to corruption by foreign wealth (3.148), but both Thucydides (2.39; cf. 1.144) and Plato (*Leg.* 950a-d) reflect Athenian criticism of Spartan policy as a sign of insecurity (Thucydides) or savagery (Plato; cf. Aristophanes, *Av.* 1012-13). In other contexts it could be admired as properly preventing the corruption introduced by lax foreign habits (e.g., Ps.-Xenophon, *Lac.* 14.4; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 27.6-7). Roman attitudes were similarly ambivalent: what was admired by Valerius Maximus (2.6.1), was criticized by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. rom.* 2.17.1; 14.6.1-6). Josephus can use such ambivalence to draw credit for Judeans (here), before claiming Judean superiority (2.260-61) and criticizing the Spartans (2.273); see Berthelot 2003: 359-68.

<sup>1045</sup> This exit restriction was often seen as twinned with the policy on deportation (e.g., Ps.-Xenophon, *Lac.* 14.4; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 27.6). The ban was not as total as Josephus implies, but little is known about it (see MacDowell 1986: 115-16).

<sup>1046</sup> The motif of corruption (διαφθορά) echoes the

fear of 2.209. The repeated emphasis on protection of the laws (cf. 2.257, 262, 264, 267) helps establish the parallel with Judean policy.

<sup>1047</sup> Greek: δυσκολία, also used for unfriendliness to foreigners in *Ant.* 1.246. Josephus can exploit the Athenian critique of Spartans on this score (see Plato, *Leg.* 950a-d); the hesitant tone in his criticism is later removed (2.273).

<sup>1048</sup> For διατριβή as “residence,” cf. *Life* 270; the term was used earlier in this treatise in a different sense (2.171, “work” or “occupation”). The policy of 2.259 is now given a negative twist, as a foil to Judean openness in 2.261. The reference to citizenship (πολιτεία) evokes the earlier discussion of Roman generosity in this regard (2.40-41), a passage with other links to 2.261. Romans liked to think that their policy in granting Roman citizenship was more generous than that of either Sparta or Athens (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.17; Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.24), and Josephus’ critique here fits that prejudice well. Josephus does not quite claim that Judeans grant “citizenship” to proselytes, but 2.261 gets as close as he can to that notion.

<sup>1049</sup> “Customs” is implied, but the Greek is vague (simply τὰ τῶν ἄλλων). Josephus has already illustrated (1.162, 166, 225), and will go on to emphasize, *other people’s* emulation of Judeans (the ζηλ- root occurs four times in 2.280-86); the flipside is that Judeans do not emulate (ζηλώω) others (cf. 2.123, 271, 273). That suggests Judean satisfaction with their own traditions, and comparative superiority to others (for a parallel in Thucydides 2.37, see Schäublin 1982: 330). The comment is relevant in this context as it explains the Judean social boundaries (2.258): Judeans have no wish to associate with others, not because they are inhospitable or merely defensive, but because they have nothing to learn from them. In other words, what Apollonius considers a negative feature in their culture (2.145, 148) is actually a sign of its strength.

<sup>1050</sup> Greek: ἡδέως δεχόμεθα (cf. 2.210: φιλοφρονῶς δεχόμεθα). The verb is very similar to that used in 2.256, 258 (παραδέχομαι, “admit”), but slightly less precise (admittance suggests some political entity to be entered).

<sup>1051</sup> Greek: τοὺς μετέχειν τῶν ἡμετέρων βουλομένους. The same verb (μετέχειν) was used in 2.209, and supplemented there with reference to living under



Athenian  
intolerance of  
religious  
difference

that would be evidence, I take it, of both benevolence<sup>1052</sup> and generosity.<sup>1053</sup>

(2.37) 262 I refrain from saying more about the Lacedaemonians.<sup>1054</sup> But the Athenians, who considered their city common [to all],<sup>1055</sup> as to their attitude on these matters: Apollonius did not know<sup>1056</sup> that they imposed an inexorable punishment<sup>1057</sup> even on those who uttered a single word about the Gods in contravention of their laws.<sup>1058</sup> 263 For what other reason did Socrates die?<sup>1059</sup> He certainly did not try to betray the city to its enemies, nor did he rob any temple.<sup>1060</sup> Rather, because he used to swear by novel oaths<sup>1061</sup> and claimed that something supernatural gave him

the same laws (2.210; cf. 2.123). The parallel suggests that Josephus here also refers to proselytes, rather than those who simply copy Judean customs (2.282-86), but the imprecision puts the most generous gloss on Judean policy. As in 2.123, 210, the “welcome” serves an important apologetic context (proving Judeans are not hostile to non-Judeans). But, unlike Philo, Josephus does not here stress the degree to which proselytes abandon their previous lifestyle (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.51-53; 4.178); that was precisely what offended Roman observers (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1; Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.96-106).

<sup>1052</sup> Greek: φιλανθρωπία; in 2.146 this was highlighted as a Judean virtue (cf. 2.213), in contrast to Apollonius’ charge of μισανθρωπία (2.148, just echoed in 2.258). The term had been used of Romans in their policy on citizenship (2.40), and Josephus implicitly aligns Judeans here with that Roman attitude (see notes to 2.40 and to “them” at 2.260; cf. Berthelot 2003: 361-66).

<sup>1053</sup> Greek: μεγαλοψυχία; cf. Roman *magnanimitas* in 2.73. Josephus has now completely rebutted the charge of 2.258 by redescribing Judean policy, finishing with this strong assertion of Judean virtue.

<sup>1054</sup> It is hard to know what more Josephus could have said about them, but he signals a shift of focus to Athens, and excuses the fact that he has far more to say on that subject (2.262-68). On “saying no more,” cf. 2.168, 222, 231, 276.

<sup>1055</sup> Greek: κοινήν ... τὴν ἑαυτῶν ... πόλιν. This echoes the famous claim by Pericles that Athens (in contrast to Sparta) was a city “common to all” (Thucydides 2.39.1); cf. the allusion by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 3.11.4 (the policy is copied by Rome), and Josephus’ own comment on the temple in 2.193. Apollonius had complained that Judeans did not “share fellowship” (κοινωνέω) with others; Josephus now shows (through 5 examples) that even the city most inclined to such fellowship enforced clear limits in this matter.

<sup>1056</sup> For his ignorance, cf. 2.145 (and similar attacks on Apion, 2.3, 26, 38, etc.). Josephus claims to know more about Athens than his opponent.

<sup>1057</sup> Greek: ἀπαραιτήτως ἐκόλασαν; for the ἀπα-

ραιτ- root, see note to “punishment” at 2.178. Here, as in the next clause, Josephus verbally assimilates Athenian practice to what he has already represented as Judean. The punishments in all 5 cases concern the death penalty (carried out, threatened, or nearly imposed); cf. Josephus’ emphasis on capital punishment (2.215-17).

<sup>1058</sup> For the phraseology see 1.43; 2.219. The focus is now broad enough to include not only foreigners with dangerous views about the Gods, but also citizens (such as Socrates) who introduce novelty or challenge traditional beliefs. The “laws” are again prominent (cf. 2.254, 257, 259).

<sup>1059</sup> Josephus takes for granted knowledge about this most famous death: the trial and charges were known by means of Plato’s *Apology* and Xenophon’s *Memorabilia*. Josephus interprets this death as evidence of proper Athenian self-protection against the corruption of its religion, just as he had earlier lauded Plato as an exponent of the correct conception of God and the architect of its preservation (2.255-57). But the two cases clash head-on: Plato regarded Socrates as innocent of all charges and his death as heroic. Plato is not named in this context, nor Socrates in other contexts where Greek philosophers are praised (e.g., 2.168); but the inconsistency would be obvious to an unsympathetic reader.

<sup>1060</sup> The two hypothetical cases would merit the death penalty. Although Socrates kept out of politics and served loyally in the Athenian army (Plato, *Apol.* 28d), there were two occasions when he refused to follow the majority political judgment on moral grounds (*Apol.* 32 b-d). More generally, although the charges at his trial (in 399 BCE) were religious, not political, there were political forces ranged against him, not least because some of the young men he had influenced were considered to have undermined Athens and its democracy (e.g., Critias, Charmides, and Alcibiades); see Garland 1992: 136-51; Vlastos 1994: 87-108.

<sup>1061</sup> Socrates’ distinctive oath was “by the dog” (τὴν κύναν or μὰ τὸν κύναν, e.g., *Apol.* 22a; *Phaed.* 98e; *Gorg.* 482b). The intention of such an oath and its connotations are unclear: it may have been merely humor-

signs<sup>1062</sup>—a private joke, as some say<sup>1063</sup>—it was for these reasons that he was condemned to die by drinking hemlock.<sup>1064</sup> **264** Also, the prosecutor accused him of corrupting the young,<sup>1065</sup> on the grounds that he encouraged them to treat the ancestral constitution and the laws with contempt.<sup>1066</sup> Socrates underwent such punishment as an Athenian citizen.<sup>1067</sup> **265** Anaxagoras, on the other hand, was from

ous, or an act of piety to avoid swearing by the Gods, or a “Rhadamanthine” oath of great antiquity (cf. Burnet 1924: 93-94; the same oath is used by a slave in Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 83). Although subsequently famous (Tertullian invents further variants, *Apol.* 14.7), this was probably not one of the charges in the trial. Josephus labels the oaths “novel” to fit the context where novelty implies breaking with tradition, and thus endangers established truth (2.252-57). As far as we can tell, the legal charges were that Socrates did not recognize (or teach) the Gods recognized by the city, but other, and new, supernatural entities (ἕτερα δαιμόνια καινά, *Apol.* 24b, 26b; καινούς θεούς, *Euthyphr.* 3b; cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.1.1; Diogenes Laertius 2.40). The charge of novelty was certainly central to the trial, but Josephus is probably confused on the place of oaths in this matter.

<sup>1062</sup> Greek: καί τι δαιμόνιον αὐτῷ σημαίνειν ἔφασκεν. The word δαιμόνιον is hard to translate: it means something higher up the hierarchy of being than a human being, but not as high (or perhaps as purely good) as a “God”—what we might call a supernatural force (or, in Socrates’ terms, a bastard child of the Gods, *Apol.* 27c-d). Josephus uses the term quite frequently (e.g., *War* 1.69, 84; 6.303) with this sense of a supernatural agent, only occasionally with a negative twist (*War* 7.185; cf. Paul in 1 Cor 10:20, influenced by LXX Deut 32:17). Socrates frequently referred to something divine and supernatural (θεῖον τι καί δαιμόνιον) that acted like an internal voice, a unique gift that warned him not to pursue a particular course of action (e.g., *Apol.* 31c-d; 41a-c; *Euthyphr.* 3b; *Theaet.* 151a; *Phaedr.* 242b; *Euthyd.* 272e; *Resp.* 496c, often using, as here, the language of “signs”; cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.1.2-5; 4.8.1). It is possible that this was one factor behind the charge of introducing καινά δαιμόνια (see previous note; *Euthyphr.* 3b; *Apol.* 31c-d), but the religious charges of impiety and novelty arose from a wider presumption that Socrates questioned the existence of the Gods, as usually conceived, and taught religion in non-traditional ways (see *Apol.* 18b, 19b, 23d, 26c-d).

<sup>1063</sup> L and S read (from the end of the previous clause): ἔφασκεν, ἢ διαπαίζων, ὡς ἔνιοι λέγουσι (“he claimed, either joking, as some say ...”). This is clearly corrupt, and could be corrected in 3 ways: i) adding another alternative, lost from the text, to accompany the single “either” (so Hudson and Naber, adding ἢ σπου-

δάζων, “or in all seriousness”); ii) reading the Greek of L and S differently to make: ἔφασκε, νῆ Δία παίζων, ὡς ἔνιοι λέγουσιν (“he claimed, by Zeus joking, as some say ...”; so Niese, followed by Thackeray, Reinach, and Münster). It is not unprecedented for Josephus to make an oath “by Zeus” (cf. 1.255), though it jars here, coming after he has ridiculed stories about Zeus in 2.240-49, and right after he has commented on “novel oaths.” If the oath is taken to be not his own, but that used by “some,” it may express Josephus’ irony on the urgency with which some try to clear Socrates of the charge, but if so, the point is poorly expressed; iii) following the Latin *seorsum ludens*, the Greek ἢ διαπαίζων could be emended to ἰδίᾳ παίζων (so Boysen), rendering the meaning “joking privately” or “as a private joke.” Niese’s solution (ii) requires the least textual emendation, but is highly problematic. The third option is clearly preferable and should be read here (though not mentioned by Münster).

<sup>1064</sup> For the famous scene, see Plato’s *Phaedo*.

<sup>1065</sup> The prosecuting team consisted of Meletus (the leader), Anytus, and Lycon (Plato, *Apol.* 23c). The charge of corrupting the young concerned Socrates’ influence on those he taught (*Apol.* 23d, 24b, 25d, 29c); it was closely connected with the other charges, since he was accused of teaching them to believe in new deities rather than those prescribed by the city (*Apol.* 26b; cf. *Euthyphr.* 2c). For the danger of “corruption” (διαφθέρω), cf. 2.209, 259.

<sup>1066</sup> The language seems designed to parallel Judean issues (cf. 2.222, 287). For the political animus against Socrates, see above, note to “temple” at 2.263. Whether there was a formal charge of “impiety” is not clear, but the supposed attack on the city’s Gods could be taken as both a religious and a political crime. For Socrates’ defense, that he understood all he did as service to God for the benefit of the city, see *Apol.* 28c, 30e-31a; cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.1.1-2.8. It is ironic that the terms of this charge against Socrates match Tacitus’ complaint about proselytes in Rome: that they are taught to renounce their ancestral tradition, despise the Gods, and disown their country (*Hist.* 5.5.1-2).

<sup>1067</sup> The next 3 cases concern non-Athenians and thus the introduction of “foreign” ideas. Socrates is responsible only for novelty, but if the Athenians were so severe in their treatment of a native Athenian, they cannot be expected to be tolerant of foreign impiety.

Clazomenae,<sup>1068</sup> but because the Athenians thought that the sun was a God and he said it was a white-hot mass,<sup>1069</sup> they were only a few votes short of condemning him to death.<sup>1070</sup> **266** They offered a reward of a talent to anyone who would kill Diagoras of Melos, since he was said to have mocked their mysteries.<sup>1071</sup> And Protagoras, had he not swiftly fled, would have been arrested and put to death, since he was thought to have written something about the Gods that was unacceptable to the Athenians.<sup>1072</sup> **267** Why should we be surprised if they were disposed like this towards such influential men, when they did not spare even women?<sup>1073</sup> For they killed the priestess Ninos,<sup>1074</sup> when someone accused her of initiating people into the mysteries of foreign Gods;<sup>1075</sup> this was forbidden by their law and the penalty

<sup>1068</sup> Anaxagoras (ca. 500–428 BCE) was an important “natural” philosopher, who thought the universe was directed by a Mind or Reason (see note to “Anaxagoras” at 2.168); he lived in Athens ca. 456–436 BCE, and narrowly escaped death after a trial (see below). His origin is mentioned to categorize him as a foreigner, liable to introduce alien ideas (cf. 2.257, 259–60). Clazomenae is on the Ionian coast, near Smyrna, so he was a Greek, though not an Athenian. He was closely associated with Socrates (cf. Plato, *Apol.* 26d) who, like Euripides, was tarred with his brush.

<sup>1069</sup> Greek: μύδρον διάπυρον. μύδρον (following Hudson’s undoubtedly correct emendation of μύλον, in L and S) means an incandescent mass of metal (e.g., iron in the forge) or stone (e.g., lava from a volcano). The phrase was closely associated with Anaxagoras (see Diogenes Laertius 2.8, 12, 15; Origen, *Cels.* 5.11) who considered the sun and moon fragments of earth which had become white-hot through the rapidity of their movement (cf. Plato, *Phaed.* 97b; *Leg.* 967c). This was shocking to popular opinion, not because there was, as yet, an established cult of the Sun in Athens, but because of the popular belief that the planets were divine, as perfect spheres, self-moving, high in the upper ether, influencing the earth.

<sup>1070</sup> There were various versions of his trial (Diogenes Laertius 2.12–14; see Decharme 1904: 157–61). It may have been connected with the decree of Diopethes (Plutarch, *Per.* 32) directed against “impiety,” but with strong political overtones, in opposition to Pericles. The latter ensured Anaxagoras’ escape to Lampsacus. This case is potentially awkward for Josephus, who can hardly approve of the Athenians’ views about the sun (cf. 2.192; but cf. *War* 2.128, 148 on the Essenes), and elsewhere celebrates (Judean high-minded resistance to popular “superstition” (1.201–4; 2.239). But in this context he implicitly commends this action as an instance when the Athenians preserved their traditions, in the face of foreign influence.

<sup>1071</sup> Diagoras (another “foreigner” from Melos, one

of the Cyclades islands) lived in Athens at the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE. He was regularly dubbed “the atheist” (e.g., Diodorus 13.6.7; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.2, 63; 3.89; Aelian, *Var. hist.* 2.31) and is said to have mocked and disclosed the Eleusinian mysteries, turning would-be initiates away (Craterus, *FGH* 342, frag. 16). For the reward of a silver talent on his head (2 if caught alive), see Aristophanes, *Av.* 1072–74; Melanthius, *FGH* 326, frag. 3.

<sup>1072</sup> Protagoras’ ethnicity is not here indicated; he was another foreign visitor in Athens, from Abdera in Thrace (ca. 490–420 BCE). He was famously agnostic, declaring it was impossible to tell whether Gods exist or not, and for this reason was said to have been banned from Athens, and his books burned (Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.63; Diogenes Laertius 9.51–52; cf., however, the more positive evaluation in Plato, *Meno* 91e). Josephus is vague about his offense, perhaps out of ignorance, or perhaps to suggest that even a relatively minor offense to the Athenians elicited this strong reaction.

<sup>1073</sup> Ruthlessness might be expected towards influential, and thus dangerous, men; that even women were prosecuted proves how seriously the Athenians took this matter. Although only one example will be cited, the presence of the category is needed for the argument, and the application of the death penalty closes this series of examples with a case as striking as the first. The men here are called “influential” (ὀξίῳπιστοι) but not “philosophers” or “wise.” That might have stood too obviously in contradiction with the endorsement of Greek wisdom in 2.168, 239 (cf. 2.242, 247). But neither can Josephus afford to distance himself from these Athenian judgments (cf. 2.269; *pace* Gerber 1997: 212).

<sup>1074</sup> L reads *vūn γὰρ* (S: *vūn δὲ*) τὴν ἱερείαν (leaving the identity of the priestess unspecified) but the first word is probably rightly emended to *Νίνου* (so all modern editors). She lived in Athens in the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and is referred to by Demosthenes, *Boeot.* 1.2; 2.9; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Din.* 11.

<sup>1075</sup> The Greek (ξένους ἔμυει θεούς) says “initiating

fixed for those who introduced a foreign God was death.<sup>1076</sup> **268** Those who made use of such a law evidently did not think that other peoples' deities were Gods; for they would not have begrudged themselves the benefit of having more.<sup>1077</sup>

**269** So much to the credit of the Athenians.<sup>1078</sup> As for the Scythians, although they take pleasure in murdering people and are little better than wild animals,<sup>1079</sup> they think nonetheless that they should protect their customs;<sup>1080</sup> and when Anacharsis, a man admired by the Greeks for his wisdom,<sup>1081</sup> returned home, they killed him, since

*Scythians and  
Persians*

foreign Gods," but Josephus clearly means what is given here. Of the 5 Athenian cases, this is the only one that is explicitly about the introduction of *foreign* deities, which is the issue most relevant to the context (2.251, 259-60).

<sup>1076</sup> As in 2.262, the emphasis is on the death penalty; for the motif of "introducing" (εἰσάγειν), see 2.251, 254.

<sup>1077</sup> The rationale is that the more true Gods one honors, the more benefits one can expect to gain. This concluding comment adds to the topic of tradition that of truth. So long as the issue is the protection of one's own traditions and beliefs, others' Gods are rejected simply for being foreign; their reality is not at issue. But now questions are raised about truth and error, whether the "Gods" concerned are real or fake. If the Athenians were right to doubt that others' deities were Gods, it is implied that the Judeans rightly stick to their conceptions about God not just because they are *their own*, but also because they are *true*; cf. *Ant.* 8.335-50 (contrasting the true God and the false Gods of foreigners). The rationale is that of Josephus and it is unclear to what extent it corresponds to that of the Athenians themselves.

<sup>1078</sup> Greek: τὰ μὲν οὖν Ἀθηναίων ἐχέτω καλῶς (following Niese's emendation of ὄχετο [in L and S] to ἐχέτω). The phrase signals the end of the Athenian section, but its meaning is not clear: καλῶς ἔχω is often used by Josephus in the sense "to be good/proper/all right," but never elsewhere in the imperative like this. Some positive verdict is being pronounced, but the translation remains uncertain.

Josephus now gives in brief 2 non-Greek (Scythian and Persian) examples of hostility to outside influence, though only the first is specific. There are at least 2 reasons for these additions. In the first place, Apollonius had compared Judeans with other "barbarians" (2.148), and, it seems, specifically with the Persians (2.270), and Josephus can use that comparison now for his own purposes. Secondly, if he had confined himself to examples of Greek inhospitality to foreign customs, his comparison with Judeans would have been vulnerable: it was one thing for Greeks to resist (inferior) "barbarian" habits, but what right had barbarians (such as Judeans) to resist other, and more "civilized" customs?

Josephus therefore needs an example of barbarians properly protecting their own traditions, and the famous case of Anacharsis comes first to mind. Unfortunately, this implies a parallel between Judeans and Scythians, who in other respects are hardly role models.

<sup>1079</sup> Ever since Herodotus (4.1-82), the Scythians could stand for the wild, savage, uncivilized "other" on the NE boundary of the Greek and Roman world (for Herodotus' own complex approach see Hartog 1988). They had become a byword for inhospitality, cruelty, and the primitive life (e.g., *War* 7.244-51; 2 Macc. 4.47; Plato, *Leg.* 637d-e; Polybius 9.34.11; Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.150; Lucian, *Tox.* 8). Josephus here does nothing to diminish their notoreity (they even *take pleasure* in murder; cf. Ovid, *Trist.* 4.461-62); underlining the common opinion makes clear he does not endorse their culture entirely, but it somewhat weakens the value of their commitment to "protect their customs."

<sup>1080</sup> This is the moral Josephus is intent to draw (cf. 2.254, 259, 262). The following story was originally told (Herodotus 4.76-78) from a quite different angle, criticizing Scythian resistance to the influence of Greek religion. Josephus may know Herodotus directly. He uses here the verb περιστέλλω, in the sense of "protecting" or "defending" customs, a sense very different from his uses of the term elsewhere. But it occurs in precisely this sense in Herodotus 4.80.5, at the close of the discussion of Scythian travellers (Anacharsis and Scylas) who brought back Greek customs.

<sup>1081</sup> Anacharsis is a largely legendary Scythian figure of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE, whom Herodotus recounts as travelling the world, displaying proofs of his "wisdom" (4.76-77). In some traditions he would become the archetype of the wise foreigner who could critique Greek customs (e.g., Lucian, *Anacharsis*), or the "noble savage" whose simple lifestyle demonstrated the Cynic ideal (appropriate sayings and letters were attributed to him). Although not a Greek, he was admired by Greeks (cf. 1.175 on the Judean admired by Aristotle). There is a subtle difference from those "among the Greeks" who were admired for their wisdom (2.168, 239, 281; cf. 1.175; 2.255), with whom Josephus has aligned his opinions. Despite being admired for his wisdom by Greeks, Anacharsis was executed by his compatriots,



he seemed to have come back infected with Greek customs.<sup>1082</sup> Among Persians also, one might find many people who were punished for the same reason.<sup>1083</sup> **270** But Apollonius evidently took pleasure in the Persians' laws and admired them,<sup>1084</sup> since the Greeks benefited from their courage and their common mind concerning the Gods<sup>1085</sup>—the latter in relation to the temples that the Persians burned; their courage in coming close to being enslaved!<sup>1086</sup> He also imitated all the Persian habits, abusing other people's wives and castrating children.<sup>1087</sup>

*Judean  
commitment to  
the laws*

**271** Among us, the death penalty is fixed for anyone who so mistreats even a

and properly so according to Josephus. This reveals the difference between Josephus' fundamental loyalty to Judean culture and his merely tactical alliance with Greeks. If what the Greeks considered "wisdom" were an ultimate value for Josephus, this death would be an outrage, not a moral paradigm. Where Greek philosophy agrees with Judean tradition, Greek opinions can be lauded. But if the protection of Judean culture from foreign infection is at stake, Greek customs and even Greek wisdom can be dismissed, along with the rest.

<sup>1082</sup> Herodotus uses similar terms 3 times (4.76.1, 5; 77.2). In Herodotus' story, he introduced to Scythia the cult of the Mother of the Gods, which he had learned at Cyzicus; this introduction of a foreign cult would have suited Josephus' context perfectly, and it is curious he does not mention it.

<sup>1083</sup> This huge generalization is not supported by examples. It may be introduced simply to suggest a second barbarian parallel (as there were two Greek ones: Sparta and Athens), and to match the comparison with the Persians advanced by Apollonius (2.270).

<sup>1084</sup> The mention of Apollonius shows again the importance of the apologetic mode for the rhetoric of this segment. Apollonius had compared Judeans unfavorably with other "barbarians" (2.148, 150, 238). As this section now reveals, he had contrasted Judean "cowardice" (2.148) with Persian "courage" (ἀνδρεία), and Judean religious incompatibility (2.258) with the religious agreement ("common mind," ὁμογνωμοσύνη) between Persians and Greeks (despite their known history of enmity). Thus even the Persians, the classic "barbarians" in the Greek tradition, were nobler and nearer to "civilized" standards than the Judeans. Josephus turns this point back on Apollonius in sarcasm (how much the Greeks enjoyed this commonality with Persians!) and in personal polemic (if Apollonius admired the Persians, he was clearly "Persian" in his morals as well). The viciousness in this final attack on Apollonius matches the rhetorically climactic assault on Apion in 2.141-44. The rhetorical flourish threatens to derail Josephus' argument, but the mention of "courage" and admiration of others' laws reintroduces the theme of Judean commitment to their own laws, and their disin-

clination to emulate others' (2.271, developed in 2.272-75; cf. 2.261).

<sup>1085</sup> Josephus is being sarcastic; his statement reveals what Apollonius stressed in his comparative evaluation of the Persians (see previous note); the noun ὁμογνωμοσύνη ("common mind") is found only here in Josephus, and may derive from Apollonius. The term could refer to their internal religious unanimity, but this would hardly form a contrast with Judeans (cf. 2.68), and the point is more likely to be that, despite their wars against Greece, Persian religion had more in common with its Greek counterpart than did the peculiar cult and beliefs of the Judeans (cf. 2.258).

<sup>1086</sup> For the burning of temples after the Ionian revolt (493 BCE), see Herodotus 6.32; 8.109. Equally famous was Xerxes' destruction of the Athenian acropolis (480 BCE), already alluded to in 2.131 (see note to "acropolis"); for the supposed rationale, see Cicero, *Resp.* 3.14; *Leg.* 2.26. Following a trope as old as 5<sup>th</sup>-century Athens, Josephus presents the Persians as the savage and enslaving "barbarians," in contrast to the freedom-loving Greeks (who just survived the Persian Wars). Apollonius' admiration reveals him to be similarly "barbarian."

<sup>1087</sup> The charge is probably gratuitous, built from supposition that Apollonius must be "Persian" in every respect (ethos attacks often included allegations of sexual misdemeanor). The accusation of "abusing" others' wives (ὑβρίζων; the term can mean "rape" in a sexual context; cf. 2.201, 212) could allude to the tradition that Persians committed incest between parents and children (between mothers and sons and/or fathers and daughters; Philo, *Spec.* 3.13-14; Tertullian, *Apol.* 9, citing Ctesias; Origen, *Cels.* 5.27; 6.80). More likely, it echoes a salacious story that Persians introduced to the Greek world novel forms of sexual intercourse (see Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.7.21, on the vice of a Persian with a Samian woman). The castration of children was associated with Persians through the notoreity of eunuchs in the Persian court; for its practice on Ionian captives, see Herodotus 6.32. Josephus elsewhere indicates that his son's tutor, one of Domitian's slaves, was a eunuch (*Life* 429).

brute animal;<sup>1088</sup> and neither fear of our conquerors nor emulation of the laws respected by other people has been powerful enough to draw us away from these laws.<sup>1089</sup> **272** We have trained our courage not for undertaking wars of self-aggrandizement but for preserving the laws.<sup>1090</sup> While meekly enduring defeat of other kinds,<sup>1091</sup> whenever people force us to alter our regulations then we undertake<sup>1092</sup> wars, even when it is beyond our capacity,<sup>1093</sup> and we hold out to the bitter end.<sup>1094</sup> **273** For why would we emulate other people's laws when we see that they are not preserved even by those who laid them down?<sup>1095</sup> Was it not inevitable that the Lacedaemonians would condemn their antisocial constitution and their contempt for marriage,<sup>1096</sup> and the Eleans and Thebans their unnatural and extremely licentious

<sup>1088</sup> Apollonius is associated with a practice so low down the moral scale that Judeans would not stoop to this even with animals; and they regard it as so serious even there as to condemn offenders to death. For the rule against mistreating animals, see 2.213. Lev 22:24 could be read as banning not only the sacrifice of animals with crushed or missing testicles, but also the infliction of such damage upon them. In *Ant.* 4.290-91 Josephus linked the taboo on eunuchs (derived from Deut 23:2) with a ban on castrating men or animals, and a similar double ban is articulated in *Hypoth.* 7.7 (cf. *b. Sabb.* 110b). None of these parallel texts mentions the death penalty in this connection, nor could it be justified from the biblical law. But Josephus is keen to emphasize the severity of Judean punishments (cf. 2.215-17), a theme to which he will return (2.276-77).

<sup>1089</sup> Josephus pulls the argument back on track: Judeans are both bravely committed to their laws (2.272) and wholly satisfied with them, showing no inclination to emulate others (2.273-75). For the emulation theme, see note to "customs" at 2.261. The "conquerors" had been alluded to before (2.228, 233) as applying pressure, even torture, on Judeans faithful to the law. Judean resistance to both pressure and temptation is further evidence of their powers of endurance (cf. 2.146).

<sup>1090</sup> If Apollonius contrasted Persian courage with Judean cowardice (2.148, 270), Josephus responds by heralding Judean courage, though in relation to a very particular cause. Courage (ἀνδρεία) was most obviously associated with warfare, and demonstrated in victory (bravery in defeat could be considered merely "rash" or "foolhardy"; see note to "recklessness" at 2.148). Josephus can hardly point to Judean courage in victorious warfare, and so denigrates war by association with greed or self-aggrandizement (πλεονεξία; cf. 1.62; 2.292 for the same connection with war; 2.158, 186 for the vice in general). Elsewhere he suggests that God forbade Judeans to interfere with others' lands (*Ant.* 4.102, 296-97). The Spartans were commonly charged with waging war purely for aggrandizement (e.g.,

Isocrates, *Bus.* 20; *Panath.* 188, 241; Polybius 6.49.1), a motive that both Romans (Cicero, *Resp.* 1.27) and Judeans (Philo, *Mos.* 1.307) were keen to disavow in the case of their own warfare. But Josephus will not concede that Judeans lack courage (cf. 2.232-35 for the favorable contrast with Spartans). In fact they train it (for the theme, cf. 2.171-74) for the far nobler task of preserving their laws, an unambiguous good (cf. 2.153, 226; for the "preservation" theme, see note to "ever" at 2.156).

<sup>1091</sup> Josephus concedes episodes of defeat (cf. 1.212; 2.125-34), but almost makes a virtue of them by using the language of "endurance" (ὑπομένω, associated with toughness in 2.230, 234). But the rest of the sentence makes clear that defeat is not an option on the issues that really count (cf. the rhetorical strategy of 1.212).

<sup>1092</sup> L and S read ἀιρούμεθα ("choose"), followed by Niese, Reinach, and Thackeray. But, as Schreckenberg argues (1977: 168-69), Josephus' more typical language is that of "undertaking" war (ἀίρω; used above), so Holwerda's emendation (ἀιρόμεθα) is probably to be preferred.

<sup>1093</sup> The phrase suggests utter commitment but also serves to explain Judean defeat.

<sup>1094</sup> Greek: μέχρι τῶν ἑσχάτων ταῖς συμφοραῖς ἐγκαρτεροῦμεν (literally: "we put up with misfortunes until the last"). The verb (cf. 2.225) echoes the Judean virtue of καρτερία ("endurance," 2.146). For συμφοραῖ, cf. 2.125, 153; for the sentiment as a whole (endurance under extreme conditions), cf. 2.228.

<sup>1095</sup> The theme of emulation, first raised in 2.261 (in response to 2.258), and heralded in 2.271, now dominates the remaining sections of this segment: Judeans have no cause to emulate others' laws (which are clearly inferior, 2.273-78), while others understandably emulate theirs (2.279-86). Selecting items easily disparaged, Josephus castigates others' laws as flawed and generally abandoned (2.273-75), or if worthy, not properly enforced (2.276).

<sup>1096</sup> The earlier ambiguous verdict on the Spartan attitude to foreigners (2.259-60) is now unambiguously

intercourse between males?<sup>1097</sup> **274** In any case, even if they have not completely abandoned them in practice, they no longer admit to acts they once considered very fine and beneficial;<sup>1098</sup> **275** but they also renounce<sup>1099</sup> laws on these matters that were once so powerful among the Greeks that they even attributed to the Gods intercourse between males,<sup>1100</sup> and by the same principle also marriage between real siblings,<sup>1101</sup> concocting this defense for their own bizarre and unnatural pleasures.<sup>1102</sup>

*Judean severity  
and resilience*

**(2.38) 276** I refrain from speaking here about punishments,<sup>1103</sup> what large exemptions<sup>1104</sup> most legislators gave criminals from the beginning<sup>1105</sup>—legislating for adul-

negative, especially as the Spartans condemn it themselves (cf. 2.226-27). The Spartan attitude to marriage had not been mentioned before. The “contempt” (ὀλιγωρία) could relate to the men’s prior loyalty to their “mess,” and their reluctance to live fully with their wives (see note to “prepared” at 2.230), or to what Aristotle considered the Spartans’ failure to regulate their women (*Pol.* 1269b-1270a); cf. Müller 353. But it is more likely an allusion to the famous Spartan habit of wife-swapping (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 15; Ps.-Xenophon, *Lac.* 1). Josephus has already emphasized the Judean respect for marriage (2.199-203), and here echoes the Roman ideal of marital fidelity (see Appendix 6).

<sup>1097</sup> If sexual intercourse between male and female is “natural” (κατὰ φύσιν, 2.199), that between males is “unnatural” (παρὰ φύσιν); for Roman attitudes, see note to “women” at 2.199. Here the unnatural is caused by excessive passion (ἄγαν ἀνέδην, not passion wrongly oriented), on the presumption that overabundant lust will tire of female partners and seek an extra outlet among males. Eleans and Thebans are twinned in exactly this context in Plato, *Symp.* 182b; Xenophon, *Symp.* 8.34; Cicero, *Resp.* 4.4; Plutarch, *Mor.* 11f; Cicero complains that the *libido* of the Eleans and Thebans was allowed to run loose in *licentia*. It is possible that Josephus is drawing on precisely this passage. In any case it is not accidental that Josephus chooses Greek examples (explicitly, 2.275): for homoeroticism as a “Greek” practice (in Roman eyes), see note to “women” at 2.199,

<sup>1098</sup> This is a clever rhetorical twist, as it allows for a change in moral fashion but attributes no less blame to the Greeks. Once they had a warped sense of morality (they thought such things “very fine and beneficial”); now they are ashamed of them, but still practice them secretly (and hypocritically). So they are neither faithful to their traditional laws, nor improved in their moral practice.

<sup>1099</sup> Reading ἀπόμυσται, with Niese and all modern editors.

<sup>1100</sup> The most obvious case is the relationship between Zeus and Ganymede, the Trojan prince carried off by Zeus to be his cupbearer (Homer, *Il.* 20.231-35). Af-

ter Theognis (1345-48), this was taken to be a sexual relationship (Ovid, *Met.* 10.152-61; Virgil, *Aen.* 5.254-57). Josephus’ judgment closely matches Plato, *Leg.* 636c-d, where “unnatural” homoerotic relationships are condemned as rooted in an uncontrolled pursuit of pleasure. Cretans are blamed for inventing the story of Ganymede, providing a mythological precedent for their lust.

<sup>1101</sup> The “same principle” is presumably that of uncontrolled lust. In mythology, Zeus and Hera were siblings as well as spouses, though this was not mentioned above (2.240-49). Judean horror at sibling sex (see Lev 20:17), was shared in the Roman world, where it was considered an oriental oddity (e.g. in Egypt, where Ptolemies married their sisters). The association of these two “vices” makes it easier to regard both as outlandish examples of lust.

<sup>1102</sup> Josephus reiterates his claim that these practices represent merely the indulgence of pleasure and, like Plato (see above), interprets myth as a cover for immorality (cf. *Ant.* 1.22).

<sup>1103</sup> For the *praeteritio*, cf. 2.168, 231, 262; it allows Josephus to raise a subject, but excuses the fact that he touches on it briefly. Josephus now turns from the charge that others abandon their laws to the claim that they fail to take seriously even those they pretend to observe. By contrast, the severity of Judean punishments was a major theme of 2.190-218 (esp. 2.215-17), reiterated in 2.271. *Hypoth.* 7.1 provides a close parallel in theme (not vocabulary); cf. Philo, *Spec.* 3.181-83.

<sup>1104</sup> Greek: διαλύσεις (as Schreckenberg shows [1977: 169], emendation is unnecessary). The term can denote the settlement of a legal case or the annulment of a fine (or a marriage); but here, in context, it suggests not quite the full dismissal of a charge, or cancellation of its penalty, but release from its proper severity.

<sup>1105</sup> The non-specific “most” signals a move towards generalization, increasingly evident from this point on. The notion of gifts to criminals (πληροί) is deliberately shocking, and “from the beginning” suggests that this is a flaw built into the legislative framework, not a later relaxation of just laws.

tery a monetary fine,<sup>1106</sup> for taking a girl's virginity, marriage<sup>1107</sup>—and, regarding impiety, how many excuses they embrace allowing denial of the charge,<sup>1108</sup> if anyone even attempts to make an investigation; for most people, by now, transgressing the law has become a fine art!<sup>1109</sup> **277** But certainly not among us.<sup>1110</sup> Rather, even if we are deprived of wealth, cities, and other good things,<sup>1111</sup> at least the law endures for us immortal,<sup>1112</sup> and no Judean, however far he may go from his homeland,<sup>1113</sup> or however much he fears a cruel master,<sup>1114</sup> will not fear the law more than him.<sup>1115</sup> **278** If, then, we adopt this attitude towards the laws because of their excellence, let them concede that we have extremely good laws.<sup>1116</sup> But if they think they

<sup>1106</sup> Contrast the Judean attitude to adultery (punished by death), as described in 2.201, 215 (see note to “woman” at 2.201).

<sup>1107</sup> For φθορά as the taking of a girl's virginity, see *Ant.* 17.309 (cf. the verb φθείρω in *Ant.* 4.252). Oddly, biblical laws prescribe precisely what Josephus here criticizes, at least for rape of a girl not already betrothed (Exod 22:16-17; Deut 22:28-29). Elsewhere Josephus cites this legislation with approval (*Ant.* 4.252; cf. Philo, *Spec.* 3.69-71). The rape of a betrothed girl is another matter (cf. 2.201, for the death penalty). Josephus' rhetoric creates an antithesis that he could hardly sustain on biblical grounds.

<sup>1108</sup> On Judean refusal to allow excuses, see 2.214. Impiety is selected as the worst possible offense (cf. 2.194, 217, with the death penalty). The Athenian examples cited in 2.262-68 suggest the opposite of this claim, but Josephus may be playing on the conservative Roman's perception that in contemporary society people did not take either marriage or religion with the proper seriousness exhibited in the “good old days” (see Appendix 6).

<sup>1109</sup> Thackeray's felicitous translation of μελέτη (a practiced skill); cf. the equally generalized claim of 2.182.

<sup>1110</sup> From here to 2.286 the argumentative sequence bears a close resemblance to that of Philo, *Mos.* 2.12-24: there it is argued that, where others' laws change, the Judeans' remain constant, and have been preserved “immortal” even under extreme pressure; and the value of the laws is proved by the fact that they are emulated by others, with specific examples including the observance of the sabbath and of fasts (as in 2.282). Details regarding these parallels are noted below; for their significance see Appendix 5.

<sup>1111</sup> Cf. 2.272, conceding occasions of defeat. The loss of Jerusalem may be particularly in mind (cf. 1.209-12, which also speaks of a “cruel master”). Josephus consistently claims that the law is the one thing Judeans will never abandon, expressing a cultural tenacity that can adjust to loss of sovereignty and population dispersal. This is the ideology by which

Judean culture will survive in the Diaspora and despite the disastrous Revolt.

<sup>1112</sup> Greek: ἀθάνατος διαμένει (the verb suggests long-lasting endurance); contrast others' abandonment of their laws in 2.273-75. For a similar rhetorical flourish, cf. Bar. 4:1; Wis. 18:4; Tob. 1:6. Philo's claim is exactly parallel: while others' regulations have been unsettled by wars, changes of fortune, or luxury, Moses' have remained firm and immovable from the day when they were first enacted until now: “and we hope that they will remain for all future ages immortal (ἀθάνατα), so long as the sun and moon and the whole heaven and universe exist” (*Mos.* 2.14).

<sup>1113</sup> It is assumed that it is easier to keep one's national laws in the homeland (πατρίς), but Judean loyalty is proven even in the Diaspora (cf. 1.32-33). The sentiment shows that, for Josephus, even a Diaspora Ἰουδαῖος is defined by relation to his “homeland”: he belongs to it even if he is not resident there. For the geographical dimension to the term Ἰουδαῖος (“Judean”), see Introduction, § 9.

<sup>1114</sup> The phrase echoes Agatharchides' description of Ptolemy I (cited in 1.210), in a context parallel to this. The term δεσπότης (“master”) could be used for a slave-owner, and the condition of Judean slaves may also be in mind. For Judean fearlessness under pressure, cf. 2.232-33, 271.

<sup>1115</sup> Cf. 2.174 for the law as the Judeans' boundary, rule, father, and master (δεσπότης). Cf. Demoratus' speech to Xerxes on the indomitable Spartan spirit: although free, they have a master (δεσπότης), law, which they fear much more than Xerxes' subjects fear him (Herodotus 7.104).

<sup>1116</sup> Greek: κρατίστους νόμους; superlatives will now abound (cf. 2.284-88, 293-94) and could be taken to mean “extremely good” or, with a higher claim, “the very best.” Cf. Cicero's claim that the Roman constitution is the best in the world (*Resp.* 1.70-71; *Leg.* 2.23; 3.12). The claims are mostly attributed to others or advanced in rhetorical questions, thus avoiding direct and explicit self-praise (cf. Gerber 1997: 213-14). The nameless “them” must refer to Lysimachus and Apol-



are despicable laws to which we remain faithful to this degree,<sup>1117</sup> what should those people not suffer, deservedly, who do not observe better ones?<sup>1118</sup>

*The witness of time*

**279** Further, since a long span of time is believed to be the truest test of everything,<sup>1119</sup> I would make this my witness to the excellence of our legislator<sup>1120</sup> and of the pronouncement concerning God handed down by him.<sup>1121</sup> For an immense time has passed, if one compares him to the eras of the other legislators,<sup>1122</sup> and throughout all that time one would find that<sup>1123</sup> **(2.39) 280** the value of the laws has been proved by us,<sup>1124</sup> and they have induced emulation from all other people to an ever increasing degree.<sup>1125</sup> **281** The first were the philosophers among the Greeks,<sup>1126</sup> who

*Emulation by philosophers*

Ionius Molon (cf. 2.145, 236). Their accusation that the Judean laws taught vice and not a single virtue (ἀρετή, 2.145) is echoed in this counter-claim of the excellence (ἀρετή) of the laws. The argument in this section offers a neat rhetorical version of the crooked coin toss: “Heads I win, tails you lose.” If the Judean laws are good, Judeans must be commended for their faithfulness; if they are bad, *others* should be castigated for abandoning their laws, which are supposedly better. A negative verdict on Judeans, for showing blind loyalty to poor laws, is not here considered (cf. Agatharchides in 1.209-11).

<sup>1117</sup> “Despicable” (φῶλος) echoes the charge of 2.236, levelled against Judeans (φουλότατοι); it will be repeated in 2.285. The hypothetical case acknowledges that it is not enough merely to trumpet Judeans’ loyalty to their laws (2.219-35, 271-77). But 2.190-218 has shown that there is nothing despicable about the laws, and 2.279-86 will reaffirm their excellence.

<sup>1118</sup> The question allows a rhetorical concession (that others’ laws are supposedly “better”), but builds on the impression given in 2.273-76 that they do not take their own laws seriously. The possibility that they abandon only their poor or dysfunctional laws, but preserve their best, is not mooted. For Josephus, laws are a package that one either keeps or abandons entire, and the abandonment of laws must be considered a fault (cf. 2.153).

<sup>1119</sup> That value is proved by longevity was a standard opinion in antiquity (see Droge 1989; Pilhofer 1990): only genuinely good things could survive the vicissitudes of history. Josephus is happy to accept this assumption, since he considers the antiquity of Moses’ laws incontestable (2.156). A countervailing conviction, that the antique can become outdated, is not here recognized, although it is attributed to others in 2.182. This argument from longevity will be combined with another, from universal emulation, to form the final vindication of the laws (2.279-86).

<sup>1120</sup> “Excellence” (ἀρετή) could also be translated “virtue.” The term is prominent in the closing parts of this book in relation to both Moses and the laws (2.278, 286, 290; cf. 2.145, 153, 159).

<sup>1121</sup> Greek: καὶ τῆς ὑπ’ ἐκείνου φήμης περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ παραδοθείσης. φήμη normally means a report or rumor. In older Greek (from Homer to the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE), it can have the special religious sense of an oracle, prophetic voice, or some other form of divine message. Josephus will shortly mention Moses’ prophetic role (2.286), and might here hint at the notion of divine revelation (so Müller 354). But the term is probably best translated more neutrally, as “pronouncement”; cf. the λόγος concerning God in 2.181, 198. The emphasis falls on Moses’ theology, as this fits the first case of emulators, Greek philosophers (2.281); cf. 2.163-68.

<sup>1122</sup> For the comparative method, cf. 2.150, 238; for Moses’ relative antiquity, cf. 2.152-56. The “immense time” was earlier fixed at 2,000 years (2.226), and, as elsewhere (2.156), the historical claim is taken to be uncontroversial. Cf. Philo, *Mos.* 2.17: the law has been preserved securely (πεφυλάχθαι ἐν βεβαίῳ) through all time (ἐξ ἅπαντος τοῦ χρόνου).

<sup>1123</sup> The text of L and S is corrupt, and Latin not much help. It is possible that something has dropped out (between 279 and 280), but sense is restored by Niese’s emendation (παρὰ πάντ’ ἄν εὖροι τοῦτον ὅτι ...), followed by all modern editors.

<sup>1124</sup> Greek: ὑφ’ ἡμῶν τε διελέγχθησαν οἱ νόμοι. The verb διελέγχω means to test or examine (cf. *War* 1.489, 548), often in the negative sense, to “prove wrong” or “convict” (e.g., *War* 1.487, 643), but sometimes in the positive sense, to “establish,” “prove,” or “demonstrate” (e.g., *War* 1.470; 3.3; *Ant.* 13.430). From this, it can mean to “prove the value” of something (cf. *War* 2.152, of the souls of the Essenes, whose mettle is proved under torture). Josephus does not dwell on this point (unless there is a lacuna in the text); the more important proof comes in the next clause, and the witness of Judeans may be not much more than a foil to that supplied by “all other people.”

<sup>1125</sup> “Emulation” (ζῆλος) is now the main theme of this paragraph (the noun here and in 2.282; the cognate verb in 2.285, 286). The emphasis is part of the argument that springs from 2.258. To the charge that Judeans do not accept other people with different views and customs (2.258), Josephus has replied that Judeans

gave the appearance of keeping to their ancestral traditions,<sup>1127</sup> but in practice<sup>1128</sup> and in their philosophy took their lead from him,<sup>1129</sup> holding similar views about God<sup>1130</sup> and teaching a frugal lifestyle<sup>1131</sup> and fellowship with one another.<sup>1132</sup> **282** What is more, even among the masses<sup>1133</sup> for a long time there has been much emulation of our piety,<sup>1134</sup> and there is not one city of the Greeks, nor a single barbarian nation,<sup>1135</sup> where the custom of the seventh day, on which we rest, has not

*Emulation by  
the masses*

do not emulate (ζηλώω) others (2.261, 271, 273) and have no good reason to do so. In fact, he now claims, the opposite is the case: others emulate us, which is proof of Judean cultural superiority (for the theme and the same vocabulary, cf. 1.162, 166, 225; *War* 7.357). “All other people” is a grand claim, to be illustrated by philosophers (2.281) and “the masses” (2.282), two groups that in combination can be taken to cover the whole of humanity (cf. 2.169, 224). “To an ever increasing degree” (ἀεὶ καὶ μᾶλλον) supports the argument from time (2.279), but throws weight on the evidence of the present, which will be supplied in 2.282-84.

<sup>1126</sup> For this positive category, cf. 1.175; 2.168, 239, 257. The philosophical imitation of Moses was earlier traced back to Pythagoras (1.162-65; 2.168).

<sup>1127</sup> This allows for the fact that they did not acknowledge their debt to Moses, and were not generally recognized to have Judean connections. Keeping to one’s ancestral traditions (τὰ πάτρια) is usually a virtue for Josephus (cf. 2.144; 2.269), but here he claims it was better that they did not in fact do so.

<sup>1128</sup> Greek: ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι, read by L and S and supported by Latin (*ipsis rebus*). Niese suggested the text should be emended to ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν (“in their writings”), a conjecture followed by Reinach and Münster. But “in practice” makes a better contrast to “in appearance” (and to the following “in their philosophy”), and Niese’s conjecture is unnecessary (so also Pilhofer 1990: 205, n.56).

<sup>1129</sup> The same claim was made in 2.168 (cf. 2.257); it reflects a long Judean tradition (see note to “expression” at 2.168), but Josephus makes no effort to substantiate it.

<sup>1130</sup> “Similar” (ὅμοια) allows for (undefined) difference. Theology is where Josephus finds the best point of contact with the Greek philosophical tradition (cf. 2.168), not least in the critique of myth (2.239, 255).

<sup>1131</sup> Greek: εὐτέλεια, a term not used before in this treatise and only once by Josephus, in a different sense, elsewhere (*Ant.* 5.219; cf. Philo, *Mos.* 2.183-85). But there had been earlier criticism of its opposite, πολυτέλεια (“expense” or “extravagance,” 2.205, 234), while “moderation” (σωφροσύνη) was highlighted in 2.170, along with “simplicity of diet” (λιτότης τροφῆς) in 2.234. With the exception of the Epicureans, philosophers were known to disapprove of luxury or the indul-

gence of physical appetites. But it is bold to assert that they learned this from Moses.

<sup>1132</sup> A concern for social justice is another common philosophical trait, but Josephus uses almost the exact terminology he had employed in relation to the virtue taught by the law (κοινωνία πρὸς ἀλλήλους, 2.146; cf. 2.196, 207-8).

<sup>1133</sup> This is taken as more remarkable, since one would not expect “the masses” to show such good moral sense (cf. 2.224). In fact, Josephus’ point might backfire if it were only “the masses” who imitated Judean customs, since this could demonstrate merely their “superstitious” nature. But as they are twinned with “philosophers” (2.281), this criticism would not apply.

<sup>1134</sup> All that follows is put under the label of “piety” (εὐσεβεία; cf. 1.212; 2.170-71), which gives respectability to what might otherwise appear irrational rites. That this has happened “for a long time” reinforces the witness of time (2.279); from here to 2.284 many of the verbs are in the perfect tense, suggesting a past process still continuing in the present. For similar claims of widescale Gentile imitation of, and even participation in Judean rites, cf. *War* 2.463, 560; 7.45; *Ant.* 3.318. Once again, the closest parallel is in Philo, *Mos.* 2.12-24. For the phenomenon of Gentile sympathizers (sometimes labelled “Godfearers,” in a variety of Greek and Latin forms) see Reynolds and Tannenbaum 1987; Feldman 1993: 342-82; Levinskaya 1996: 51-126; Wander 1998; Cohen 1999: 140-74

<sup>1135</sup> Reading βάρβαρον (as conjectured by Niese, followed by Reinach and Münster), the adjective agreeing with ἔθνος (on the assumption that Greeks are organized in cities, barbarians in nations). βάρβαρος is read by L and S (supported by Latin, and followed by Naber and Thackeray); that would agree with πόλις (“not one city of the Greeks, nor a barbarian one, nor a single nation”). Either reading is possible; even with βάρβαρον the phrase is surprisingly awkward in Greek (οὐδ’ ἔστιν οὐ πόλις Ἑλλήνων οὐδητισοῦν οὐδὲ βάρβαρον οὐδὲ ἐν ἔθνος). In combination, the categories cover the whole world, including the city of Rome. For the translation of βάρβαρος, see note to “Greeks” at 1.58. There is good evidence for various forms of “Judaizing” in Rome in Josephus’ day (see notes below), but it was a controversial topic, criticized by some authors (Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.96-106; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1-2)

permeated,<sup>1136</sup> and where our fasts<sup>1137</sup> and lighting of lamps<sup>1138</sup> and many of our prohibitions with regard to food have not been observed.<sup>1139</sup> **283** They try to imitate also<sup>1140</sup> our concord among ourselves,<sup>1141</sup> our distribution of possessions,<sup>1142</sup> our industriousness in crafts,<sup>1143</sup> and our endurance under torture on behalf of the

and susceptible to political charges in the last years of Domitian's reign (Suetonius, *Dom.* 12.2; Dio Cassius 67.14.1-2; 68.1.2: "Judean lifestyle"; see Smallwood 1956; Williams 1990; Barclay 1996a: 310-13). That Josephus dares to finish his encomium with this point suggests either courage or political naivety on his part, or the passing of the political difficulties with the death of Domitian (96 CE; see Introduction, § 6).

<sup>1136</sup> Greek: διαπεφοίτηκε. The verb was used in an identical context in 1.166; the simple form (φοιτάω) is used in 2.284 and in the closely parallel text from Philo, *Mos.* 2.27 (cf. *Mos.* 1.2). The spreading of customs is thus described in very different language to that used of proselytism, where Gentiles "come into" or "choose to share" Judean laws (2.123, 209-10, 261). Josephus is here describing the imitation of particular customs, not the wholesale adoption of the Judean law. The Judeans' observance of the sabbath was very well known in Rome (see Goldenberg 1974; Barclay 1996b; Williams 2004), where it became associated, and even confused, with the day of Saturn (e.g., Tibullus 1.3.15-18; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.4; Frontinus, *Strat.* 2.1.17; Dio Cassius 37.16-19; Tertullian, *Nat.* 1.13). Thus where non-Judeans stopped activities on the inauspicious day of Saturn, this could be interpreted, by Judeans and others (rightly or wrongly) as an imitation of the Judean sabbath (e.g., Horace, *Sat.* 1.9.71-72; Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.96, 105-6; see Barclay 1996a: 296-97). But the "imitation" was not confined to Rome. Philo implies the same in Alexandria (*Mos.* 2.21-22). One can imagine the adoption of sabbath rest to different degrees, and in different forms. On a broader level, Judeans had long claimed that Greek literary authorities shared their respect for the seventh day (e.g., Aristobulus in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.11-16, with reference to Homer and Hesiod; Philo, *Opif.* 90-127; *Hypoth.* 7.20).

<sup>1137</sup> The major fast, universal to Judeans, was that on the day of Atonement (cf. *Ant.* 3.240); this was known to Strabo (*apud* Josephus, *Ant.* 14.66) and Philo implies it was copied, or at least "reverenced," by Gentiles (*Mos.* 2.23-24). There is also strong evidence that Judeans in Rome fasted on the sabbath (Williams 2004, with reference to Pompeius Trogus, *apud* Justin, *Epitome* 36.2.14; Petronius, frag. 37; Martial 4.4), and it is possible that Judeans interpreted others' fasting as an imitation of their own (cf. the parallel drawn, playfully, by Augustus in Suetonius, *Aug.* 76.2).

<sup>1138</sup> Cf. 1.308; 2.118 (with note to "rites"). The

Judean practice was known in Rome and associated by Seneca with the sabbath (*Ep.* 95.47), and by Persius with "Herod's day" (*Sat.* 5.180-81). Seneca attacks this as superstitious excess. Since the lighting of lamps, even in daytime, was common in religious rites (e.g., for the Lares, Juvenal, *Sat.* 12.89-91), Judeans could, rightly or wrongly, interpret others' practice as the spread of their own custom.

<sup>1139</sup> Reading πολλὰ τῶν εἰς βρώσιν ἡμῖν οὐ νομοισμένων (with L, Thackeray, and Münster). The οὐ (or its placement) has occasioned some suspicion (Niese, Reinach), but Josephus is likely to be speaking of negative rules (food disallowed; cf. 2.174, 234). The most famous in Rome, and elsewhere, was the ban on pork (see note to "pork" at 2.137). Sympathizers of Judean culture might well adopt this ban (Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.98-99), but other forms of dietary restriction (e.g., vegetarianism) could be confused with an interest in such "foreign rites" (Seneca, *Ep.* 108.22).

<sup>1140</sup> After listing 4 Judean practices, Josephus broadens the claim with reference to 4 general social qualities (cf. 2.281). "Similarity" becomes an argument for imitation (cf. 2.168, 257, 281), which is then taken to prove Judean superiority (cf. 2.152; Gerber 1997: 214).

<sup>1141</sup> Greek: ὁμόνοια ἢ πρὸς ἀλλήλους. The term was applied to Judeans in 2.179, but *in contrast* to the norm among others. Here the Judean ideal is what others *try* (πειράω) to imitate. "Concord among ourselves" may be, in practice, little different from "fellowship among ourselves" (2.146, 281); the Judean trait was noted by Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1, in connection with mutual compassion (*apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu*).

<sup>1142</sup> A phrase (ἀνάδοσις τῶν ὄντων) not used by Josephus elsewhere; for the theme of generosity to the needy, cf. 2.207, 211-14. Judean charity, based on biblical concern for the poor (e.g., Deut 15:7-8; Prov 31:20; Sir 4:4-5; Ps.-Phocylides 29), was undoubtedly distinctive in its rationale and range of application. Apart from Tacitus (see previous note), few non-Judeans comment on this trait, though, much later, Julian notes that "no Judean ever has to beg" (*Ad Arsacium* 84a [430d]). Juvenal, however, speaks of Judeans begging in Rome *Sat.* 6.542-47).

<sup>1143</sup> Greek: τὸ φιλεργὸν ἐν ταῖς τέχναῖς. Josephus had earlier stressed Judean commitment to work (2.174, 234), in contrast to Spartan laziness (2.229). The em-

laws.<sup>1144</sup> **284** For what is most remarkable is that the law by itself has had such a powerful influence, without the seductive allure of pleasure,<sup>1145</sup> and just as God permeates the whole universe,<sup>1146</sup> so the law has traveled through all humanity. Anyone who surveys his homeland and his own household will not doubt my claims.<sup>1147</sup> **285** So, our critics<sup>1148</sup> should either condemn everyone for their deliberate wickedness, if they have been eager to emulate other people's "despicable" customs in preference to their own "good" ones,<sup>1149</sup> or leave off disparaging us.<sup>1150</sup> **286** For, in honoring our own legislator and in believing his prophetic pronouncements about God<sup>1151</sup>

phasis may counter charges of Judean indolence (see note to "day" at 1.209). It is striking how prominent this theme becomes at the very end of this treatise (after here, at 2.291, 294); see Appendix 6 for its Roman character.

<sup>1144</sup> "Endurance" (τὸ καρτερικόν) echoes the virtue of καρτερία, often emphasized (2.146, 225-35). Here it is associated with ἀνάγκαι a term that, in the plural, Josephus associates with "torture" (e.g., *Ant.* 15.227; 16.232, 253; 17.76-77). For Judean courage under torture for the sake of the laws, cf. 2.232-33. It is not clear how others imitate this virtue, when they are generally criticized for caring very little for their literature (1.42-43) and abandoning their laws (2.227, 273-75). Josephus is using this opportunity to extol those Judean virtues that he wishes to highlight, in preparation for the *peroratio* on Judeans as the moral educators of humanity (2.291-95).

<sup>1145</sup> The text is slightly uncertain, but the sense is clear. While other nations are driven by pleasures (2.275), Judeans practice austerity (2.195, 204, 234, 281), as any philosopher would hope. The influence of Judean customs is attributed to the power of the law (cf. 2.271), not of Judeans themselves; the latter idea would offend their conquerors (Seneca *apud* Augustine, *Civ.* 6.11).

<sup>1146</sup> For the verb (φοιτάω), see note to "permeated" at 2.282. God's omnipresence (cf. 2.166, 190, 193) is a particularly Stoic theme, adopted by Judeans at least since Aristobulus. The parallel here proposed between the law and God is a strong, if indirect, claim to its divine origin (cf. note to "will" at 2.160). It implies that Judean laws are not simply the "ancestral customs" of one nation, but as inherently universal as God himself.

<sup>1147</sup> The use of others as witnesses strengthens Josephus' argument. The claim is based on sufficiently vague criteria (2.282-83) to be credible, at least to a sympathetic readership. The reference to the household reinforces the significance of these customs in the daily routines of life (cf. 2.173-74).

<sup>1148</sup> The critics (οἱ κατηγοροῦντες) are unnamed, but Lysimachus and Molon are particularly in mind (labelled κατήγοροι in 2.236). Their judgment on Judeans as "most despicable" (φασυλότατοι) in 2.236

is echoed in the use here of the same adjective (φάυλα) in connection with the law. Thus 2.236-286 is held together as an extended response to their charges, especially focused in 2.258. On a wider scale, this concluding comment harks back to 2.145-50, where the same critics are named in their attack on the law.

<sup>1149</sup> As in 2.278, Josephus deflects criticism onto others, instructing his critics how they should argue (as often in debate with Apion, 2.49, 56, etc.). Rhetorically adopting his critics' evaluation, he suggests the absurdity of their position, which would issue in *universal* condemnation. To keep one's own customs, even if they are bad, might be excusable (cf. 2.262, 269); but voluntarily to adopt others' despicable customs is sheer perversity or worse ("wickedness" translates πονηρία, a strong term cognate with πονηροί ["criminals"] in 2.276).

<sup>1150</sup> The verb βασκαίνω, when used with the dative, as here, normally means to "envy" or "begrudge" (e.g., *Ant.* 10.250, 257; *Life* 425). There may be elements of that notion here (cf. 1.224-25), but the sense seems to be broader, to include any form of disparagement (the normal sense with the accusative); cf. "our detractors" (οἱ βασκαίνοντες) in 1.72.

<sup>1151</sup> Greek: τοῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνου προφητευθεῖσι περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πεπιστευκότες. No great stress has been placed on Moses' prophetic status. In 1.40 it was implied that he was the first of the prophets; 2.75 used the participle *prophetans*; and in 2.218 his prediction about life beyond death was described in these terms. Here his prophecy is not future prediction but pronouncement on behalf of God (cf. φήμη, 2.279), as in the emphatic statement in *Ant.* 4.329 (based on Deut 34:10) that Moses had no equal among the prophets since "in all he said he seemed to hear God speaking." Even in the *Antiquities*, however, Moses is rarely described in prophetic terms (see *Ant.* 2.327; 3.60; 4.165, 320). The title is far more prominent in Philo's depiction: in the *Life of Moses*, it stands as one of the 4 chief titles, alongside king, legislator, and high-priest (*Mos.* 1.175, 201; 2.187-291); see Meeks 1967. For prophets and prophecy in Josephus see Feldman 1990a. This statement throws emphasis again on the *theological* center of Moses' message (cf. 2.165-68, 190-92, 279).



we are not making an effort to become invidious;<sup>1152</sup> in fact, if we did not ourselves appreciate the excellence of the laws,<sup>1153</sup> we would in any case<sup>1154</sup> have been induced to take pride in them by the number of those who emulate them.<sup>1155</sup>

*Conclusion: the tasks completed*

(2.40) 287<sup>1156</sup> Now, I have given a detailed account of the laws and the constitution in what I have written on *The Ancient Histories*.<sup>1157</sup> Here I have made reference to them so far as was necessary,<sup>1158</sup> setting out neither to censure other people's customs<sup>1159</sup> nor to offer an encomium on ours,<sup>1160</sup> but to prove that those who have written about us unjustly have shamelessly taken issue with truth itself.<sup>1161</sup> 288 Moreover, I think I have fulfilled satisfactorily in this text the promises I made earlier:<sup>1162</sup> I have demonstrated that our people was in existence in ancient times, although the critics claim that it is very recent in origin,<sup>1163</sup> and I have provided many ancient

For "belief" as the proper response, cf. 2.160, 163, 169, 218.

<sup>1152</sup> Josephus is acutely conscious of the problem of self-praise (cf. 2.147, to be echoed in 2.287); Judean reverence for Moses is simply a natural response to the good, and would be justified in any case by *others'* opinion (see next clause).

<sup>1153</sup> The ἄρετή of the laws (cf. 2.278) is parallel to that of Moses (2.279); cf. the charge of 2.145 that the law teaches no virtue (ἀρετή).

<sup>1154</sup> Reading πάντως ἄν with Holwerda and Niese minor, followed by all modern editors.

<sup>1155</sup> If Judean pride is not a self-made boast but generated by others' attitudes, it is unobjectionable. By deflecting the responsibility in this way, Josephus is on safer ground for the *peroratio*, which inevitably entails a display of pride.

<sup>1156</sup> The concluding segment of the treatise (2.287-96) contains a summary (2.287-92), a *peroratio* (2.293-95), and a literary epilogue (2.296). These effectively tie the work together, and restate its aims; but in the process they also offer two summaries of Judean values (2.291-92 and 2.293-94) that reinforce 2.283 and offer a picture of Judean culture particularly well attuned to contemporary Roman conservatism (see Appendix 6).

<sup>1157</sup> Greek: ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἀρχαιολογίας μοι γραφείοις (closely parallel to the phraseology of 1.2). Josephus elsewhere refers to the subject matter of this work by the preposition περὶ + accusative (1.1, 54) and, although the subject matter (or title) is normally singular (1.1, 54, 127; *Ant.* 20.259, 267; *Life* 430), it can be plural (2.136), and is probably so here (not περὶ + genitive singular). Such reference back to the earlier work is rare (elsewhere in *Apion* only in 1.1, 2, 54, 127; 2.136). Here it directs the reader to the far longer summaries of the laws in *Ant.* 3.244-286; 4.196-301, and excuses the relative brevity of their treatment here (cf. 2.145, 150). But it also signals the different genre of the present work, throwing the weight of emphasis onto its *apologetic* task (next sentence).

<sup>1158</sup> The "them" are the laws and the constitution,

the subject of 2.145-286. Although the preceding discussion constitutes, in fact, a rather different approach to the Judean constitution and laws from that offered in *Antiquities*, it is portrayed as merely a selection, chosen for defensive purposes (cf. note to "briefly" at 2.145; on the relationship between the 2 works, see Introduction, § 2).

<sup>1159</sup> Cf. Josephus' defense of his polemical tone in 2.150, 236-37. By this disavowal, and by blaming others for starting the comparative exercise, he justifies the sharpness of his own critique.

<sup>1160</sup> The disclaimer echoes 2.147, though both passages leave it ambiguous whether Josephus claims not to have *set out* (here προθέμενος) to praise Judean culture (but was forced into it), or to have refrained from it altogether. For his sensitivity to the opprobrium caused by self-praise, see 2.4, 286.

<sup>1161</sup> To charge others with shamelessness (cf. 2.26, on Apion) raises the polemical temperature. The comment echoes 2.145, where Apollonius and Lysimachus were accused of making charges that were neither just (δικαίους) nor true (ἀληθείς). But the concern to prove truth, and disprove falsehood, also echoes the prologue (1.3), and the summary to follow now surveys the whole work.

<sup>1162</sup> The agenda-setting promises were made in 1.3-5, 58-59, 219; 2.145. They are picked up now (2.288-92) by surveying all the major topics of the work, on Judean antiquity, on versions of the exodus, and on Moses and his laws. Josephus likes to claim he has done his job "satisfactorily" (ικανῶς); cf. 1.1, 58, 287.

<sup>1163</sup> The critics are unnamed (as in 1.2, 58) and the nature of their claim not consistently represented. Here they are said to have claimed that the Judean nation is "very recent" (νεώτατον); in 1.2, the comparative was used ("more recent," νεώτερον), and in 1.58 just "recent" (νέα κατάστασις). It is possible that none of these represent any real charge; they are simply a rhetorical foil, concocted and variously reproduced for the sake of Josephus' argumentation (see Gruen 2005). But there is some evidence for a contemporary critical ob-

witnesses who have referred to us in their writings, although they maintain that there is none.<sup>1164</sup> **289** Further, they claimed that our ancestors were Egyptian; but it has been shown that they came into Egypt from elsewhere.<sup>1165</sup> They falsely asserted that they were expelled because of bodily injury;<sup>1166</sup> but it has been seen that it was by choice and with plenty of physical strength that they returned to their native land.<sup>1167</sup> **290** They insulted our legislator, as an utterly despicable man;<sup>1168</sup> but God is found to have been witness to his excellence from of old<sup>1169</sup>—and, after him, time.<sup>1170</sup> **(2.41) 291** Concerning the laws, there was no need of further comment. For they themselves have been seen, through their own content,<sup>1171</sup> teaching not impiety but

*The value of  
the laws*

servation that Judeans were of doubtful ancient integrity, and/or insufficiently important to be mentioned by the best Greek historians, and Josephus could have twisted this into a denial that Judeans were an ancient people at all (see note to “historians” at 1.2). The proof of Judean antiquity was conducted in 1.69-218, with a preliminary discussion of trustworthy sources in 1.6-56.

<sup>1164</sup> Josephus earlier suggested not that they denied the existence of *any* witnesses, only that of *famous Greek* historians (1.2, 58). By generalizing and exaggerating the charge he justifies the provision of the range of witnesses gathered in 1.69-218, and makes his case appear more comprehensively successful. For the “witness” language, cf. 1.4, 59, 69, 74, 93, 106, 129, etc. In fact, many of his “witnesses” were of the Hellenistic era; only some were, or were claimed to be, “ancient” (e.g., 1.166, 172).

<sup>1165</sup> The issue of Judean identity, as distinct from Egyptian, was already implicit in 1.1, where Josephus refers to “our own original composition” and “the land that we now possess.” But it first emerges clearly at the end of the Hyksos-story, which proves, Josephus insists (as his *first* conclusion), that Judeans came into Egypt “from elsewhere” (ἐτέρωθεν, as here; see note to “elsewhere” at 1.104). Throughout his discussion of the exodus stories (1.219–2.32), Josephus has shown a persistent annoyance with tales that “mixed” Judeans with Egyptians (e.g., 1.229, 253, 278), or that left unclear who was Judean and who Egyptian (e.g., 1.298, 302, 314). Hence he had repeatedly stressed that neither the Judeans nor Moses were Egyptian (e.g., 1.228-29, 252-53, 270, 278, 279-86; 2.8; cf. 2.28, 122; *Ant.* 2.177). The point is emphasized not simply because it would be unbiblical to designate Judeans “Egyptian” in origin; Josephus also wants to create a clear rhetorical gap between the two peoples, and so exploit the Roman denigration of Egyptians, without damaging Judeans by association; see further Barclay 2004.

<sup>1166</sup> Greek: λύμη σωμάτων, also used in 2.8 (see note to “afflictions” ad loc.). Where his sources used the language of pollution, leprosy, or disease (1.233, 289, 305; 2.15), Josephus himself avoids pollution language, and speaks largely of physical impairment (see

notes to “Egypt” at 1.299; to “people” at 1.233; to “people” at 1.234; to “disfigured” at 1.304).

<sup>1167</sup> In fact, Josephus has not given *his own* version of the exodus (except in 2.157-58), though he did endorse Manetho’s story of the Hyksos. There the Hyksos (Judeans for Josephus) left by treaty and unharmed (1.88), but hardly voluntarily (1.84-90). For “choice” in this matter, cf. 2.157. Josephus had used the successful crossing of the desert to refute others’ accounts of their sickness (1.277-78, 314-15; 2.23); thus, the strength of the emigrants was implied, but never positively proved. It is important here that their “native land” (οἰκεία γῆ) was located elsewhere before, as well as after, the Egyptian sojourn (cf. 1.224). This point also was hardly proved in the course of this work, even with the Hyksos, 1.75, 90. Nonetheless, identification with the land remains for Josephus a key component of Judean identity (see Introduction, § 9).

<sup>1168</sup> Greek: φαυλότατος, here conveying moral, not just social disdain (so also of Judeans, 2.236; of the laws, 1.210; 2.278, 285). Elsewhere, Josephus indicates that Moses was not always disdained by Egyptians (1.279; cf. 2.10), but in the cited exodus accounts he plays the role of a rebellious and impious Egyptian priest (1.239-40, 309-12). But the insults here may concern his character as a charlatan, and his responsibility for the wicked Judean laws (2.145, 148, 161).

<sup>1169</sup> On Moses’ excellence (ἀρετή), see note to “legislator” at 2.279. God’s witness has been introduced in rather muted terms here (compared to *Antiquities*). In the depiction of Moses’ character (2.157-63) Josephus records only Moses’ conviction that God was his leader and counsellor (2.160).

<sup>1170</sup> For the proof from time, see 2.279 (with reference back to 2.152-56); but this has been given rather little weight in this treatise, except insofar as Moses’ antiquity is associated with that of the Judeans as a whole (cf. 2.226). For the notion of time as “witness,” see Hypereides, *Lycophron* 14; *Epitaphios* 1 (noted by Schäublin 1982: 332, n.52).

<sup>1171</sup> Literally: “they themselves have been seen, through themselves ...” (αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἑωράθησαν δι’ αὐτῶν). Josephus’ rhetorical claim that he has needed

the truest piety,<sup>1172</sup> exhorting not to misanthropy but to the sharing of possessions,<sup>1173</sup> opposing injustice, attending to justice,<sup>1174</sup> banishing laziness and extravagance,<sup>1175</sup> teaching people to be self-sufficient and hard working,<sup>1176</sup> **292** deterring from wars of self-aggrandizement, but equipping them to be courageous on their behalf,<sup>1177</sup> inexorable in punishment,<sup>1178</sup> unsophisticated in verbal tricks,<sup>1179</sup> but confirmed always by action;<sup>1180</sup> for this we offer [as evidence] clearer than documents.<sup>1181</sup>

*Peroration*

**293** Thus, I would be bold enough to say that we have introduced<sup>1182</sup> others to an

to do no more than *cite* the laws obscures the fact that he has selected, prioritized, grouped, labelled, and interpreted them. In the list that follows (relieved by stylistic variation in the Greek), Josephus stresses their virtues, as a foil to the vices that they were supposed to “teach” (2.145, 148).

<sup>1172</sup> Piety is consistently placed first (cf. 2.146, 170, 188, 293); it was at the heart of the presentation of the law in 2.160-89. That it is “truest” may stand in contrast to the debased forms of piety encouraged by myth (2.239-54). For the charge of impiety or “atheism,” see 2.148, 258.

<sup>1173</sup> Greek: τὴν τῶν ὄντων κοινωνίαν (cf. 2.283: ἀνάδοσις τῶν ὄντων). κοινωνία is normally used for relationships within the Judean community (2.146, 196, 208), but here seems to include φιλανθρωπία (2.146, 209-14) in answer to the charge of “misanthropy” (2.148, 258; cf. 2.281; Gerber 1997: 219). See the full discussion in Berthelot 1999 and 2003: 376-81 (finding here an echo of the implicit claim to conform to “Bouzygian” civilities, 2.211).

<sup>1174</sup> Justice (δικαιοσύνη) was prominent in 2.146, 170 and is instantiated in much of the law (e.g., 2.207-8) and its system of punishments (2.215-17). The adjective ἐπιμελεῖς (“attending to”) is cognate with the terms Josephus used for the “supervision” of priests (2.187-88), including their supervision of justice. But priests are absent from these concluding summaries of the law (2.291-92, 293-94).

<sup>1175</sup> Greek: ἀργίαν καὶ πολυτέλειαν ἐξορίζοντες. In the context of the sabbath, ἀργία and its cognate verb ἀργέω can have the positive connotation of rest (2.234, 282), but here, as elsewhere, “worklessness” is negatively charged as indolence (cf. 1.209; 2.228). For the notion of Judean laziness, see note to “day” at 1.209. Extravagance has been criticized in 2.205, 234, and contrasted with the Judean ideal of “simplicity of lifestyle” (2.281; cf. “moderation” in 2.170).

<sup>1176</sup> Greek: αὐτάρκεις καὶ φιλοπόνους. The theme emerged during the contrast between Spartan “luxury” (2.228-29) and Judean self-employment (αὐτουργία, 2.234), but it is more prominent in the conclusion to this work (cf. 2.283, 294) than in its main body (cf. *Ant.* 2.7, 202-3; 3.49, 58). For endurance in πόνος, cf. 2.146.

<sup>1177</sup> A close echo of 2.272 (see note to “laws”). Josephus again responds to Apollonius’ charge of “cowardice” (2.148) and insists that Judean laws instill courage, but for the right cause and without the dubious morality of warfare.

<sup>1178</sup> “Inexorable” (ἀπαράτητοι) is a frequent epithet for Judean legislation; see note to “punishment” at 2.178. This constituted a significant strand in the presentation of the laws (2.190-218), especially at its end (2.215-17; cf. 2.276). For its congruence with conservative Roman values, see Appendix 6.

<sup>1179</sup> Greek: ἀσόφιστοι λόγων παρασκευαῖς. The adjective is very rare (hapax in Josephus): it can mean “proof against sophistry” (Epictetus 1.7.26), but, as used here of the laws (not people), more likely means “not characterized by rhetorical sophistry.” Josephus earlier criticizes Greek historiography for its “cleverness of language” (δεινότης λόγων, 1.27), and lambasts others’ accounts of the Judean war for being written up σοφιστικῶς (*War* 1.1; cf. Apollonius and Lysimachus as σοφισταί, *Apion* 2.236). In 2.171-78 Josephus has claimed a perfect balance of “words” and “deeds.” But that polarity was highly adaptable (see note to “character” at 2.171) and is here deployed in a form conducive to the Roman self-image (with implicit criticism of the “slippery Greeks”); see note to “deeds” at 2.172 and Appendix 6.

<sup>1180</sup> Cf. 2.150: we not only have these laws, but keep them. For the Roman emphasis on action, cf. Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* 8: *optimus quisque facere quam dicere malebat*. See further Appendix 6.

<sup>1181</sup> Omitting a further αἰί (“always/continually”), suspected by Niese and bracketed or omitted by Thackeray and Münster. This statement threatens to upset the balance of 2.171-78 (where the importance of written documentation was stressed). By shifting the subject from the laws to Judeans (“we”), the ground is prepared for the final *peroratio* on Judean excellence (2.293-95).

<sup>1182</sup> The Greek (a noun, εἰσηγεταί) conveys the sense of introducing or proposing an idea, and anticipates the claim that Judeans were the first inventors of the following moral ideals (2.295).

enormous number of ideals that are, at the same time, extremely fine.<sup>1183</sup> For what could be finer than unswerving piety?<sup>1184</sup> What could be more just than to obey the laws?<sup>1185</sup> **294** What could be more profitable than concord with one another,<sup>1186</sup> and neither to fall out in adverse circumstances, nor in favorable ones to become violent and split into factions,<sup>1187</sup> but in war to despise death,<sup>1188</sup> and in peace to be diligent in crafts and agriculture,<sup>1189</sup> and to be convinced that God is in control, watching over everything everywhere?<sup>1190</sup> **295** If such ideals had been put in writing by others earlier or observed more securely, we would owe them gratitude, as pupils.<sup>1191</sup> But if we, above all others, are seen to make use of them,<sup>1192</sup> and if we have demonstrated that their first invention belongs to us,<sup>1193</sup> then let the Apions and Molons,

<sup>1183</sup> Greek: πλείστων ἄμα καὶ καλλίστων. Again, the superlatives could be taken in a stronger sense (“the most and finest”; cf. note to “laws” at 2.278). This is Josephus’ final answer to Apollonius’ charge that Judeans had produced nothing useful for civilization (2.148; Gerber 1997: 221-22). It opens the last of the 3 summaries of Judean excellence (2.281-83, 291-92, 293-94). As in 1.184-85, 188, rhetorical questions make the claims less direct, and thus less obnoxious. Here they are structured in a tricolon.

<sup>1184</sup> Greek: εὐσεβεία ἀπαράβατος. The adjective is used only once elsewhere by Josephus, with the meaning “not transgressing” (*Ant.* 18.266). Here it seems to mean either inviolable (so Thackeray) or unaltering (cf. Heb 7:24); for the verb παραβαίνειν, see 1.178, 182, 204, 276. Piety again heads the list (cf. 2.146, 170, 291).

<sup>1185</sup> For justice, cf. 2.146, 291. On Judean commitment to obey the laws, see 2.156, 174, 178, 219-35, 271-78.

<sup>1186</sup> For “concord” (ὁμονοέω) cf. 2.179-81, 283.

<sup>1187</sup> For the combination of adverse and favorable circumstances, see 2.153 (Judeans will not change the law in either). The claim to political unity is extraordinary. Falling out (δίιστημι) and splitting into factions (στασιάζω) is precisely how Josephus describes the disintegration of the Judean nation before and during the Revolt; civic strife (στάσις) is a key theme in the narrative (e.g., *War* 1.10, 25, 27). Here a political ideal overrides historical reality to a striking degree; cf. the claim in *Hypoth.* 6.2 that Moses kept the people ἀστασίαστοι. The disavowal of violence (ἐξυβρίζω) provides another echo of the intertext in Philo, *Mos.* 2.12-24 (at 2.13: others turn “violent” from the surfeit of goods).

<sup>1188</sup> Contempt for death was highlighted in 2.146; cf. the discussion of Judean courage in the face of death (2.219-35).

<sup>1189</sup> For the emphasis on agriculture, cf. 1.60; the Spartans were judged deficient in both spheres, 2.229. The repeated emphasis on hard work in the concluding

sections of this treatise (cf. 2.283, 291) is notable, and may be part of a “Romanizing” strategy (see Appendix 6).

<sup>1190</sup> The climactic statement again puts piety, in the form of theological conviction, at the centre of Judean culture, reflecting its distinctive, “theocratic” ideal (cf. 2.160, 165-66, 180-81, 185, 190-92). The point is strengthened by alliteration and assonance (πάντα δὲ καὶ πανταχοῦ πεπεισθαι τὸν θεὸν ἐποπτεύοντα).

<sup>1191</sup> The hypothesis has already been ruled out by Moses’ temporal priority to other legislators (2.152-56)—or at least to other *Greek* legislators. There has been no discussion of Egyptian or other eastern law-codes. On the difference in status in such matters between teacher and pupil, see note to “manner” at 2.152. The presumption in such cultural competition is that good ideas (here, good moral ideals) can have only one source, to which many nations lay claim (see note to “intellectuals” at 2.135). In context this statement implies that if gratitude is due, it is really owed by others to *Judeans*. On observing the law “securely” (βεβαίως), cf. 2.156.

<sup>1192</sup> For the verb (χράσμαι), cf. 2.153; for “above all others,” cf. 2.150. On the failure of others to adhere to their laws, see 2.182, 225-31, 273-75.

<sup>1193</sup> This claim to “first invention” (πρώτη εὑρεσις) is the ultimate answer to the charge of 2.148, that Judeans had contributed no invention (εὔρημα) of value for the rest of humanity (cf. 2.135). Although, for the sake of argument, Josephus can turn this alleged deficiency into a virtue (2.182-83: Judeans eschew “novelty”), this conclusion indicates that at a deeper level he wishes to present Judeans as the inventors of piety and morals. In this regard, the emphasis on Judean antiquity that occupied most of book 1 (1.6-218) is the *foundation* for this historical and cultural claim to Judean priority. Within the more immediate context, Moses’ antiquity (2.152-56, 168, 257, 279, 290) is an essential element in this climactic assertion that the best in human culture is essentially derivative from the Judean tradition.



*Dedication to  
Epaphroditus*

and all those who take pleasure in lies and insults, stand fully refuted.<sup>1194</sup>

**296** May both this and the previous book be dedicated to you, Epaphroditus, as you especially love the truth,<sup>1195</sup> and, on your account,<sup>1196</sup> to those who will likewise wish to know about our people.<sup>1197</sup>

<sup>1194</sup> ἐξεληλέγχθωσαν concludes the sentence, a hefty word to pronounce the final verdict. That Apion and Molon are brought together (cf. Lysimachus and Molon in 2.145, 236) indicates again that the apologetic encomium (2.145-286) is rhetorically linked to the previous segment of response to Egyptian “libels” (1.219-2.144). The language of lies and insults echoes 2.147-148, but was also prominent in the refutation of Apion (2.28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 49).

<sup>1195</sup> The epilogue ties the two books together. Each had begun with a dedication to Epaphroditus (1.1; 2.1); for his identity, see note to “Epaphroditus” at 1.1.

<sup>1196</sup> Greek: διὰ σέ. This would normally mean “for your sake” (so Thackeray), but διὰ + accusative of person can also mean “by the aid of” (see *LSJ* B.III), and what is probably here in mind is Epaphroditus’ role, as literary patron, both in supporting Josephus in his composition of the work and in disseminating it at his own expense (see Fantham 1996).

<sup>1197</sup> The language echoes 1.3, and indicates only general interest in the Judean people. For the audience of this work, implied and intended, see Introduction, § 7.

## APPENDIX 1: MANETHO

Although his work is known to us only in précis or fragments, Manetho has attracted immense scholarly interest both for the data he provides on Egyptian chronology and for light he might shed on the origins of “anti-Judaism.” Our knowledge of his life is very sparse. The sources (which spell his name variously, generally Μανέθως or Μανέθων) agree on his status as Egyptian priest, but differ in locating him at Sebennytus or Heliopolis. His life apparently spanned the reigns of Ptolemy I Soter (305—282 BCE) and his successor, Philadelphus (282—246 BCE). Tradition associates him with one or the other in introducing a cult-statue of Serapis at Alexandria (Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 361-362), and he evidently played some part in mediating between Hellenistic culture and native Egyptian tradition in the new Ptolemaic regime (see Laqueur 1928: 1060-64; Waddell 1940: x-xiv; Fraser 1972: 505-11).

Manetho’s only known significant work is his Αἰγυπτιακά, a three-volume survey of Egyptian history from the creation of the world to the reign of Nectanebo (341 BCE). So far as we can tell, Manetho melded material from priestly chronicles and popular narratives of various kinds, though the two are not as neatly separable as Josephus claims (*Apion* 1.105, 228-29). Although some Greeks had written about Egyptian history and culture (e.g., Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera), Manetho was probably the first to present in Greek a full indigenous account, for which he could claim superior access to Egyptian sources (and thus criticise Herodotus, 1.73). This self-presentation has been labelled “apologetic historiography,” a phenomenon parallel to, perhaps even influenced by, the work of Berossus (Sterling 1992: 117-36). But the stance seems more aggressive than defensive: native pride here employs Hellenistic tools to glorify Egypt, at the expense of other nations (Mendels 1990). In such “autoethnography” (Pratt 1994) Manetho is a forerunner of Josephus, who nearly four hundred years later would selectively affirm and ridicule Manetho’s material for his own very different purposes.

Josephus provides our only full citations from Manetho. However, at some point the Αἰγυπτιακά was condensed into an epitome known to us via the early Christian chronographers Julius Africanus (d. 240 CE), Eusebius (260—340 CE) and Syncellus (ca. 800 CE); for them it provided an important resource in tracing the course of world history (see chart in Labow 2005: 63). Since these sources are themselves intertwined in complex ways, and indicate that Manetho’s text had suffered

alterations and additions over the centuries, the reconstruction of Manetho’s original king-lists proves to be a highly complex and often uncertain procedure. The full evidence, collected in FHG 2.512-616, was reassembled and reassessed by Waddell (1940) and Jacoby (FGH 609); an extensive appraisal has also been offered by Laqueur (1928), Helck (1956), and Redford (1986).

Where Josephus cites Manetho, does he provide a reliable account of his work, or is he dependent on an altered and interpolated text? The question has engendered intense scholarly debate. Pursuing earlier critical questions, Meyer (1904: 71-79) offered an elegant source-critical analysis which laid the foundation for subsequent discussion. He argued that Josephus did not know Manetho’s work at first-hand, but was using one or more copies of edited excerpts. The original Manetho is to be found in *Apion* 1.75-82, 94-97 (the Hyksos story and its aftermath), possibly in 1.98-101 (Sethos and Harmais), and certainly in 1.232-249 (the leper story); but the paraphrase in 1.84-90 (which contains doublets with the story in 1.75-82) is from a reworking of Manetho, and the crucial links with the Judeans effected in 1.83 and 1.91 (by etymology), in 1.102 (dating via Danaus), and in 1.250 (identifying Osarsiph and Moses) are emendations or additions to Manetho’s text. The reference to “another copy” in 1.83 (with its confused repetition in 1.91) was, for Meyer, clear evidence that Josephus, or his source, knew variant versions of Manetho, and the accretions to the original can be identified by observing the contradictions, overlaps, and inconsistencies in Josephus’ text.

Such source-critical analysis was pursued further by Weill (1918: 71-145) and Laqueur (1928: 1064-80), who each adapted and modified Meyer’s arguments. Weill disagreed with Meyer on the reconstruction of 1.94 (the king who expelled the Hyksos) and took many aspects of Manetho’s story to reflect recurrent legendary motifs, rather than historical events. Egyptian tradition contained various versions of disasters, some associated with foreign invasions, some with polluted natives. The “shepherd” (Hyksos) story represents the first, the “leper” story the second, and both had been associated with Judeans before Manetho’s time; Manetho simply linked both to Jerusalem and combined them, somewhat awkwardly, in 1.232-49. In subsequent Alexandrian debates, a “philo-semitic” version of Manetho retold the Hyksos story (so 1.84-90 and the false etymologies) and an “anti-semitic” version edited and added to the “leper” story (so 1.250). Josephus had both these ver-

sions before him (see Weill's summary, 1918: 133-45). Laqueur's analysis was considerably more complex, entailing two stages in Josephus' acquaintance with Manetho, first with the authentic Manetho (of whom he approved) then with the variant versions, both friendly and hostile to Jews, which he incorporated or resented; Josephus also found, and incorporated in 1.254-77, a pagan rationalistic critique of Manetho (see summary in Laqueur 1928: 1079-80, translated in Waddell 1940: xvii-xix).

These analyses demonstrate both the strength and the weaknesses of source-criticism. In the quest to find the original Manetho (which is crucial for Egyptologists), these critics made highly acute observations on the oddities, confusions, gaps, and overlaps in the material conveyed by Josephus. Their careful attention to the text has scarcely been bettered, and they had good grounds to suspect the presence of Manetho-adaptations, not only in texts such as 1.83 and 1.250, but also in the strained associations between the Hyksos, or the "lepers," and Judeans. The difficulties begin with the explanations of these phenomena, which require the positing of several intermediary layers between Manetho and Josephus; the more ingenious the hypotheses, the less plausible they seem. Apart from the further speculative proposals advanced by Momigliano (1975b), no significant new source-critical hypotheses have been proposed since Laqueur, not because the puzzles are solved but because even the simpler "solutions" seem unprovable. Most hypotheses appear over-confident, especially in proposing the tendencies of the editors of Manetho—in this case two contrasting tendencies in different layers of editing. The presumption that Josephus accurately represents what he found in his sources (Meyer 1904: 71-72; Weill 1918: 92, 98) is especially vulnerable to criticism. So too is the hypothesis that Judeans before Josephus had linked a modified version of the Hyksos story to their own accounts of the exodus (Weill 1918: 87-88, 108; Laqueur 1928: 1071-72; cf. Gruen 1998: 57-67, who proposes Judean insertion of the Solymite invasion into the "leper" story). If we must allow for confusions introduced by Josephus (whose text is also insecure at crucial points), and for the possibility that Manetho himself created doublets and added asides, it becomes increasingly uncertain what we can attribute to the editing processes between Manetho and Josephus.

The lasting legacy of source-criticism is its perception of the problems in the text. In our case those problems particularly cluster at the beginnings and endings of Josephus' citations from Manetho (e.g., 1.82-83, 94, 102, 250). Unfortunately, the source-critical problem has become entangled with a larger question, on the origins of "anti-Judaism." In debate on this topic, much weight has been placed on determining whether Manetho connected either of his stories with "Judeans,"

and if so, what such connections might imply. In pursuit of this agenda, the early source critics are often cited (perhaps less often studied), but the discussion has been bedevilled by ill-defined notions of "anti-Judaism," and lack of clarity about what in Manetho's stories would constitute a connection with Judaism. Three main opinions are detectable:

- i) Some scholars consider that Manetho made no allusion to Judeans in either the Hyksos or the leper stories. He may have made reference in both to Jerusalem (so Heinemann 1931: 26-28; Gabba 1989: 630-36), or those references may be interpolations (so Jacoby in *FGH* 609), but the identification of Moses with Osarsiph in 1.250 is an "antisemitic" addendum not to be attributed to Manetho; neither story was connected to Judeans or Judaism, either in origin or in Manetho's version (cf. Gager 1972: 113-18).
- ii) Others have argued that, although the Hyksos story was, for Manetho, innocent of any connection with Judeans, the depiction of the "Solymite" return to Egypt and the description of the leper-leader in 1.238-39 are implicit references to Judeans, even if 1.250 is a later addition (Tcherikover 1959: 361-64; Aziza 1987: 49-55; cf. Schürer 3.595-96).
- iii) Others again think that the references to "Jerusalem" in both Manetho's stories imply that he considered the Hyksos the ancestors of the Judeans, whose nation was subsequently augmented by the expelled "lepers." Thus both stories convey an anti-Judean animus. This case was presented on insufficient grounds by Pucci ben Ze'ev (1993), but is well argued, with detailed response to Meyer, by Schäfer (1997b); cf. Sevenster 1975: 184-88; Stern 1.62-65.

Crucial evidence for this latter argument is the presence in Hecataeus of an association between the Judeans' departure from Egypt and Egyptian tales of foreigners and plague (*apud* Diodorus 40.1-3). This parallel was important in Weill's argument that the various Egyptian sagas had been associated with the Judeans already before Manetho. Whether, or in what sense, this represents "anti-Judaism" is a moot point (cf. Willrich 1895: 53-56), but such material has been significant for the case that hostility to Judeans began in Egypt in pre-Ptolemaic times (see Yoyotte 1963 and Schäfer 1997a). Others have suggested that Manetho himself represents its beginning (associated with the publication of the LXX and/or envy of Judean roles in the Ptolemaic regime), while those who follow option i) suggest that it was only in later Alexandrian conditions that anti-Judaism wormed its way into the Manethonian text by scribal corruption. See further, on this topic, Appendix 3.

For our purposes, since our focus is on Josephus' text, we are not concerned here to reconstruct the "au-

thetic Manetho.” Clearly, to appreciate Josephus’ use of his source it would be helpful to know precisely what he had before him. But on many occasions, given the difficulty of the material, we have to remain agnostic on this matter, while noting the various options. But we should keep open the possibility that Josephus himself has caused some of the difficulties and confusions that the source-critics have spotlighted, either by his selection, truncation, and paraphrase of his sources, or by his

own adjustments to his “cited” texts. Josephus can be at times a clumsy writer, introducing inconsistencies by his own rhetorical and historical maneuvers, and our analysis of his rhetorical needs or goals will sometimes suggest that he, rather than redactors, may have adapted and misrepresented Manetho. For further bibliography on Manetho and the history of Egypt in the relevant period, see Labow 2005: 53-58.



## APPENDIX 2: PSEUDO-HECATAEUS

The genuine Hecataeus of Abdera (or Teos) is known to us only by reputation and in citation by others. Serving in the court of Ptolemy I in Alexandria, he wrote (ca. 300 BCE) an extensive ethnographic work on the Egyptians, which was the basis for much of book 1 of the *Bibliothēke* of Diodorus of Siculus (1<sup>st</sup> century BCE). In the course of this work he wrote an excursus on Judeans, who were depicted as a group of colonists from Egypt—a famous text known to us only from Diodorus 40.3, as preserved by Photius (9<sup>th</sup> century CE). Perhaps because of this excursus, he was a figure of special interest to Judeans in the hellenistic world (and subsequently to early Christians). In *Let. Aris.* 31 he is said to have commented on the special holiness of the Judeans' scriptures. Josephus, in his *Antiquities*, claims that Hecataeus wrote an entire book on Abraham (*Ant.* 1.159), while in *Apion* 1.183-204 he quotes extensively from a book by Hecataeus (perhaps entitled *On the Judeans*; cf. 1.214), concerning events in the early hellenistic era. Later, in *Apion* 2.43, Josephus refers to another statement of Hecataeus on Alexander and the Judeans. Origen says that a "book about the Judeans" by Hecataeus was discussed by the 2<sup>nd</sup>-century author, Herennius Philo, who raised doubts about the authenticity of the work (*Cels.* 1.15). Finally, Clement of Alexandria cites verses on monotheism, ascribed to Sophocles, from a book by "Hecataeus the historian" entitled *According to Abraham and the Egyptians* (*Strom.* 5.14.113).

Few doubts have been raised about the authenticity of the excursus in Diodorus (though Photius wrongly attributed it to another Hecataeus, of Miletus). But all the other passages have come under varying degrees of suspicion, with debate swirling most vigorously around the citations in *Apion* 1.183-204. If the material is genuinely from Hecataeus, it increases our knowledge of this pioneering hellenistic historian and adds considerably to our otherwise meager stock of early hellenistic comments on Judeans. On the other hand, if some or all of the material is pseudepigraphic, it introduces us to one or more hellenistic Judeans who used Hecataeus' name to advance their own vision of Judaism and its location in hellenistic culture.

The debate concerning authenticity has surfaced more than once in the history of scholarship, but has been conducted with especial vigor since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The critical questions were then sharpened most pointedly by Willrich, and the conclusion that the non-Diodoran material was inauthentic dominated

scholarship via influential figures such as Reinach, Schürer, and Jacoby. Despite a well-argued defense of the authenticity of *Apion* 1.183-204 by Lewy in 1932, critical doubts remained dominant until the 1960s. Since then, scholarship has been divided. Several important voices have insisted that all the questionable passages derive from one or more Jewish figures, to be dubbed "Pseudo-Hecataeus" (e.g., Schaller 1963; Wacholder 1974; Walter 1980; Holladay 1983). But equally strong opinions revived Lewy's defense of the *Apion* passages and added further ammunition in support of authenticity (Gager 1969; Gauger 1982; Stern ad loc.; Sterling 1992; cf. Goodman in the revised Schürer; Labow 2005: 171-77 with full bibliography). Recently, however, in a fresh and thorough investigation of the question, Bar-Kochva (1996a) has made a strong case that the "Hecataeus" in the *Apion* passages is a Jewish pseudepigrapher. This new contribution seems set to dominate scholarship for the foreseeable future (see Gruen 1998 and the change of mind on this topic in J. Collins 2000). (For a full catalogue of scholarly opinions see Holladay 1983: 294, nn. 27-28; Kasher 1996a: 148-50; cf. the chart in Sterling 1992: 81-83.)

We may confine our attention here to the passages in *Apion*. There is general agreement that the book on Abraham to which Josephus and Clement refer is a Jewish forgery, while the passage in *Let. Aris.* 31 is too brief to allow a confident conclusion (and, if confined to the final comment of the section, may well derive from the authentic Hecataeus). There is an immediate problem in evaluating the citations in *Apion*: it is often difficult to be sure when Josephus is *citing* his source and when he is paraphrasing, even interpreting, the material before him; even in cases where it appears he is citing verbatim, it is impossible to reconstruct the context of his selections, which are sometimes extremely brief. In evaluating how these stand in relation to the authentic Hecataeus, it does not help that the latter is accessible to us only through the abbreviation (and interpretation?) of Diodorus/Photius. Both the entities we would like to compare are thus beset with uncertainties.

In the history of scholarship a number of poor arguments have been mounted against the authenticity of the Hecataeus in *Apion*. The fact that a Judean wrote a book *On Abraham* in Hecataeus' name should not, for instance, determine the issue in this clearly different case. Nor should Herennius Philo's doubts on the authenticity of the book *On Judeans* carry much weight, given

the cultural context in which he wrote: in the Hadrianic era it was understandably difficult to credit that Judeans could receive so much praise (see Lewy 1932: 118-19). Nor can too sharp a distinction be drawn between the degree of praise accorded to Judeans in the Diodorus excursus and the *Apion* passages: to characterize one as “scientific/objective” and the other as “panegyric” (Jacoby 1943) is certainly to underestimate the generally positive tone of the excursus (and Josephus’ capacity to select what he wishes in *Apion*). Many arguments have also revolved around alleged or real historical inaccuracies in the *Apion* passages—for instance, statements on Ezekias as high-priest (1.187), the recipients of tithes (1.188), the deportation by Persians (1.194), the location of the temple (1.198), and the gift of the territory of Samaria by Alexander (2.43). In most cases these inaccuracies could point either way—to a hellenistic author poorly informed on Judean history and culture, or to an idealizing Judean portrait, unafraid to be creative (see the response in Gager 1969 to the argument concerning tithes, mounted in Schaller 1963). In some of these cases, moreover, our knowledge of the historical reality is too patchy to allow confident conclusions: it is only when an error is clear and *best explained as an historical anachronism* that a solid case can be mounted against authenticity (see below).

As has been observed in this debate (e.g., Gauger 1982), authenticity questions sometimes seem to be determined more by presumption than by hard evidence. It is not clear that either side can escape the burden of proof—or at least, if proof is an impossible demand, the burden of arguing why its conclusion is more likely than the alternative. It hardly seems adequate, for instance, to use our historical uncertainties to argue that alleged anachronisms “might be” explained if we knew more about late Persian/early hellenistic conditions. Nor is it satisfactory to claim an authentic core to the *Apion* material, and explain awkward material as the product of “slight revision” by Judeans who transmitted the material (so, e.g., Stern 1.24), unless one can simultaneously exclude as less likely the more radical alternative that the whole is a Judean concoction.

From the welter of argumentation in this debate, the following seem to be the most decisive points tipping the balance *against* authenticity:

1. Granted the problems in comparing the two, there are *major discrepancies* in content between the excursus in Diodorus and our material in *Apion*. The most striking is the absence in the latter of reference to Moses (which Josephus would surely have included had it appeared, in the interests of his argument for Judean antiquity). Even if the book *On the Judeans* was primarily about contemporary history, it is hard to imagine that the real Hecataeus would not have traced the laws to which Judeans were faithful (1.190-93) to the consti-

tution of Moses which he had described in the excursus. Moreover, in the excursus he had suggested that Judeans had ceased to remain faithful to their *πάτρια* in the Persian and Macedonian periods, while in the *Apion* passage enormous emphasis is placed on their unswerving fidelity to these very *πάτρια* (1.190-93). The latter in fact looks like a *correction* of Hecataeus by a Jewish apologist. There are other connections in subject-matter between the excursus and the *Apion* material, but these significant discrepancies suggest that the connection is one of imitation and Judean correction rather than overlap in material by the same author.

2. Although scholars have overdrawn the contrast between the excursus and Josephus’ material in relation to their praise of Judeans, a significant difference should be noted in the *ideological stance* of the two texts. In the excursus, Hecataeus’ praise of much in Judean culture is clearly within a hellenistic framework of cultural analysis, which interprets Judeans from a standpoint determined by hellenistic values and patterns of historical explanation (e.g., on their origins and their “anti-social” behavior). By contrast, the material in Josephus, while clearly knowledgeable concerning hellenistic politics and values, betrays no signs of a *framework of analysis* other than that comfortable to Judeans. Here the contrast with the other Greek authors cited in this segment (1.161-214) is striking: in the other cases we can see that even when (indeed, especially when) they praise Judeans, they do so in terms which reinforce a specifically hellenistic cultural system (see, e.g., our comments on Clearchus, 1.175-82), which Josephus has to accept without reply. By contrast, nothing in the “Hecataean” material seems the least awkward or culturally alien to Josephus. Nor can this be put down to his selectivity alone. The best test is in fact the passage he cites at length, the account of the Jewish archer Mosollamos (1.200-204). Here, as Bar-Kochva has demonstrated (1996a: 57-71), the viewpoint of the author is wholly unlike that of the real Hecataeus, and of even the most “philosophical” Greeks known to us (the defense of the passage mounted by Lewy 1932 and again by Kasher 1996a is not convincing). Further, even if we omit the final comment of 1.193 as Josephan over-interpretation, the stance of this “Hecataean” material towards pagan religious practices seems far more likely to originate from a Judean than from the real Hecataeus.

3. Although many of historical inaccuracies in the Josephan text are indecisive in this debate, some seem to be better explained as *anachronisms* than on any other hypothesis. This holds particularly for the gift of Samaria to Judeans by Alexander (2.43). Neither Josephus nor any other source gives us reason to date this political reality to a period before the Hasmonean era (see commentary ad loc., and Bar-Kochva 1996a: 113-21).

4. Finally, if Josephus did draw on the real Hecataeus, it seems odd that he did not also gain access to the excursus in Hecataeus' Egyptian history, since the latter would have been much more useful to his argument. In this segment of his work, he is urging that famous Greek historians bore witness to the antiquity of the Judean people. The most he can do with this "Hecataean" material is point to the "flourishing" of the Judeans at the time of Ptolemy I (1.185). But in the Judean excursus he would have had a Greek referring explicitly to Moses and his constitution as a phenomenon as old as Danaus and Cadmus. It seems more likely that Josephus had no access to the real Hecataeus at all, than that he knew one genuine work but was unable to trace the better known and more useful other.

It is not hard to explain why a hellenized Judean author would create a work *On Judeans* in the name of

Hecataeus. Building on the genuine excursus of Hecataeus, he could see the possibility of expanding Hecataeus' testimony (and correcting some of his less positive remarks). Although we cannot fix the date and location of our Ps.-Hecataeus, the similarity in tone and purpose with *Letter of Aristeas* might suggest a comparable date and place, perhaps in Alexandria in the late second-century BCE: see discussion in Wacholder 1974: 263-73; Walter 1980: 144-51; Bar-Kochva 1996a: 122-42. Josephus seems to have believed that the Aristeas-text he encountered was authentic and portrayed the real views of a Ptolemaic courtier (*Ant.* 12.17). Similarly he was delighted to be able to cite from a text purporting to come from Hecataeus. His prime "Greek" witness, to whom he devotes the lion's share of this segment, turns out to be not a Greek at all.

### APPENDIX 3: EXODUS NARRATIVES IN CULTURAL CONTEXT

#### 1. *The Exodus Narratives Cited by Josephus*

*Against Apion* contains fragments or paraphrases of five narratives relating the departure from Egypt of a people who are associated in one way or another with Jerusalem or Judeans (hereafter, “exodus narratives”). In the case of Manetho we have two such stories, placed at different points in his history of Egypt, one (Manetho 1) concerning the Hyksos (“shepherds”), the other (Manetho 2) about defiled Egyptians who called in the aid of the “shepherds.” We can follow both of Manetho’s stories in some detail, as they are given in

cited excerpt or paraphrase by Josephus (Manetho 1 in 1.75-90; Manetho 2 in 1.228-51). Chaeremon’s story is available only in the briefest paraphrase, whose details are selected to indicate their incompatibility with Manetho (1.288-92). Lysimachus is also accessible only in précis (1.305-11). In the case of the fifth, from Apion, we can only glimpse at such details as Josephus relates, out of an apparently fuller exodus narrative (2.10-27).

The structural similarities and differences among these stories are best grasped when their essential features are presented in tabular form:<sup>1</sup>

	Historical Context	Cause	Spur	Expellees	Leader	Laws	Numbers	Allies	Conflict	Result
Manetho 1	Thoummosis	Egyptian revolt against foreign rulers		Hyksos/“shepherds” from east		Cruelty and sacrilege	240,000		Siege of Avaris	Crossed desert; built Jerusalem
Manetho 2	Amenophis	King’s desire to see Gods	Seer Amenophis	Polluted Egyptians	Osarsephos/Moses	Against Egyptian religion	80,000	“Shepherds” from Jerusalem	Conquest of Egypt; return of king/son	Flight to Syria
Chaeremon	Amenophis	Isis’ anger at temple destroyed	Scribe Phritobautes	Impure/Noxious	Tisithen/Moses; Peteseeph/Joseph		250,000	Foreigners(?) at Pelusium	Conquest of Egypt; return of Ramesses	200,000 “Judeans” driven to Syria
Lysimachus	Bocchoris	Crop-failure; Ammon oracle		Unholy and ungodly; lepers and scabies-sufferers; “Judeans”	Moses	Against all temples; ill-will to all	110,000			Crossed desert; built Hierosyla and temple
Apion	1 <sup>st</sup> year of 7 <sup>th</sup> Olympiad <sup>2</sup>			Egyptians: lepers, blind, and lame	Moses	Sinai laws	110,000			Crossed desert

It appears that two main narrative lines are at work in these stories:

- 1) In the first, the story concerns an invasion of *foreigners*, whose cruelty and impiety cause Egypt to rise in revolt and to expel the tyrannical outsiders. This is the story line of Manetho 1, which echoes a theme constantly recycled in Egyptian national ideology (see section III).
- 2) In the second, some national calamity or divine wrath (the two are connected) triggers the identification of *an impure or diseased segment of the Egyptian population*, who are accordingly expelled. This scenario occurs in a simple form in Lysimachus’ narrative, and perhaps in that of Apion. Again there are parallels in Egyptian tradition.

What we find in Manetho 2 and, apparently, in Chaeremon is the *combination* of these two types of

narrative, featuring both hated foreigners and polluted Egyptians. It is easy enough to detect in Manetho 2 the seams between these two story-lines (see notes on 1.232-51), and there appears to be some residue of the same combination in Chaeremon’s alliance of the polluted Egyptians with mysterious migrants at Pelusium (1.291). It is not difficult to understand how such com-

<sup>1</sup> In the following table, the column headings are mostly self-explanatory. “Cause” indicates the event or problem that sets off the narrative, “spur” the person who advises the king’s action; “laws” are the patterns of behavior adopted by the expellees (sometimes presented as a constitution, sometimes less formally); “conflict” is the label for the clash(es) between the main actors in the drama.

<sup>2</sup> For the year, and relation to reign of Bocchoris, see note to “year” at 2.17.



binations could occur. Egyptian loathing of the foreign invader was often expressed in depictions of religious sacrilege, impurity, and Sethian outrage against the Gods of cosmic order. At the same time, the priestly concern to preserve the purity of the land would naturally identify internal challengers to royal or priestly power as representatives of Seth and bearers of pollution (see below, III). Manetho 2 stitches the two narratives together by positing a link between foreigners and insiders through their common city (Avaris) and their shared hostility to Egyptian religion. In both Manetho 2 and Chaeremon, the invasion-motif causes the temporary displacement of the Egyptian king, whose son returns to wreak vengeance and recapture Egypt; one can reasonably detect here historicized echoes of the Horus-Seth myth, with the son in the role of Osiris (see note to “Ramesses” at 1.292).

The notion of pollution could be given a more or less “medical” interpretation (plague, leprosy, scabies, etc.) according to the mental framework of the narrator. In the case of Manetho it is not clear whether it was Manetho himself, or only Josephus in his paraphrase, who characterized the polluted as “lepers.” Josephus certainly appears to be responsible for their further characterization as “disfigured” and “lame.” Chaeremon appears to have used the “religious” category of pollution, with its “noxious” effects, while in Lysimachus the religious and medical categories are juxtaposed, and distributed between two groups of victim, perhaps a sign of the merging of two traditions (see notes at 1.305-6). In Apion, on the other hand, if we may trust Josephus, the medical has become the dominant category, and is developed to include groin-tumors contracted during the crossing of the desert (2.20-27), and, perhaps, scabies contracted through contact with pigs (see note to “pork” at 2.137).

The stories as we find them in Josephus identify the leader of the expellees as Moses,<sup>3</sup> but the dual names found in Manetho 2 (1.250) and Chaeremon (1.290) probably indicate that other versions of these stories utilized different names. The inconcinnity between the two namings in Manetho 2 (1.235, 250) has led most scholars to conclude that the identification of this figure with Moses was a *late* phenomenon and perhaps an addition to the original text of Manetho (see note to “Moses” at 1.250, and Appendix 1). This has been taken to indicate that the story became associated with Moses, and hence with Judeans, only after Manetho. Similarly, one might trace an increasing degree of clarity in the

identification of the expellees as “Judeans.” In Lysimachus and Chaeremon the label appears to have been used explicitly, though it is not clear at what point in the narrative and with what meaning (see notes at 1.292, 305). In Manetho 2, however, the label is missing, as the people from Jerusalem appear to have been designated “Solymites” (1.248). Nonetheless, if Manetho identified their homeland as “Judea” and their home city as “Jerusalem” (1.90, 94, 241), the connection with Judeans was implicit. Moreover, the evidence from Hecataeus (see below) suggests that Egyptian exodus narratives could be associated unambiguously with Judeans from before the time of Manetho.

It is tempting to plot an evolutionary schema from Manetho to Apion, tracing greater explicitness in the connection between such stories and the Judeans, with corresponding degrees of hostility to Judeans (so, e.g., Gager 1972: 113-33; Aziza 1987). But the uncertainties in determining Manetho’s text and meaning, and the impossibility of dating Lysimachus, render all such attempts precarious, to say the least. The fact that Chaeremon appears to follow a combined narrative pattern, like Manetho 2, is no proof that he is directly or even indirectly dependent on Manetho. In fact, the malleability of these stories suggests that they could be adapted, recontextualized, and joined in many different variations and combinations, independently of one another.

Indeed, the full complexity of possible configurations becomes clearer when we widen our focus beyond Josephus’ selection, and survey all that we know of exodus narratives in the range of extant non-Judean literature. And here it will emerge that the essential question concerning these stories is not how they relate to one another in literary traditions, nor the degree to which they do, or do not, express anti-Judean sentiment, but the different cultural frameworks in which they operate, and the sense that they make within very different construals of history, culture, and the cosmos.

## II. Exodus Narratives in non-Judean Sources

Surveying our literary sources within the time-frame 300 BCE to 200 CE, we may identify altogether 14 versions of an exodus narrative, sometimes in near complete form, often only in fragment. Placing our sources in rough chronological order (Lysimachus is undatable, while many draw on older narratives), we can draw up the following inventory:

1. Hecataeus of Abdera (ca. 300 BCE), as paraphrased in Diodorus 40.3
2. Manetho 1 (3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE), as excerpted in *Apion* 1.75-90

<sup>3</sup> Manetho 1 names no leader, and reserves “Moses” for the subsequent narrative (Manetho 2).

3. Manetho 2 (3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE), as excerpted and paraphrased in *Apion* 1.228-51
4. Diodorus 1 (1<sup>st</sup> century BCE) 1.28, 55 (probably drawn from Hecataeus)
5. Diodorus 2 (1<sup>st</sup> century BCE) 34-35.1.1-5, in the epitome of Photius (probably drawn from Posidonius)
6. Lysimachus (date?), as paraphrased in *Apion* 1.305-11
7. Strabo (ca. 64 BCE – 20s CE), *Geographica* 16.2.34-39; 17.2.5<sup>4</sup>
8. Pompeius Trogus (turn of era), epitome of book 36 in Justin, *Epitome*
9. Chaeremon (1<sup>st</sup> century CE), as paraphrased in *Apion* 1.288-92
10. Apion (1<sup>st</sup> century CE), as excerpted and paraphrased in *Apion* 2.10-27
11. Plutarch (1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries CE) *Mor.* 363c-d
12. Tacitus 1 (1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries CE) *Hist.* 5.2.2
13. Tacitus 2 (1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries CE) *Hist.* 5.3-4
14. Celsus (2<sup>nd</sup> century CE), as reported in Origen, *Cels.* 1.22-26; 3.5-6; 4.31, 47

There are other remarks about Moses or the Judeans that might derive from or reflect narratives of the exodus, but not clearly or fully enough to list here. Such might include:

- a) Plutarch's notice, in passing, that Judeans honor the ass that first led them to a spring of water (*Quaest. conv.* 4.5.2; cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3.2).
- b) An additional version in Tacitus' collection of theories on Judean origins identifies them as Assyrians who once had control of a part of Egypt (*Hist.* 5.2.3).
- c) Numenius' reference to Moses leading out the Judeans, after creating plagues in Egypt (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.8.1-2); but this seems to be drawn from the biblical account, as embellished by Judean legends about Jannes and Jambres.
- d) the provision of a date for the exodus by Apollonius Molon (see *Apion* 2.16) and Ptolemy of Mendes (*apud* Tatian, *Ad Gr.* 38).
- e) the association of Moses with leprosy and the letter alpha in Nicarchus, Ptolemy Chennus, and Helladius (2<sup>nd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> centuries CE; see Stern nos. 248, 331, 472).
- f) Polemo of Ilium (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10.15) refers to a part of the Egyptian army being expelled and moving to Syria-Palestine (Stern 1.102-3); this might have a connection with Manetho 1.

It can be seen from the above list that only 5 of these sources are available to us first-hand (nos. 4, 7, 11, 12, 13), and even these are all reporting earlier/other accounts of the exodus, usually in a highly condensed form. All the others are accessible only in citation, paraphrase, or epitome, with many possible distortative effects in the process, especially in those cases where the citation comes from a hostile source (nos. 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 14); omissions, misunderstandings, and misrepresentations have to be allowed for throughout.

The table on the next page indicates the key similarities and differences among the 14 sources.

Of these 14 sources, the first 10 date from before the time of Josephus, and were thus, theoretically, accessible to him. He cites 5 of these (Manetho 1; Manetho 2; Lysimachus; Chaeremon; Apion) and omits to mention Hecataeus, Diodorus (1 and 2), Strabo, and Pompeius Trogus. He claims to cite Hecataeus in another context (1.183-204), but really quotes a Judean pseudepigrapher (see Appendix 2). Hecataeus' real version of the exodus might have been, in some respects, quite appealing to Josephus, as would the largely positive accounts of Judeans and their Egyptian origins in the versions by Strabo and Pompeius Trogus. Since Josephus cites Strabo's *Historica Hypomnemata* frequently in his *Antiquities*, it is striking that he makes no reference to Strabo's account of the exodus in his *Geographica*. But even this would have been unacceptable to Josephus insofar as it suggests that the Judeans were, by origin, Egyptians.

It is striking how prominently etiological elements appear in many of the exodus narratives, and how diverse they are. These etiologies are related to various facets of the stories – the Egyptian origins of Judeans, their revolt against Egypt, the circumstances of their desert crossing, and their initial settlement in Judea. Of course, there are many etiological elements in biblical narratives as well, such as the Passover customs and the giving of the law. Indeed, it appears that one of the chief reasons for recycling, adapting, developing, and inventing exodus narratives is the capacity of this story to explain, from Judean origins, what appeared distinctive and/or objectionable about their names, habits, and attitudes. We find in the final column all the Judean customs that were most commonly commented upon in Greek and Roman literature (circumcision; sabbath; food laws; monotheism; fasts; lamp-lighting), and almost all the standard stereotypes and slanders that were deployed against them (inhospitality to non-Judeans; intolerance; ass-worship).

The extensive scholarly discussion of these sources has almost always been conducted under the heading of ancient "anti-Semitism" (or equivalents), which has directed attention primarily to two questions: 1. Which exodus stories are less, and which more, hostile to

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the excerpt from *Historica Hypomnemata* in Josephus, *Ant.* 14.14-18: this mentions in passing that "the Judeans were originally Egyptians" but "made their home nearby."

	Context	Cause	Emigrants	Leader	Result	Etiological Elements
1. Hecataeus	Ancient times	Plague, caused by Gods; decline in traditional religion	Foreigners; colonists	Moses	Built Jerusalem and temple	Different religion; unsocial and inhospitable way of life
2. Manetho 1	Thoummosis	Egyptian revolt against foreign rulers	Hyksos/ "shepherds" from east		Crossed desert; built Jerusalem	
3. Manetho 2	Amenophis	King's desire to see Gods	Polluted Egyptians	Osarsephos/ Moses	Flight to Syria	
4. Diodorus 1	Ancient times		colonists		Settled in Judea	Circumcision
5. Diodorus 2		Purge of Egypt	Impious; hated by Gods; leprous	Moses	Settled around Jerusalem	Hatred of humanity; outlandish laws; ban on commensality
6. Lysimachus	Bocchoris	Crop-failure; scabies; Ammon oracle	Unholy / diseased "Judeans"	Moses	Crossed desert; built Hierosyla and temple	Religious intolerance; antisocial attitudes; fasting; lamp-lighting; name of Jerusalem
7. Strabo		Emigrants' dissatisfaction with Egyptian religion	Right-minded Egyptians	Moses	Settled in Jerusalem	Aniconic religion; present flourishing of Judeans in Egypt; circumcision <sup>5</sup>
8. Pompeius Trogus		Scabies and leprosy; warning by oracle	Moses and the diseased (from Damascus)	Moses	Settled in Damascus via Sinai	Sabbath as fast day; anti-social lifestyle
9. Chaeremon	Amenophis	Isis' anger	Impure Egyptians	Tisithen/ Moses; Peteseeph/ Joseph	"Judeans" driven to Syria	
10. Apion	1 <sup>st</sup> year of 7 <sup>th</sup> Olympiad		Lepers and sick; Egyptians	Moses	Crossed desert in 7 days	Loyalty to Moses; sabbath; prayer- houses; hostility to Rome
11. Plutarch		Typhon's flight from battle	Typhon		7-day flight on ass; father of Hierosolymus and Judeans	Sabbath; ass-worship; name of Jerusalem and Judeans
12. Tacitus 1	Reign of Isis		Excess Egyptian population	Hiero- solymos and Iuda	Discharge to neighboring Lands	Name of Jerusalem and Judeans
13. Tacitus 2	Bocchoris	Plague; scabies; Ammon oracle	Race (of Judeans); hated by Gods	Moses	7-day crossing of desert; founded city and temple	Contrary religion; sacrifice of Egyptian sacred animals; worship of ass; abstinence from pork; fasts; unleavened bread; sabbaths
14. Celsus		Revolt against Egyptian religion	Egyptian shepherds and goatherds; runaway slaves	Moses		Circumcision; monotheism; hostility to Egyptian religion

Judeans? 2. Where and when were these stories created and, if they draw on earlier prototypes, how and why were these associated with Judeans? (See, among recent authors, Gager 1972; Sevenster 1975; Aziza 1987; Gabba 1989; de Lange 1991; Feldman 1993: 84-287; Schäfer 1997a: 15-33; Yavetz 1993; 1997; for older literature see Heinemann 1931; Marcus 1946) But as Gruen has argued (1998: 41-72), to analyze the stories by asking if they are "pro-" or "anti-" Jewish, or the degree to which they are either, is both fruitless and senseless. Almost every story has elements that could be taken to be complimentary or derogatory of the Judeans, and it profits little to attempt to tease out the precise proportions. More importantly, this is to ask the wrong question concerning stories whose rationale was not to express a positive or negative verdict on Judeans, but to place them within a wider cultural matrix, a framework of explanation that made sense of the Judeans' existence, their history, and their behavior. Thus the most important task in analysis of these stories is to understand their cultural logics, what "sense" they made within their world of discourse, what traditions they echo, and what values they represent.

As soon as one approaches the stories from this angle, a fundamental dichotomy appears, not between the "pro-Jewish" and "anti-Jewish" narratives, but between

those that operate within an *Egyptian* cultural framework and those whose rationale is primarily *Hellenistic*. Although, as we shall see, there are some versions that bear elements of both (traces of an Egyptian logic within a Hellenistic framework), it is important to understand the difference between the two systems of thought before we trace the points at which they overlap.

### III. *Egyptian logics: eradicating Typhonian impurity*

The last generation of scholarship (since Yoyotte 1963) has increasingly come to recognize that the logic of some of these stories derives from a system of thought whose roots go extremely deep within Egyptian tradition. Not surprisingly, the best examples of this among the 14 stories listed above are those that derive from authors most steeped in Egyptian culture, the Egyptian priests Manetho and Chaeremon. The cultural system within which these operate may be described (in simplified form) in the following terms. Egypt is understood not as one nation among others but as the focal point of the cosmos, the land that maintains the right order (*Ma'at*) by which not only human society but nature itself is governed and preserved. The Gods oversee this order and ensure its continuity, in constant struggle with the forces of chaos and injustice. It is the role of the king, as the divine representative, to embody this order and enforce this struggle against all that corrupts and pollutes the world, whether foreign armies, insubordinate subjects, or any acts that flout (Egyptian) justice

<sup>5</sup> So in Strabo, *Geogr.* 17.2.5, along with female excision; elsewhere, however, he describes circumcision as a later degeneration (16.2.37).

and piety. The priests and temples play a critical role in maintaining the equilibrium of the cosmos, and any act of disrespect or violence against them, and against the sacred animals they venerate, is an assault against the nation, the king, and the order of the cosmos. The continual struggle against evil can be represented as the reenactment of a mythological schema, in which, for our purposes, the most important feature is the perpetual enmity between, on the one side, Isis with her son Horus, and on the other, Seth/Typhon (Griffiths 1960a). From the 8<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE, Seth had become the epitome of evil within Egyptian mythology, the object of execration and fear: he was associated with foreigners (especially foreign invaders), with the marginal, the impure, the infertile desert, and all that causes disorder or chaos (Te Velde 1977). He was also associated with the ass.

This essentially timeless schema of conflict was repeatedly projected into the sphere of history and experience, so that historical events and figures (foreign invaders, disruptive Egyptians, or whoever is classified as the enemy) take on the archetypal role of Seth/Typhon in their opposition to the Gods and the king.<sup>6</sup> Royal ideology is strongly underpinned by this scheme: the coronation itself enacts the cosmic victory over Seth, and the defeat of foreign enemies is represented as the binding or spearing of the Sethian enemy (see van Henten 1993; van Henten and Abusch 1996). The Persian occupation of Egypt after 525 BCE was clearly represented in terms of this paradigm: Cambyses was blamed for devastating Egyptian temples and slaughtering the sacred animals (see note to “Gods” at 2.129), and Ochus (Artaxerxes III) was considered “accursed” (ἐναργής) and “polluted” (μιαρός), and appropriately dubbed “the ass” (Plutarch, *Mor.* 363c). Such traditions were ever adaptable to new circumstances and new situations of conflict. They were employed by the new Ptolemaic regime (Koenen 1983), but could also be used in native Egyptian circles to express opposition to the Ptolemies, understood as the newest emergence of the foreign, Typhonian, foe. In the *Demotic Chronicle*, for instance, the Persians are portrayed as “herds of wild beasts,” and the “Ionians” (Greeks) as foreigners who threaten the rule of law, ideally upheld by the king (probably 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE; Spiegelberg 1914; further literature in Lloyd 1982: 41, n. 20). More dramatically, in the *Potter’s Oracle* this native tradition is turned against Alexandria, with bitter criticism leveled against

both Persians and Greeks (mysteriously labeled “girdle-wearers,” ζωνόφοροι), who have brought internecine violence, lawless deeds, and terrible damage to the stability of nature (e.g., failure of harvests), and who are repeatedly described as “Typhonians” (latest version 130 BCE, with older roots; Koenen 1968; further literature in Frankfurter 1992: 209, n. 32).

It is easy enough to recognize the application of these archetypes in both Manetho 1 and Manetho 2. In the former, the dreaded Hyksos, as foreign invaders, play the paradigmatic role in massacring the Egyptian population and razing the temples (1.76). Their base is the city of Avaris, the city of Seth/Typhon (1.78, 86, 237), from which they are eventually expelled by the king. In Manetho 2, as we have seen, two versions of this same paradigm are stitched together. We find again the cruel foreigners (Solymites), whose impiety extends to mutilating the images of the Gods and roasting the sacred animals (1.248-49); but we find also the polluted figures within the nation, who must be expelled on the order of the Gods in order to purge the land, and whose dangerous, Typhonian character is revealed by their oath to eat sacred animals, and by their occupation of the city of Avaris (1.232-39). In Chaeremon’s version, we are not surprised to find reference to the wrath of Isis and damaged temples, together with the divine order to purify the land of its contaminated residents (1.289-90). Echoes of the Isis-Horus myth are also present in Chaeremon (1.292, 300), and the story climaxes, as one would expect, with the king’s return to reclaim the land. In all these versions, the shocking feature of the enemy is their opposition specifically to the Egyptian people and to the Egyptian religious apparatus (not their general unsociability, or their difference from other religious cults).<sup>7</sup> It is also notable that the focus of interest is the outrage caused by the Typhonian characters, and their eventual expulsion. What happens to them after they have left Egypt, on their journey or in their new settlement, is of very little concern; all that matters is that Egypt is cleansed.

Given the adaptability of this archetypal schema, its continual updating and reapplication to new events and persons, we can understand how it is here projected in new directions, the Hyksos legends linked now to Judea and Jerusalem (1.90), the story of the polluted overlaid by reference to Moses (1.250). These are old story-patterns, continually recycled, and such small adjustments and new associations are precisely what we find in par-

<sup>6</sup> See Frankfurter 1992 with reference to the twin characteristics of this tradition: archaizing (mobilizing ancient paradigms of conflict) and synthesizing (assimilating new characters and events).

<sup>7</sup> Even the oath in Manetho 2, to associate with none but their fellow confederates (1.239), concerns specifically their hostility to fellow Egyptians: the rebels make an alliance with foreigners easily enough (1.241).



allel texts like the *Potter's Oracle*. None of these stories was originally written (or told) with Judeans in mind. Thus the significant question is not “why were stories concocted to depict the Judeans as Typhonians?” but “why and when were Typhonian archetypes transferred to Judeans?” Because Manetho’s stories are obviously composite, and because the reference to Moses in 1.250 is clearly superimposed on an original reference to Osarseph, it has been common to argue that the original Manetho made no connection between these tales and the Judeans, with the responsibility shifted to later editors of Manetho’s text (see Appendix 1). But such a hypothesis is unnecessary. Of all the places to which the Hyksos could have gone, Manetho 1 names their destination as Judea and Jerusalem (1.90, 94); it requires unconvincing surgery to remove these details from the text as secondary accretions. Of course, the Hyksos story was originally nothing to do with Judeans (despite Josephus’ spurious claim); but there seems no adequate reason to doubt that Manetho made some link at this superficial level. And he was not the only one of his generation to do so: we know from Diodorus (40.3) that Manetho’s contemporary Hecataeus knew an Egyptian tradition that also linked Moses and the origin of the Judean nation with an Egyptian story of plague and expulsion (see further below).

If this traces the link with Judeans as far back as we can go, it still leaves the question of *why* the Typhonian archetype was transferred to Judeans. As Gruen has argued (1998: 59-63), there seems nothing to commend the old idea that these stories were created to counter *Judean* versions of the exodus: as we have seen, the shape and most of the details in these Egyptian tales were pre-formed, and had been applied to many others before they were connected to Judeans. I am not convinced by Gruen’s own hypothesis (1998: 63-72), that it was Judeans themselves who found in such Egyptian tales suitable vehicles for claiming their own former domination of Egypt: the tenor of the stories, regarding both foreign invaders and polluted natives, seems too deeply rooted in Egyptian xenophobia, and too remote from any moment in Judean history or myth, to seem attractive to (undoubtedly creative) Judean story-tellers.<sup>8</sup> Our best clue to the rationale for this transfer of

the Typhonian archetype may come from an unlikely source—papyri dating from the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE. In the heat of the Diaspora Revolt (116-17 CE), when, with messianic fervor, Judeans from Cyrenaica and Egypt were wreaking havoc in the Egyptian countryside and destroying Egyptian temples, we can trace the reaction of the native population. These not only mobilized in force against the Judeans, but employed against them a powerful and ancient ideology, labeling them “unholy” and “lawless,” identifying them with those once expelled by the wrath of Isis, and thus applying to them the stereotype of the Typhonian foe, the polluting element in the land and the cosmos, who must be eradicated by death or expulsion (*CPJ* 438, 443, 450, 520).<sup>9</sup> Of course, the Diaspora Revolt was an extreme event, in which murderous Judeans were naturally understood in this archetypal frame. But it nonetheless suggests the mechanisms by which Typhonian traits could be linked to Judeans, if they were regarded in other, and earlier, circumstances as foreigners, who remained aloof from, or critical towards, the cosmos-sustaining cult, and displayed their hostility to native Egyptians in recognizable ways.

We cannot know when this impression of “Judean Typhonians” first arose, although Hecataeus and Manetho indicate that it was established by the early 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE. It is possible, as has been suggested, that the Judeans’ military role in the Persian occupation of Egypt may have been one factor (so Yoyotte 1963), but our only evidence here is the hostility between Judeans and native Egyptians in the Elephantine garrison (410 BCE). The focal point of that dispute appears to have been the animal sacrifices in the Judean temple in Elephantine,<sup>10</sup> an issue that could hardly arise outside this specific context. But it might be a symptom of the perception that Judeans were in general hostile to the native religious traditions. We know of an influx of Judeans at the beginning of the Ptolemaic period, some in military roles. They were hardly the only “foreigners” to arrive at that time, but there is evidence to suggest that all foreigners in Egypt in that period could be tarred

<sup>8</sup> To be sure, Manetho 2 is a composite tale, but, as I have indicated above, *both* the main story-lines follow Egyptian archetypes. I sense in Gruen’s suggestion still a trace of the old search for “positive” or “negative” features of the stories (the “positive” picture of powerful Judeans here traced to Judeans themselves), despite his proper dismissal of this form of analysis. The fragments of Artapanus, a Judean adaptation of Egyptian motifs, would be the closest parallel to the phe-

nomenon proposed by Gruen, and Josephus himself is evidence that a Judean author *could* find in an Egyptian expulsion tale (Manetho 1) a depiction of Judean history. But I see no evidence that *requires* Judean influence on the tales recycled and adapted by Manetho and Chaeremon.

<sup>9</sup> See Frankfurter 1992, on which I draw. Even if he is wrong to place the fragmentary *CPJ* 520 in this historical context (cf. the alternative offered by Bohak 1995), it bears witness to the popular application of the Typhonian archetype to Judeans, which is my larger point.

<sup>10</sup> *Cowley Papyrus* 33; see discussion in Modrzejewski 1995: 36-44.

with the Typhonian brush. In Hecataeus' version of the exodus, for instance, the motif of the plague (= pollution), accompanied by divine wrath, is connected not just to Judeans but to "many strangers of all sorts dwelling in their midst, and practicing different rites of religion and sacrifice," to the detriment of Egyptian cult (Diodorus 40.3.1); the result was the expulsion of *all* the aliens, one group of which went to Greece, another to Judea. One can thus imagine a fairly broad application of the Typhonian stereotype at the beginning of the Ptolemaic era, in reaction to the sudden arrival of large number of foreign Ptolemaic troops in the countryside. Over time, perhaps, this became more narrowly associated with Judeans because, of all the foreigners who settled in Egypt, they remained the most stubbornly unassimilated to Egyptian religious customs. Manetho's reference to Judea and Jerusalem (as the destination of the Hyksos) might also be linked to the campaign of Ptolemy I (Soter), who in 312/11 or 302/1 BCE besieged and captured Jerusalem (see 1.209-10). It would have been useful propaganda to represent his enemies as the defeated Typhonian foe, and his campaign as a revenge attack on the descendants of the hated Hyksos. None of these hypotheses can be proved, but they would all make sense in the conditions of early Ptolemaic Egypt. And, once established in the public consciousness, Judean refusal to participate in Egyptian cult could continuously confirm their alien character, threatening the heart of Egyptian culture. There are hints that Judeans were hated in the cult-centre of Memphis in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE (*CPJ* 141; cf. *Sib. Or.* 5.60-62, 68-70), and such stereotypes could become fixed if supported by the daily evidence of religious difference.<sup>11</sup>

#### IV. Hellenistic logics: ethnographic enquiry and cultural comparison

A fundamentally different logic drives versions of the exodus that arose within the cultural matrix of Hellenism. Here, even where there are traces of Egyptian motifs, the structure and rationale of the stories is utterly different, because they serve a quite different cultural purpose. The issue here is not whether they are more or less "anti-Jewish," but what cultural narratives and values they represent.

Our first evidence for this shift comes in the work of Hecataeus, who forms a bridge between the Egyptian and Hellenistic worlds. Although Manetho also worked

at the interface between Egyptian and Greek culture, his stories are, as we have seen, wholly molded by an Egyptian structure of thought, even if they are written in Greek. In Hecataeus, on the other hand, there emerges a quite different interest in the exodus, as the point of origin of the Judean nation, and the story that has the capacity to explain some of the notable characteristics associated with Judean culture. In other words, Hecataeus' cultural frame is shaped by *ethnography* and *etiology*, the Greek attempt to plot the origins of nations on the map of world history and geography, and to provide rational explanation for the fascinatingly (and sometimes alarmingly) different customs practiced by the peoples of the known world (see Trüdinger 1918). To put the matter schematically, where Egyptian stories map the Judeans onto the essentially timeless pattern of cosmic conflict (historicized in particular cases), Hellenistic narratives are concerned to place Judeans in the unrepeatable flow of world history. Where the Egyptian schema is fundamentally dualistic (Egyptian order vs. the chaos created by invasion or impiety), the Hellenistic tradition assumes a kaleidoscope of differing national customs. Where the Egyptian tradition posits Judeans as essentially the same as others (they are Typhonians, like countless others before them), Hellenistic comprehension expects (and sometimes exaggerates) cultural particularity, interested to explain what makes Judeans different from everyone else.

Hecataeus clearly drew on Egyptian sources for a part of his story, which opens, as we have seen, with the traditional Egyptian motifs of the polluted foreigner, the threat to Egyptian religion, and the Gods' punishment of the disordered land. But he is not really interested in what these foreigners had done in Egypt, or how they upset its order; his focus shifts, characteristically, to what happened *after* they left. The expulsion of Judeans (alongside others) is now interpreted in quite other terms, as the dispatch of *colonies* from Egypt, to Greece and "certain other regions" or to Judea – an interpretation which moves in a quite different explanatory framework, derived from the Greek cultural tradition.<sup>12</sup> Now Moses is interpreted not as a renegade Egyptian

<sup>11</sup> For hatred and even violence between Egyptian communities in relation to the varied animal cults, see note to "religion" at 2.65. Judeans had the added stain of being "foreigners."

<sup>12</sup> On Hecataeus as a model of ethnography, see Bar-Kochva 1996a: 29-39; for further literature on the Hellenic character of his work, see Gruen 1998: 53, n. 42. Where Hecataeus identifies the leaders of Greek colonists as Danaus and Cadmus, he is clearly drawing on Greek tradition. This is a move also open to Egyptians, of course (cf. Manetho in 1.102). The distinction I am drawing here concerns not the ethnicity of the authors of these tales, but the cultural logics that influence their tales. Even where Egyptian and Hellenistic logics intertwine, it is still illuminating to note their differences in structure and intent.

priest but as a *founder* of a nation, who establishes the physical, legal, and political framework for the new nation of Judeans. Most of the features attributed to him have no connection whatever with Egypt: they reflect what Hecataeus knows about the Judean people (from Greek or Judean sources), tracing back to Moses contemporary customs and laws. What is important about Judean worship is that it is *imageless*, not that it involves the destruction of Egyptian temples or the consumption of sacred animals. The Egyptian origin of the Judeans is used to explain the Judean custom of circumcision (Diodorus 1), by a characteristically Greek understanding of cultural diffusion. Otherwise there is only one connection between the Judeans and their departure from Egypt, and that is the famous comment on their “somewhat unsocial and inhospitable way of life” (Diodorus 40.3.4, “because of their own expulsion”). Here is the first example of what will become a major theme in Hellenistic depictions of the exodus, the etiological link with Judean social aloofness. But it is notable how *unEgyptian* is this implied criticism. In Egyptian logic (whose traditions are hardly hospitable to foreigners), the question was what attitude Judean took to the Egyptian cults that maintained the natural and social order; for Hecataeus and his successors, it was the unassimilable position of Judeans in the pluralistic world of Hellenistic cities that was the real bone of contention.

This is not the place to examine in detail all of the 14 sources listed above. In some cases one can trace the residue of the Egyptian mythological structure that we have analyzed above and which can be seen, in its purest forms, in Manetho and Chaeremon. Besides the Egyptian motifs we have already noted in Hecataeus, there are Egyptian remnants in other sources: Diodorus 2 has the Judeans expelled from Egypt as impious, detested by the Gods and leprous; Pompeius Trogus has Egypt troubled with scabies and leprosy, and warned by an oracle to expel those, like Moses, afflicted with disease; and Tacitus has an oracle from Ammon instructing Bocchoris to purge his kingdom, after a plague. But in each case these are but the circumstances that bring about the exodus, not the chief point of interest in its present retelling. None of these authors can make much sense of divine wrath in the aftermath of a plague. Diodorus 2 is far more interested in the anti-social habits of the Judeans, Pompeius Trogus in both that and their sabbath-fasts, and Tacitus in tracing the origin of a long list of Judean customs. In two other cases one finds a more equal merging of the Egyptian and the Hellenistic. Plutarch notes (but regards as peculiar) the overlay of an etiology (for the names “Judean” and “Jerusalem”) on top of an old Egyptian myth (Typhon riding on an ass; cf. Tacitus 1). In the case of Lysimachus, the Egyptian structure, complete with oracle and dis-

ease, temples and crop-failure, is fully expanded by reference to the desert-journey, with multiple etiological factors.

Here emerges another significant difference between the Hellenistic and Egyptian cultural models. The Egyptian mythology, as we have seen, was not driven by etiological considerations: Judean hostility to Egypt was taken for granted, as it followed an established archetype, and no other Judean customs were the subject of explanation. But in the Hellenistic traditions, a plethora of Judean customs required to be explained, and were conveniently connected to one feature or another of the exodus. In some cases, this was as simple as Judean origin from Egypt: following a hint in Herodotus (2.104; see *Apion* 1.168-70), Hecataeus (in Diodorus 1) explained Judean circumcision in this way, as did Strabo (in *Geogr.* 17.2.5), and later Celsus. But there were plenty of Judean customs that were clearly *not* Egyptian (or were not known to be), and had to be explained some other way, often by reference to Judean experience during the desert journey. Thus sabbaths could be traced to the seven-day journey (Pompeius Trogus; Tacitus; Plutarch; Apion), and fasting similarly (Lysimachus; Pompeius Trogus; Tacitus). Tacitus finds reason in the circumstances of the exodus for the worship of the ass, abstinence from pork, unleavened bread, and the use of bulls and sheep in sacrifice. Indeed, it often seems that details in the exodus are invented precisely for their etiological value; the stories are structured primarily by a quest to explain the many different customs in the world, not by an interest in history or in Egypt *per se*. It is characteristic that when Strabo connects Moses’ aniconism to the exodus, he comments briefly on Moses’ rejection of animal cult, but far more on his (admirably philosophical) view that God should be worshipped without any image at all: in focus and viewpoint, Strabo’s framework for recounting the exodus is far removed from the Egyptian structure analyzed above.

One of the most prominent motifs to emerge in this connection is the philosophical and social concern for intercultural relations, so important in the Hellenistic era (see Berthelot 2003). We have already seen how Hecataeus introduces this into his account, and it is striking how dominant it becomes in Diodorus 2, where the chief characteristics of the Judeans are their hatred of humankind, their refusal to eat with others, and their resolution to show no-one else good will. This also becomes the dominant motif in Lysimachus, who has Moses commit all his followers to show good will to no-one, a stance then illustrated by their mistreatment of the inhabitants of their new land, and the nomenclature of their new city (Hierosyla: “temple-robbery”). Where the Egyptian narratives had portrayed Judeans, or their allies, as hostile to Egypt, here it is their gener-

alized hostility, the difficulty of Judeans in general social interaction, that is the issue. By the same token, although Tacitus knows of Judean hostility to Egyptian cults, he is more interested in their opposition to *everyone's* religion: Moses, he suggests, introduced distinctive religious practices quite opposed to those of all other people (*Hist.* 5.4.1). The same themes are to be found outside the exodus-framework, in complaints by Apollonius Molon, among others (*Apion* 2.148, 258). Where they occur in exodus stories, they reflect the deployment of that “story of origin” as an antitype of the values of tolerance and sociability that were considered necessary for the well-being of civilization as a whole.

But our interest here is not so much the individual motifs in these stories, nor in the way the exodus could be turned more or less against the Judeans. Neither of these features can be understood apart from the larger cultural framework in which the story is retold. Once this larger cultural context is understood, one may enquire into the specific historical circumstances in which such narrative patterns were deployed and developed. In relation to the stories related in *Apion*, we know too little about Manetho to offer more than generalized hypotheses (see above), while the problem in dating Lysimachus makes reconstruction of his social and historical context precarious. Chaeremon, the 1<sup>st</sup>-century Stoic philosopher may have reactivated aspects of the old Egyptian tales in order to prove the (in his day) philosophically important point that the Judeans were *not* bearers of an ancient and independent wisdom, but an aberrant offshoot of Egyptian culture (see *Reading Options* to 1.219-320; Introduction, 7). Apion, his contemporary, exploited the potential of such stories within the imperial politics of his day. Although most of his exodus narrative is lost to us, it is possible that he re-

ported in particular Lysimachus' version (see note to “110,000” at 2.20), and exploited its portrayal of the anti-social, iconoclastic Moses. Apion was perhaps the medium by which Tacitus learned his Lysimachan version of the exodus, and it is possible that Apion stands also behind other features of the Tacitean picture (e.g., on pork and sacrifice of Egyptian sacred animals, see *Apion* 2.137). What was new in Apion was the connection of all this to the Alexandrian riots and the crisis concerning the temple in 40-41 CE. It is highly likely that the Alexandrian riots aroused in Egypt all the old stereotypes of the dangerous and chaotic Typhonians, especially if, as Gruen argues, the Egyptian element in the city population had a significant part to play (Gruen 2002: 54-83). Although Apion was not Egyptian, he could certainly exploit this upsurge of anti-Judean sentiment and, importantly, translate these themes into terms that Romans could understand. By dating the exodus to the year of the foundation of Rome and Carthage (2.17), by chronicling a history of Judean trouble-making in Egypt, including disloyalty to Rome (2.33-64), and by pinpointing Judean religious difference as a mark of disrespect for emperors (2.73), Apion politicized the story of Judeans in Egypt to present them as a nuisance and a threat, not just to Egypt, and not just to civilized social intercourse, but to Rome's imperial interests as well. If so, one could understand why Tacitus might draw from Apion, with the added evidence of the Judean revolt (though with his own ambiguities and subtleties). In any case, whether or not Tacitus used Apion, the political charge in Apion's account of Judean origins and Judean history may have made him, in Josephus' eyes, the most dangerous opponent of the Judean cause.



## APPENDIX 4: THE JUDEANS AND THE ASS

The two stories that Josephus recounts connecting Judeans to the worship of an ass or ass-head (*Apion* 2.80, 112-14) can be supplemented by five other literary sources which make some connection between Judeans and the ass. Despite a long history of discussion, the sources and meaning of this connection remain largely obscure. We may survey here the evidence, and the problems in its interpretation, before suggesting the possible sources for the charge of onolatry, and the cultural significance of this charge at various stages in its tradition.

The seven literary sources that directly connect Judeans with the ass are as follows:

1. Mnaseas *apud* Josephus, *Apion* 2.112-14: "...when the Judeans were conducting a war against the Idumeans a long time ago, there was a certain man in one of the Idumean cities called Dorii who used to worship Apollo there and who came to the Judeans—he says his name was Zabidos—and then promised to hand over to them Apollo, the God of the Dorians, and that he would come to our temple, if they all withdrew. The whole population of Judeans believed him. Zabidos in fact made a wooden contraption, which he placed around himself; he fastened to it three rows of lamps and walked about in such a way that he appeared to those standing at a distance to be like stars travelling upon the earth. The Judeans, stunned by this strange sight, remained at a distance keeping still, but Zabidos, completely untroubled, sneaked into the sanctuary, tore off the golden head of the pack-ass—so he wittily writes—and went off quickly back to Dora." (Translation mine; for commentary see main text)

*Comments:* much of this text we know only in a Latin translation of Josephus' Greek, and Mnaseas' original version at third hand: from Josephus, who learned it from Apion, who cited Mnaseas. It probably went through several corruptions and alterations along the way. The reference to the ass-head seems, in this version, almost incidental to the main story about the Judeans' superstitious credulity. On Mnaseas (early 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE), see 2.112, note at "story."

2. Diodorus 34/35.1.1-5: when Antiochus Sidetes was besieging Jerusalem, his advisors urge him to wipe out the misanthropic Judeans, who were once expelled from Egypt as impious and detested by the Gods. Their hatred of humankind was enshrined in outlandish laws

forbidding them to share meals or show good-will to others. "His friends reminded Antiochus also of the enmity that in times past his ancestors had felt for this people. Antiochus, called Epiphanes, on defeating the Jews had entered the innermost sanctuary of the god's temple, where it was lawful for the priest alone to enter. Finding there a marble statue of a heavily bearded man seated on an ass, with a book in his hands, he supposed it to be an image of Moses, the founder of Jerusalem and organizer of the nation, the man, moreover, who had ordained for the Jews their misanthropic and lawless customs. And since Epiphanes was shocked by such hatred directed against all mankind, he had set himself to break down their traditional practices ..." (34/35.1.3; translation LCL)

*Comments:* we rely here on the epitome of Diodorus' work by Photius (9<sup>th</sup> century CE). There are good reasons to think that Diodorus is drawing on Posidonius for this story (Berthelot 2003: 123-40); for Posidonius (ca. 135-51 BCE) see 2.79, note at "Posidonius." The main focus of the story is not the ass, but the image of Moses, and his anti-social laws. It is not said that either the ass or the image were objects of worship, though their location in the temple would imply worship of Moses at least.

3. Apion *apud* Josephus, *Apion* 2.80: "For Apion dared to assert that in this shrine the Judeans had set up the head of an ass, and worshipped that animal, considering it worthy of the greatest reverence. He claims that this was revealed when Antiochus Epiphanes plundered the temple and discovered this head, made of gold and worth a considerable sum of money." (Translation mine; for commentary see main text)

*Comments:* Josephus gives us only this highly abbreviated account of Apion's story; on Apion (late first century BCE-ca. 50 CE), see 2.2, note at "scholar." The story seems to combine the worship of an ass with the motif of a golden ass-head. In this connection, Josephus mentions Posidonius and Apollonius Molon as providing "fodder" for Apion (2.79), but it is not clear what exactly they are responsible for. It is probable that Apion mentioned Posidonius as his source for this story, and that Apollonius Molon is the origin of a different but related charge (of religious intolerance; see notes to "Posidonius," "Molon," and "people" at 2.79).

4. Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 31 (363 c-d): "But those who relate that Typhon's flight from the battle was made on the

back of an ass and lasted for seven days, and that after he had made his escape, he became the father of sons, Hierosolymus and Judaeus, are manifestly, as the very names show, attempting to drag Jewish traditions into the legend.” (Translation LCL: commentary in Griffiths 1970: 418-19)

*Comments:* the connection between Typhon (Seth) and the ass is found frequently elsewhere (see below). The link with Judean traditions (the seven days evokes the sabbath; for the eponymous names, cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2.2) seems, as Plutarch says, somewhat strained, and its origins are obscure. But Plutarch (40s–120s CE) draws on old Egyptian traditions throughout this treatise.

5. Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 4.5.2 (670 d-e): “Perhaps it is consistent that they [Judeans] should revere the pig who taught them sowing and plowing, inasmuch as they honour the ass who first led them to a spring of water.” (Translation LCL)

*Comments:* the remark about the ass is an aside, but seems to presuppose a well-known tradition.

6. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3.2; 4.2: “Nothing caused them [the Judeans departing Egypt] so much distress as scarcity of water, and in fact they had already fallen exhausted over the plain nigh unto death, when a herd of wild asses moved from their pasturage to a rock that was shaded by a grove of trees. Moses followed them, and, conjecturing the truth from the grassy ground, discovered abundant streams of water... They dedicated, in a shrine, a statue of that creature whose guidance enabled them to put an end to their wandering and thirst ...” (Translation LCL)

*Comments:* this is clearly the same tradition as that evidenced in Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* (above). Tacitus (ca. 56–120 CE) traces the etiology of ass-worship to an exodus-incident.

7. Damocritus, *Suda* s.v.: “He wrote a work ... *On Jews*. In the latter he states that they used to worship an asinine golden head ...” (Translation Stern 1.531)

*Comments:* This bare summary is all we have. Damocritus cannot be securely dated (probably first or second century CE). Like Apion he also had a story of the sacrifice of a Greek, but the differences from Apion suggest that the two traditions are independent.

The charge of ass-worship has also been seen to lie behind some changes in the LXX translation of the Pentateuch (Exod 4:20; Num 16:15; see Bar-Kochva 1996b: 316-17; but note Bickerman’s caution, 1980: 251 n.123). These texts might indicate a concern by Egyptian Judeans in the third century BCE to dissociate themselves from the ass, but the evidence is at best in-

direct. At the other end of the time-scale, the charge of ass-worship was also brought against early Christians: see, e.g., Tertullian, *Nat.* 1.14; *Apol.* 16.1-3; Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 9.3; 28; the Palatine crucifixion-graffito (Jacoby 1927; Speyer 1963; Vischer 1951). This may have arisen out of their early association with Judeans, but it certainly indicates the valence of religious caricature, and the potency of the ass as a symbol of ridicule, in the first two centuries CE.

The nature of our evidence makes it extremely hard to deduce the origin, development, or meaning of the association between Judeans and the ass. As noted above, much of our evidence is at one remove or more; it is generally brief or fragmentary, and sometimes oblique. The traditions connect Judeans with worship of an ass, of a golden ass-head, and of the figure of Moses seated on an ass; and the relationship between these three traditions is hard to trace. In many cases, the political and cultural contexts of the stories also remain obscure. In attempting to trace connections between the stories, we should not assume that our authors simply reproduce their sources exactly. In the case of such inventive authors as Mnaseas and Apion, we should rather expect that they combined, adapted, and twisted their materials for their own rhetorical ends.

A large set of older theories, which explained the ass-connection via philological links with Judean words or names, is now rightly discarded (see Bickerman 1980: 245-46; Bar-Kochva 1996b: 318-19; cf. Müller 258-59). For the association to stick, it must have “made sense” culturally to those who recycled it, on a basis broader than clever word-play. Bickerman (1980; originally 1927) doubted a basis in Egyptian worship of Seth, since there is no direct evidence for the charge that the Judeans’ God was Seth/Typhon (1980: 246). He proposed that the story first arose when Idumeans transferred to Judeans some pagan folklore about snatching off the golden head of an ass-statue. Mnaseas learned this and introduced it into the Greek tradition, whence it was employed by apologists for Antiochus Epiphanes, eager to give a negative impression of the mysterious cult of the Judeans (1980: 245-55). Bar-Kochva 1996b posits a quite different schema of origin and diffusion: he argues that its roots lie in the Egyptian association of the ass with Seth/Typhon, and that the Diodorus-version of the ass as a vehicle for transport was one of its earliest forms. See also Tcherikover 1959: 365-66; Feldman 1993: 499-501; Schäfer 1997a: 55-62.

In truth, any hypothesis that connects our scattered snippets of evidence is bound to be speculative. As we have seen, the main emphasis in the Diodorus/Posidonius story is on the antisocial character of Judean laws. This suggests that Posidonius adapted an earlier ass-worship legend and shifted the focus onto Moses (who was thus placed on the ass) and his laws (he is depicted

holding a book). I consider it likely that Apion derived his story of Antiochus Epiphanes' discovery of the ass from Posidonius (*pace* Schäfer and Bar-Kochva), but adapted it for his own purposes (see note to "Posidonius" at 2.79): he removed Moses from the ass and focused instead on the motif of the "golden head," which he learned from Mnaseas. The etiological connection between the ass and the exodus (Plutarch and Tacitus) looks like a later, learned explanation for an already established association between the Judeans and the ass; it may even derive from Apion's own inventiveness. Thus, tracing the roots of the association would take us back to Mnaseas and Posidonius; and since Mnaseas' golden head is *torn off* a full ass-statue (see Bickerman 1980: 253), both seem to take for granted, as the basis of their stories, that Judeans had a cult-statue of an ass in their temple.

Perhaps more important than this search for the roots of, and connections among, our various sources is another form of inquiry: what was the cultural valence of this association between Judeans and the ass, and why was it told and recycled? This inquiry would have to be defined more exactly by reference to the varying cultural milieux in which the legend circulated, but we might suggest the following:

1. With the majority of scholars, I consider it likely that Judeans were first associated with the ass in Egypt. The ass is the familiar beast of Seth, and was associated by Egyptians with their enemies and invaders (Te Velde 1977; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 362f). For instance, the last and much hated Persian king, Ochus, was doubly associated by Egyptians with the ass: according to Plutarch (*Is. Os.* 363c), he was nicknamed "the ass"; according to Aelian (*Nat. an.* 10.28), he deified the animal. Since we know that the Judeans were associated with the Hyksos, and with Typhonian features such as the site of Avaris and opposition to the Egyptian Gods (see Appendix 3), it is highly likely that they were linked to Seth's sacred animal, the ass, at least from the early Ptolemaic period.
2. In the Hellenistic world the Judeans were widely regarded as originating from Egypt, which was universally associated with animal cults. At the same time, the Judean reputation as a "philosophical" reli-

gion arose in literary circles, arousing speculation about the content and focus of their cult. Their temple was reputed to be imageless, and their inner sanctum empty, but inaccessible. As Egyptian traditions became more familiar in the Hellenistic world, it was open to those with particular hostility towards Judeans to charge them with hiding a dark and amusing mystery: an ass-statue in their inner sanctum. The story may have been fostered at and after moments of high drama concerning the Jerusalem temple, such as the Antiochan "reform" and the Maccabean revolt, although it is not necessary to posit some historical episode as the source of the legend. It was certainly available to Mnaseas and Posidonius in the second century BCE (in Mnaseas' case, before the Antiochan crisis). They each used it for their own literary and cultural purposes, to critique Judean superstition (Mnaseas) or antisocial behavior (Posidonius). A connection with Idumeans (in Egypt?) is implied by Mnaseas' story, but remains obscure.

3. Apion had his own reasons for relaunching this story, drawing on Mnaseas and Posidonius. He portrayed the Judeans as Egyptian expellees, but as a nation that had produced no cultural benefits for humanity, only a debased form of religion. He was familiar enough with the Egyptian connotations of the ass, but also its general reputation in the Hellenistic-Roman world as a symbol of obstinacy, stupidity, ugliness, and lechery (Stricker 1965). He wrote at a time when the nature of Judean cult was the focus of intense discussion, regarding both their synagogues (in Alexandria) and their temple (in Jerusalem). While Apion was on the Alexandrian embassy to Rome, Gaius announced his plan to reform the Jerusalem temple with a statue of himself as Zeus, an echo of the earlier project of Antiochus. This was the perfect time to excavate old stories of Antiochus' discovery of the ass-head in the temple, to link them to Mnaseas' tale of the golden head, and perhaps to concoct the etiological link of ass-guidance in the desert. Apion was certainly inventive enough to weave these tales together, and perhaps sufficiently influential to inject the ass-libel into the Roman imagination.

## APPENDIX 5: THE SOURCES OF THE APOLOGETIC ENCOMIUM (2.145-286)

Aside from occasional references to Plato (2.224, 256-57), Josephus gives no indication in his apologetic encomium that he is drawing on specific sources other than knowledge of his own tradition. But it has long been suspected that his material is not created *de novo*. Compared with his earlier works, this description of Judean culture contains many new features: the law is summarized here (2.190-218) quite differently than in *Antiquities*; there are new claims for Moses' priority to Greek philosophers and legislators (2.152-56, 168, 281); there is new terminology (e.g., "theocracy," 2.165), representing a different depiction of the Judean constitution; and there are new emphases in the presentation of the law (e.g., on Judean severity in punishment). Without denying to Josephus the capacity for originality, we may still consider the extent of such difference striking. At the same time, we know that he has accessed sources for the writing of this treatise that he had not employed before, including Judean sources such as Ps.-Hecataeus (see Appendix 2) and those he names, but misrepresents, in 1.218. But what proves beyond doubt that Josephus *has* used sources is the existence of Judean literature with extremely close parallels to Josephus' material, often at those points where its novelty is most striking. Whether he has used these sources directly, or has drawn, with them, from a common pool, the extent of similarity between his work and theirs indicates his dependence on Judean traditions, which he here adapts for his own purposes.

This phenomenon has long been recognized in the comparison between *Apion* and two other Judean texts: the sentences of Ps.-Phocylides and the work entitled *Hypothetica* and cited by Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 8.6-7; the title at 8.5.11). Modern discussion of the relationship between these works was launched by Wendland (1896) and Motzo (1911-12), and has elicited considerable debate in recent years. Crouch (1972) examined the three sources as evidence for the adoption of lists of duties in Hellenistic Judaism; Küchler (1979) showed how much their common material owed to Greek ethical maxims; Niebuhr (1987: 32-72), in reply, emphasized its dependence on biblical sources; Carras (1989; 1993) discussed what this shared tradition might prove regarding "common Judaism." Gerber, in a well-balanced analysis of similarities and differences, supported what is now the majority view that there is no direct literary relationship between these three texts, but that each draws from a common pool of material, designed to extol the law in terms congruent with Hellenistic culture (1997: 100-18;

cf. Wilson 2005: 20-22). Most recently, Berthelot has revived the older opinion that Josephus uses *Hypothetica* directly, though in a limited and highly selective fashion (2003: 368-74).

In this appendix, I wish to: 1) discuss the relationship between *Apion*, *Hypothetica*, and Ps.-Phocylides, and present in outline the main evidence that all three draw from a common Judean tradition; 2) add further evidence that Josephus used Judean sources, as noted in the commentary; and 3) draw tentative conclusions on Josephus' use of sources, and the ways he has molded this inherited material to fit his own goals.

### 1. *Apion*, *Hypothetica*, and Ps.-Phocylides

There are a large number of parallels, some remarkably close, between parts of Josephus' apology and a text cited by Eusebius in *Praep. ev.* 8.6.1-7.20 (hereafter cited without the prefix 8 = book 8). Eusebius gives four excerpts from this work, indicating short gaps between the first two (6.1; 6.2-9), and between the third and fourth (7.1-9; 7.10-20); the interval between the second and third is of indeterminate length. It is claimed that these are from the first book of a work entitled Ὑποθετικά (5.11), a title which has occasioned much debate.<sup>1</sup> Before discussing the relationship of this work to *Apion*, we should investigate briefly the question of its authorship.

#### 1.1 *The Authorship of Hypothetica*

Eusebius attributes the work to Philo, an attribution which is now generally accepted, but which has not always been believed, and does not deserve to be so.<sup>2</sup> In his *editio maior* of Philo, Cohn omitted these excerpts as inauthentic,<sup>3</sup> and there are at least

---

<sup>1</sup> For the title, see Bernays 1885, arguing that it means not "hypotheses" but "practical moral instructions." Cf. Colson 1941: 410-11; Sterling 1990: 418-22 ("hypothetical propositions"); Carras 1993: 26. It is generally assumed that the title is original to the work, but it might be Eusebius' own label.

<sup>2</sup> The question is generally noted but swiftly dismissed: e.g., Crouch 1972: 81, n.29; Küchler 1979: 223, n.2; Niebuhr 1987: 32, n.109; Gerber 1997: 101. Cf. the earlier, more open, discussion by Colson 1941: 407-8 and, most recently, Sterling 1990: 413.

<sup>3</sup> Cohn and Wendland 1896-1930. I have been unable to trace an explanation for this omission, but Heinemann relates



four good reasons to sustain that doubt:

1. The author adopts a style expressly non-committal towards the biblical account of the exodus and the Judean evaluation of Moses. The exodus might have been prompted either by the Judeans' own initiative, or as a result of dreams and visions from God (6.1); the law might be derived either from Moses' own reasoning or from some supernatural source (παρὰ δαίμονος, 6.9). The circumstances of the entry into the land are discussed through reasoned weighing of probabilities, not by reference to the biblical record (6.5), and readers are allowed to think what they like about Moses, even at the end of the argument (6.2, 8). Throughout, the author's stance is rhetorically neutral: Moses is *a* legislator, not "ours."<sup>4</sup> Nothing we know of Philo's style elsewhere prepares us for this approach to such central issues in Judean history, and it is hard to believe that he would suspend his own convictions so fully, even in the genre of apologetic.<sup>5</sup>
2. The author arranges his work very poorly, especially the mini-collections of material on the law (7.1-9). These are loosely strung together by such phrases as "there are other things again, of various kinds" (7.3) or "there is a host of other things besides, which belong to unwritten customs and regulations, and in the laws themselves" (7.6). Given the care with which Philo organizes his discussion of the laws (*De Decalogo*; *De Specialibus Legibus* bks 1-4), it is hard to imagine that he would be this careless, even in incorporating pre-formed material.
3. In this short section of text there is a proportionately large number of *hapax legomena*, although the sub-

that Cohn's judgment related to the discrepancy between the punishments listed in *Hypothetica* compared to those in Philo's other works (1932: 353); see below, n.7. In the *editio minor* the fragments of *Hypothetica* are included in an appendix.

<sup>4</sup> The difference from a passage on the Essenes elsewhere excerpted by Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 8.11.1-18) is obvious: there Moses is immediately introduced as "our legislator." That excerpt is said to derive from a work of Philo entitled *The Apology for the Judeans*. There is no reason to consider these two works identical, and if Philo wrote *The Apology* (as he probably did), it is hard to believe that he would write two apologetic works from such different stances (*pace* Sterling 1990: 414; cf. those listed in his n.11).

<sup>5</sup> The difference is admitted by Sterling 1990: 421, who nonetheless thinks the work authentic. Wendland (1896: 714-15) maintained that the form of argument καθ' ὑποθεσιν was consciously framed in the terms of general reason, without specifically Judean presuppositions.

ject-matter overlaps entirely with topics often discussed by Philo. Of the thirteen cases I have noted,<sup>6</sup> three are terms relevant to central topics in Philo's theology: the noun "religious rites" (ῥοσία; 7.5, 7), the adverb "lawfully" (νομίμως, 7.8), and the noun designating God as "observer" (ἐπόπτης) of all things (7.9). It is hard to imagine why Philo would change his core vocabulary on these topics in this work.

4. The author speaks of the passage from Egypt into the homeland as coming "into this land" (εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην, 6.5). While Josephus can speak in these terms (see note to "possess" at 1.1), I know of no case where Philo does so; he never lived in the homeland and could hardly call it "this land."<sup>7</sup>

In the light of the above, we should doubt Eusebius' attribution of this work to Philo, advanced in the fourth century CE. It is easy to imagine how anonymous works were attributed to Philo, as is the case with other works supposedly by Philo, or by Judean literary figures.<sup>8</sup> Although there are strong Philonic echoes in the description of the sabbath (7.10-14), these can be attributed to a Hellenized Judean in the same circle as Philo, or dependent upon him.<sup>9</sup> We thus cannot date the *Hypo-*

<sup>6</sup> Not counting the reference to Bouzyges (7.8): πολυανδρία (6.1); ἀνδρία (6.2); ἀπρονοήτως (6.4); ῥοσία (7.5, 7); πρασιά (7.6); ἀτόκιος (7.7); κατοίχομαι (7.7); ἀνθυποβάλλω (7.8); νομίμως (7.8); ἐπόπτης (7.9); ἐμπειρῶς ἔχω (7.11; 13; the adjective is used in a parallel context: *Spec.* 2.62; *Prob.* 82; *Contempl.* 31); ὄψιος (7.13); μονοειδής (7.16).

<sup>7</sup> Among the other motifs in this work unparalleled in the huge Philonic corpus is the claim that Moses' laws were 2,000 years old (6.9). I leave out of account here another discrepancy with Philo that is sometimes mentioned in this connection, that the death penalty is mentioned in the *Hypothetica* far more often than in Philo's accounts of the laws, and sometimes in contradiction to them. As Heinemann showed (1932: 352-58), this is not an insuperable problem: Philo is demonstrably inconsistent on this matter (as is Josephus), and an emphasis on the severity of the laws might be a *Tendenz* born of apologetic concerns.

<sup>8</sup> On other works wrongly attributed to Philo, see Schürer (revised) 3.2: 868-88; but Schürer raises no doubt over *Hypothetica* (3.2: 866-68). 4 Maccabees was once attributed to Josephus.

<sup>9</sup> Colson (1941: 408, note) confessed that "the style as well as the substance" of 6.2-7.9 was "rather unlike Philo," but thought that the passage on the sabbath (7.10-14) was "thoroughly Philonic." If we grant that the pieces come from the same work (and are not a later compilation of Philonic and non-Philonic material), the sabbath passage could be *influenced* by Philo rather than *composed* by him.

*thetica*, or even be sure that it was written before Josephus.

### 1.2 Differences and Parallels between *Hypothetica* and *Apion*

It is important to recognize first the large range of differences between these two texts, both in subject matter and style. In our extant fragments, *Hypothetica* provides a survey of early Judean history, beginning with the entry into Egypt (6.1). It then defends the character of Moses against the charge of “charlatanry,” by recounting his success in crossing the desert (6.2-4), before discussing how the Judeans gained control of their homeland (6.5-8). Thus most of the narrative here has no parallel in *Apion*, though one section does (6.2-4 with *Apion* 2.157-61). Almost all of Josephus’ discussion of the constitution (2.163-89) is unparalleled in what we know of *Hypothetica*, although Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 8.6.10) refers to the Judeans’ πολιτεία as the subject of this work. It is possible that he left out from *Hypothetica* sections which overlapped with *Apion* 2.163-228, a passage he proceeds to cite in full almost immediately afterwards (*Praep. ev.* 8.8.1-55). Of course, this hypothesis must remain speculative, but it is intriguing that one part of this section of *Apion*, on sabbath instruction in the law (2.175-78), does contain close verbal parallels with *Hypoth.* 7.10-14 (see below); it is thus possible that the overlaps were more extensive than Eusebius lets us see. In the summary of the laws (*Hypoth.* 7.1-9; *Apion* 2.190-218), besides the striking similarities (see below), there are obvious and large differences. *Hypothetica* contains no discussion of the nature of God, the temple, or the purity laws (*Apion* 2.190-98); nor does it contain any material parallel to Josephus’ discussion of attitudes to foreigners (2.209-11). Conversely, it does contain rules concerning slaves (7.2), temple theft (7.2), goods vowed to God (7.3-5), and the treatment of captive families (7.8), all matters without parallel in *Apion*. A lengthy discussion of the sabbatical year (7.15-20) is also unparalleled. Moreover, the two texts do not follow the same structure or sequence: where their individual instructions match each other, they are sometimes in similar contexts, but sometimes not (see further Gerber 1997: 109-11).

Despite these differences, there are sufficient similarities between the two works to suggest some (at least indirect) link between them. Both combine an apologetic discussion of the life of Moses with a summary of the laws, the latter serving implicit, but not explicit, apologetic purposes. Both compare Judean laws favorably with those of others (*Hypoth.* 7.1, 8; *Apion* 2.216, 225-35, 273-5, 276, etc.). Both summaries of the law draw inspiration not only from the biblical texts, but also from common “unwritten” codes of ethics, familiar

in the Greco-Roman world. To these general similarities, we may add the following more specific observations, graded in increasing degrees of similarity:

1. *Distant Parallels*. There are several cases where the same theme is discussed, but in largely different terms. Thus both refer to Judeans’ willingness to die for the law, *Hypothetica* as “not changing a single word” and being prepared to “die a thousand deaths rather than accept anything contrary to the laws and customs” (6.9), Josephus as “suffering anything rather than utter a single word in contravention of the laws” (2.219; cf. 1.42; 2.232-35). Both also speak of God as watching over all things. *Hypoth.* 7.9 describes God as ἐπόπτης in this connection; Josephus normally uses different vocabulary (*Apion* 2.160, 165-66), but in his peroration uses a participle from the same root (2.294: ἐποπτεύοντα). Both also emphasize the ban on abortion (*Hypoth.* 7.7; *Apion* 2.202), but with largely different vocabulary. Conversely, there are cases where the same striking terms are used, though their application differs: both use the adjective “simple” (ἀπλᾶ καὶ δηλα, *Hypoth.* 7.1; ἀπλᾶ καὶ γνωρίμοι, *Apion* 2.190), one in connection with penalties, the other with “proclamations and prohibitions”.<sup>10</sup>
2. *Closer Parallels of Theme and Vocabulary*. There are a number of examples of extended parallel, where the same theme is discussed with some congruence of vocabulary, the congruence having no biblical source. a) Both *Hypothetica* and *Apion* defend the reputation of Moses against the charge that he was a γόης (*Hypoth.* 6.2; *Apion* 2.145, 161). Both do so by describing his leadership of the people in the desert, using partly similar vocabulary.<sup>11</sup> b) Both

<sup>10</sup> However, Josephus’ unusual term προρρήσεις is paralleled in *Hypoth.* 7.9 (it is used only once in the Philonic corpus, at *Flacc.* 86). Further intriguing similarities: both refer to the Mosaic law as lasting “more than 2,000 years” (*Apion* 2.226; *Hypoth.* 6.9); *Hypothetica* celebrates Moses’ achievement in keeping the people of Israel together in the desert ἀσασιάστοι (6.2), while, in his peroration, Josephus somewhat implausibly claims that the law’s achievement is to keep its adherents from σασιάζειν (*Apion* 2.294).

<sup>11</sup> E.g., πάτριος γῆ (*Hypoth.* 6.1; *Apion* 2.157); διασώζω (*Hypoth.* 6.2; *Apion* 2.157); ἀνυδρία (*Hypoth.* 6.2; *Apion* 2.157, ἄνυδρον). As Gerber notes (1997: 104, n.18), some of these similarities could derive accidentally from the similar subject matter. But it is remarkable that in both cases they speak of the Judean wanderers in the desert at λαοί (plural; *Hypoth.* 6.3; *Apion* 2.159). This usage is unique in Josephus, who elsewhere always speaks of the Judean λαός (the plural is used only in *War* 4.132; *Ant.* 18.118, 352, in

texts describe the educational benefits of the sabbath instruction in the law, stressing how this dispels ignorance and averts transgression of the law (*Hypoth.* 7.10-14; *Apion* 2.175-78). At some points, the form of argument is identical (e.g., “if anyone were to be asked about our laws, he would repeat them readily”) and there are several striking parallels in vocabulary.<sup>12</sup> c) Both texts stress the severity of Judean punishments (notably the death penalty) and the strictness with which they are applied (*Hypoth.* 7.1; *Apion* 2.215-17, 276). In this context, the list of laws that carry the death penalty is partly identical (*Hypoth.* 7.1; *Apion* 2.215-17).<sup>13</sup>

3. *Six Very Close Parallels.* There are at least six examples within the summaries of the law (*Hypoth.* 7.1-9; *Apion* 2.190-218) that show a striking degree of similarity. Of course, if the two texts agree in citing central biblical laws, and in so doing use common biblical language, that might display only their independent use of the Bible—a matter of general interest, but no indication of their relationship to one another. However, in the cases to be discussed, the first five show extremely close agreement in citing *non-biblical* laws, or in reshaping biblical law in non-biblical language. The sixth has a biblical root, but is a comparatively marginal law within the biblical corpus, and its unexpected selection here is evidence for some commonality between our texts. These six parallels have all been cited in the commentary, but I repeat them here in parallel for ease of reference.<sup>14</sup>

#### *Apion*

#### *Hypothetica*

##### i) *Women and Men*

2.201 γυνή χειρών, φησίν,  
ἀνδρὸς  
εἰς ἅπαντα. τοιγαροῦν  
ὑπακούετω,  
μὴ πρὸς ὕβριν, ἀλλ' ἴν'  
ἄρχηται.

7.3 γυναῖκας ἀνδράσι  
δουλεύειν, πρὸς ὕβρεως  
μὲν οὐδεμιᾶς, πρὸς  
εὐπειθειαν δ' ἐν ἅπασι.

different contexts; the first two only in some textual traditions).

<sup>12</sup> See note to “times” at 2.175; to “laws” at 2.178; to “name” at 2.178.

<sup>13</sup> Gerber 1997: 107-11 argues that the fact that here Josephus *repeats* material he had included in the earlier summary of the law is further evidence that he has derived it from a source. The argument is not completely convincing (Josephus could repeat his material for his own rhetorical ends), but might add some weight to the cumulative argument.

<sup>14</sup> For tabular presentations of the whole evidence (distant and closer parallels; and including Ps.-Phocylides), see Küchler 1979: 211-15, 223-27; Niebuhr 1987: 42; Gerber 1997: 113-14; Wilson 2005: 20.

Although both texts may draw remotely on Gen 3:16, there is no direct scriptural source for this rule. Both balance the demand for women’s obedience with the prohibition of ὕβρις, and thus reflect a common tradition concerning marital power-relations. This probably relates to the development of “household codes” in the Greco-Roman world (see note to “man” at 2.201).

##### ii) *Friends and Secrets*

2.207 κρύπτειν οὐδὲν ἔα  
πρὸς φίλους ... κἂν  
συμβῆ τις ἔχθρα,  
τὰ πόρρητα  
λέγειν κεκώλυκεν.

7.8 μὴ φίλων  
ἀπόρρητα ἐν ἔχθρα φαίνειν.

There are distant parallels in Judean wisdom sources, but no biblical source (see note to “secrets” at 2.207). In this case the verbal parallels are very striking (three terms in a short sentence). The inspiration appears to come from a Greek tradition of moral maxims, which forbids betraying a friend’s secrets in anger (see note to “secrets” at 2.207).

##### iii) *Picking up and putting down*

2.208 (cf. 2.216) ὁ μὴ  
κατέθηκέ τις  
οὐκ ἀναιρήσεται

7.6 ἂ μὴ κατέθηκεν,  
μηδ' ἀναιρεῖσθαι

As discussed in the commentary (note to “up” at 2.208), this maxim derives more or less verbatim from a common Greek tradition, sometimes attributed to Solon. Thus the verbal agreement may reflect not direct dependence between *Apion* and *Hypothetica*, but common dependence on a tradition of Greek moral *sententiae*.

##### iv) *Fire, water, and food*

2.211 πᾶσι παρέχειν  
τοῖς δεομένοις πῦρ  
ὔδαρ τροφήν

7.6 μὴ πυρὸς δεθθέντι  
φθονεῖν· μὴνάματα  
ὑδάτων ἀποκλείειν·  
ἀλλὰ καὶ πτωχοῖς καὶ  
πηροῖς τροφήν ἐρανίζουσι  
πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐαγῶς  
ἀνέχειν.

While *Hypothetica* is considerably more elaborate, the same three items (fire, water, food) are mentioned in the same order; the same or similar verbs are also used (δέομαι; παρέχω/ἀνέχω). There is no precise biblical precedent, but a strong echo of the stock of Greek moral precepts known at the “curses of Bouzyges” (see note to “them” at 2.211).

##### v) *Suppliant animals*

2.213 ἂ δ' ὥσπερ  
ἴκετεύοντα προσφεύγει  
ταῖς οἰκίαις ἀπέπευ  
ἀνελεῖν.

7.9 μὴ ζώων ἴκεσίαν οἶα  
ἔσθ' ὅτε προσφευγόντων  
ἀναιρεῖν

Again there is no biblical warrant, relating to animals. In this case, there is no known Greek equivalent either (see note to “killing” at 2.213), but the presence of three common terms/roots strongly suggests some literary connection.

vi) *Birds in the nest*

2.213 οὐδὲ νεοττοῖς τοὺς 7.9 μὴ νεοττιάν φησι  
γονέας αὐτῶν ἐπέτρεψε κατοικίδιον ἔρημουν·  
συνεξαίρειν.

Here there is only one verbal parallel, and the source of the injunction is clearly biblical (Deut 22:6-7: the LXX uses the term νεοσσά; see note to “nestlings” at 2.213). But it is remarkable that our two texts cite this injunction at all, and both in juxtaposition with the rule about suppliant animals. To highlight these commandments suggests at least a common Judean tradition of Torah-interpretation.

The cumulative evidence makes it certain that there is some connection between our two texts. Although it was once commonly thought that Josephus was directly dependent on *Hypothetica*,<sup>15</sup> there are good reasons to doubt this simple solution. The two texts show no commonality in the structure, sequence, or form of their material. Even closely parallel materials are often expressed in different terms, and there is much material in each text that is not common with the other. If Josephus was using *Hypothetica*, it is hard to see why he would use precisely these materials, and not others, especially in his summary of the law. If *Hypothetica* is not by Philo (see above), it is theoretically possible that it might be dependent on Josephus, but the same evidence would argue against literary dependence in that direction also. We should thus conclude, with the majority of recent scholars, that each text is drawing independently on a common strand of Judean tradition—not necessarily a single written source, but a variety of traditions with common concerns and interests.<sup>16</sup> As far as we can see, Josephus seems to be particularly dependent on this tradition in composing the last two segments of the law summary (2.199-214).

### 1.3 *The evidence from Ps.-Phocylides*

The above hypothesis, of a common pool of tradition, is greatly strengthened by the fact that *Apion* and

*Hypothetica* also contain many parallels to the collection of Judean moral *sententiae* known as *The Sentences of Phocylides*.<sup>17</sup> The form and diction of Ps.-Phocylides are very different from *Apion* and *Hypothetica*, but it is significant that in its presentation of Judean laws and morals it is sometimes similar to those two texts where they are also similar to each other. The parallels between *Apion* and Ps.-Phocylides have been cited in the course of the commentary, but we may note particularly the following:<sup>18</sup>

a) Ps.-Phocylides contains a set of laws about marriage and sexual relations that stand very close in theme and substance to the laws summarized in *Apion* and *Hypothetica*:

	Ps.-Phocylides	<i>Apion</i>	<i>Hypothetica</i>
against homoerotic relations	3, 190-91, 213-14	2.199, 215	7.1
no violence	198	2.200	7.1
dowry rules	199-200	2.200	
marriage within permitted degrees	179-83	2.200?	
marital power relations	195-97	2.201	7.3
against abortion	184-85	2.202	7.7

b) family/household relations are also discussed in ways similar to Josephus’ summary in *Apion* 2.205-6:

	Ps.-Phocylides	<i>Apion</i>	<i>Hypothetica</i>
burial	99	2.205 (211)	
children to honor parents	8, 208-9	2.206	
honor to elders	220-22	2.206	
elders parallel to God	8	2.206	

c) rules regarding the treatment of animals show another set of correspondences:

	Ps.-Phocylides	<i>Apion</i>	<i>Hypothetica</i>
no sex with animals	188	2.213?	7.7?
the nestling rule	84-85	2.213	7.9

Once again, there is insufficient evidence for any direct literary relationship between these three texts, but the material in Ps.-Phocylides demonstrates that the agreements between *Apion* and *Hypothetica* are not merely accidental, but represent the presence of a Judean tradition, in the Greek language, engaged in creative reflection, selection, and interpretation of its biblical and legal

<sup>15</sup> Wendland 1896: 712-13; Motzo 1911-12; Belkin 1936: 29-37; Momigliano 1975b [1931]: 768-70; Troiani 1977: 56-60; Vermes 1982: 301-2, n.50.

<sup>16</sup> So, most recently, Gerber 1997: 111-16; cf. Heinemann 1932: 354-56; Küchler 1979: 209, 220; Niebuhr 1987: 43-44; Carras 1993: 42-47. See, however, Berthelot 2003: 368-74.

<sup>17</sup> For this text see van der Horst 1978; Thomas 1992; Wilson 1994; Barclay 1996a: 336-46; Wilson 2005.

<sup>18</sup> See the fuller table in Gerber 1997: 113-14. I have selected here the parallels I consider most significant.



materials. Judging from what these three sources have in common, we may discern the following characteristics in this stream of tradition:

1. In providing summaries of the law, this tradition is capable of *absorbing non-biblical materials* into the Judean law. It is clear that the moral rules in these texts are primarily inspired by, and rooted in, the biblical sources.<sup>19</sup> But we have seen many cases where Greek maxims (on property, household relations, or social responsibility) have been creatively adopted *within* a Judean framework, by a process of confident Judean accommodation.<sup>20</sup> These unwritten laws were so much the staple of everyday social life that they could become culturally unspecific: the “curses of Bouzyges” could be identified as such, or absorbed, incognito, into the “common sense” definition of friendly social relations. Thus, absorbing such rules required no Judean consciousness of adopting “alien” traditions, simply a slow, subtle, and unconscious process of cultural reframing. The attribution of the rudiments of Judean law to the ancient figure of Phocylides is a more specific claim to cultural priority, but in essence the strategy is the same: whether “they” taught what we believe, or we incorporate “their” maxims (consciously or otherwise), the Judean tradition is here represented as the highest and fullest expression of what *anyone* should consider the moral life at its best.
2. The tradition makes a specific claim that Judean culture provides *the highest ideals of sexual and household ethics*. Of course, sexual mores were never a matter of universal consensus, but the package of rules here displayed appears to develop the Judean tradition in a way that matches a philosophically-influenced set of ideals: against homoerotic relations (as excess of lust); against sexual license (as being ruled by the passions); against child exposure (as cruelty to a human being); for male authority (as proper governance of the home). The biblical tradition could clearly be expanded and interpreted in these directions without difficulty, but the common material is a development beyond the biblical base both in substance and in emphasis. It also reinforces the significance of this sphere of ethics by stress on its strictness in standard and application.
3. There is also a specific claim that Judean culture offers *the best form of social justice*. There is a notable emphasis in this material on systems of “fel-

lowship,” on fairness and compassion in social dealings, and on care for the vulnerable. This is the context in which the laws on animal welfare (suppliants; mother and offspring) are significant: they demonstrate the *extent* to which the concern for kindness, fairness, and compassion is developed within the Judean tradition. There is a claim here both to match and to exceed the common expectations of friendliness and humanity, as practiced in the Greek world.

4. Indeed, one further characteristic of this tradition is its *comparative mode* of discourse. Judean culture is generally presented as *stricter* in applying its rules and penalties, *more humane* in its treatment of persons and animals. The sabbath instruction ensures that Judeans *know their laws better* than anyone else, while the curses of Bouzyges are so successfully absorbed that he himself is unnecessary (*Hypoth.* 7.8). Such comparisons are sometimes general, sometimes specific, sometimes explicit, and sometimes implicit; but this mode of analysis offers many possibilities for placing Judean culture on the map of competing cultures. It is thus unlikely that Josephus’ critical and comparative arguments are occasioned, as he claims, *only* by the strategy of his opponents (2.150, 238).
5. Finally, we may note that Josephus was not the first to present an encomium of his people’s traditions *within an apologetic framework*. *Apion* and *Hypothetica* appear to draw from a common tradition in retelling the story of Moses, and early Israelite history, as an answer to “libels” against Moses. To what extent these libels are rhetorically concocted, to what extent “live” in the author’s day, it is impossible to say, but the fact that both *Apion* and *Hypothetica* use the charge of “Moses as charlatan” suggests that, once embedded within this tradition, such apologetic motifs became standard features and useful occasions for encomiastic retelling of history. The apologetic features can be more or less explicit: in the summaries of the law they are notably absent, at least on the surface of the text. But, as one would expect from ancient rhetoric, encomium and apology can be mixed in various ways, and to various degrees, and the tradition gives opportunity for individual authors to develop this mixture according to their own rhetorical needs (see further, Introduction, § 5).

## 2. *Apion* 2.145-286 and other Judean sources

In discussing the sources of *Apion* 2.145ff., scholars normally discuss only the above parallels. However, there is good evidence that Josephus at times used other Judean sources as well. I list them here, starting with the most certain cases and ending with the least.

<sup>19</sup> This is especially, and rightly, emphasized by Niebuhr 1987: 33-72.

<sup>20</sup> On the label “accommodation,” see Barclay 1996a: 96-98.

### 2.1 *Aristobulus*

In 1.165, Josephus' comment that Pythagoras is correctly said to have "adopted many of the Judeans' regulations for his philosophy" is verbally so close to Aristobulus to constitute almost a quotation from his work (see note to "philosophy" ad loc.). Of course, we know Aristobulus only in fragments, but this evidence that Josephus had read his work (whether in full or in excerpt) encourages us to look for other signs. In fact, we have five or six clues that passages in *Apion* 2.145-286 draw from the work of Aristobulus. i) In 2.168, Josephus gives a list of Greek philosophers (starting with Pythagoras) who supposedly learned the truth about God from Moses. Most of this list is also present in Aristobulus, who claims the priority of Moses and his influence on philosophy (see note to "expression" at 2.168). ii) In the same context, and in 2.190, Josephus refers to the "majesty" (μεγαλειότης) of God, a very rare item in his vocabulary. This again seems to have been drawn from Aristobulus (see note to "God" at 2.168). iii) Also in 2.190, Josephus uses a formula describing God as "beginning, middle, and end," an Orphic phrase that he almost certainly learned from Aristobulus (see note to "things" at 2.190). iv) Aristobulus also stressed the self-sufficiency of God (using an Orphic poem), an emphasis that Josephus repeats in 2.190 (see note to "all" at 2.190). v) Two sections later (2.192), Josephus' stress that God created without assistance has parallels both in Philo (see below) and in Aristobulus (see note to "assistants" at 2.192). The combination of all these features in 2.190-92 prompts the suggestion that *all* of 2.190-92 may be largely, if not entirely, prompted by the philosophical description of God in Aristobulus. vi) The emphasis in *Apion* on piety may also be inspired by the philosophy of Aristobulus, which highlighted the virtues taught by the Judean law, starting with piety (see note to "it" at 2.170). But here the relationship to Aristobulus may be more remote, since this feature is not unique to his work. In the light of this evidence, we may conclude that Josephus drew from Aristobulus his philosophical definition of the nature of God (2.190-92; perhaps also the related 2.166-67), together with the claim that Greek philosophers *learned* their understanding of God from Moses. This latter is a claim Josephus mentions several times, but never defends (2.168, 255, 257, 281), perhaps because it was never fully his own argument, but one he had borrowed from Aristobulus.<sup>21</sup>

### 2.2 *Philo, Life of Moses*

In the concluding stage of his argument (2.277-86), Josephus marshals a set of evidence for the superiority of the Judean constitution that runs closely parallel to

material at the start of Philo's second book on the life of Moses (*Mos.* 2.12-24). This includes the argument i) that while others change their laws, Judeans do not; ii) that even under pressure, the Judean laws remain "immortal," time proving their excellence; and iii) that others emulate Judean customs and laws, including the sabbath rest and fasting (see notes to "us" and "immortal" at 2.277; notes to "permeated" and "fasts" at 2.282). The combination of themes, in this order, and with the same argumentative purpose, is striking. Although the texts are different in several other respects (Philo adds the honoring of the Septuagint translation; cf. *Apion* 2.42-47), this is strong evidence that Josephus has read and used Philo, or at least that both utilize a common apologetic tradition.

### 2.3 *Other material in Philo*<sup>22</sup>

Throughout the commentary on 2.145-286, we have noted passages in Philo that bear some points of comparison with *Apion*. Most of these are too remote or too general to suggest any literary dependence, but some are close or unusual enough to raise that possibility. Josephus' special concern to find a moral rationale for ritual practices (2.190-218) bears a general similarity to Philo's philosophical program, though this represents perhaps a widespread tendency in Judean thought of the Hellenistic era, rather than a specific relationship between Josephus and Philo. More striking, because more particular, are parallels regarding: i) one temple, matched with one God (see note to "God" at 2.193); ii) not insulting others' Gods, out of respect for the name of God (see note to "God" at 2.237); iii) God creating without assistants (see note to "assistants" at 2.192); iv) corpse-impurity as a way to signal the sin of murder (see note to "pure" at 2.205); v) proselytes as an example of moral "kinship" (see note to "lifestyle" at 2.210); vi) moral lessons drawn "indirectly" (πρόρωθεν) from rules on the treatment of animals (see note to "indirectly" at 2.213). Perhaps none of these are so close or sufficiently unique to *prove* a direct literary relationship. In each case it is possible that Josephus and Philo independently drew from a tradition that explained and defended Judean culture in these terms. If so, this would add to that "pool" of tradition identified above, in relation to *Hypothetica* and Ps.-Phocylides. But since there

<sup>21</sup> On the philosophy of Aristobulus, see Holladay 1995 and Barclay 1996a: 150-58.

<sup>22</sup> Although most scholars regard *Hypothetica* as Philonic, I have argued above that it is probably not. It provides by far the most and the closest parallels with *Apion* in the "Philonic" corpus.

is one strong candidate for direct dependence on Philo (above, 2.2), it is also possible that at least some of these common points indicate Josephus' use of Philo's treatises on the laws (*De Decalogo*, *De Specialibus Legibus*, and *De Virtutibus*). Indeed, as Berthelot argues (2003: 374-76), the common order of material in Josephus' summary of the law and parts of *De Virtutibus* (82-160) may suggest the direct influence of Philo on Josephus (though the incidence of common vocabulary is not particularly high).

#### 2.4 *Aristeas*

Since we know that Josephus had read and used some parts of *The Letter of Aristeas* in writing his *Antiquities* (12.1-118; cf. here, *Apion* 2.42-47), it is likely that he had also read the long description of the symposium (*Aristeas* 187-311) where the Judean translators offer advice to the king and discuss the moral values central to the Judean tradition. These notably refer every matter to God, and make piety a central topic in Judean culture (see note to "it" at 2.170). At least it is likely that this was *one* source for Josephus' understanding of the Judean constitution as embodying key religious and social virtues such as piety, harmony, and human fellowship.

As noted in the Introduction (§ 2), while writing his *Antiquities* Josephus was gathering materials on the meaning of the law, with which he intended to write a four-volume work "On Customs and Causes." This was to include discussion on the nature of God, and on the moral and philosophical meaning of the Judean laws. This project took Josephus into new intellectual territory, where he was least at home and most dependent on his Judean predecessors. The evidence collected above indicates some of the materials on which he drew, but it may be only the tip of an iceberg. Very many of the Judean materials from the Hellenistic and early Roman period are lost, and many of those we have (e.g., Aristobulus) are known only in fragments: there may be much more overlap than we can now trace between *Apion* and earlier Judean texts or models. In some cases, Josephus may not have known that the sources he read were Judean (e.g., Ps.-Hecataeus), in others he probably did, though he pretended not to (1.218).<sup>23</sup> It is possible that it was through research in such literature that he came across the description of the Judean constitution as a "theocracy" (2.165—was he confident

enough in Greek to coin this term himself?), or the materials necessary for his extended critique of Greek myth (2.240-54—did he really read Homer for himself?). It is also possible, even likely, that his knowledge of Plato was derived from a Judean predecessor. While he refers to Plato on several occasions (2.168, 254-57), and often comes close to motifs in Plato's works (especially his *Republic* and his *Laws*), it is hard to imagine Josephus wading through these long books for himself, but more likely that he knew of famous excerpts, perhaps as noted by Judean philosophers.<sup>24</sup> This raises the possibility that most of the material in 2.145-286 might be secondary—not taken wholesale from a single source, but adapted, expanded, reshaped, and re-expressed from a number of different Judean traditions. In drawing conclusions, I will push this suggestion one step further in speculating on Josephus' adaptation of the material he inherited.

### 3. *Conclusions*

As Gerber rightly notes (1997: 117-18), to attempt to identify Josephus' redaction of his sources is a perilous procedure, when the extent of those sources is itself a matter of conjecture. However, as we have seen, there are *some* passages where we can be confident that Josephus used previous traditions, and others where the likelihood is strong. Moreover, we know when Josephus is speaking in his own voice, in his introductions and conclusions, and in the themes that he repeats or emphasizes for his own rhetorical ends. Judging by these criteria, we may tentatively suggest the following conclusions, regarding material both within and outwith the summary of the law.

#### 3.1 *Before the summary (2.151-89)*

Josephus' description of the shape of the Judean constitution contains several passages that are clearly inspired by sources he has used. The defense of Moses against the charge of "charlatanism" (2.157-62) is close enough to that in *Hypothetica* 6.2-4 to suggest that his material here is largely traditional (see above, 1.2). The description of the nature of God (2.166-67) may be drawn from Aristobulus, as is certainly the gist of the claim in 2.168 (see above, 2.1). The emphasis on the sabbath as an occasion for teaching is so similar to *Hypothetica* 7.10-14 that it cannot be claimed to be Josephus in conception, even if it is clearly his own in some of its wording.

<sup>23</sup> Josephus seems to have believed the pseudonymous claim of *Aristeas* (*Ant.* 12.100). On the evidence in *Antiquities* for Josephus' (limited) knowledge of Judean literature in Greek, see S. Schwartz 1990: 51-55.

<sup>24</sup> On *Apion* and Plato, see the excursus in Gerber 1997: 226-43, rightly correcting some of the excessive claims by Schäublin; I have drawn attention to the closer parallels throughout the commentary.

Other elements here (the emphasis on piety and the coining of “theocracy”) may similarly be drawn from tradition. The whole is not well structured, and gives the appearance of a patchwork of diverse materials, which is perhaps exactly what it is. Josephus may have introduced into its conclusion the statements about priests (2.185-87; it overlaps material in the summary), while the stress on Judean harmony (2.179-81) and Judean conservatism (2.182-83) sound distinctively Josephan. Beyond this point we cannot go, but the above would suggest that most of the constitutional discussion is re-hashed from diverse sources available to Josephus.

### 3.2 *The summary of the law (2.190-218)*

There is good reason to think that much, if not most, of this material is drawn from earlier Judean sources. Its difference from Josephus’ earlier summaries (in *Ant.* bks 3-4) is striking, in content, style, and emphasis. There is strong evidence of dependence on a pool of tradition that summarized, interpreted, and supplemented biblical laws, not least through absorption of Greek maxims (see above, 1.2—1.3). The moral and philosophical explanations of the law, including ritual laws, are similar to the strain of interpretation we know from *Aristeas*, Aristobulus, and Philo, while the specific statements about God (2.190-192) may be derived more or less fully from Aristobulus (see above, 2.1). On the other hand, the arrangement of the material in three paragraphs (2.190-98; 2.199-208; 2.209-214) may be Josephus’ own (to match the first three virtues of 2.146), while the specific paragraph on the “welcome” of foreigners (2.209-10) is so clearly in Josephus’ own hand that it stands out markedly from the rest of the summary (see note to “noting” at 2.209). The concluding comment on the reward of the righteous (2.218) is also sufficiently close to Josephus’ statements on the afterlife to be labelled as Josephus’ own contribution (see notes to “life” and “ages” ad loc.). The emphasis

on the severity of punishments (the death penalty) may be derived from elsewhere (cf. *Hypothetica*), but the repetitions may be traced to Josephus’ hand. Thus it would be incorrect to take the whole of 2.190-218 as lifted complete and verbatim from some literary source. It is better to regard it as material largely derived from, or inspired by, a number of sources, but edited, arranged, and expanded by Josephus himself.

### 3.3 *After the summary (2.219-86)*

Here we have the least information to be able to determine what might be derived from tradition. The claims for the “immortality” of the law, and its emulation by others (2.277-86), are probably drawn from Philo, or a common source (see above, 2.3). The critique of Homeric mythology may also be derivative, and perhaps the comparisons with Plato, and with Sparta and Athens. Josephus himself seems to have structured this discussion, making the charge of Apollonius (2.258) the centre of an extended proof of Judean superiority (2.236-86). He also probably promoted the idea of Judean toughness, and endurance for the sake of the law. If there are elements of his presentation of Judean culture that are designed to resonate with Roman values (e.g., contempt of death, strict sexual morality, commitment to work, frugality; see Appendix 6), we might expect that these themes (prominent in the *peroratio*) have been selected from, emphasized in, or even inserted into the materials Josephus inherited and reused. Such, at least, are the most plausible lines of speculation. None of this means that Josephus *meant* some things (his own) more than others (what he inherited); we should presume that he selected what he used precisely because it fitted his agenda. But this tentative unravelling of source from redaction might still indicate his special purposes, as clearly as his addition of 2.209-10 to the summary of the law reflects his particular apologetic concerns.



## APPENDIX 6: JUDAISM IN ROMAN DRESS?

In recent years several scholars have proposed that Josephus presents Judean culture in *Apion* in a specifically Roman form, highlighting or exaggerating features of the Judean tradition that are congruent with Roman values. According to Goodman, Josephus emphasized Judean conservatism, sobriety, strict sexual morality, hard work, simplicity, practical wisdom, and contempt for death to show “that in many important aspects Jews and Romans shared the same ideals” (Goodman 1994b: 334-35; cf. 1996: 92-93; 1999: 56-58; cf. Keeble 1991: 39-44). In a similar vein, Haaland explored “the distinctively Roman character” of *Apion*, and analyzed the use of Roman stereotypes concerning Greeks. He suggested that *Apion* is different in some respects from Josephus’ earlier works and found in our treatise a special attempt “to make space for Judaism within the Roman mind” (Haaland 1999: 283, 301). Following up these suggestions, I proposed that Josephus’ statements about the Romans, his Romanized stance towards Greeks, and his particular presentation of Judean values all constitute a carefully crafted *interpretatio Romana* of Judaism (Barclay 2000). With further work on *Apion*’s (Romanized) stance towards Egyptians (Berthelot 2000; Barclay 2004), and its strategic language of “benevolence” (Berthelot 2003: 361-68), this hypothesis has continued to develop its appeal, not least since the specifically Roman context of Josephus’ works has come increasingly into focus (Goodman 1994b; Mason 2003b; Edmondson, Mason, and Rives 2005).

At numerous points during the commentary Josephus’ remarks (or lack of comment) on the Romans have been noted, and parallels adduced between his statements and those of Roman philosophers, moralists, or historians. But we need to gather these individual observations, both to assess their cumulative weight and to scrutinize critically in what ways, or to what extent, the text presents a specifically Romanized image of Judean culture. In this appendix, I wish to: 1) assess what Josephus does and does not say about the Romans in *Apion*; and 2) gather the main evidence for what could be considered particularly “Roman” features in his presentation of Judean culture and law. There are clearly difficulties in this assessment: “Roman” cultural identity was by no means a univocal or uncontested phenomenon in the first century CE, and Josephus’ sparse references to the Romans require us to work as much by inference as by direct statement. But I hope to confirm the hypothesis that, at least to a limited degree, *Apion* matches the Judean constitution to the ideals of conservative Roman

moralists, whether or not this was a conscious rhetorical strategy.

### I. *The Romans in Apion*

It is important to start with a negative observation: most of the discussion in *Apion* is conducted without reference to Rome or Romans. The extensive discussion of historiography in 1.6-27 concerns the failings of *Greek* historiography, without mention of Roman historians or historiography. There are no Roman “witnesses” to Judean antiquity, and no Romans among the critics answered by Josephus. In the long discussion of constitutions (2.145-286), comparisons are made with the Greeks, and specifically with the Athenians and Spartans, but the only non-Greeks mentioned in this context are Persians and Scythians, not Romans. No reference is made to the contemporary opinion concerning Judeans in Rome, or to the influence of *Apion* and others there; and there are no comments on contemporary Roman politics, even in connection with politically charged motifs like Judean “atheism” (2.148).

There are many possible explanations for such silence. *Apion* could be read as a pastiche of materials stemming from non-Roman or pre-Roman contexts, and in this and other respects fundamentally *unengaged* with its Roman context. Alternatively, it could be argued that the primarily *Greek* topics of discussion were standard intellectual themes *even in Rome*: Romans were by no means uninterested in the image of Sparta and Athens, and in placing themselves and others in relation to the stereotypes that Josephus employs. Or again, it is possible that some of Josephus’ silences are strategic: did he omit reference to Roman critics, and decline critical comparison with the Roman constitution, precisely because he wanted to mask any discrepancy between the Judean and the Roman ways of life? In theory, all of these options are possible, and it is only by closer observation that we will be able to adjudicate between them. As was noted in the Introduction (§ 6), *Apion* is clearly of some contemporary relevance in Rome, but not evenly or always directly so. Although a moderate case can be made that it is attuned to contemporary Roman issues, this is not true of every feature of the text: *Apion* appears to be located partly in the social and political conditions of late first-century Rome and partly in debates and problematics of a different era and a different place. Thus in looking more closely at Josephus’

relationship to Rome, we should initially leave open a range of options concerning the rhetorical stance of the text.

We may note first that, at times, Josephus makes specifically complimentary statements about the Romans, not all fully necessary to his argument. Thus in 2.40, in discussing Alexandrian citizenship, Josephus makes space to comment on “the benevolence of the Romans,” whose grants of citizenship have “ensured that their name has been shared with practically everyone, not only with individuals, but with sizeable nations as a whole.” This reference to Roman φιλανθρωπία closely matches Roman self-congratulation on this score (see note to “benevolence” at 2.40) and is twinned with a comment on universal Roman power: they can decide questions of citizenship in Egypt because they “are now rulers of the world” (2.41). The same combination of themes appears in 2.73-74 where Josephus’ deflects Apion’s criticisms with effusive comment on the Romans’ “magnanimity and moderation” in their attitudes to their subjects; while the Greeks honor their “rulers and masters” with statues, Judeans are not compelled to transgress their ancestral laws. Roman power is similarly acknowledged in 2.125-34, where Rome is labelled “the most dominant city” and Apion’s arrogance is (probably) contrasted with Roman modesty (2.125-26; for the textual problems, see commentary). In another context, Josephus implies that Romans had achieved considerable power and military success even by the time of Herodotus and Thucydides (1.66). Thus, on at least some occasions, Josephus displays a concern to honor Rome’s power and her magnanimous use of it.

In the same or similar contexts he takes pains to point out the political affinity between Judeans and Romans. In the long discussion of Alexandrian politics (2.33-78), he repeatedly points out the recognition given to Judeans by Roman authorities—“Caesar the Great” (2.37, 61), Augustus (2.61), the senate (2.61-62), and all the emperors (2.62-64). This argument is occasioned by Apion’s attempt to portray antagonism between Judeans and Rome, but Josephus’ effort in refuting this impression with counter examples suggests a concern to match Judean history with the interests of the Roman state. The virulent polemics against Cleopatra in this context (2.56-60) display his familiarity with a strand of Roman propaganda that he had already deployed in *Antiquities* but here concentrates and develops (see notes ad loc.). Josephus also handles with exceptional care the issue of Judean honors to the emperors (2.73-78), insisting that Judeans grant them their highest permitted respect, and allowing no hint of disjunction between Roman and Judean interests. In the same vein, while acknowledging Roman mastery of the world, he is careful to depict Judeans as (uniquely) Rome’s allies and friends in the East (2.125-34). Thus, by rhetorical emphasis, digres-

sion, and subtle selection, Josephus has molded his response to Apion into a statement of harmony between Judeans and Rome (see Barclay 2000: 234-37). The fact that he earlier takes care to parallel Judeans and Romans as nations unknown to the Greeks, living unspoiled lives away from the coast (1.60-68), is further evidence of this policy of alignment (see Haaland 1999: 286).

On the basis of these observations, we are entitled to enquire whether Josephus’ silence is strategic on those occasions when he could have criticized Roman habits, but declines the opportunity. It is notable, for instance, that he sets Moses’ critique of the use of images not against Greeks and Romans but against “the Greeks and some others” (2.74-75; see notes ad loc. and Barclay forthcoming a). In the same way, while critiquing the admission of foreign Gods, the decline of old cults, and the construction of new temples (2.251-53), he targets specifically, and only, “the Greeks” (2.251), although the phenomena were equally, if not more, familiar in Rome (cf. 2.248). Another veil of silence falls over the recent Judean Revolt. Although the event was undoubtedly well-known, Josephus appears to go out of his way to *avoid* reference to it in this treatise: he speaks of Titus “obtaining” the Temple (2.82), and of Judeans suffering torture and death in “theaters” and at the hands of their “conquerors” (1.42-43; 2.233), without ever admitting that these were recent experiences of *Roman* punishment during and after the Revolt. In switching the blame for national disasters, and the burning of temples, from the victims to the perpetrators (2.131), Josephus comes within an ace of levelling criticism at Rome, but leaves the implications of his argument unspoken (see Barclay 2005a). In this light one could read additional criticisms of “others,” or critical comparisons between superior Judean customs and the practices of “others” (e.g., 2.150, 180, 182, 189, 216, 234) as diplomatically vague—blanket statements that could apply to Romans, but leave strategically inexplicit any cultural conflict with Rome.

Whatever our judgment on these last cases, there is evidence to suggest that *Apion* aligns Judeans with Romans, in both political and cultural spheres. This suggests that *one* reason for Josephus’ lack of comment on the historiography or constitution of the Romans, and for his omission of any recognizably *Roman* criticism of Judeans, was to avoid any hint of antipathy between the two traditions. In praising the Romans’ generous characteristics, and in sharing their negative judgments of Cleopatra and others, Josephus displays a close knowledge of the Roman evaluation of themselves and their history—sufficient to encourage us to enquire whether other features of this text are molded in specifically Roman ways.

## II. Roman Stereotypes, Values, and Virtues

There are obvious difficulties in defining what constitute the “Roman” values with which we may compare the Judean characteristics highlighted in *Apion*. *Romanitas* was not a stable or uncontested entity, but in many respects a matter of negotiation, dispute, and continuous evolution (see Woolf 1998); like other cultural identities, Romanness was not simply inherited, but contested and constructed, “not an essence but a positioning” (S. Hall 1990: 226). Many of the “virtues” to which we will draw attention were ambiguous in value or meaning. Tacitus’ subtle discussions indicate how “austerity” and “old-fashioned” habits could be regarded as excessive and outdated in some contexts, but honorable and inviolate in others; indeed, every quality could be rhetorically manipulated in polemics or praise to the benefit of one’s own cause. But the very fact that these values were the subject of dispute indicates that they lay at the core of the Roman tradition, and there is a certain continuity in elite discourse on these topics from the late Republic to the early second century CE (roughly, Cicero to Tacitus). Roman philosophers, moralists, satirists, and historians were able to appeal to a set of conservative values that were construed as identifiably Roman, and the fact that non-Romans (such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch) highlighted these same ideals in praise of Roman history or morality suggests that this profile was widely recognized.<sup>1</sup> This is not to say that all these characteristics were originally “Roman” or even distinctively so: Romans themselves were glad to evoke others (e.g., the Spartans) as models in certain respects, and several of the values highlighted here (e.g., endurance, contempt for death, strict family morality) could be labelled generally “philosophical” (or at least “Stoic”) as readily as “Roman.” But the point is not what was old or new, but what was used to articulate the honorable Roman tradition, not least in contrast with lax or degenerate “others.” Although a number of very general values (such as piety, justice, and social harmony) could be discussed here, our focus will be on those with a recognizably Roman profile in Josephus’ historical context, whatever their cultural origins. Our survey will start with Roman attitudes to two nations much discussed in *Apion* (Egyp-

tians and Greeks), before considering six spheres of virtue (Spartan toughness, contempt for death, frugality, agricultural work, family morality, and strict punishment) that are prominent both in *Apion* and in conservative Roman moral discourse.

### 1. Denigration of Egyptians

As I have discussed in detail elsewhere (Barclay 2004; cf. Berthelot 2000), a considerable proportion of Josephus’ polemics in *Apion* consists of denigration of Egyptians, particularly in response to Apion himself (2.1-144). Two features are particularly prominent in these expressions of ethnic prejudice: ridicule of Egyptian theriomorphic religion, and disdainful comment on her national political humiliation. As soon as he introduces the Egyptian stories about Judeans, Josephus comments on the contrast between the Egyptians’ absurd worship of animals, and the “dignity” (σεμνότης; cf. Latin *gravitas*) of the Judeans’ conception of God (1.223-26). Thereafter, the animal cults are repeatedly denigrated. They are not only demeaning, but also dangerous (cultivating *wild* animals), and they engender internal conflicts (2.65-66, 86, 128, 139); in fact, they render the Egyptians sub-human (2.66). Very similar comments on Egyptian religion are common in Roman discourse, many inherited from a Hellenistic tradition, but given special political shape in a Roman context. Egyptians are regularly mocked in Roman sources as superstitious, gullible, fanatical, and religiously bizarre (e.g., Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.101; *Tusc.* 5.78: *imbutae mentes pravis erroribus*), and in his famous assault on the “mad” Egyptians in *Satire* 15, Juvenal plays up the bitter disputes caused by the local animal cults, depicting a gruesome feud ending with cannibalism. Regarding Egyptian politics, Josephus glories in Egypt’s sorry political past (2.125-34) and takes care to point out her subordination to Rome (2.41, 71-72), and her unstable, seditious population (2.69-70). This exactly matches Roman stereotypes of the Egyptians as a fickle, reckless, and insubordinate people (e.g., Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.11; cf. Dio 50.24; 51.17.1-3). The stamp of Roman power is, in the Roman view, precisely what these obstinate people need: while the rest of the empire is getting civilized, this “useless and unwarlike” population remains dangerously barbaric (Juvenal, *Sat.* 15. 110-12, 126; cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 380a-c, on local wars resolved only by the “punishment” applied by Romans). Josephus thus trades on the Egyptians’ “poor reputation” (κακοδοξία, 2.31) in ways that match very closely the scorn and disdain that the label “Egyptian” elicited in Roman literary discourse.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For Plutarch’s stance towards Rome (sympathetic, though with reservations on some aspects of contemporary Roman culture), see C.P. Jones 1971. The parallels between *Apion* and Dionysius’ depiction of the Roman constitution have been noted by Balch (1982), though I am unpersuaded by his claim that the two texts follow a common rhetorical template.

<sup>2</sup> On the crucial distinction between the labels “Alexandrian” and “Egyptian”—a distinction of great impor-

## 2. Criticisms of Greeks

As has been noted elsewhere (Haaland 1999: 284-87; Barclay 2000: 238-40), Josephus positions Judeans in relation to Greeks in ways that correspond very closely to standard Roman prejudices. His stance towards Greeks is not universally negative (Greek “wisdom” or “philosophy” are valued highly), but it frequently entails a sharp critique of certain features of “Greek” culture, often in global judgments, sometimes with careful distinction between different kinds of Greek (Athenians and Spartans). In at least five respects his judgments match those voiced by Roman authors, who defined “Romanness” through a complex process of differentiation from Greeks:

i) *Historiography*: The critique of Greek historiography in 1.6-27 climaxes with the charge that Greek authors are less concerned with the truth than with the display of literary prowess; they use their compositions to engage in competitive contests for honor, seeking favor through praise of powerful people, and using their eloquence and “cleverness” (δεινότης) to outshine others (1.24-27; cf. 1.65-68; *War* 1.16). This corresponds to a common set of Roman opinions about “Greeks,” that their histories are full of lies and inventions (Valerius Maximus 4.7.4; Pliny, *Nat.* 5.4; 28.112; 37.41; Juvenal, *Sat.* 10.174-75: *quidquid Graecia mendax audet in historia*), that they are ever adaptable in ingratiating themselves into others’ favor (Cicero, *Quint. frat.* 1.1.16; Juvenal, *Sat.* 3.58ff.: the figure of the *Graeculus esuriens*), and that their words are clever but often hypocritical or false (Plutarch, *Cat. Maj.* 12.5: Greeks speak from their lips, Romans from the heart). Related to this, Josephus elsewhere insinuates that the Greek respect for Roman emperors is insincere (2.74), a suspicion also voiced by Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.53).

ii) *Mythology*: Josephus’ critique of myth in 2.240-49, 274-75 is targeted specifically at Greeks (2.239, 275), and draws its illustrations in all cases from Homeric or other legends associated with the Greek tradition. Although such myth was equally at home in the Roman religion, it was sometimes convenient to portray the Roman tradition as distanced from “Greek” myth, especially where that was subject to moral or religious critique. Thus Dionysius of Halicarnassus represents Romulus as following the best Greek traditions in religious matters, but rejecting all the blasphemous myths concerning the Gods, which portrayed them in a morally dubious light (*Ant. rom.* 1.18.3); in these respects the θεολογία of the Romans is certainly superior to that

of the Greeks (1.20.2). Josephus’ critique draws on a long (Greek) philosophical tradition critical of myth, but would certainly find echoes and approval in the self-positioning of some Roman moralists.

iii) *Art*: Josephus associates a love of sculpture and painting specifically with “the Greeks” (“and some others,” 2.74), and in his critique of the religious effects of such art, specifically mentions painters given license in such matters “by the Greeks” (2.252). This matches two interlocking stereotypes in Roman discourse: that Greek culture lacks proper discipline, and that a fascination with art is a specifically Greek form of decadence (Gruen 1992: 131-82). Roman moralists could turn this trope against Greeks (Plutarch, *Cat. Maj.* 19.3-5), but also against fellow Romans whose collections of art appeared extravagant, indulgent, or simply “unRoman” (Livy 25.40.1-3; Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.4; in invective against the *Graeculus Verres*: *Verr.* 2.4.132-34; Pliny, *Nat.* 35.20; Pliny, *Ep.* 10.118-19).

iv) *Innovation*: Josephus’ strictures against innovation and change (2.182-83) were bound to resonate with any conservative ideology, but especially with the Roman respect for *mos maiorum* and the authority of ancient traditions. In this connection, he associates upheaval and political change specifically with Greeks (2.220-23), and in his critique of religious innovation and the introduction of foreign deities mentions explicitly only Greeks (2.250-54). Respect for antiquity, ancient custom, and ancestral tradition is a central feature of Roman identity, easily manipulated for various ends (e.g., Cicero, *Resp.* 3.34, 41; Plutarch, *Cat. Maj.* 1.2; 8.4; Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.20-21). Greeks could be accused of a passion for “novelty” (Tacitus, *Ann.* 5.10), corresponding to their ethnic characteristics of “fickleness” and unreliability (Cicero, *Sest.* 141: Greek *levitas* vs. Roman *gravitas*). Roman moralists cultivated an image of an unchanging Roman tradition, deeply resistant to change or foreign pollution. Dionysius of Halicarnassus congratulates Rome at keeping out the corrupting influence of foreign cults, or at least preventing native Romans from joining their processions (*Ant. rom.* 2.18-19), and Tacitus describes Romans objecting to Nero’s “Greek” reforms as appealing to *antiquitas* and the protection of *patrii mores* from imported *lascivia* (*Ann.* 14.20).

v) *Greek words and Roman deeds*: In describing the Mosaic constitution, Josephus contrasts the Spartan training through custom/practice with the normal Greek (and especially Athenian) passion for “words” (2.171-75); in that context he deploys this polarity to show the superiority of Moses to both systems of education (he uniquely combines them *both*), while in the conclusion he aligns Judean culture with deeds, not words (“unsophisticated in verbal tricks, but confirmed always by action,” 2.292). The contrast between “Greek” words and “Roman” deeds was a refrain constantly repeated

tance to Josephus in 2.33-78—see Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.60-61. For Roman attitudes to Egyptians, see further Reinhold 1980; Smelik and Hemelrijk 1984: 1920-54; Sonnabend 1986; Isaac 2004: 352-70.



by Roman moralists, always to the advantage of the practical Romans. “Greek” words are superficial and ephemeral, Roman deeds effective: Greeks are a *gens lingua magis strenua quam factis* (Livy 8.22.8), while *quantum Graeci praeceptis valent, tantum Romani, quod est maius, exemplis* (Quintilian 12.2.30; cf. Plutarch, *Cat. Maj.* 22.4). Roman training comes not through oral instruction, but through the habitual practices that lead to virtue (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.28).

Thus, without appealing explicitly to “Roman” judgments, Josephus presents Judeans as able, like the Romans, to perceive the flaws in the Greek cultural heritage, even while appreciating its (one-sided) strengths. His assessment of Greeks matches the prejudices of Roman moralists to a striking degree, sufficient to suggest his absorption of a specifically Roman perspective on these topics.<sup>3</sup>

### 3. *Admiration of Spartan Toughness*

Josephus’ assessment of the Spartan emphasis on custom and practice (rather than word, 2.171-75) corresponds closely to the stock image of Sparta, an image much admired in Rome. After his summary of the law, Josephus discusses the endurance displayed by Judeans in relation to their laws (2.219-35), partly by means of a comparison between Judeans and Spartans (2.225-35). It is presumed here that “everyone sings the praises of Sparta” (2.225), for two reasons in particular: the longevity of her constitution, and the toughness (or endurance: καρτερία) it inculcates. “Endurance in labors” (ἡ ἐν πόνοις καρτερία) is one of the prime virtues of the Judean laws highlighted at 2.146 (cf. 1.182; 2.123, 170, 273, 283), and it is Josephus’ rhetorical achievement in 2.225-35 to show that Judeans not only match Spartans in this regard (despite their insignificant military record), but even surpass them. A simplified and idealized portrait of Sparta circulated in Roman discourse as a model of military training, a society characterized by old-fashioned virtues like courage, frugality (see below), and military honor. Plutarch’s portraits of Spartan leaders, and particularly his *Lycurgus*, amply illustrate the image of Sparta cultivated in Josephus’ day, as a state dedicated to the training of boys to “endure hardships and conquer in battle” (καρτερεῖν πονοῦντα καὶ νικᾶν μαχόμενον, *Lyc.* 16.6). Josephus insists that Spartans did not always win their battles, or even fight to the end (2.231), and his comments on the eventual abandonment of the Spartan constitution and

the excesses in her attitude to foreigners (2.227, 261) match Roman awareness that the once great Spartan society had disappeared (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 29.1, 6) and that her grudging attitude to outsiders had been one factor in that demise (a fault avoided by Rome: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.17; 14.6.1-6; Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.24). Again, this nuanced assessment of Sparta fits Roman perceptions extremely well, and the predominant emphasis, that Judeans more than match the endurance famously displayed by Spartans, corresponds to the premium Romans placed on toughness both in military and in non-military affairs (e.g., Cicero, *Resp.* 2.2: *fortitudo in laboribus et periculis*; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.28.1: καρτερία ἢ παρὰ τοὺς πόνους; Plutarch, *Cat. Maj.* 4.3: Cato’s exemplary ability to ἐγκαρτερεῖν).<sup>4</sup>

### 4. *Contempt for Death*

Next to “endurance” at the end of the list of virtues in 2.146 lies “contempt for death” (θανάτου περιφρόνησις), a virtue that Josephus is careful to distinguish from its shadow “recklessness” (2.148) by insisting that Judeans are most certainly willing to die, but for the noble and rational purpose of defending their laws. This theme is highlighted on numerous occasions in *Apion* (1.42-43, 190-91, 212; 2.218-19, 232-35, 272, 294), in parallel with an equal emphasis in *War* (e.g., 2.151-58; 3.356; 5.315), and drawing on a long martyr-tradition especially associated with the Maccabees (see van Henten 1997). The theme of the “noble death” was deeply embedded in the philosophical tradition, where Socrates’ cheerful death was celebrated, and the necessity of suicide for the sake of honor was advocated by Stoics (see van Henten and Avemarie 2002). Thus there is nothing originally Roman about this virtue, but it is notably prominent in Roman moral discourse where praise is assigned to Romans, and to others, in its display. Josephus himself attributes this quality to Romans (*War* 6.33), and Quintilian lists it prominently amongst

<sup>3</sup> For Roman judgments on Greeks see Haarhoff 1948; Petrochilos 1974; Wardman 1976; Balsdon 1979: 30-54; Rawson 1992. For the Republican period see Gruen 1992.

<sup>4</sup> On the Spartan mystique and its reception and development in Rome, see Ollier 1972; Tigerstedt 1965-78; Rawson 1969; on the expropriation by Judeans (including the claim of kinship), see Gruen 1996. On the parallels between Josephus’ portrait of Moses and Plutarch’s life of Lycurgus, see Feldman 2005. As Mason points out (forthcoming c), Josephus’ depiction of the Essenes in *War* 2 also contains many points of contact with the Spartan myth. This common adoption of a Spartan pattern creates some similarities between the image of all Judeans in *Apion* and the image of particular Judeans (Essenes) in *War*. But the Essenes remain in many respects an extreme and peculiar phenomenon, and the portrait of tough and frugal Judeans in *Apion* is modelled not on them but on the Spartan/Roman tradition.

other Roman virtues (*Inst.* 12.3.30: *contemptus doloris ac mortis*; cf. Cicero, *Resp.* 5.9). Romans admire others who display this virtue, especially in battle (*Bell. Alex.* 15.1: a Cretan as brave as a Roman; Tacitus, *Ann.* 13.54), and Tacitus notes Judeans' contempt for death (*Hist.* 5.5.3: *moriendi contemptus*) in a way that can only signal praise.

### 5. Frugality

At a number of points during the summary of the law (2.190-218), Josephus indicates the premium placed on frugality, simplicity, and minimal expense. Sacrifices are to be offered without extravagance (πολυτέλεια, 2.195); they are occasions for moderation (σωφροσύνη, cf. 2.170), not drunkenness (2.195). The birth of a child is to be celebrated with similar sobriety (2.204), while deaths are to be marked without expensive burial rites or elaborate memorials (2.205). Marriage is to be contracted without consideration of the dowry (2.200) and money lent without interest (2.208). Elsewhere, Josephus describes the Judean way of life as marked by simplicity of diet (λιτότης τροφῆς, 2.234) and a frugal lifestyle (εὐτέλεια βίου, 2.281), characteristics learned from Moses. The closing peroration stresses again the Judean aversion to extravagance (and sloth, 2.291; see below). These virtues are, as Josephus indicates, widely promoted in the Greek philosophical tradition; resistance to the pleasures of money or food, and investment in virtue rather than material goods, are the hallmarks of most philosophical traditions, especially that of the Stoics. But they are also prominent in the model of "primitivism" adopted by Roman moralists, in reaction against the perceived "decadence" of contemporary "luxury." Cicero inveighs against expensive sacrifices (*Leg.* 2.25), and advocates simple graves and burial rites (*Leg.* 2.59, 62-66). Plutarch celebrates resistance to "luxury" as a central virtue in the Lycurgan constitution (*Lyc.* 9.3-4; 13.3, in contrast to contemporary luxury in trade, ornaments, and furniture), while Dionysius claims that Romulus had brought frugality (εὐτέλεια) and moderation (σωφροσύνη) into the Roman way of life (*Ant. rom.* 2.23). The Roman ideal of a simple, pastoral, way of life was attributed to exemplars such as Cato (e.g., Plutarch, *Cat. Maj.* 2.2-3; 4.1-4), and rhetorical appeal could always be made to the sumptuary laws (e.g., the Oppian laws of 215 BC, whose repeal occasioned a classic debate, Livy 34.1-8). Thus Tacitus frequently uses the rhetoric of old-fashioned austerity, in stereotypical contrast to the soft, effeminate, and foreign forms of indulgence that have taken hold in Rome (e.g., *Ann.* 3.30, 33-34, 52 [Tiberius' *antiqua parsimonia*], 55 [Vespasian's *adstrictus mos*]), though his own stance is ambivalent on this score. The motif is too common in ancient literature and philosophy to claim that there is anything here uniquely Ro-

man, but one can be sure that this Judean trait would appear admirable in Roman eyes.

### 6. (Agricultural) Work

Josephus' first pen-portrait of Judean culture emphasizes commitment to family, traditional piety, and agricultural work (1.60), and the same emphasis emerges in the description of the constitution. The Judean lifestyle is characterized by "intensity of work" as well as rest (2.174), by self-sufficiency and love of work, not indolence (2.291). In the comparison with Sparta, Josephus makes much of the fact that Spartan soldiers did not farm, in order to portray them as lazy spongers (2.229-30) in contrast to the Judean practice of "working for oneself" (αὐτουργία, 2.234). Others imitate Judeans in their "industriousness in crafts" (φιλεργόν ἐν ταῖς τέχναῖς, 2.283), and the peroration celebrates diligence in crafts or agriculture (τέχναῖς ἢ γεωργίας προσανέχειν, 2.294). Once again, these virtues are not uniquely Roman, but the primitive simplicity of the rustic life is frequently idealized in Roman literature, not least in relation to Cato (*Cato, Agr. praef.* 4; Plutarch, *Cat. Maj.* 1.3 [αὐτουργία]; cf. Cicero, *Flacc.* 71-73, in contrast to Greeks). In Roman tradition, her early heroes were both soldiers and farmers, summoned to war from the plough (Cicero, *Sen.* 56; Livy 3.13.36; Virgil, *Aen.* 9.607-8), and for Dionysius, the only occupations allowed by Romulus to free men were agriculture and war (*Ant. rom.* 2.28). This is an ideal still current in Josephus' day (Tacitus, *Germ.* 14.3; see below), and bound to bring credit to the Judean constitution in Roman eyes.

### 7. Family Morality

Josephus' summary of the Judean moral code includes the strictest sexual and familial morality: wives are to be ruled by their husbands, chastity is to be carefully maintained, sexual intercourse is for the production of children (not pleasure), homoerotic relations are completely banned, children are to be reared (not exposed), and their upbringing conducted with attention to noble examples from their ancestral past (2.199-204). Although little of this has a *purely* Roman flavor, it accords very well with the ideals propounded by conservative Roman moralists (Langlands 2006). According to Dionysius, Romulus made provision for the indissolubility of marriage, and punished adultery with the death penalty; women were to be ruled by their husbands (*Ant. rom.* 2.25). He also insisted that most children be raised (*Ant.* 2.15.1-2), and the Judean ban on infant-exposure was still noted (and probably honored) by Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.5.3; cf. Hecataeus *apud* Diodorus 40.3.8). It was a Stoic ideal that sex should be limited to the production of children (Musonius Rufus, frags. 12-13), and one still regarded as the "official" purpose

of marriage (Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.27). Homoeroticism was subject to acute moral censure in Rome, at least for the “pathic” partner, if he was Roman and free (see Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.70; Plutarch, *Mor.* 751b-752c; Richlin 1993). In the education of children, learning about Roman *exempla* was of critical importance: Plutarch’s Cato taught his son to read, to endure hardships, and to learn the history of Rome (Plutarch, *Cat. Maj.* 20.3-5), while Quintilian’s very Roman list of virtues (*fortitudo, iustitia, fides, continentia, frugalitas, contemptus dororis ac mortis*) is taught by the moral example of heroes of the past (*Inst.* 12.2.30). Everything Josephus says in this regard is in accord with conservative Roman ideals.

#### 8. Strict Punishment

One of the most striking features of the Judean culture as depicted in *Apion* is its severity in dealing with transgression. The theme is introduced in 2.178 with reference to the Judean refusal to allow exemption from punishment, but it becomes most prominent in the summary of the laws (2.190-218), where the death penalty is mentioned repeatedly (2.199, 210, 206, 207). The summary is concluded with reference to punitive legislation, which offers no excuses to transgressors (2.214), and a repetition and extension of the capital charges (2.215-17). This theme is repeated later in a contrast between the laxity of others’ legislation, which allows all kinds of excuse and evasion, and the strict imposition of penalties practiced by Judeans (2.276-77). Even the peroration returns to this theme, with emphasis on the laws as inexorable (ἀπαράιτητος; cf. 2.178, 215, 262) in punishment. This is a virtue admired by any moralist in antiquity, especially any influenced by Stoicism. We find the same theme in *Hypoth.* 7.1-2, a text closely related to *Apion* (see Appendix 5). But it is also prominent in the Roman notion of *disciplina*, the proper and full exaction of punishment, even by a father on his son. Dionysius repeatedly emphasizes this feature of Romulus’ constitution (*Ant. rom.* 2.24-25), noting its “inexorable wrath” (ἀπαράιτητος ὀργή) against adultery and drunkenness (2.25.7). He also contrasts Roman severity in this regard with lax manners (ἦθη τὰ ἐκκελυμένα) common among the Greeks (2.27.1), a contrast closely parallel to that of Josephus (2.276-77). For Tacitus, this is a time-honored and mostly admirable feature of the Roman tradition (e.g., *Ann.* 3.21; 6.13 [*prisca severitas*]; 11.18; 13.35) though (being Tacitus) he can also appreciate an alternative point of view (*Ann.* 3.50). Precisely what “severity” means, and how far it should be exercised, were matters for debate and dispute, but Josephus takes the moral high ground in his claims on this matter, and could hardly be faulted for such in Rome.

These features of Roman moral discourse form a coherent whole, evoking the simple, strict, brave, and hardworking farmer/soldier of the idealized Roman past. If these standards are what conservative Romans expected of themselves, or imagined of their past, they are also projected outwards in the idealization, or the moral critique, of non-Romans. An especially interesting example may be found in Tacitus’ depiction of the Germans.<sup>5</sup> In this ethnography, as is common elsewhere, Tacitus employs the trope of the idealized primitive people (the ancient equivalent of the “noble savage”)—those who live closer to nature and thus free of the corruptions of “civilization,” such as greed, luxury, or sloth. Tacitus’ portrait of the Germans is both positive and negative, and both reveal his moral stance: where he praises the Germans he contrasts them, sometimes explicitly, with the moral decadence of his day, and where he criticizes them he implies a Roman standard of measurement. Chief among the faults of the Germans is their lack of application to agriculture, born from an impetuous spirit: “one could more easily persuade them to challenge an enemy and earn their wounds than to plough the soil and await the annual harvest” (14.3; cf. 15.1-3, a parallel to Josephus’ critique of Spartans). On the other hand, prominent among their virtues are courage in warfare (6.3-6), their strict system of punishments (7.2-4 [in the hands of the priests]; 12.1-2), their economic simplicity (no charging of interest, 26.1), and their lack of ostentation in funeral rites or monuments to the dead (27.1-2). Tacitus also goes to some lengths in extolling their strict sexual morality and noble family code. In contrast to Roman decadence, “no one there is amused at vice, nor calls the corruption of others and oneself ‘modern life’” (19.1). Living lives of “well-protected chastity, corrupted by none of the enticements of public performances, none of the temptations of banquets, men and women are equally ignorant of the secrets that letters can hold”; as a result “there are extremely few instances of adultery” (19.1). Moreover, “to limit the number of their children, or kill any offspring born after the first is considered an outrage” (19.2). With a cynical comment on Roman legislation, Tacitus concludes: “good morals there are stronger than good laws are elsewhere” (19.2). One may conclude that if Tacitus had read and (just as importantly) believed Josephus’ *Apion*, he would have made equally appreciative remarks.

<sup>5</sup> On his *Germania*, see especially Lund 1988; Rives 1999; the translations below are from Rives.

### III. *Conclusions*

The above survey suggests that, at least in part, *Apion* aligns Judeans with Romans, politically and culturally, both in what is said overtly, and in what is left unsaid or merely implied. It is important to keep a sense of proportion here. The data we have picked out from the text represent only *some* elements in a long and complex document: there are long stretches of the treatise (especially in book 1) where its Roman context is invisible, and there are other features of the Judean constitution (e.g., its definition as “theocracy,” or the weekly learning of the law) to which one would be hard pressed to find “Roman” parallels. What is more, as we have noted, several of the virtues here highlighted are rooted in broader or earlier cultural traditions: one would not have to be Roman to approve of most of the above. Authorial intentions are hard to discern in this matter: some of the material in Josephus’ summary is inherited from earlier Judean tradition (see Appendix 5), and it is difficult to gauge how much he has molded that tradition into a particularly “Roman” form. It may be significant that in the final three summaries of Judean virtues (2.283, 291-92, 293-94) the qualities named above cluster with particular intensity. That might suggest an edi-

torial hand in bringing these features to prominence, though even here the parallel with Roman virtue remains implicit. Given the evidence of careful statement (or silence) regarding Romans (see above, § 1), it seems likely that the text was written in awareness of its political and cultural context. It is difficult to say whether, or to what extent, Josephus deliberately “Romanized” his portrait of Judean culture, but it is fair to conclude that there is much here that would seem congruent with Roman virtues and attractive to Romanized readers. To judge from both Juvenal and Tacitus, Judeans could be represented in Rome as devotees of an antisocial cult whose values were the very antithesis of the Roman way of life: *profana illic omnia quae apud nos sacra, rursum concessa apud illos quae nobis incesta* (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4.1; cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.96-106). There is much in *Apion* that would help to dispel that prejudice, whether consciously made prominent for that purpose, or simply embedded in Judean tradition and in Josephus’ own Romanized outlook. Although the Judeans in this treatise are not simply “Romans” from another place, they are at least partly presented in ways that a Romanized audience would both understand and applaud.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, L.C. 1993. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alexander, L.C. 1999. The Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text. Pp. 15-44 in M. Edwards, M. Goodman, and S. Price, eds. 1999. *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Altshuler, D. 1978-79. The Treatise "On Customs and Causes" by Flavius Josephus. *JQR* 69: 226-32.
- Amir, Y. 1985-88. θεοκρατία as a Concept of Political Philosophy: Josephus' Presentation of Moses' *Politeia*. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 8-9: 83-105.
- Amir, Y. 1994. Josephus on the Mosaic 'Constitution.' Pp. 13-27 in H.G. Reventlow et al., eds. *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Applebaum, S. 1979. *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Arlenius, A.P. 1544. *Flavii Iosephi Opera*. Basel: Froben.
- Ashcroft, B., G. Griffiths, and H. Tiffin, eds. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literature*. London: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., G. Griffiths, and H. Tiffin, eds. 1998. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Attridge, H.W. 1976. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- Attridge, H.W. and Oden, R.A. 1981. *Philo of Byblos, The Phoenician History. Introduction, Critical Text, Translation, Notes*. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Aune, D.E. 1982. The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus. *JBL* 101: 419-21.
- Aziza, C. 1987. L'utilisation polémique du récit de l'Exode chez les écrivains alexandrins (IV<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.– I<sup>er</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.). *ANRW* II.20.1: 41-65.
- Baer, R.A. 1970. *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Balch, D.L. 1981. *Let Wives be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Balch, D.L. 1982. Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius on Rome and Josephus on the Jews. *JSJ* 13: 102-22.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1979. *Romans and Aliens*. London: Duckworth.
- Barber, G.L. 1935. *The Historian Ephorus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barclay, J.M.G. 1996a. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan, (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Barclay, J.M.G. 1996b. "Do we undermine the law?" A Study of Romans 14.1-15.6. Pp. 287-308 in J.D.G. Dunn, ed. *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Barclay, J.M.G. 1998a. Josephus v. Apion: Analysis of an Argument. Pp. 194-221 in S. Mason, ed. *Understanding Josephus. Seven Perspectives*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Barclay, J.M.G. 1998b. Who was considered an apostate in the Jewish Diaspora? Pp. 80-98 in G.N. Stanton and G.G. Stroumsa, eds. *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barclay, J.M.G. 2000. Judaism in Roman Dress: Josephus' Tactics in the *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 231-245 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999*. Münster: LIT.
- Barclay, J.M.G. 2004. The Politics of Contempt: Judaeans and Egyptians in Josephus's *Against Apion*. Pp. 109-27 in J.M.G. Barclay, ed. *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. London: T & T Clark International.
- Barclay, J.M.G. 2005a. The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome. Pp. 315-32 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barclay, J.M.G. 2005b. Judean Historiography in Rome: Josephus and History in *Contra Apionem* Book 1. Pp. 29-43 in J. Sievers and G. Lembi, eds. *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Leiden: Brill.
- Barclay, J.M.G. forthcoming (a). Snarling Sweetly: A Study of Josephus on Idolatry. In S.C. Barton, ed. *Idolatry*. London: T & T Clark International.
- Barclay, J.M.G. forthcoming (b). 'By the Grace of God I am what I am.' Grace and Agency in Philo and Paul. In S.J. Gathercole and J.M.G. Barclay, eds. *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Context*. London: T & T Clark International.

- Barclay, J.M.G. forthcoming (c). Memory Politics: Josephus on Jews in the Memory of the Greeks.
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1989. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1995-96. The Hellenistic 'Blood-Libel'—Its Contents, Sources, and Transmission. *Tarbiz* 65: 347-74 (Hebrew).
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1996a. *Pseudo-Hecataeus "On the Jews": Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1996b. An Ass in the Jerusalem Temple: The Origins and Development of the Slander. Pp. 310-26 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1997. Aristotle, the Learned Jew and the Indian Kalanoi. *Tarbiz* 67: 435-81 (Hebrew).
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1999. The Wisdom of the Jew and the Wisdom of Aristotle. Pp. 241-50 in J.U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1999-2000a. The Anti-Jewish Treatise of Apollonius Molon. *Tarbiz* 69: 5-58 (Hebrew).
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1999-2000b. Lysimachus of Alexandria and the Hostile Traditions Concerning the Exodus. *Tarbiz* 69: 471-506 (Hebrew).
- Bar-Kochva, B. 2000. Apollonius Molon versus Posidonius of Apamea. Pp. 22-37 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999*. Münster: LIT.
- Bar-Kochva, B. 2001. A Distorted Account of the Jewish Origo (C 1 :305-311). Pp. 11-28 in J.U. Kalms ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Amsterdam 2000*. Münster: LIT
- Barnes, T.D. 2005. The Sack of the Temple in Josephus and Tacitus. Pp. 129-44 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barrett, C.K. 1994. *The Acts of the Apostles: Vol. 1 (Acts I–XIV)*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Barth, F. 1969. Introduction. Pp. 9-38 in F. Barth, ed., *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Barton, C.A. 2001. *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones*. Berkeley : University of California Press.
- Barton, J. 1986. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd.
- Barton, S.C.B. and G.H.R. Horsley, 1981. A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches. *JAC* 24 : 7-41.
- Bauckham, R. 1996. Josephus' Account of the Temple in *Contra Apionem* 2.102-109. Pp. 327-47 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Baumgarten, A.I. 1981. *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos: A Commentary*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Baumgarten, A.I. 1984-89. *Korban* and the Pharisaic *Paradosis*. *JANESCU* 16-17: 5-17.
- Beard, M. 1986. Cicero and Divination: The Formation of a Latin Discourse. *JRS* 76: 33-46.
- Beard, M. et al. 1991. *Literacy in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology.
- Beard, M., J. North, and S. Price, 1998. *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beaulieu, P.-A. 1989. *The Reign of Nabonidus King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Becher, I. 1966. *Das Bild der Kleopatra in der griechischen und lateinischen Literatur*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Beckerath, J. von 1964. *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten*. Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin.
- Beckerath, J. von 1994. *Chronologie des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg.
- Beckerath, J. von 1999. *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Beckwith, R. 1985. *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Begg, C.T. and P. Spilsbury, 2005. *Flavius Josephus. Translation and Commentary*, ed. S. Mason. Vol. 5: *Judean Antiquities Books 8-10*. Leiden: Brill (=BJP 5).
- Bekker, I. 1855-56. *Flavii Iosephi opera omnia ab Immanuele Bekkero recognita*. 6 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Belkin, S. 1936. *The Alexandrian Halakah in Apologetic Literature of the First Century C.E.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Belkin, S. 1936-37. The Alexandrian Source for Contra Apionem II. *JQR* 27: 1-21.
- Berger, K. 1984. Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament. *ANRW* II.25.2: 1031-1432.
- Bernays, J. 1885. *Gesammelte Abhandlungen, vol. 1* (ed. H. Usener). Berlin: W. Hertz.
- Berthelot, K. 1999. κοινωνία et φιλανθρωπία dans le *Contre Apion* de Flavius Josephus. Pp. 94-123 in J.U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- Berthelot, K. 2000. The Use of Greek and Roman Stereotypes of the Egyptians by Hellenistic Jewish Apologists,

- with special reference to Josephus' *Against Apion*. Pp. 185-221 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999*. Münster: LIT.
- Berthelot, K. 2003. *Philanthrôpia Judaica: Le débat autour de la "misanthropie" des lois juives dans l'Antiquité*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bhabha, H.K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bickerman, E.J. 1952. *Origines Gentium*. CP 47: 65-81.
- Bickerman, E.J. 1979. *The God of the Maccabees*. Translated by H. Moehring. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bickerman, E.J. 1980. Ritualmord und Eselkult: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte antiker Publizistik. Pp. 225-55 in *idem*, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History, Vol. 2*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bietak, M. 1996. *Avaris: The Capital of the Hyksos. Recent Excavations at Tell el-Dab'a*. London: British Museum Press.
- Bietak, M. 1997. Avaris, Capital of the Hyksos Kingdom: New Results of Excavations. Pp. 87-140 in E.D. Oren, ed. *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, University Museum.
- Bilde, P. 1988. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Bilde, P. 1996. *Contra Apionem* 1.28-56: Josephus' View of His Own Work in the Context of the Jewish Canon. Pp. 94-114 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bloch, R. 1999. Mose und die Scharlatane. Zum Vorwurf γόης καὶ ἀπατερόν in *Contra Apionem* 2:145.161. Pp. 142-57 in J.U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- Bloch, R. 2000. Geography without Territory: Tacitus' Digression on the Jews and its Ethnographic Context. Pp. 38-54 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999*. Münster: LIT.
- Bohak, G. 1995. CPJ III, 520: The Egyptian Reaction to Onias' Temple. *JSJ* 26: 32-41.
- Bollansée, J. 1999. *Hermippos of Smyrna (Die Fragmenta der griechischen Historiker. Volume IVA, Fascicle 3F)*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bonneau, D. 1993. *Le Régime administratif de l'eau du Nil dans l'Égypte Greque, Romaine et Byzantine*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Boswell, J. 1988. *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*. London: Penguin Press.
- Bowersock, G. 1994. *Fiction as History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bowersock, G. 1995. *Martyrdom and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyarin, D. 1999. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Boysen, C. 1898. *Flavii Iosephi Opera ex Versione Latina Antiqua. VI: De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive Contra Apionem*. Vienna: Tempsky.
- Boys-Stones, G. 2001. *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Braun, H. 1938. *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Briquel-Chatonnet, F. 1992. *Les Relations entre les Cités de la Côte phénicienne et les Royaumes d'Israël et de Juda*. Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek.
- Bringmann, K. 1983. *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Briscoe, J. 1969. Eastern Policy and Seleucid Politics 169–146 BCE. *Historia* 18: 49-70.
- Brown, P. 1988. *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Bruce, F.F. 1965. Josephus and Daniel. *ASTI* 4: 148-62.
- Burkert, W. 1987 *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Burnet, J. 1924. *Plato's Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates and Crito*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Burstein, S.M. 1978. *The Babyloniaca of Berossus*. Malibu: Undena Publication.
- Burstein, S.M. 1989. *Agatharchides of Cnidus: On the Erythraean Sea*. London: Hakluyt Society.
- Busink, Th.A. 1980. *Der Tempel von Jerusalem. Vol. 2*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Büttner-Wobst, T. 1906. *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*. I: 2, Berlin: Weidmann.
- Cadbury, H.J. 1922. Commentary on the Preface of Luke. Pp. 489-510 in F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. II: Prolegomena II*. London: Macmillan.
- Calabi, F. 1993. *Flavio Giuseppe: In Difesa degli Ebrei (Contro Apione)*. Venezia: Marsilio.
- Cameron, A. 1932. The Exposure of Children and Greek Ethics. *Classical Review* 46: 105-14.



- Campbell, R.A. 1994. *The Elders. Seniority within Earliest Christianity*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Cancik, H. 1987. Theokratie und Priesterherrschaft. Die mosaische Verfassung bei Flavius Josephus, c. Apionem 2, 157-198. Pp. 65-77 in J. Taubes, ed. *Religionstheorie und Politische Theologie. Vol 3: Theokratie*. München: W. Fink.
- Cardauns, B. 1978. Varro und die römische Religion. *ANRW* II.16.1: 80-103.
- Carleton Paget, J. 1994. *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Carras, G.P. 1989 Paul, Josephus and Judaism. The Shared Judaism of Paul and Josephus. D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University.
- Carras, G.P. 1993 Dependence or Common Tradition in Philo *Hypothetica* VIII 6.10-7.20 and Josephus *Contra Apionem* 2.190-219. *SPhilo* 5: 24-47.
- Carson, A. 1990. Putting Her in Her Place: Women, Dirt, and Desire. Pp. 135-54 in D. Halperin, J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin, eds. *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carter, J.M. 1970. *The Battle of Actium*. London: Hamilton.
- Cartledge, P. and A. Spawforth 2002. *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta: A Tale of Two Cities*. 2nd edition, London: Routledge.
- Castelli, S. 2001. *Antiquities* 3-4 and *Against Apion* 2.145ff. Different Approaches to the Law. Pp. 151-69 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Amsterdam 2000*. Münster: LIT.
- Catastini, A. 1995. Le Testimonianze di Manetone e la 'Storia di Giuseppe' (*Genesi* 37-50). *Henoch* 17: 279-300.
- Cataudella, Q. 1933. Jos. 'c. Ap' I, 189. *Rivista di Filologia* 61: 75-76.
- Césaire, A. 1972. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Trans. J. Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Chapman, S.B. 2000. *The Law and the Prophets. A Study in Old Testament Canon Formation*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Childs, P. and P. Williams. 1997. *An Introduction to Postcolonial Theory*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Clark, K.W. 1959-60. Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A.D. 70. *NTS* 6: 269-80.
- Cohen, S.J.D. 1979. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome. His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Cohen, S.J.D. 1987. Respect for Judaism by Gentiles in the Writings of Josephus. *HTR* 80: 409-30.
- Cohen, S.J.D. 1988. History and Historiography in the *Against Apion* of Josephus. Pp. 1-11 in *History and Theory, Beiheft 27: Essays in Jewish Historiography*.
- Cohen, S.J.D. 1994. ἸΟΥΔΑΙΟΣ ΤΟ ΓΕΝΟΣ and Related Expressions in Josephus. Pp. 23-38 in F. Parente and J. Sievers, eds. *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Cohen, S.J.D. 1999. *The Beginnings of Jewishness. Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cohn, L. 1905. Epaphroditus. *PW* V: 2711-14.
- Cohn, L. and P. Wendland, 1896-1930. *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*. 7 vols. Berlin: G. Reimer.
- Colcace, P. Radici 1976. Choeril. Sam. Fr. 4 Naeke. *Rivista di Filologia* 104: 15-20.
- Collins, A.Y. 1976. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- Collins, J.J. 2000. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2nd edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Collins, J.J. 2005. Anti-Semitism in Antiquity? The Case of Alexandria. Pp. 9-29 in C. Bakhos, ed. *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context*. Leiden: Brill.
- Collins, N. 2000. *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Colson, F.H. 1941. *Philo. Vol. IX* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cotton, H.M. and W. Eck, 2005. Josephus' Roman Audience: Josephus and the Roman Elites. Pp. 37-52 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cramer, F.H. 1954. *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Crouch, J.E. 1972. *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Dawson, D. 1992. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Decharme, P. 1904. *La critique des traditions religieuses chez les Grecs*. Paris: A. Pickard.
- De Jonge, M. 1974 Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes. Pp. 205-19 in O. Betz, K. Haacker, and M. Hengel, eds. *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum and dem Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- De Lange, N.R.M. 1991. The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Ancient Evidence and Modern Interpretations. Pp. 21-37

- in S.L. Gilman and S.T. Katz, eds. *Anti-Semitism in Times of Crisis*. New York: New York University Press.
- Delia, A. 1991. *Alexandrian Citizenship During the Roman Principate*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Delling, G. 1965. Josephus und die heidnischen Religionen. *Klio* 43-45: 263-69.
- Derrett, J.D.M. 1970. ΚΟΡΒΑΝ, Ο ΕΣΤΙΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ. *NTS* 16: 364-68.
- Dietrich, B.C. 1967. *Death, Fate and the Gods: The Development of a Religious Idea in Greek Popular Belief and in Homer*. London: Athlone Press.
- Dihle, A. 1961. Zur hellenistischen Ethnographie. Pp. 205-32 in *Greces et Barbares*. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique VIII. Geneva: Foundation Hardt.
- Dillery, J. 2003. Putting Him Back Together Again: Apion Historian, Apion *Grammatikos*. *CP* 98: 383-90.
- Dindorf, W. 1864. *Flavii Josephi Opera, graece et latine*. 2 vols. Paris: A.F. Didot.
- Dindorf, W. 1875. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Dochhorn, J. 2001. Die auf Menander von Ephesus zurückgehende Liste der Könige von Tyrus in C 1:116-126. Pp. 77-102 in J.U. Kalms, ed., *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Amsterdam 2000*. Münster: LIT.
- Doering, L. 1999. *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und –praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Doran, R. 1985. Pseudo-Hecataeus. Pp. 905-19 in J. Charlesworth, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Dormeyer, D. 2001. Des Josephus zwei *suasoriae* (Übungsreden) “Über das Volk der Juden.” Die beiden Vorworte (Pröomien) C 1:1-5; 2:1-7 und die beiden Vorworte Lk 1,1-4; Act 1,1-14. Pp. 241-61 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Amsterdam 2000*. Münster: LIT.
- Droge, A.J. 1989. *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Droge, A.J. 1996. Josephus between Greeks and Romans. Pp. 115-42 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Droge, A.J. and J.D. Tabor, 1992. *A Noble Death: Suicide and Martyrdom among Christians and Jews in Antiquity*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Du Toit, D.S. 1999. Die Verwendung von θεῖος als Attribut für Menschen in den Schriften des Josephus. Pp. 53-93 in J.U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- Eddy, S.K. 1961. *The King is Dead. Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Edmondson, J., S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. 2005. *Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, M., M. Goodman, and S. Price, eds. 1999. *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elledge, C.D. 2006. *Life After Death in Early Judaism: The Evidence of Josephus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Eissfeldt, O. 1948. Tyros. *PW* VIIA: 1876-1908.
- Esler, P. 2003. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Esler, P. forthcoming. Judean Ethnic Identity in Josephus' *Contra Apionem*.
- Fantham, E. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture From Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Faraone, C.A. 1999. *Ancient Greek Love Magic*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Fascher, E. 1963. Der Vorwurf der Gottlosigkeit in der Auseinandersetzung bei Juden, Griechen und Christen. Pp. 78-105 in O. Betz et al., eds. *Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Feeney, D.C. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts and Beliefs* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feldman, D.M. 1968 *Birth-Control in Jewish Law: Marital Relations, Contraception, and Abortion as Set Forth in the Classical Texts of Jewish Law*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Feldman, L.H. 1981. *Josephus. Vol. X* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Feldman, L.H. 1984. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Feldman, L.H. 1998. Pro-Jewish Intimations in Anti-Jewish Remarks Cited in Josephus' *Against Apion*. *JQR* 78: 187-251.
- Feldman, L.H. 1990a. Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus. *JTS* 41: 386-422.
- Feldman, L.H. 1990b. Origen's *Contra Celsum* and Josephus' *Contra Apionem*: The Issue of Jewish Origins. *VC* 44: 105-35.

- Feldman, L.H. 1993. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Feldman, L.H. 1998a. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Feldman, L.H. 1998b. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Feldman, L.H. 2000. *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. S. Mason. Vol. 3: *Judean Antiquities 1-4*. Leiden: Brill (=BJP 3).
- Feldman, L.H. 2005. Parallel Lives of Two Lawgivers: Josephus' Moses and Plutarch's Lycurgus. Pp. 209-242 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feldman, L.H. and Levison, J.R., eds. 1996. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Finley, M.I. 1990. *The Use and Abuse of History*. London: Penguin.
- Fish, S. 1989. *Doing What Comes Naturally: Change, Rhetoric, and the Practice of Theory in Literary and Legal Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 1971. *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: G. Chapman.
- Flower, M.A. 1994. *Theopompos of Chios*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Frankfurter, D. 1992. Lest Egypt's City be Deserted: Religion and Ideology in the Egyptian Response to the Jewish Revolt (116-17 C.E.). *JJS* 43: 203-20.
- Frankfurter, D. 1998. *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fraser, P.M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Frede, M. 1989. Chaeremon der Stoiker. *ANRW* II.36.3: 2067-2103.
- Frier, B.W. 1979. *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*. Rome: American Academy in Rome.
- Gabba, E. 1989. The Growth of anti-Judaism or the Greek-attitude towards Jews. Pp. 614-56 in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein, eds. *The Cambridge History of Judaism. Vol 2: The Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gafni, I.M. 1997. *Land, Center, and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Gagarin, M. 1981. *Drakon and the Early Athenian Homicide Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gager, J.G. 1969. Pseudo-Hecataeus Again. *ZNW* 60: 130-39.
- Gager, J.G. 1972. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Gambetti, S. 2003. *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 C.E. and the Persecution of the Jews: A Historical Assessment*, Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Garland, R. 1992. *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*. London: Duckworth.
- Garnsey, P. 1988. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garvie, A.F. 1969. *Aeschylus' Supplices. Play and Trilogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gauger, J-D. 1982. Zitate in der jüdischen Apologetik und die Authentizität der Hekataios-Passagen bei Flavius Josephus und im Ps. Aristeeas-Brief. *JSJ* 13: 6-46.
- Gauthier, P. 1981. La citoyenneté en Grèce et à Rome: participation et intégration. *Ktèma* 6: 167-79.
- Gerber, C. 1994. Die heiligen Schriften des Judentums nach Flavius Josephus. Pp. 91-113 in M. Hengel and H. Löhr, eds. *Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Gerber, C. 1997. *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gerber, C. 1999. Des Josephus Apologie für das Judentum. Prolegomena zu einer Interpretation von C 2:145ff. Pp. 251-69 in J.U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- Gerber, F. 1991. Plut. Caes. 3,1: Eine Korrektur des Flavius Josephus. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 134: 157-61.
- Giangrande, G. 1962. Emendations to Josephus Flavius' *Contra Apionem*. *CQ* 12: 108-17.
- Gianotti, G.F. 2002. Nota Critico-Testuale a Ios. *Contra Apionem* 1.139. *Lexis* 20: 123-32.
- Gibbs, S.L. 1976. *Greek and Roman Sundials*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goldenberg, R. 1974. The Jewish Sabbath in the Roman World. *ANRW* II.19.1: 414-47.
- Goldenberg, R. 1997. The Septuagint Ban on Cursing the Gods. *JSJ* 28: 381-89.

- Goldhill, S., ed. 2001. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldstein, J. 1976. *1 Maccabees* (Anchor Bible Commentary). New York: Doubleday.
- Goodman, M. 1989. Nerva, the *Fiscus Judaicus* and Jewish Identity. *JRS* 79: 40-44.
- Goodman, M. 1994a. *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Goodman, M. 1994b. Josephus as Roman Citizen. Pp. 329-38 in F. Parente and J. Sievers, eds. *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Goodman 1996. The Roman Identity of Roman Jews. Pp. 85-99 in I. Gafni et al., eds. *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World. Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center.
- Goodman, M. 1999. Josephus' Treatise *Against Apion*. Pp. 45-58 in M. Edwards, M. Goodman, and S. Price, eds. *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodman, M. 2005. The *Fiscus Judaicus* and Gentile Attitudes to Judaism in Flavian Rome. Pp. 167-77 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gorman, P. 1983. Pythagoras Palaestinus. *Philologus* 127: 30-42.
- Goudriaan, K. 1988. *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Goudriaan, K. 1992. Ethnical Strategies in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Pp. 74-99 in P. Bilde et al., eds. *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Graf, F. 1997. *Magic in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Grainger, J.D. 2003. *Nerva and the Roman Succession Crisis of AD 96-99*. Melton Park: Routledge.
- Grant, M. 1972. *Cleopatra*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Grant, R.M. 1970. *Theophilus of Antioch, Ad Autolyicum*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Gray, R. 1993. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, A.R. 1983. David's Relations with Hiram: Biblical and Josephan Evidence for Tyrian Chronology. Pp. 373-97 in C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor, eds. *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*. Winowa Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Gregory, A. 1994. "Powerful Images." Responses to Portraits and the Political Use of Images in Rome. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 7: 80-99.
- Griffin, J. 1985. *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. London: Duckworth.
- Griffin, M. 2000a. The Flavians. Pp. 1-83 in A.K. Bowman et al., eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. XI: The High Empire, A.D. 70-192*. Second edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffin, M. 2000b. Nerva to Trajan. Pp. 84-131 in A.K. Bowman et al., eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. XI: The High Empire, A.D. 70-192*. Second edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffiths, J.G. 1953. The Egyptian Derivation of the Name Moses. *JNES* 12: 225-31.
- Griffiths, J.G. 1960a. *The Conflict of Horus and Seth from Egyptian and Classical Sources: a Study in Mythology*. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press.
- Griffiths, J.G. 1960b. The Flight of the Gods before Typhon: an Unrecognized Myth? *Hermes* 88: 374-76.
- Griffiths, J.G. 1970. *Plutarch: De Iside et Osiride*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Griffiths, J.G. 1983. Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Era. Pp. 273-93 in D. Hellholm, ed. *Apocalypticism in the Ancient World and the Near East*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Grimal, N.C. 1992. *A History of Ancient Egypt*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gruen, E.S. 1990. *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Gruen, E.S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. London: Duckworth.
- Gruen, E.S. 1996. The Purported Jewish-Spartan Affiliation. Pp. 254-69 in R.W. Wallace and E.M. Harris, eds. *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in honor of E. Badian*. Norman/London: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Gruen, E.S. 1998. *Heritage and Hellenism. The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gruen, E.S. 2002. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Gruen, E.S. 2005. Greeks and Jews: Mutual Misperceptions in Josephus' *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 31-51 in C. Bakhos, ed. *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gutschmid, A. von, 1893. *Kleine Schriften. Vol. IV* (ed. F. Rühl). Leipzig: Teubner. [cited as Gutschmid].
- Haaland, G. 1999. Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience: Toward an Understanding of *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 282-304 in J. U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- Haaland, G. 2005. Josephus and the Philosophers of Rome: Does *Contra Apionem* Mirror Domitian's Crushing of



- the “Stoic Opposition”? Pp. 297-316 in J. Sievers and G. Lembi, eds. *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Leiden: Brill.
- Haarhoff, T.J. 1948. *The Stranger at the Gate*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Habicht, C. 1989. The Seleucids and their Rivals. Pp. 324-87 in A.E. Astin et al., eds. *Cambridge Ancient History vol. VIII: Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 BC*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hahn, J. with the assistance of C. Ronning, ed. 2002. *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels: Geschehen—Wahrnehmung—Bewältigung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hahn, S. 1950. Josephus on Prayer in C. Ap. II. 197 §. Pp. 111-15 in O. Kolmós, ed. *Etudes Orientales à la Mémoire de Paul Hirschler*. Budapest: Karcag.
- Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hall, J.M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J.M. 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, S. 1990. Cultural Identity and Diaspora. Pp. 222-37 in J. Rutherford, ed. *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hannestad, N. 1986. *Roman Art and Imperial Policy*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Hansen, G. 2001. Das letzte Werk des Josephus und seine Textgestalt. Pp. 65-75 in J.U. Kalms, ed., *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Amsterdam 2000*. Münster: LIT.
- Hardwick, M.E. 1989. *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Hardwick, M.E. 1996. *Contra Apionem* and Christian Apologetics. Pp. 369-402 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Harnack, A. von 1905. *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Harris, W.V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Harrison, J.R. 2003. *Paul's Language of Grace in its Graeco-Roman Context*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Harrison, T. 2000. *The Emptiness of Asia: Aeschylus' Persians and the History of the Fifth Century*. London: Duckworth.
- Hartog, F. 1988. *The Mirror of Herodotus: the Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Harvey, G. 1996. *The True Israel. Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Hayes, W.C. 1973. Egypt from the Death of Ammenemes III to Sequenre II. Pp. 313-416 in I.E.S. Edwards et al., eds. *Cambridge Ancient History vol. II.1*. Third edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayward, C.T.R. 1996. *The Jewish Temple: a non-biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge.
- Heinemann, I. 1931. Antisemitismus. *PW* Supplement V: 3-43.
- Heinemann, I. 1932. *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*. Breslau: Marcus.
- Helck, H.W. 1956. *Untersuchungen zu Manetho and den ägyptischen Königslisten*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Hengel, M. 1971. Proseuche und Synagoge. Jüdische Gemeinde, Gotteshaus und Gottesdienst in der Diaspora und in Palästina. Pp. 157-84 in G. Jeremias et al., eds. *Tradition und Glaube*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hengel, M. 1974. *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. London: SCM Press.
- Hengel, M. 1981. *The Charismatic Leader and his Followers*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Hennig, D. 1972. Zur Ägyptenreise des Germanicus. *Chiron* 2: 349-65.
- Hezser, C. 2001. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hilgard, A. 1901. *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticem*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Höffken, P. 2001. Zum Kanonbewusstsein des Josephus Flavius in *Contra Apionem* und in den *Antiquitates*. *JSJ* 32: 159-77.
- Hölbl, G. 1994. *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Holladay, C.R. 1983. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Vol. 1: Historians*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Holladay, C.R. 1989. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Vol. 2: Poets*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Holladay, C.R. 1995. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Vol. 3: Aristobulus*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Hölscher, G. 1916. Josephus. *PW* IX: 1934-2000.
- Honigman, S. 1997. Philon, Flavius Josephus, et la Citoyenneté Alexandrine: vers une Utopie Politique. *JJS* 48: 62-90.
- Horbury, W. 1991. Herod's Temple and Herod's Days. Pp. 103-49 in W. Horbury, ed. *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

- Horbury, W. and D. Noy 1992. *Jewish Inscriptions in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornblower, J. 1981. *Hieronymus of Cardia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, J. 1720. *Flavii Josephi Opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*. Oxford: Sheldon.
- Hughes, D.D. 1991. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge.
- Hughes-Hallett, L. 1990. *Cleopatra: Histories, Dreams and Distortions*. London: Pimlico.
- Hutchinson, J. and A.D. Smith, 1996. *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huxley, G. 1969. Choirilus of Samos. *GRBS* 10: 12-29.
- Ilan, T. 1996. *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Inowlocki, S. 2005a. "Neither Adding nor Omitting Anything": Josephus' Promise not to Modify the Scriptures in Greek and Latin Context. *JJS* 56: 48-65.
- Inowlocki, S. 2005b. La pratique de la citation dans le *Contre Apion* de Flavius Josèphe. *Ktèma* 30: 371-93.
- Isaac, B. 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Iser, W. 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jablónski, P.E. 1804. *Opuscula quibus lingua et antiquitas aegyptiorum difficilia librorum sacrorum loca et historiae ecclesiasticae capita illustrantur* (ed. J.G. TeWater). Leiden: Honkoop.
- Jackson, B.S. 1975. *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Jacobs, A.S. 2004. *Remains of the Jews. The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Jacobson, H. 1976. Hermippus, Pythagoras and the Jews. *REJ* 135: 145-49.
- Jacobson, H. 1977. Apion's Nickname. *AJP* 98: 413-15.
- Jacobson, H. 2000. Apion Ciceronianus. *Mnemosune* 53: 592.
- Jacobson, H. 2001. Apion, the Jews, and Human Sacrifice. *CQ* 51: 318-19.
- Jacoby, A. 1927. Der angebliche Eselkult der Juden und Christen. *AR* 25: 265-82.
- Jacoby, F. 1943. *Die Fragmenta der griechischen Historiker. Vol. 3A*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Jacoby, F. 1949. *Attis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Jaeger, W. 1938. *Diokles von Karystos. Die griechische Medizin und die Schule des Aristoteles*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Janne, H. 1936. Un contresens de Cassiodore: les "furets" du *Contre Apion*. *Byzantion* 11: 225-27.
- Jeremias, J. 1969. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. London: SCM Press.
- Johnson, S. 2004. *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jones, B.W. 1992. *The Emperor Domitian*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, B.W. 1996. *Suetonius, Domitian: Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Bibliography*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Jones, C.P. 1971. *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Jones, C.P. 2002. Towards a Chronology of Josephus. *Studia Classica Israelica* 21: 113-21.
- Jones, K.R. 2005. The Figure of Apion in Josephus' *Contra Apionem*. *JSJ* 36: 278-315.
- Jonquière, T. 2001. Prayer in *Contra Apionem* 2:195-97. Pp. 171-88 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Amsterdam 2000*. Münster: LIT.
- Kamlah, E. 1974. Frömmigkeit und Tugend. Die Gesetzesapologie des Josephus in c Ap 2, 145-295. Pp. 220-32 in O. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel, eds. *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kapparis, K. 2002. *Abortion in the Ancient World*. London: Duckworth.
- Kasher, A. 1985. *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kasher, A. 1996a. Hecataeus of Abdera on Mosollamus the Jewish Mounted Archer (*Contra Apionem* 1.200-204). Pp. 147-58 in H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer, eds. *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. Band 1: Judentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kasher, A. 1996b. Polemic and Apologetic Methods of Writing in *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 143-86 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Kasher, A. 1997. *Flavius Josephus: Against Apion*. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center (Hebrew).
- Katzenstein, H.J. 1973. *The History of Tyre*. Jerusalem: Schocken Institute for Jewish Research.
- Keeble, K. 1991. *A Critical Study of Flavius Josephus Contra Apionem*. M.Phil. thesis, Oxford University.
- Kirk, G.S. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol.2: Books 5-8*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klawans, J. 2000. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koenen, L. 1968. Die Prophezeiungen des "Töpfers." *ZPE* 2: 178-209.

- Koenen, L. 1974. Bemerkungen zum Text des Töpferorakels und zu dem Akaziensymbol. *ZPE* 13: 313-19.
- Koenen, L. 1983. Die Adaptation ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof. Pp. 143-90 in E. Van't Dack et al., eds. *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*. Leuven: Studia Hellenistica.
- Kokkinos, N. 1998. *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kovacs, J.L. and C. Rowland, 2004. *Revelation: the Apocalypse of Jesus Christ*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kraeling, C.H. 1932. The Jewish Community at Antioch. *JBL* 51: 130-60.
- Krauter, S. 2004. *Bürgerrecht und Kultteilnahme: Politische und kultische Rechte und Pflichten in griechischen Poleis, Rom und antiken Judentum*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Krieger, K.-S. 1999. Eine Überlegung zur Datierung der *Vita*. Pp. 189-208 in J.U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- Krieger, K.-S. 2000. Die Funktionen der Septuaginta-Legende in Flavius Josephus' Werken *Antiquitates* und *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 246-61 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999*. Münster: LIT.
- Küchler, M. 1979. *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen. Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kuhrt, A. 1987. Berossus' *Babyloniaka* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia. Pp. 32-56 in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White, eds. *Hellenism in the East. The Interaction of Greek and non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*. London: Duckworth.
- Kuhrt, A. 1995. *The Ancient Near East c.3000–330 BC*. Vol. 2. London: Routledge.
- Kushnir-Stein, A. 2002. The Coinage of Agrippa II. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21: 123-31.
- Labow, D. 2005. *Flavius Josephus Contra Apionem, Buch 1. Einleitung, Text, Textkritischer Apparat, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Lambers-Petry, D. 2001. Proselytenwerbung bei Josephus? Überlegungen zur Absicht der Schrift *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 223-38 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Amsterdam 2000*. Münster: LIT.
- Lane Fox, R. 1986. *Pagans and Christians*. London: Penguin.
- Langlands, R. 2006. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laqueur, R. 1920. *Der Jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus: ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Giessen: v. Münchow.
- Laqueur, R. 1928. Manethon. *PW* XIV: 1061-1101.
- Launey, M. 1949. *Recherches sur les Armées Hellénistiques*. Paris: de Boccard.
- Lebram, J.C.H. 1968. Aspekte der Alttestamentlichen Kanonsbildung. *VT* 18: 173-89.
- Leiman, S.Z. 1989. Josephus and the Canon of the Bible. Pp. 50-58 in L.H. Feldman and G. Hata, eds. *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Leonhardt, J. 2001. *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Levick, B. 1999. *Vespasian*. London: Routledge.
- Levine, L.I. 2000. *The Ancient Synagogue. The First Two Thousand Years*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Levinskaya, I. 1996. *The Book of Acts in its Diaspora Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Levison, J.R. and J.R. Wagner, 1996. Introduction: The Character and Context of Josephus' *Against Apion*. Pp. 1-48 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Levison, J.R. 2002. The Roman Character of Funerals in the Writings of Josephus. *JSJ* 33: 245-77.
- Lévy, H. 1946. Tacite et l'origine du peuple juif. *Latomus* 5: 331-40.
- Lévy, I. 1900. Notes d'Histoire de d'Épigraphie. *REJ* 41: 174-95.
- Lévy, I. 1950-51. Ptolémée Lathyre et les Juifs. *HUCA* 23.2: 127-36.
- Lewy, H. 1932. Hekataios von Abdera περί Ἰουδαίων. *ZNW* 31: 117-32.
- Lewy, H. 1938. Aristotle and the Jewish Sage according to Clearchus of Soli. *HTR* 31: 205-35.
- Lieberg, G. 1973. Die "theologia tripertita" in Forschung und Bezeugung. *ANRW* I.4: 63-115.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. 2000. Religion. Pp. 984-1008 in A. Bowman, P. Garnsey, and D. Rathbone, eds. *Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. XI: The High Empire A.D. 70-192*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lilja, S. 1983. *Homosexuality in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Lindemann, A. 1995. "Do not let a woman destroy the unborn baby in her belly." Abortion in Ancient Judaism and Christianity. *ST* 49: 253-71.
- Lindner, H. 1972. *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

- Lindsay, D.R. 1993. *Josephus and Faith. Πίστις and Πιστεύειν as Faith Terminology in the Writings of Flavius Josephus and in the New Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Ling, R. 1991. *Roman Painting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liver, J. 1953. The Chronology of Tyre at the Beginning of the First Millennium B.C. *IEJ* 3: 113-20.
- Lloyd, A.B. 1975. *Herodotus, Book 2: Introduction*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Lloyd, A.B. 1976. *Herodotus, Book 2. Commentary 1-98*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Lloyd, A.B. 1982. Nationalist Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt. *Historia* 31: 33-55.
- Lloyd, A.B. 1988. *Herodotus, Book 2. Commentary 99-182*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Loomba, A. 1998. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Loraux, N. 1993. *The Children of Athena*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Loraux, N. 2000. *Born of the Earth: Myth and Politics in Athens*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lord, A.B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Luce, T.J. 1989. Ancient Views on the Causes of Bias in Historical Writing. *CP* 84: 16-31.
- Lüderitz, G. (with appendix by J. Reynolds) 1983. *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika*. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- Lund, A.A. 1988. *P. Cornelius Tacitus: Germania*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Luther, H. 1910. *Josephus und Justus von Tiberius: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des jüdischen Aufstandes*. Halle: Wischan & Burkhardt.
- Macaulay, T.B. 1835/1972. Minute on Indian Education. Pp. 244-50 in J. Clive and T. Pinney, eds. *T.B. Macaulay: Selected Writings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McDonald, L.M. and J.A. Sanders, 2002. Introduction. Pp. 3-17 in L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders, eds. *The Canon Debate*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- MacDowell, D.M. 1986. *Spartan Law*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Macfie, A.L. 2000. *Orientalism: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- MacKenzie, J. 1995. *Orientalism: History, Theory, and the Arts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- McLaren, J.S. 2004. Constructing Judean History in the Diaspora: Josephus's Accounts of Judas. Pp. 90-108 in J.M.G. Barclay, ed. *Negotiating Diaspora. Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. London: T & T Clark International.
- Mader, G. 2000. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management*. Leiden: Brill.
- Malaise, M. 1972. *Les conditions de pénétrations et de diffusion des cults égyptiens en Italie*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Malkin, I., ed. 2001. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Washington: Center for Hellenic Studies.
- March, J. 1998. *Cassell's Dictionary of Classical Mythology*. London: Cassell.
- Marcus, J. 2000. "Under the Law:" the Background of a Pauline Expression. *CBQ* 62: 72-83.
- Marcus, R. 1946. Antisemitism in the Hellenistic-Roman World. Pp. 61-78 in K.S. Pinson, ed. *Essays on Antisemitism*. New York: Conference on Jewish Relations.
- Marincola, J. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marrou, H.I. 1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. London: Sheed and Ward.
- Martin, D. 1995. Heterosexism and the Interpretation of Romans 1.18-32. *BibInt* 3: 332-55.
- Martin, D. 2002. Paul and the Judaism/Hellenism Dichotomy: Toward a Social History of the Question. Pp. 29-61 in T. Engberg-Pedersen, ed. *Paul beyond the Hellenism/Judaism Divide*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Martin, D. 2004. *Inventing Superstition: from the Hippocratics to the Christians*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Mason, S. 1991. *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition-Critical Study*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Mason, S. 1994. Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House. Pp. 161-91 in F. Parente and J. Sievers, eds. *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Mason, S. 1996. The *Contra Apionem* in Social and Literary Context: An Invitation to Judean Philosophy. Pp. 187-228 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Mason, S. 1998. Should Any Wish to Enquire Further (*Ant.* 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus's *Judean Antiquities/Life*. Pp. 64-103 in S. Mason, ed. *Understanding Josephus. Seven Perspectives*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Mason, S. 2000. Introduction to the *Judean Antiquities*. Pp. xiii-xlv in L.H. Feldman, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. S. Mason. Vol. 3: *Judean Antiquities 1-4*. Leiden: Brill (=BJP 3).



- Mason, S. 2001. *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. S. Mason. Vol. 9: *Life of Josephus*. Leiden: Brill (=BJP 9).
- Mason, S. 2002. Josephus and his Twenty-Two Book Canon. Pp. 110-27 in L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders, eds. *The Canon Debate*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Mason, S. 2003a. *Josephus and the New Testament*. Second edition; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Mason, S. 2003b. Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading On and Between the Lines. Pp. 559-89 in A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, eds., *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden: Brill
- Mason, S. 2005a. Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the Context of a Flavian Audience. Pp. 71-100 in J. Sievers and G. Lembi, eds. *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Leiden: Brill.
- Mason, S. 2005b. Figured Speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus. Pp. 243-88 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mason, S. forthcoming (a). Introduction to the Judean War.
- Mason, S. forthcoming (b). Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Taxonomical Challenges for Time Travellers.
- Mason, S. forthcoming (c). The Essenes of Josephus' *Judean War*: From Story to History. In Z. Rodgers, ed. *Making History: Josephus and the Historical Method*. Leiden: Brill.
- Matthews, S. 2001. *First Converts: Rich Pagan Women and the Rhetoric of Mission in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mattingly, D.J., ed. 1997. *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology.
- Mattingly, H. 1936. *Coins of the British Empire in the British Museum, Vol. 3*. London: British Museum.
- Mayer-Schärdel, B. 1995. *Das Frauenbild des Josephus: Eine sozialgeschichtliche und kulturanthropologische Untersuchung*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Meeks, W.A. 1967. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Mendels, D. 1987. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Mendels, D. 1990. The Apologetic Character of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*. Pp. 91-110 in H. Verdin et al., eds. *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.* Louvain: Louvain University Press.
- Meyer, E. 1904. *Aegyptische Chronologie*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Meyer, E. 1931. *Geschichte des Altertums*. Second edition, Stuttgart: Cotta.
- Meyer, R. 1974. Bemerkungen zum literargeschichtlichen Hintergrund der Kanonstheorie des Josephus. Pp. 285-99 in O. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel, eds. *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Millar, F. 1983. The Phoenician Cities: A Case Study of Hellenisation. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 29: 55-71.
- Millar, F. 2005. Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome. Pp. 101-28 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mitteis, L. and U. Wilcken, 1912. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde Vol. I.2*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Modrzejewski, J.M. 1995. *The Jews of Egypt from Ramses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Moessner, D. 1996. "Eyewitnesses," "Informed Contemporaries," and "Unknown Inquirers": Josephus' Criteria for Authentic Historiography and the Meaning of παρακολουθέω. *NovT* 38: 105-22.
- Momigliano, A. 1966. Un'Apologia des Giudaismo: Il "Contro Apione" di Flavio Giuseppe. Pp. 513-22 in *Terzo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici. Vol. 1*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Momigliano, A. 1969. Time in Ancient Historiography. Pp. 13-41 in *Quarto Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del mondo antico*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Momigliano, A. 1975a. *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press.
- Momigliano, A. 1975b. Intorno al Contro Apione. Pp. 765-84 in *Quinto Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Momigliano, A. 1977. Interpretazioni Minime. *Athenaeum* 55: 186-90.
- Momigliano, A. 1984. The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography. Pp. 29-44 in *Secondo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Montet, P. 1941. *Le Drame d'Avaris. Essai sur la pénétration des Sémites en Egypte*. Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Moore, S.D. 2001. *God's Beauty Parlour*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Moore, S.D. 2005. Questions of Biblical Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi; or, the Postcolonial and the Postmodern. Pp. 79-96 in S.D. Moore and F.F. Segovia, eds. *Postcolonial Biblical Criti-*

- cism: Interdisciplinary Intersections*. London: T & T Clark International.
- Moore, S.D. and F.F. Segovia, eds. 2005. *Postcolonial Biblical Criticism: Interdisciplinary Intersections*. London: T & T Clark International.
- Moore-Gilbert, B. 1997. *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*. London: Verso.
- Mørkholm, O. 1966. *Antiochus IV of Syria*. Copenhagen: Glydendal.
- Motzo, B. 1911-12. Le Ὑποθετικά di Filone. *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 47: 556-73.
- Motzo, B. 1912-13. Il κατὰ Ἰουδαίων di Apione. *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 48: 459-68.
- Mras, K. 1954. *Eusebius Werke. 8: Die Praeparatio Evangelica*. GCS 8.1-2. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Müller, J.G. 1877. *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion. Text und Erklärung aus dem Nachlass von J.G. Müller* (eds. C.J. Riggenbach and C. von Orelli). Basel: Bahnmeier [cited as Müller].
- Mussies, G. 1979. The Interpretatio Judaica of Serapis. Pp. 189-214 in M.J. Vermaseren, ed. *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*. Leiden: Brill.
- Musurillo, H.A. 1954. *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs. Acta Alexandrinorum*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Naber, S.A. 1896. *Flavii Iosephi Opera omnia*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Neitzel, S. 1977. *Apions Γλωσσαι Ὀμηρικάί*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Neusner, J. 1980. *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Holy Things. Part 6: The Mishnaic System of Sacrifice and Sanctuary*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Newsom, C.A. 2003. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Niebuhr, K.-W. 1987. *Gesetz und Paränese: Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Niehoff, M. 1992. *The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Niehoff, M. 2001. *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Niese, B. 1889a. *Flavii Iosephi Opera edidit et apparatus critico instruxit. Vol. 5: De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive Contra Apionem libri II*. Berlin: Weidmann [cited as Niese or Niese maior].
- Niese, B. 1889b. *Flavii Iosephi Opera recognovit. Vol. 5: De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive Contra Apionem libri II*. Berlin: Weidmann [cited as Niese minor].
- Nissinen, M. 1998. *Homoeroticism in the Biblical World*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Nodet, E. 1992. *Flavius Josèphe, Les Antiquités Juives, Livres I à III*. Paris: Cerf.
- Nodet, E. 1995. *Flavius Josèphe, Les Antiquités Juives, Livres IV et V*. Paris: Cerf.
- Norden, E. 1923. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- O'Connor, D. 1997. The Hyksos Period in Egypt. Pp. 45-68 in E.D. Oren, ed. *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- O'Neill, J.C. 1999. Who wrote what in Josephus' *Contra Apionem*? Pp. 270-81 in J.U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- Ollier, Fr. 1972. *Le Mirage Spartiate: Étude sur l'Idéalisation de Sparte dans l'Antiquité grecque de l'Origine jusqu'aux Cyniques*. Reprint, 2 vols. in 1 (originally 1933, 1943). New York: Arno Press.
- Oppenheimer, A. 1998. Jewish Penal Authority in Roman Judaea. Pp. 181-91 in M. Goodman, ed. *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Oren, E.D., ed. 1997. *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Ostwald, M. 1969. *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Otto, W. 1905. *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Aegypten*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Otto, W. 1934. *Zur Geschichte der Zeit des 6. Ptolemäers*. München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Otto, W. and H. Bengtson, 1938 *Zur Geschichte des Niederganges des Ptolemäerreiches*. München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Pavis D'Esurac, H. 1976. *La Préfecture de l'Annone: Service Administratif Impérial d'Auguste à Constantin*. Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Pearce, S. 1998. Belonging and Not Belonging: Local Perspectives in Philo of Alexandria. Pp. 79-105 in S. Jones and S. Pearce, eds. *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Pearson, L. 1987. *The Greek Historians of the West: Timaeus and his Predecessors*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Pépin, J. 1958. *Mythe et Allégorie: les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. Paris: Aubier-Montaigne.
- Petersen, H. 1958. Real and Alleged Literary Projects of Josephus. *AJP* 79: 259-74.

- Petrochilos, N. 1974. *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*. Athens: National and Capodistrian University of Athens.
- Pilhofer, P. 1990. *Presbyteron Kreitton: Der Alterbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Plescia, J. 1970. *The Oath and Perjury in Ancient Greece*. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press.
- Pomeroy, A.J. 1991. *The Appropriate Comment: Death Notices in the Ancient Historians*. Frankfurt am Main/New York: P. Lang.
- Pomeroy, S. 1985. Infanticide in Hellenistic Greece. Pp. 207-22 in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt, eds. *Images of Women in Antiquity*. London: Routledge.
- Powell, B. 1991. *Homer and the Origins of the Greek Alphabet*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Pratt, M.L. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Pratt, M.L. 1994. Transculturation and Autoethnography: Peru 1615/1980. Pp. 24-46 in F. Barker et al., eds. *Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Préaux, C. 1939. *L'économie royale des Lagides*. Brussels: la Fondation de l'Égyptologie reine Élizabeth.
- Price, J.J. 2005. The Provincial Historian in Rome. Pp. 101-18 in J. Sievers and G. Lembi, eds. *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Leiden: Brill.
- Price, S.R.F. 1984. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Price, S.R.F. 1999. Latin Christian Apologetics: Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Pp. 105-30 in M. Edwards, M. Goodman, and S. Price, eds. 1999. *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pucci ben Zeev, M. 1993. The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974-1990). *JSJ* 24: 215-34.
- Pucci ben Zeev, M. 1995. Josephus, Bronze Tablets, and Greek Inscriptions. *L'Antiquité Classique* 64: 211-15.
- Pucci ben Zeev, M. 1998. *Jewish Rights in the Roman World*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Quirke, S. 1992. *Ancient Egyptian Religion*. London: British Museum Press.
- Raaflaub, K.A. 2000. Poets, Lawgivers, and the Beginnings of Political Reflection in Archaic Greece. Pp. 23-59 in C. Rowe and M. Schofield, eds. *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rajak, T. 1973. Justus of Tiberias. *CQ* 23: 345-68.
- Rajak, T. 1983. *Josephus: The Historian and his Society*. London: Duckworth.
- Rajak, T. 2002. *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*. Leiden: Brill.
- Rajak, T. 2005. Josephus in the Diaspora. Pp. 79-97 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ranke, H. 1935-77. *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*. 3 vols. Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin.
- Rankin, H.D. 1987. *Celts and the Classical World*. London: Croom Helm.
- Rawson, E. 1969. *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Rawson, E. 1971. Prodigy Lists and the Use of the *Annales Maximi*. *CQ* 21: 158-69.
- Rawson, E. 1992. The Romans. Pp. 1-28 in K. Dover, ed. *Perceptions of the Ancient Greeks*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Redford, D.R. 1967. *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Redford, D.R. 1970. The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition. *Orientalia* 39: 1-51.
- Redford, D.R. 1986. *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books*. Mississauga: Benben Publications.
- Redford, D.R. 1997. Textual Sources for the Hyksos Period. Pp. 1-44 in E.D. Oren, ed. *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Redford, D.R. ed. 2001. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reinach, T. 1895. *Texts d'Auteurs Grecs et Latins relatifs au Juifs et Judaïsme*. Paris: Leroux.
- Reinach, T. 1900. Notes sur le second livre du Contre Apion de Joseph. Pp. 13-15 in M. Brann and F. Rosenthal, eds. *Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann. Vol. 1.1*. Breslau: Schles.Verlags-Anstalt.
- Reinach, T. 1930. *Flavius Josephus, Contre Apion* (text and notes by Reinach; translation by L. Blum). Paris: Société Édition "Les Belles Lettres" [cited as Reinach].
- Reinhold, M. 1980. Roman Attitudes Towards Egyptians. *Ancient World* 3: 97-103.
- Rengstorff, K.H. 1973-83. *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Reynolds, J.M. and R. Tannenbaum, 1987. *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.

- Richardson, J.S. 1996. *The Romans in Spain*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Richlin, A. 1993. Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men. *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3: 523-73.
- Richter, G.M.A. 1965. *The Portraits of the Greeks*. 3 vols. London: Phaidon Press.
- Riddle, J.M. 1992. *Contraception and Abortion from the Ancient World to the Renaissance*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Rives, J. 1985. Human Sacrifice among Pagans and Christians. *JRS* 85: 65-85.
- Rives, J. 1999. *Tacitus, Germania*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Rives, J. 2005. Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. Pp. 145-66 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Romilly, J. de 1977. *The Rise and Fall of States according to Greek Authors*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Rosenfeld, B.-Z. 2000. Flavius Josephus and his Portrait of the Coast (Paralia) of Contemporary Roman Palestine: Geography and Ideology. *JQR* 91: 143-83.
- Rowe, C. 2000. The *Politicus* and other Dialogues. Pp. 233-57 in C. Rowe and M. Schofield, eds. *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rowe, C. and M. Schofield, eds. 2000. *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rühl, F. 1893. Die tyrische Königsliste des Menander von Ephesus. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 48: 565-78.
- Ryle, H.E. 1914. *The Canon of the Old Testament*. London: Macmillan.
- Sack, R.H. 1992. Nabonidus. *ABD* 4: 973-76.
- Said, E.W. 1978. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. New York: Vintage.
- Said, E.W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Samuel, A.E. 1962. *Ptolemaic Chronology*. München: Beck.
- Sanders, E.P. 1990. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM Press.
- Sanders, E.P. 1992. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE*. London: SCM Press.
- Sardar, Z. 1999. *Orientalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Schäfer, P. 1997a. *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Schäfer, P. 1997b. Die Manetho-Fragmenta bei Josephus und die Anfänge des antiken "Antisemitismus." Pp. 186-206 in G.W. Most, ed. *Aporematia I: Collecting Fragments/Fragmenta sammeln*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schaller, B. 1963. Hekataios von Abdera über die Juden: zur Frage der Echtheit und der Datierung. *ZNW* 54: 15-31.
- Schäublin, C. 1982. Josephus und die Griechen. *Hermes* 110: 316-41.
- Scheller, M. 1955. σαββα and σαββατάωσις. *Glotta* 34: 298-300.
- Schibli, H.S. 1990. *Pherekydes of Syros*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Schimanowski, G. 2000. Die Bedeutung des Sabbat bei Josephus. Pp. 97-121 in J.U. Kalms, ed. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999*. Münster: LIT.
- Schlatter, A. 1932. *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*. Güterlsoh: Bertelsmann.
- Schlatter, A. 1970. Wie Sprach Josephus von Gott? Pp. 65-142 in *idem, Kleinere Schriften zu Flavius Josephus* (ed. K.H. Rengstorf). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schnabel, P. 1923. *Berosus und die babylonish-hellenistische Literatur*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schofield, M. 1980. *An Essay on Anaxagoras*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schofield, M. 1986. Cicero For and Against Divination. *JRS* 76: 47-65.
- Schrekenberg, H. 1968. *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Schrekenberg, H. 1972. *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Schrekenberg, H. 1977. *Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Schrekenberg, H. 1979. *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus, Supplementband*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Schrekenberg, H. 1992. Josephus in Early Christian Texts. Pp. 51-85 in H. Schrekenberg and K. Schubert, eds., *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity*. CRINT II.2. Assen: van Gorcum.
- Schrekenberg, H. 1996a. Text, Überlieferung und Textkritik von *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 49-82 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.



- Schreckenberg, H. 1996b. A Concordance to the Latin Text of *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 453-517 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Schreckenberg, H. 1998. Josephus. *RAC* 18: 761-801.
- Schröder, B. 1996. *Die ‚väterlichen Gesetze‘: Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schürer, E. (revised) 1973-1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, and M. Goodman, 3 vols., Edinburgh: T & T Clark [cited as Schürer revised]
- Schwartz, D.R. 1983-84. Josephus on the Jewish Constitutions and Community. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 7: 30-52.
- Schwartz, D.R. 1992. *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schwartz, D.R. 2002. Rome and the Jews: Josephus on ‘Freedom’ and ‘Autonomy’. Pp. 65-81 in A.K. Bowman et al., eds. *Representations of Empire: Rome and the Mediterranean World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schwartz, D.R. 2005. Herodians and *Ioudaioi* in Flavian Rome. Pp. 63-78 in J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schwartz, D.R. forthcoming. Josephus on his Jewish Forerunners (*Contra Apionem* 1.218).
- Schwartz, S. 1990. *Josephus and Judean Politics*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Schwyzer, H.-R. 1932. *Chairemon*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Scott, J.C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J.M. ed. 1997. *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Leiden: Brill.
- Scott, K. 1936. *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Segal, C. 1992. Bard and Audience in Homer. Pp. 3-29 in R. Lamberton and J.J. Keaney, eds. *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sevenster, J.N. 1975. *The Roots of Pagan Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Shahar, Y. 2004. *Josephus Geographicus: The Classical Context of Geography in Josephus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Shavit, Y. 1997. *Athens in Jerusalem*. London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*. 2nd edition, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Shrimpton, G.S. 1991. *Theopompos the Historian*. Montreal: Queen's University Press.
- Shutt, R.J.H. 1961. *Studies in Josephus*. London: SPCK.
- Shutt, R.J.H. 1980. The Concept of God in the Works of Josephus. *JSJ* 31: 171-89.
- Shutt, R.J.H. 1987. Josephus in Latin: A Retroversion into Greek and an English Translation. *JSP* 1: 79-93.
- Sickingler, J.P. 1999. *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Siegert, F., H. Schreckenberg, and M. Vogel, 2001. *Flavius Josephus, Aus meinem Leben (Vita). Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Siegert, F., H. Schreckenberg, and M. Vogel, 2006. *Flavius Josephus, Über das Alter des Judentums (Contra Apionem)*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Sievers, J. 1998. Josephus and the Afterlife. Pp. 20-34 in S. Mason, ed. *Understanding Josephus. Seven Perspectives*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Smallwood, E.M. 1956. Domitian's Attitude toward the Jews and Judaism. *CP* 51: 1- 13.
- Smallwood, E.M. 1970. *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, Second edition, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Smallwood, E.M. 1981. *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Smelik, K.A.D. and Hemelrijk, E.A. 1984. ‘Who knows not what Monsters Demented Egypt Worships?’: Opinions on Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity. *ANRW* II.17.4: 1852-2000.
- Smith, A.D. 1986. *The Ethnic Origin of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Solmsen, F. 1989. *Isis among the Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Sonnabend, H. 1986. *Fremdenbild und Politik: Vorstellungen der Römer von Ägypten und dem Partherreich in der späten Republik und frühen Kaiserzeit*. Frankfurt: P. Lang.
- Southern, P. 1997. *Domitian: Tragic Tyrant*. London: Routledge.
- Sperling, A. 1886. *Apion der Grammatiker und sein Verhältnis zum Judentum*. Dresden: Lehmann.
- Speyer, W. 1963. Zu den Vorwürfen der Heiden gegen die Christen. *JAC* 6: 129-36.
- Spiegelberg, W. 1914. *Die sogennante Demotische Chronik*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Spilsbury, P. 1996. *Contra Apionem and Antiquitates Judaicae: Points of Contact*. Pp. 348-68 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

- Spilsbury, P. 1998. *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Spilsbury, P. 2001. Josephus. Pp. 241-60 in D.A. Carson et al., eds. *Justification and Variegated Nomism. Vol 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Spilsbury, P. 2003. Flavius Josephus on the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire. *JTS* 54: 1-24.
- Spivak, G.C. 1994. Can the Subaltern Speak? Pp. 66-111 in P. Williams and L. Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Steindorff, G. 1905. Epaphroditus. *PW* V: 2710-11.
- Sterling, G. 1990. Philo and the Logic of Apologetics. *SBLSP* 29: 412-30.
- Sterling, G.E. 1992. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Stern, M. 1974-84. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities [cited as Stern].
- Stern, M. 1976. Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and Other Classes. Pp. 587-95 in S. Safrai and M. Stern, eds. *The Jewish People in the First Century. Vol. 2*. CRINT I.2. Assen: van Gorcum.
- Stowers, S. 1986. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Stricker, B.H. 1965. Asinarii. *Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden* 46: 52-75.
- Sugirtharajah, R.S. 1998. *Asian Biblical Hermeneutics and Postcolonialism: Contesting the Interpretations*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Syme, R. 1983. Domitian, the Last Years. *Chiron* 13: 121-46.
- Szegedy-Maszak, A. 1981. *The Nomoi of Theophrastus*. New York: Arno.
- Takács, S.A. 1995. *Isis and Serapis in the Roman World*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Talbert, R.J.A., ed. 2000. *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Taubes, J., ed. 1987. *Religionstheorie und politische Theologie. Band 3: Theokratie*. München: W. Fink.
- Tcherikover, V. 1959. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Te Velde, H. 1977. *Seth, God of Confusion: A Study of his Role in Egyptian Mythology and Religion*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Terrian, A. 1985. Some Stock Arguments for the Magnanimity of the Law in Hellenistic Jewish Apologetics. Pp. 141-49 in B.S. Jackson, ed. *Jewish Law Association Studies. I*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Thackeray, H. St.John. 1926. *Josephus. Vol. I: The Life / Against Apion*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [cited as Thackeray].
- Thackeray, H. St.John. 1929. *Josephus: the Man and the Historian*. New York: Jewish Institute of Religion.
- Thoma, C. 1989. The High Priesthood in the Judgment of Josephus. Pp. 196-215 in L.H. Feldman and G. Hata, eds. *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Thomas, J. 1992. *Der jüdische Phokylides: Formengeschichtliche Zugänge zu Pseudo-Phokylides und Vergleich mit der neutestamentliche Paränese*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Thompson, L.A. 1982. Domitian and the Jewish Tax. *Historia* 31: 329-42.
- Thraede, K. 1962a. Erfinder, II. *RAC* 5: 1191-1278.
- Thraede, K. 1962b. Das Lob des Erfinders: Bemerkungen zur Analyse der Heuremata-Kataloge. *Rheinische Museum für Philologie* 105: 158-86.
- Tiede, D.L. 1972. *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker*. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- Tigerstedt, E.N. 1965-78. *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity*. 3 vols. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wicksell.
- Todd, S.C. 1996. *Athens and Sparta*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Tosato, A. 1987. La Teocrazia nell' Antico Israele. *CNS* 8: 1-50.
- Trebilco, P. 1991. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Troiani, L. 1975. Sui Frammenti di Manetone nel Primo Libro del *Contra Apionem* di Flavio Giuseppe. *Studi Classici e Orientali* 24: 97-126.
- Troiani, L. 1977. *Commento storico al 'Contro Apione' di Giuseppe. Introduzione, Commento storico, traduzione e indici*, Pisa: Giardini [cited as Troiani].
- Troiani, L. 1978. Osservazioni sopra l'Apologia di Filone: gli Hypothetica. *Athenaeum* 56: 304-14.
- Troiani, L. 1994. The Politeia of Israel in the Greco-Roman Age. Pp. 11-22 in F. Parente and J. Sievers, eds. *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Trüdinger, K. 1918. *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie*. Basel: E. Birkhäuser.
- Unger, E. 1970. *Babylon: die heilige Stadt nach der Beschreibung der Babylonier*. 2nd edition, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- van der Horst, P. 1978. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

- van der Horst, P. 1984. *Chaeremon: Egyptian Priest and Stoic Philosopher*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- van der Horst, P. 1993. 'Thou shalt not revile the Gods.' The LXX translation of Ex. 22:28 (27), its background and influence. *SPhilo* 5: 1-8.
- van der Horst, P. 1996. The Distinctive Vocabulary of *Contra Apionem*. Pp. 83-93 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- van der Horst, P. 2002. *Japheth in the Tents of Shem: Studies on Jewish Hellenism in Antiquity*. Leuven: Peeters.
- VanderKam, J.C. 2004. *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- van Henten, J.-W. 1993. Antiochus IV as a Typhonic Figure in Daniel 7. Pp. 223-43 in A.S. van der Woude, ed. *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- van Henten, J.-W. 1997. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. Leiden: Brill.
- van Henten, J.-W. 1999. Martyrion and Martyrdom: Some Remarks about Noble Death in Josephus. Pp. 124-41 in J.U. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds. *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münster: LIT.
- van Henten, J.-W. and Abusch, R. 1996. The Jews as Typhonians and Josephus' Strategy of Refutation. Pp. 271-309 in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- van Henten, J.-W. and F. Avemarie 2002. *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts from Graeco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Antiquity*. London: Routledge.
- van Henten, J.-W. forthcoming. Cleopatra in Josephus: from Herod's Rival to the Wise Ruler's Opposite.
- van Seters, J. 1966. *The Hyksos: A New Investigation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- van Seters, J. 1983. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- van Unnik, W.C. 1949. De la règle Μητε προσθεῖναι μητε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du canon. *VC* 3: 1-36.
- van Unnik, W.C. 1976. *Het Godspraak 'Het Begin en het Einde' bij Flavius Josephus en in de Openbaring van Johannes*. (Mededelingen der Kon. Ned. Akademie van Wetenschappen 39). Amsterdam.
- van Unnik, W.C. 1978. *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*. Heidelberg: Schneider.
- van Unnik, W.C. 1979. Flavius Josephus and the Mysteries. Pp. 244-79 in M.J. Vermaseren, ed. *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- van Unnik, W.C. 1993. *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Vanusia, P. 2001. *The Gift of the Nile: Hellenising Egypt from Aeschylus to Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Veltman, F. 1978. The Defense Speeches of Paul in Acts. Pp. 243-56 in C.H. Talbert, ed., *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Veltri, G. 1994. *Eine Tora für den König Tolmai*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Verbrugge, G.P. and Wickersham, J.M. 1996. *Berosos and Manetho: Introduced and Translated*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Vermes, G. 1982. A Summary of the Law by Flavius Josephus. *NovT* 24: 289-303.
- Vermes, G. and M. Goodman, eds. 1989. *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Vischer, L. 1951. Le prétendu 'culte de l'âne' dans l'Église primitive. *RHR* 139: 14-35.
- Viviano, B.T. 1978. *Study as Worship: Aboth and the New Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Vlastos, G. 1994. *Socratic Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Volkman, H. 1958. *Kleopatra: Politik und Propaganda*. München: R. Oldenborg.
- Wacholder, B.Z. 1968. Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles. *HTR* 61: 451-81.
- Wacholder, B.Z. 1974. *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College.
- Waddell, W.G. 1940. *Manetho, with an English Translation*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Wagner, G. 1987. *Les Oasis d'Égypte*. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1988. Greek Knowledge, Roman Power. *CP* 83: 224-33.
- Walter, N. 1980. *Fragmenta jüdisch-hellenistischer Historiker*, JSHRZ Vol. I.2, Second edition, Gütersloh: G. Mohn.
- Wander, B. 1998. *Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wardman, A. 1976. *Rome's Debt to Greece*. London: Elek.
- Weaver, P.R.C. 1994. Epaphroditus, Josephus, and Epictetus. *CQ* 44: 468-79.
- Webster, D.L. 1976. On Theocracies. *American Anthropologist* 78: 812-28.

- Webster, J. and Cooper, N., eds. 1996. *Roman Imperialism: Postcolonial Perspectives*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Wehrli, F. 1948. *Die Schule des Aristoteles. 3: Klearchos*. Basel: B. Schwabe.
- Weill, R. 1918. *La Fin du Moyen Empire Égyptien*. Paris: Picard.
- Weingärtner, D.G. 1969. *Die Ägyptenreise des Germanicus*. Bonn: R. Habelt.
- Weiss, H. 1998. The Sabbath in the Writings of Josephus. *JSJ* 29: 363-90.
- Wendland, P. 1896. Die Therapeuten und die philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben. *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 22: 693-770.
- Wendland, P. 1903. Die hellenistische Zeugnisse über die ägyptische Beschneidung. *APF* 2 : 22-31.
- Wenschkewitz, H. 1932. *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- West, M.L. 1971. *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Whiston, W. 1995. *The Works of Josephus*. New updated edition, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson (first published 1736).
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilcken, U. 1928. Zur Germanicus Papyrus. *Hermes* 63: 48-65.
- Wildung, D. 1977a. *Imhotep und Amenhotep: Gottwerdung im alten Ägypten*. München: Deutscher Kunstverlag.
- Wildung, D. 1977b. *Egyptian Saints: Deification in Pharaonic Egypt*. New York: New York University Press.
- Will, E. 1966. *Histoire politique du Monde Hellenistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*. Vol. I. Nancy: Berger-Levrault.
- Williams, M.H. 1990. Domitian, the Jews and the 'Judaizers'—a simple matter of cupiditas and maiestas? *Historia* 39: 196-211.
- Williams, M.H. 1994. The Structure of Roman Jewry Re-Considered: Were the Synagogues of Ancient Rome Entirely Homogeneous? *ZPE* 104: 129-41.
- Williams, M.H. 1998. *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diaspora Sourcebook*. London: Duckworth.
- Williams, M.H. 2004. Being a Jew in Rome: Sabbath Fasting as an Expression of Romano-Jewish Identity. Pp. 8-18 in J.M.G. Barclay, ed. *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. London: T & T Clark International.
- Williams, T. 1962. The Curses of Bouzyges: New Evidence. *Mnemosune* 15: 396-98.
- Willrich, H. 1895. *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Willrich, H. 1904. Der historische Kern des III. Makkabäerbuches. *Hermes* 39: 244-58.
- Wilson, S.G. 2004. *Leaving the Fold: Apostates and Defectors in Antiquity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Wilson, W.T. 1994. *The Mysteries of Righteousness: The Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wilson, W.T. 2005. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Winkler, J. 1990. *Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge.
- Wiseman, D.J. 1956. *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings (626–556 B.C.) in the British Museum*. London: Trustees of the British Museum.
- Wiseman, D.J. 1985. *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1979. *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*. Leicester: Leicester University Press .
- Wolf, F.A. 1795. *Prolegomena ad Homerum*. Halis Saxonum: Orphanotropheus.
- Woodman, A.J. 1988. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London: Croom Helm.
- Woolf, G. 1998. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, N.T. 2003. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Yavetz, Z. 1975. Reflections on Titus and Josephus. *GRBS* 16: 411-32.
- Yavetz, Z. 1993. Judeophobia in Classical Antiquity: A Different Approach. *JJS* 44: 1-22.
- Yavetz, Z. 1997. *Judenfeindschaft in der Antike*. München: Beck.
- Young, F. 1999. Greek Apologists of the Second Century. Pp. 81-104 in M. Edwards, M. Goodman, and S. Price, eds. 1999. *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Young, R.J.C. 1990. *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West*. London: Routledge.
- Young, R.J.C. 2001. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Yoyotte, J. 1963. L'Égypte ancienne et les origines de l'antijudaïsme. *RHR* 163: 133-43.
- Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.





## INDEX OF ANCIENT TEXTS

References are given as follows:

In the Introduction: by Roman numerals (e.g., viii); in notes with n (e.g., viii,n3)

In the Commentary: by book and note (e.g., 2n120)

In the Reading Options and Appendices: by page number (e.g., p.343); in notes with n

### GREEK AND ROMAN TEXTS

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Abydenus<br/><i>Apud</i> Eusebius, <i>Praeparatio evangelica</i> 9.41; see ad loc.<br/>Fragments 1n461, 1n465, 1n469, 1n480</p> <p>Aelian<br/><i>De natura animalium</i><br/>4.44 2n231<br/>10.16 2n500, 2n513, 2n514<br/>10.21 2n229, 2.313<br/>10.24 2n229<br/>10.27 2n504<br/>10.28 1n542, 2n468, p.352<br/>10.29 2n7, 2n32<br/>11.40 2n7 (<i>bis</i>)<br/>12.5 1n777</p> <p><i>Varia historia</i><br/>2.31 2n1071<br/>3.46 2n839<br/>4.1 2n839<br/>6.6 2n930<br/>6.8 2n468<br/>12.21 2n937<br/>14.34 2n627, 2n742</p> <p>Ammianus Marcellinus<br/>17.12 2n38</p> <p>Anaximenes of Lampsacus 1n760<br/><i>Rhetorica ad Alexandrinum</i><br/>1426b 22-1247b 11 xxxiv,n51<br/>1436b-1438a xxxiv,n53</p> <p>Antoninus Liberalis, <i>Metamorphoses</i><br/>28.1-4 2n465</p> <p>Apollodorus<br/>1.6.3 2n465</p> <p>Appian<br/><i>Bella civilia</i><br/>2.90 2n202<br/>4.38 2n204<br/>4.61 2n214<br/>4.63 2n214<br/>5.1 2n204<br/>5.8-9 2n204<br/>5.9 2n199, 2n200, 2.208<br/>5.11 2n205</p> | <p><i>Historia romana</i><br/>11.50 1n713</p> <p>Apuleius<br/><i>Apologia</i><br/>90-91 2n530</p> <p><i>Metamorphoses</i><br/>11.3-5 1n977</p> <p>Aristides<br/><i>Panathenaikos</i><br/>63 2n130</p> <p>Aristophanes<br/><i>Aves</i><br/>1012-13 2n1044<br/>1072-74 2n1071</p> <p><i>Ranae</i><br/>612 2n108</p> <p><i>Vespae</i><br/>83 2n1061</p> <p>Aristophanes of Byzantium<br/>1n735</p> <p>Aristotle<br/><i>Ethica nichomachea</i><br/>1148b,19-25 2n323<br/>1165b, 16-17 2n770<br/>1169b,16 2n783</p> <p><i>Metaphysica</i><br/>984b,15-19 2n652</p> <p><i>Politica</i><br/>Bk 1 2n682, 2n795<br/>1260a-1266a 2n907<br/>1268b-1269a 2n717<br/>1269a-1271b 2n921<br/>1269b-1270a 2n1096<br/>1329b 1n34<br/>1331-1342 2n694<br/>1334b 2n673<br/>Bks 4-6 2n634</p> <p><i>Rhetorica</i><br/>Bk 3 2n10</p> | <p><i>Fragment 591</i> 1n95</p> <p>Ps.-Aristotle<br/><i>De Mundo</i><br/>399b,14-15 2n755</p> <p>Arrian<br/><i>Anabasis</i><br/>2.16 1n398<br/>3.1 2n142<br/>7.2-3 1n594, 1n607<br/>7.17.1-2 1n648</p> <p>Athenaeus<br/><i>Deipnosophistae</i><br/>16f 2n32, 2n94<br/>139d 1n759<br/>158d 1n1018<br/>299f 2n301, 2n513<br/>346d-e 2n402<br/>392d-e 1n402<br/>505e 2n911<br/>506f 2n919<br/>507b-d 2n910<br/>508a-c 2n907<br/>509b-c 2n912<br/>509b 2n919<br/>549c 2n177<br/>680d 2n7<br/>701c 1n580</p> <p>Aulus Gellius<br/><i>Noctes atticae</i><br/>2.6.18 2n477<br/>3.11 2n47<br/>5.14.1 2n7<br/>5.14.2 2n7<br/>5.14.3 2n7, 2n494<br/>5.14.4 2n31, 2n32<br/>6.8.4 2n7, 2n32<br/>7.8.1 2n94<br/>15.11.4 xxxviii,n76</p> <p><i>Bellum Alexandrinum</i><br/>15.1 p.367<br/>24 2n102</p> <p>Caesar<br/><i>Bellum Gallicum</i><br/>6.13 2n742</p> |
|--|--|--|

- Ps.-Callisthenes  
*Alexander Romance*, 2n119  
 1.1-3 1n845, 1n855
- Cato  
 Fragments p.10
- Catullus  
 66.35-36 2n163
- Chariton, *Chaereas* xxxiv,n52
- Cicero  
*Pro Balbo*  
 31 2n130, 2n133
- Brutus*  
 9 2n157  
 245 2n275  
 316 2n275
- De Divinatione*  
 1.2 p.47  
 1.7 1n682  
 1.36-37 1n13, p.10  
 1.39-71 1n702  
 1.105-8 p.92  
 Bk 2 p.77  
 2.76-83 p.92  
 2.80-81 1n691  
 2.97 p.77  
 2.116 1n75  
 2.122-47 1n702  
 2.125 1n702  
 2.141 1n702  
 2.148 1n702
- De Domo Suo*  
 1.1 2n732
- De Finibus*  
 2.62 1n180  
 5.4 1n551
- Pro Flacco*  
 9 2n904  
 11-11 1n66  
 16-19 1n69, 2n904  
 24 2n904  
 57 2n904  
 63 2n922  
 66 2n235  
 67-68 2n292  
 69 2n457  
 71-73 p.367
- Pro Fonteio*  
 31 2n323
- De Haruspicum Responso*  
 19 2n457
- De Legibus*  
 1.5 1n75  
 1.57 2n579  
 2.5 2n134
- 2.14 2n909, 2n910  
 2.19-22 2n732  
 2.23 2n1116  
 2.25 2n779, p.367  
 2.26 2n1086  
 2.28 2n1007  
 2.39 2n909  
 2.40 2n722  
 2.47-48 2n697  
 2.47 2n722  
 2.59 2n826, p.367  
 2.62-66 2n826, p.367  
 3.1 2n909  
 3.12 2n1116
- Pro Lege Manilia*  
 41 2n489
- Pro Murena*  
 74 2n922
- De Natura Deorum* (2n707)  
 1.2 2n710, 2n1071  
 1.3-4 2n665  
 1.5-7 2n711  
 1.39-41 2n964  
 1.42-43 2n961  
 1.43-45 2n710  
 1.44-49 2n759  
 1.44-45 2n752  
 1.45 2n701  
 1.61-64 2n710  
 1.63 2n1071, 2n1072  
 1.76-102 2n759  
 1.83 2n980  
 1.101 1n777, p.364  
 1.117-19 2n710  
 1.121-24 2n710  
 2.8 2n665  
 2.12 2n701  
 2.45 2n759  
 2.59 2n759  
 2.61-62 2n1007  
 2.63-64 2n977, 2n1030  
 2.63 2n964  
 2.70-72 2n961, 2n1030  
 2.73-167 2n711  
 2.79 2n1007  
 2.148 2n568  
 2.158-61 2n315  
 2.160 2n500  
 3.44 2n1006  
 3.47 2n1007  
 3.60 2n961  
 3.61 2n1007  
 3.63-64 2n1007  
 3.65-69 2n711  
 3.77 2n961  
 3.88 2n1007  
 3.89 2n1071  
 3.91 2n627
- De Officiis*  
 1.52 1n1039, 2n851, 2n852  
 1.150-51 1n246  
 3.54-55 2n851, 2n852
- De Oratore*  
 2.51-64 p.9  
 2.53 1n57  
 2.62 1n104
- De Provinciis consularibus*  
 5.10 2n457
- Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem*  
 1.1.16 1n100, p.365  
 1.2.4 1n100
- De Republica (Resp.)* 2n891  
 1.3 2n678  
 1.13 2n678  
 1.27 2n1090  
 1.42-53 2n634  
 1.58 1n231  
 1.61-69 2n634  
 1.69-70 2n634  
 1.70-71 2n1116  
 2.2 2n541, 2n723, p.366  
 2.5-10 1n238  
 2.14-15 2n582  
 2.15 2n921  
 2.18 2n59, 2n580  
 2.21-22 2n907  
 2.21 2n909  
 2.30 2n573  
 2.41 2n634  
 2.42 1n417, 2n59, 2n669, 2n921  
 2.50 2n921  
 2.52 2n907  
 2.57 2n634  
 2.69 2n669  
 3 frag. 3 1n246  
 3.4-6 2n678  
 3.14 2n1086  
 3.15 1n95  
 3.25 1n95  
 3.33 2n638  
 3.34 2n634, 2n722, p.365  
 3.41 2n634, 2n722, p.365  
 3.48 2n696  
 4.3 2n678  
 4.4 2n1097  
 5.9 2n542, p.367
- Pro Rabirio Postumo*  
 23 2n157
- Pro Scauro*  
 3-4 2n677
- De Senectute*  
 56 p.367
- Pro Sestio*  
 141 2n904
- Tusculanae Disputationes*  
 1.4 2n257, p.365  
 1.38 1n61  
 1.79 2n911  
 1.101 1n180  
 2.65 1n180

- 4.70 2n796, p.368  
5.78 1n781, 2n231, p.364  
5.102 2n257  
5.113 1n180
- In Verrem*  
34.34.34-34 2n257, p.365  
2.5.150 2n1079
- Cleanthes  
Fragments 2n656
- Curtius Rufus, *Alexander*  
4.1.30 2n102  
4.8.9-11 2n146  
5.1.16-39 p.77  
5.1.16 1n464  
5.1.24 1n474  
5.1.34-35 1n471  
5.1.35 1n472
- Demosthenes  
*In Aristocratem*  
51 1.93
- Contra Boeotum*  
1.2 2n1074  
2.9 2n1074
- De Corona*  
3-8 xxxiv,n53  
3-4 xxxii,n46, xxxv,n58, 2n543  
3 2n16  
4 2n562
- In Timocratem*  
68 2n750
- Dio Cassius  
37.16-19 2n1136  
37.16.1-4 2n292  
37.16.2-4 1n713  
37.16.5-17.1 lxi,n157  
37.17.2 2n759  
37.30.3 2n323  
42.34.1 2n201  
42.34.2 2n229  
42.36-42 2n202  
42.39 2n199  
42.43.4 2n200  
42.44.1-4 2n200  
43.39.5 2n131  
48.24.2 2n199, 2n204, 2n208  
48.27.2 2n204  
49.22.4-5 1n713  
49.32.4-5 2n209  
49.34.1 2n204  
49.41 2n203  
50.1.5 2n209  
50.3 2n209  
50.5 2n204  
50.15 2n211  
50.24-30 2n194, 2n204, 2n205  
50.24-27 1n311  
50.24 p.364
- 50.24.6-7 2n102  
50.33 2n211  
51.5.4-5 2n213  
51.6-16 2n215  
51.6-15 2n212  
51.17.1-3 p.364  
51.17.1-2 2n102  
51.17.1 1n311  
51.17.4 p.48  
53.19 1n104  
66.1.4 xxxvii,n64, 1, liii  
66.7.2 xxxvii,n67, 1n713  
66.15.3-4 xxxvii,n64  
66.18.1 xxxvii,n64  
67.13.2 xxxviii,n75  
67.14.1-2 xxviii, xxxix, p.243,  
2n1135  
67.14.3 xxxix,n78  
5.5.5-5 xxxviii,n75, 1n3  
67.14.4 1n3  
68.1.2 xxviii, xxxix, xl, 2n552,  
2n1135  
71.4.1 2n323
- Dio Chrysostom  
*De Dei cognitione (Oration 12)* 2n262  
55-59 2n759
- Diodorus Siculus  
For Hecataeus in 40.3, see entry for  
Hecataeus of Abdera  
1.2 1n35  
1.4 1n13  
1.8.1 2n568  
1.9.3 1n18, 2n490  
1.10.4 1n41  
1.14.3 2n572  
1.21.3 1n988  
1.21.6-11 1n778  
1.23.1 1n13  
1.24.2 1n13  
1.25.3 1n977  
1.28 1n353, p.343  
1.28.2-3 1n558  
1.28.3 2n512  
1.29.5 1n654  
1.31.6 1n654  
1.35.6 1n891  
1.35.7 2n509  
1.36.1-6 1n929  
1.37.3 1n56  
1.37.4 1n84  
1.44.3 2n468  
1.44.4 1n43  
1.45 1n1025  
1.46.4 2n468  
1.46.7 1n43  
1.53-58 1n348, 2n482  
1.55.4-5 1n558, p.343  
1.55.5 2n512  
1.56.6 1n69  
1.57.4 1n302  
1.58.3 2n482  
1.59.1 2n482  
1.64.5 1n818  
1.65 1n1025, 1n1025
- 1.67.9-11 2n323  
1.69 1n113  
1.69.5-6 2n467  
1.69.5 2n490  
1.69.6 1n929  
1.69.7 1n75  
1.73.2 2n511  
1.77 2n579, 2n870  
1.78.3 2n875  
1.78.4 2n810  
1.79 1n1025, 2n579  
1.81.1 2n821  
1.81.7 2n821  
1.86.3 2n465  
1.87-89 2n231  
1.87 2n310  
1.88.6 1n988  
1.89.4-5 1n778  
1.90.2 1n778, 1n835  
1.94 1n1025  
1.94.1-2 2n579, 2n592, 2n624,  
2n627  
1.94.1 2n579, 2n626  
1.94.2 2n579, 2n640  
1.95.4-5 2n468  
1.95.6 2n512  
1.96-98 1n64  
1.96.1-3 2n490  
1.98.2 1n65  
2.1-2 2n1  
2.7-10 p.77, 1n475  
2.7 1n464  
2.10 1n471, 1n472  
2.15 1n75  
2.29-31 1n114, p.77  
2.29.4-6 2n707  
2.29 1n40  
2.31.9 1n13, p.10, 1n40, p.77  
2.36.7 2n856  
2.55.3-6 2n336  
3.6 1n717  
3.11 1n717  
3.32.4 2n512  
5.42.1 1n631  
5.44-46 1n660  
5.45.4 2n742  
12.19-21 2n582  
12.71.2 1n77  
13.6.7 2n1071  
16.46-51 1n845, 1n855  
16.51 1n857  
Bks 18-20 1n727  
19.55.5 1n626  
19.80-110 1n621  
19.86.2-4 1n626  
19.98 1n575  
19.100.1-2 1n725  
20.14.1 1n398  
20.113.1 1n625  
21.17.4 1n79, 1n104  
22.5 2n323, 2n339  
31.13 2n323  
31.17c 2n172  
31.18 2n172  
33.6 2n172  
33.12 2n177



- 33.13 2n172, 2n187  
 33.20 2n172  
 33.22 2n177  
 33.23 2n177  
 33.28b 2n175  
 Bks 34/35 2n274  
 34/35.1.1-5 2n276, 2n281, 2n291,  
 2n297, 2n323, 2n439, 2n1042,  
 p.350  
 34/35.1.2-3 1n1039  
 34/35.1.3 2n283  
 34/35.14 2n172  
 34/35.20 2n172, 2n189
- Diogenes Laertius  
 1.9 1n593  
 1.23 1n65  
 1.24-28 1n63  
 1.27 1n64  
 1.57 2n839  
 2.8 2n1069  
 2.11 2n1030  
 2.12-14 2n1070  
 2.12 2n1069  
 2.15 2n1069  
 2.40 2n1061  
 3.34 2n275, 2n1029  
 5.36-57 1n551  
 5.78 2n157  
 8.1 1n530, 2n48  
 8.3 1n64, 1n538  
 8.6-7 1n535  
 8.6 1n64  
 8.10 1n538  
 8.13 1n543  
 8.32 1n540  
 9.51-52 2n1072  
 9.69 1n612
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus  
*Antiquitates romanae*  
 1.1 1n101, 1n758  
 1.1.2 1n99  
 1.4.1 1n2129  
 1.4.2-3 1n264  
 1.4.2 xxxiv, 1n18, 1n275  
 1.5.2-3 xxxiv  
 1.6.5 1n100  
 1.8.3 1n80  
 1.9.4 2n129  
 1.18.3 p.365  
 1.20.2 p.365  
 1.41 2n1042  
 1.41.1 2n129  
 1.72 1n263  
 1.74 1n417, 2n59  
 1.89.1 xxxiv, 2n129  
 2.8.3-4 xxxiv  
 2.15.1-2 p.367  
 2.15.2 2n811  
 2.17 2n937, 2n1048, p.366  
 2.17.1 2n1044  
 2.18-20 2n961  
 2.18-19 p.365
- 2.19 2n1019  
 2.23 2n779, p.367  
 2.24-25 p.368  
 2.25 p.367  
 2.25.7 p.368  
 2.27.1 p.368  
 2.28 2n677, p.366, p.367  
 2.28.1 2n541, p.366  
 2.28.2 2n930  
 2.49.5 2n929  
 3.11.4 2n1055  
 3.11.5-6 2n129  
 9.22.1 1n189  
 14.6.1-6 2n1044, p.366  
 14.6.3-6 2n129
- De Demosthene*  
 5-7 2n911  
 23-30 2n911
- De Dinarcho*  
 11 2n1074
- De Isaeo*  
 1.2 1n537
- Ad Pompeium Geminum*  
 1 2n1032, 2n1032  
 2 2n919
- De Thucydide*  
 2-3 1n84  
 5-7 p.10  
 5 1n57, 1n58, 1n59, 1n88, 1m171  
 8 1n171  
 23 1n56  
 51 1n101
- Ephorus 1n72  
 Frag. 105a 1n48
- Erotianus  
 Fragment 33 2n500, 2n504
- Epictetus  
 1.7.26 2n1179  
 1.11.12-13 xli,n88  
 1.2.4 xli,n88, 2n513  
 4.7.6 2n673
- Euripides  
*Alcestis*  
 1-3 2n1001
- Bacchae* 1n855
- Hercules furens*  
 822-23 2n1005  
 843-45 2n1005  
 1345-46 2n753
- Iphigenia taurica* 2n323, 2n345
- Fragment 292 2n964
- (Valerius) Flaccus  
*Argonautica*  
 1.12-13 xxxvii  
 1.13 1n574
- Florus  
 2.13.54-60 2n202  
 2.21 2n204  
 2.21.8-11 2n211  
 2.13.60 2n200
- Frontinus, *Strategemata*  
 2.1.17 1n713, 2n1136
- Galen  
*Simplicium Medicamentorum*  
 4.20 1n575
- De Pulsuum Differentiis*  
 2.4 2n408
- Hecataeus of Abdera  
*Apud* Diodorus 40.3 1n593, 1n615,  
 1n617, 1n871, 1n876, 1n946, 2n592,  
 2n732, p.336, p.338, p.342, p.346  
 40.3.1 p.347  
 40.3.2-3 1n327  
 40.3.2 1n327, 1n1042  
 40.3.3 1n597, 1n662, 1n793  
 40.3.4-6 1n629, 2n776  
 40.3.4-5 2n736  
 40.3.4 1n671, 1n1039, 2n439,  
 2n646, 2n759, 2n1042, p.348  
 40.3.5 2n742  
 40.3.5-6 1n636, 1n716  
 40.3.6 2n607, 2n777  
 40.3.7 1n631, 1n673  
 40.3.8 1n241, 1n250, 1n643, 1n654,  
 2n811, p.367
- See also references in Diodorus book  
 1; Plutarch, *Mor.* 353a-c
- Hecataeus of Miletus 1n103, 2n964
- Ps.-Hecataeus see 1.183-204; 2.43,  
 with notes; Appendix 2; lxvi
- Herodotus  
 1.1 1n252  
 1.50 2n478  
 1.60 2n409  
 1.65-66 2n580  
 1.65 2n626, 2n627, 2n675  
 1.105 2n558  
 1.132 2n782  
 1.170.3 1n63  
 1.173.2 1n573  
 1.178-87 p.77  
 1.178-79 1n464  
 1.179 1n465  
 1.184-85 1n475  
 1.188-91 1n499  
 1.188-90 1n500  
 1.188 1n495  
 1.191 1n463

- Bk 2 1n43, 1n113  
 2.3.1 1n821  
 2.8 1n818  
 2.18 2n504  
 2.36-37 2n512  
 2.37 2n511  
 2.38-41 1n891  
 2.41-45 2n504  
 2.42 1n778, 1n812  
 2.44 p.67, 1n398, 1n558  
 2.45 2n323  
 2.46 1n891  
 2.47-48 2n513  
 2.47 2n514  
 2.52 1n34  
 2.53 1n53  
 2.60-64 2n778  
 2.62 1n1036  
 2.65 2n231  
 2.68-70 1n891  
 2.71-74 1n778, 2n231  
 2.77 1n41  
 2.77.1 1n40  
 2.79 1n245  
 2.90 2n313  
 2.91 1n245  
 2.99-182 1n556  
 2.99-100 1n556  
 2.100 1n40  
 2.102-9 2n482  
 2.102-7 1n348  
 2.102-4 1n556  
 2.104 1n557, 2n512, 2n516  
 2.106 1n558  
 2.111.4 2n38  
 2.111 2n482  
 2.124-26 1n818  
 2.137-39 1n824  
 2.138 1n1033  
 2.141 1n556  
 2..143 1n40  
 2.149.2 2n40  
 2.156 1n988  
 2.160 1n43, 2n511  
 2.168 1n321  
 2.177 2n579  
 2.178 1n245  
 2.180 2n478  
 Bk 2 1n256  
 3.5 1n558  
 3.8 1n571  
 3.11 2n323  
 3.16-18 2n468  
 3.26 2n93  
 3.27-29 1n856, 2n468  
 3.37-38 2n468  
 3.38 2n585  
 3.80-82 2n634  
 3.80 2n610  
 3.91 1n558  
 3.125 1n539  
 3.148 2n1044  
 3.159 1n501  
 4.1-82 2n1079  
 4.39 1n558  
 4.76-78 2n1080
- 4.76-77 2n1081  
 4.76.1 2n1082  
 4.76.5 2n1082  
 4.77.2 2n1082  
 4.80.5 2n1080  
 4.106 2n323  
 5.58-61 1n48, 1n50  
 6.32 2n1086, 2n1087  
 7.59-100 1n566  
 7.70 1n572  
 7.89 1n558, 1n573  
 7.104 2n688, 2n1115  
 7.197 2n336  
 8.53 2n476  
 8.73 1n95  
 8.109 2n1086  
 8.144.2 lx,n153
- Hesiod  
*Theogonia* 1n71  
 66 2n585  
 222-23 2n1006  
 417 2n585  
 924-25 2n976  
 934-36 2n1004
- Hippocrates  
*De Aera, aquis, locis*  
 12-24 1n41
- Homer  
*Iliad*  
 1.396-406 2n975  
 4.385 1n49  
 4.388 1n49  
 4.440 2n1004  
 5.335-80 2n987  
 5.381-404 2n987  
 5.842-906 2n987  
 6.168-69 1n52  
 6.184 1n573  
 6.204 1n573  
 8.19-27 2n973  
 9.239 2n1005  
 9.305 2n1005  
 11.37 2n1004  
 13.299 2n1004  
 13.449 2n624  
 14.312-51 2n998  
 14.312-28 2n991  
 14.353 2n998  
 15.119 2n1004  
 Bk 16 2n995  
 16.433-34 2n995  
 16.441 2n995  
 16.458-60 2n995  
 16.522 2n995  
 18.368-617 2n981  
 20.1-74 2n986  
 20.231-35 2n1100  
 21.385-513 2n986  
 21.446-47 2n1000  
 21.448-49 2n1001  
 21.542 2n1005  
 22.179-80 2n995
- Odyssey*  
 5.283 1n570  
 Bk 8 2n997  
 8.266-366 2n997  
 8.320 2n991  
 9.112 2n586  
 11.568 2n624  
 17.50 2n507  
 17.218 2n770  
 19.178-79 2n624
- Homeric Hymn to Apollo*  
 172-73 2n47
- Horace  
*Carmina (Odes)*  
 1.3.15-18 2n1136  
 1.31.17-20 2n787  
 1.37 2n194
- Satirae*  
 1.5.100 2n408  
 1.9.69 2n67  
 1.9.70 2n501  
 1.9.71-72 2n1136
- Hypereides  
*Lycophron*  
 14 2n1170
- Epitaphios*  
 1 2n1170
- Iamblichus  
*Vita Pythagorae*  
 12 1n64  
 58 1n531  
 69 1n543  
 125 1n544  
 134-56 1n532  
 139 1n540  
 146 1n535, 1n546  
 148 1n540  
 195 1n544  
 257 1n544
- Isocrates  
*Antidosis (Oratio 15)* xxxiii,n47,  
 xxxiv  
 8-13 2n543  
 293-94 1n91
- Busiris (Oratio 11)*  
 5 2n323  
 19-20 2n930  
 20 2n1090  
 24-25 2n568  
 28-29 1n64  
 36-37 2n323
- In Callimachum (Oratio 18)*  
 35 2n108
- Evagoras (Oratio 9)*  
 7 2n717  
 12 1n589

- Helenaë Encomium*  
10.14 xxxv,n59
- Panathenaicus (Oratio 12)*  
37 xxxiv  
46 2n930, 2n935  
61-73 xxxiv  
88-111 xxxiv  
98 2n935  
188 2n1090  
241 2n935, 2n1090
- Panegyricus (Oratio 4)*  
33 2n473  
46 2n748  
50 1n91
- Iulius Solinus, *Collectanea*  
40.2-5 2n477
- Julian the apostate  
*Ad Arscium*  
84a 2n1142
- Contra Galileos*  
218a-c 2n457
- Justin, *Epitome*: see *Pompeius Trogus*
- Juvenal, *Satirae*  
Satire 3 1n180  
3.10-18 xli  
3.58ff. 1n102, 365  
3.296 xli, 2n35  
6.153-60 xli  
6.157-69 2n500  
6.159 2n67  
6.542-47 xli, 1n1028, 2n1142  
6.542-46 2n530  
6.554-64 p.77  
6.564 xli,n88  
6.595-97 2n812  
8.223 1n387  
10.174-75 p.9, p.365  
10.174 1n69, 1n101  
12.89-91 2n1138  
14.96-106 xli, p.92, 2n447, p.243,  
2n846, 2n1051, 2n1135, p.369  
14.96 2n1136  
14.98-99 2n500, 2n1139  
14.99 2n501  
14.101-2 2n607  
14.102 p.10  
14.103-4 xli, 1n1039, 2n235,  
2n439, p.243, 2n1042  
14.103 2n852  
14.104 2n501  
14.105-6 1n707, 2n1136  
Satire 15 1n311, 1n777, 1n778,  
2n102, 2n229, p.364  
15.1-2 1n780, 2n231  
15.77-131 2n323  
15.110-12 p.364  
15.126 p.48, p.364
- Livy  
Preface 5 1n100  
Preface 6 p.10  
3.13.36 p.367  
8.22.8 2n677, p.365  
22.57.6 2n336  
23.5.12 2n323  
23.28.10 1n267  
25.40.1-3 2n257, p.365  
34.1-8 p.367  
37.18 2n238  
38.17.11 2n238  
Bk 59 2n172
- Lucan, *Pharsalia*  
3.302 2n904  
8.542-44 2n102  
10.519-23 2n199
- Lucian  
*Alexander* 1n409  
38 2n552
- Anacharsis* 1n1081
- Deorum concilium*  
10-11 1n777
- Herodotus*  
1 1n102
- Historia* 1n84  
16 1n101  
38-41 1n104  
47 1n99, 1n171  
48 1n101  
58 1n109
- Icaromenippus*  
24 2n911
- Jupiter tragoedus*  
42 1n777, 1n778, 1n891  
171-3 2n530
- De mercede conductis*  
42 2n1006
- Philopseudes*  
33-34 2n511
- De Sacrificiis*  
13 2n323  
14 1n38, 2n465  
15 1n777
- Toxaris*  
4 1n246  
8 2n1079  
9 2n673  
28 1n891  
42 1n102
- Vera historia* 2n900
- Macrobius, *Satirae*  
2.4.11 2n500
- Manetho  
See 1.73-104; 1.227-287; Appendix 1  
*passim*
- Martial, *Epigrams*  
4.4 1n1037, 2n67, 2n1137  
7.30.5 xl,n82, 2n797  
7.35.3-4 xl,n82  
7.55.7 1n574  
7.82 xl,n82, 2n501  
11.56 1n973  
11.94 1n574, 2n501  
12.57.13 1n1028
- Musonius Rufus  
Frag. 12-13 2n797, p.367-68  
Frag. 15 2n811
- Nepos, *Alcibiades*  
11 1n758
- Nicolas of Damascus  
See at Josephus, *Ant.* 1.93-94  
Fragment 103 2n930, 2n935
- Ovid  
*Amores*  
14.14 2n812
- Metamorphoses*  
5.319-31 2n465  
10.152-61 2n1100
- Remedia Amoris*  
220 2n67
- Tristia*  
4.461-62 2n1079
- Pausanias  
1.14.2 1n81  
1.17.1 2n473  
6.18.5 1n760  
8.16.4-5 1n574  
10.5.12-13 2n578
- Petronius  
*Satirae*  
102.14 1n563, 2n501
- Fragment 37* 1n1037, 2n500, 2n501,  
2n1137
- Persius  
5.180-81 1n1036, 2n425, 2n1138
- Philostratus  
*Vita Apollonii*  
1.2 2n909  
5.33-34 2n1042  
5.33 2n439

- Pindar  
Fragment 264 2n47
- Plato  
*Apologia* xxxiv, xxxv, n58, 2n1059  
17b 2n919  
18b 2n1062  
19b 2n1062  
22a 2n1061  
23c 2n1065  
23d 2n1062, 2n1065  
24b 2n1061, 2n1065  
25d 2n1065  
26b 2n1061, 2n1065, 2n1068  
26c-d 2n1062  
27c-d 2n1062  
28d 2n1060  
29c 2n1065  
31c-d 2n1062  
32b-d 2n1060  
41a-c 2n1062
- Euthyphro*  
2c 2n1065  
3b 2n1061, 2n1062
- Euthydemus*  
272e 2n1062
- Gorgias*  
482b 2n1061
- Leges* xxvi, lviii, n148, lix, n150, p.245,  
2n671, 2n694, 2n707  
Bk 1 2n921, 2n935  
624a-b 2n624, 2n626  
632d 2n626  
633a 2n663  
634a 2n626, 2n627  
636c-d 2n796, 2n1100  
637d-e 2n1079  
638b 2n582  
641a 2n675  
657b 2n721  
663b-3 2n576  
676a-689e 2n904  
676a-679e 2n568  
677a-678a 1n45  
677d 1n34, 2n584  
680a-682d 2n586  
680a 2n587  
690c 2n571  
697c-d 2n610  
701a 2n637  
704d-705a 1n238  
712b-3 2n638  
712d 2n634  
713a-714a 2n638  
713a 2n638  
715d 2n688  
715e-718a 2n656  
715e 2n754  
716b-c 2n770  
716b 2n766  
717a 2n665, 2n713  
717b-e 2n830
- 717d 2n826  
719a-b 2n1032  
720a-721a 2n795  
742c 2n841  
742e 2n800  
752c 2n700  
752e-755b 2n697  
762e 2n688  
769d-772b 2n723  
772c 2n721  
774c-e 2n800  
774c 2n803  
775a-e 2n820  
779e 2n907  
784b 2n797  
788a-c 2n683  
797a-c 2n716  
810a-811e 2n1037  
816c-d 2n721  
822d-823c 2n695  
835b-842a 2n796  
838c-d 2n670  
839c 2n907  
841c 2n907  
850a-c 2n1038  
854b 2n1011  
865a-874a 2n829  
871a-c 2n749  
875a 2n782  
885c-899d 2n710  
899d-905b 2n711  
890a 2n571  
913c 2n839  
931a 2n263  
949e-953e 2n1038  
950a-d 2n1044, 2n1047  
952c 2n1039  
953e 2n1042  
955c-d 2n837  
958c-959e 2n826  
960d 2n721  
967c 2n1069
- Meno*  
91e 2n1072
- Minos*  
318d 2n624
- Phaedo* 2n1064  
70c 2n890  
72a 2n890  
97b-c 2n652  
97b 2n1069  
98a 2n1061
- Phaedrus*  
229e 2n1031  
242b 2n1062  
244c-d 1n689
- Politicus*  
291c-d 2n634  
295a 2n695  
297d-e 2n721  
298c 2n695  
302c-303a 2n635
- Protagoras*  
326c 2n1037  
329c 2n663
- Respublica (Republic)* lviii, n148,  
2n665, 2n694, 2n891  
376c-398b 2n1032  
376e-392c 2n964  
378c-d 2n986  
378d 2n1031  
379a-380c 2n978  
379a-e 2n983  
379e 2n986  
383a 2n1033  
387b 2n1032  
388a 2n1032  
388c-d 2n995  
390c 2n997, 2n998  
391a 2n1033  
398a-b 2n1035  
398a 2n1034  
469c-e 2n857  
470a-471c 2n856  
496c 2n1062  
499c-d 2n900  
543a-576d 2n634  
545b 2n637
- Symposium*  
178b 1n71  
182b 2n1097
- Theaetetus*  
151a 2n1062
- Timaeus*  
21e-23c 1n45  
21e 1n308  
22b-c 1n34  
22b 1n34  
23b 1n46  
27d-28a 2n918  
28c 2n656, 2n918  
41c 2n764  
42e 2n764
- Pliny the elder  
*Naturalis historia*  
Preface 25 2n7 (bis), 2n494  
2.187 2n41  
2.226 1n575  
3.30 2n131  
3.42 p.9  
3.57-58 1n264  
5.4 1n101, p.365  
5.71-73 1n575  
5.112 1n56  
6.30.121-22 p.77  
6.53 2n323  
7.9-11 2n323  
7.57 p.77  
7.123 1n430  
7.191-209 2n490  
7.205 1n56  
10.172 2n812  
13.46 2n1041



- 18.4.117 2n131  
 28.112 p.9, 1n101, p.365  
 30.2.11 2n530  
 30.4 1n536  
 30.6 2n7  
 30.12 2n336  
 30.13 2n323 (*bis*)  
 30.18 2n7, 2n47  
 30.99 2n94  
 34.93 2n257  
 35.20 p.365  
 37.19 2n7  
 37.31 p.9  
 37.41 p.365  
 37.45 1n398
- Pliny the younger  
*Epistulae*  
 3.11.3 xxxviii,n76  
 10.5-7 2n138  
 10.96 2n1026  
 10.118-19 p.365
- Panegyricus*  
 31.2 2n102  
 33.3-4 xxix,n77
- Plutarch  
*Agis*  
 14.3 2n929
- Alexander*  
 26 2n142  
 65 1n594  
 69 1n594
- Antonius*  
 25 2n204  
 29 2n204  
 31.2 2n209  
 36 2n206, 2n209  
 37.4 2n204  
 54 2n203  
 58 2n209  
 60 2n205  
 63.5 2n211  
 66.3-5 2n211  
 71.1 2n203  
 76-86 2n215
- Caesar*  
 3 2n275  
 1.1 liii,n124, 2n954
- Cato Major*  
 1.2 p.365  
 1.3 p.367  
 2.2-3 p.367  
 4.1-4 p.367  
 4.3 p.366  
 8.4 p.365  
 5.5 p.365  
 19.3-5 p.365  
 20.3-5 p.367  
 22.4 p.366
- Cicero*  
 4 2n275  
 10.4 2n323
- Cleomenes*  
 4.5 2n936  
 9 2n1004  
 13.3 2n675
- De Herodoti Malignitate* 1n75
- De Laude Ipsius* xxxii,n46
- Demetrius*  
 27.5-6 1n1025
- Dion*  
 36 1n78
- Isis and Orisis*  
 352f 2n513  
 353a-c 1n674  
 353f-354a 2n514  
 354b-c 1n113, 2n511  
 354c-d 1n812  
 354d-e 1n64  
 354d 1n612  
 355c 2n468  
 356a-b 2n570  
 356a 2n579  
 356c 1n1034  
 357f 1n988  
 358b 1n988  
 358e-f 2n964  
 361-362 p.335  
 362f p.352  
 363c-d 2n70, p.343, p.345, p.350  
 363c 2n468, p.352  
 364a 1n543  
 366a 1n988  
 368f 2n468  
 371b-c 1n829  
 376b-c 1n829  
 379c-f 2n465  
 380a-c 1n778, 1n835, 2n229,  
 p.364  
 380a 1n779  
 380c-d 1n829
- Lycurgus* 2n580, 2n929, p.366  
 1 2n580  
 4 2n675  
 5-6 2n626  
 8 2n933  
 9.3-4 p.367  
 10-12 2n675  
 10 2n933  
 12 2n933  
 12.1-2 2n933  
 13.1-2 2n675  
 13.3 2n590, p.367  
 15 2n1096  
 15.4-9 2n801  
 16.6-7 2n932  
 16.6 2n675, p.366  
 16.10 2n935
- 18.1 2n937  
 19-20 2n675  
 22.1-2 2n931  
 24 2n784, 2n930  
 24.2 2n933  
 24.4 2n932  
 25 2n936  
 27.4 2n721  
 27.6-7 2n1044  
 27.6 2n1045  
 29.1 2n922, p.366  
 29.6 2n922, p.366  
 30.3 2n923  
 31 2n907
- Nicias*  
 1 1n78
- Numa*  
 9.6 2n478
- Moralia*  
 11f 2n1097  
 169c 1n713  
 227f 2n800  
 239f-240a 2n922  
 281c 1n960  
 282a 1n95  
 From 351c to 384c see *Isis and Osiris*  
 539a-540f 2n543  
 540c-f xxx,n46  
 671c-672c 2n778  
 727b-730f 1n541  
 728c 1n542  
 729a 1n543  
 751b-752c 2n796, p.368  
 826b-827c 2n634  
 826d-e 2n534  
 855d 1n2  
 870a 1n972  
 874b 1n101  
 984d 2n864  
 990d-f 2n796
- Pericles*  
 32 2n1070
- Publicola*  
 4 2n323
- De Pythiae Oraculis*  
 25 2n11
- Quaestiones convivales*  
 4.5.2 =(669e-671c) xli,n88, 2n500,  
 2n273, 2n513, p.343, p.351  
 671f-672a 2n67  
 729d 1n64  
 738f 1n48
- Quaestiones romanae et graecae*  
 83 2n336
- Theseus*  
 1 1n2

- Polybius  
 1.3 1n264  
 1.6 1n266  
 1.83.9 2n129  
 3.21.12-13 1n215  
 4.20-21 1n96  
 5.58 2n163  
 6.2-18 2n634  
 6.2 2n634  
 6.3-9 2n904  
 6.5 2n632  
 6.10-18 2n634  
 6.10-11 2n922  
 6.10 2n723, 2n921  
 6.43-48 2n922  
 6.47.7-10 2n907  
 6.47.9-10 2n263  
 6.48.2-5 2n932  
 6.49.1 2n1090  
 6.53 2n258  
 9.34.11 2n1079  
 10.38.3 2n129  
 Bk 12 1n74  
 12.3.7 1n67  
 12.4-11 1n73  
 12.4 1n188  
 12.4.4 1n67  
 12.8 1n762  
 12.10-11 1n73  
 12.11.8 1n187  
 12.12-15 1n762  
 12.12 1n100  
 12.23.1-8 1n73  
 12.24-25 1n73  
 12.25 1n188  
 12.28.12 1n73  
 26.1.10-11 2n359  
 29.27 2n175  
 30.26.9 2n301  
 31.9 2n301  
 31.10 2n172, 2n175  
 31.10.4 2n177  
 31.17-19 2n172, 2n175  
 31.20 2n172, 2n175  
 33.11 2n175  
 34.14 2n172, 2n177, 2n238  
 36.17.5-12 2n811  
 38.22 2n463
- Pompeius Trogus  
*Apud Justin, Epitome*  
 Prologue 38 2n172  
 3.2-3 2n627  
 8.4-6 1n417  
 18.6.9 1n417, 2n59  
 19.1-6 2n468  
 28.1 1n699  
 Bk 36 p.343  
 36.2.6-10 1n981  
 36.2.7-11 2n530  
 36.12.12 1n1027, 1n1034, 1n1042  
 36.2.14 1n1037, 2n70, 2n82,  
 2n1137  
 36.2.15 2n1042  
 36.2.16 2n732  
 38.3.2-6 2n177
- 38.8.2-4 2n172, 2n178  
 38.8.3 2n172, 2n178  
 38.8.5 2n172, 2n175  
 38.8.9-11 2n177  
 38.8.11 2n172
- Porphyry  
*De Abstinentia*  
 2.26 1n551, 1n593, 1n595  
 2.54 2n336  
 2.61 2n504  
 4.6 2n511  
 4.11 xxix  
 4.14 liii, 2n509, p.245, 2n864
- Vita Pythagorae*  
 1 1n530, 2n8  
 5 1n530, 2n8  
 6 1n538  
 11-12 1n538  
 11 1n546  
 14-15 1n546  
 38 1n544  
 41-44 1n541  
 41 1n543  
 45 1n543  
 57 1n535
- Propertius  
 3.11 2n204  
 3.11.29-56 2n194
- Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*  
 3.7.21 xl, 2n439, 2n1042, 2n1087  
 4.3 1n347  
 5.7.29 1n25  
 5.13.53 xxxv,n58  
 8.3.52 1n347  
 12.2.30 2n677, p.366, p.367, p.368  
 12.3.30 2n542  
 12.6.7 2n275
- Sallust  
*Bellum catalinae*  
 8 2n1080  
 22 2n323, 2n339
- Seneca  
*Apud Augustine, De Civitate Dei* 6.10-  
 11; see ad loc.
- De Beneficiis*, 2n831  
 4.29.1 2n852
- De Consolatione*  
 19.6 2n102
- Epistulae Morales*  
 88.40 2n7 (*tris*), 2n47  
 90.6 2n582  
 90.11 2n719  
 95.47-50 2n753, 2n786  
 95.47 1n1036, 2n67, 2n425, 2n1138  
 95.51 2n852  
 108.22 xxxviii,n72, 2n1139  
 114.24 1n387
- Naturales Quaestiones*  
 3.29.1 1n430  
 4.2.16 2n214
- Servius, *Commentary on Aeneid*  
 7.738 1n738
- Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes*  
 3.223 2n513
- Sophocles  
*Oedipus Coloneus*  
 260 2n473
- Soranus, *Gynaecia*  
 1.56 2n815
- Statius, *Silvae*  
 5.2.138 1n574
- Strabo, *Geographica*  
 1.2.6 1n56  
 1.2.10 1n570, 1n573  
 1.2.28 1n573  
 4.4.6 1n267  
 6.2.4 1n267  
 7.2.1 1n269  
 7.3.5 1n546  
 7.3.9 2n323  
 8.3.9 1n67  
 8.5.5 1n72  
 8.8 1n96  
 8.8.1 1n95  
 9.1.6 1n80  
 11.4.7 2n336  
 11.5.3-5 p.10  
 13.4.16 1n573  
 14.1.22 2n477  
 15.1.6 1n481  
 15.1.61-68 1n594  
 16.1.5 p.77, 1n464, 1n471, 1n648  
 16.1.6 p.77  
 16.2.2 1n240, p.67 (*bis*)  
 16.2.18 1n248  
 16.2.34-39 p.343  
 16.2.34-36 2n274  
 16.2.34 2n323  
 16.2.35-38 2n579  
 16.2.35-36 1n946  
 16.2.35 p.48, 2n253, 2n646, 2n759  
 16.2.36-39 2n592  
 16.2.36-37 2n732  
 16.2.36 1n658, 2n554  
 16.2.37 1n248, 2n401, 2n547  
 16.2.38-39 2n627  
 16.2.38 2n624, 2n625, 2n626  
 16.2.39 2n530  
 16.2.40 1n713  
 16.34 2n218  
 17.1.3 1n113, 1n246  
 17.1.3 2n511  
 17.1.8-10 2n113  
 17.1.10 2n117  
 17.1.16 2n225  
 17.1.27 2n468

- 17.1.29 1n64  
 17.1.38-40 1n778  
 17.1.42 2n93  
 17.1.44 2n231  
 17.1.52 1n75  
 17.2.5 2n512, p.343, p.344n5, p.348
- Suetonius  
*Augustus*  
 69 2n209  
 76.2 xxxviii,n2, 1n1037, 2n67,  
 2n1137
- Domitianus*, xxxvii,n66-67  
 10 xxxvii,n66  
 10.1-2 xxxix,n78  
 10.3 xxxviii,n75-76  
 10.4 xxxviii,n74-75, xxxix,n77  
 12.1 xxxviii,n71  
 12.2 xxviii, xxxvii, 1n563, 2n1135  
 14.4 1n3  
 15.1 xxxix  
 18.2 xxxixn77
- Tiberius*  
 32.2 2n67  
 52 2n221
- Vespasianus*  
 5.9 xxxvii,n64, l, liii  
 7 1n1030
- Sulpicius Severus*  
 2.30.6 1n1057  
 2.30.7 2n480
- Tacitus  
*Agricola*  
 2-3 xxxvii  
 2.1 xxxviii,n75  
 2.2 xxxviii,n76  
 11 2n555  
 45.1-2 xxxviii,n75
- Annales*  
 1.1 1n104  
 1.68 2n555  
 2.14 2n555  
 2.21 2n542  
 2.53 2n365  
 2.59 2n221  
 2.60 1n348  
 2.88 p.6, p.9, 1n66, 1n275  
 3.21 p.368  
 3.30 p.367  
 3.33-34 p.367  
 3.50 p.368  
 3.52 p.367  
 3.55 p.367  
 3.60-63 p.169  
 3.73 p.169  
 5.10 p.365  
 6.13 p.368  
 11.11.3 p.10  
 11.14 1n48  
 11.18 p.368
- 11.24-25 2n130  
 11.24 2n1048, p.366  
 11.27 p.368  
 12.36 p.169  
 13.35 p.368  
 13.54 2n542, p.366  
 13.56 p.169  
 14.20-21 p.365  
 14.20 p.365  
 14.30 2n323  
 14.60-61 p.365,n2  
 15.74 2n253
- Germania*  
 3 2n542  
 6 2n542  
 6.3-6 p.368  
 7 2n742  
 7.2-4 p.368  
 12.1-2 p.368  
 14 2n542  
 14.3-4 1n240  
 14.3 p.367, p.368  
 14.4 2n930  
 15.1-3 2n930, p.368  
 19 1n241, 2n811  
 19.1 p.368  
 19.2 p.368  
 26.1 p.368  
 27 2n825  
 27.1-2 p.368  
 30 2n555
- Historiae*  
 1.1.3-4 1n204  
 1.11 1n311, 2n102, 2n138, p.364  
 1.22 p.77  
 2.4 1n103  
 3.47.2 1n180  
 5.2-4 xli  
 5.2-3 p.6, p.9, p.125, p.167  
 5.2.2 1n1046, p.343, p.351  
 5.2.3 p.6, 1n574, 1n1046, p.343  
 5.3-4 1n1018, 1n1024, p.343  
 5.3.1 xliii, 1n1031, 1n1039,  
 1n1060, 2n530, 2n592  
 5.3.2 1n793, 2n26, 2n70, 2n75,  
 2n83, 2n273, p.343, p.351  
 5.4-5 p.243  
 5.4.1-2 1n1060  
 5.4.1 xli, p.127, 1n927, p.243,  
 2n607, p.349, p.369  
 5.4.2 p.48, 1n835, 1n1027, 1n1031,  
 1n1040, 2n26, 2n28, 2n273,  
 2n296, 2n499, 2n500, p.351  
 5.4.3 1n707, 1n1037, 2n70  
 5.4.4 2n1135  
 5.5 p.92  
 5.5.1-2 p.243, 2n1019, 2n1042,  
 2n1066, 2n1135  
 5.5.1 xli, p.167, 2n235, 2n439,  
 2n447, p.243, 2n547, 2n846,  
 2n847, 2n1051, 2n1141  
 5.5.2 xxxix,n80, xli, 1n563, 2n501,  
 2n552, 2n797  
 5.5.3-4 xli
- 5.5.3 1n241, 2n542, 2n811, p.367  
 (bis)  
 5.5.4 xliii, 1n927, 2n253, 2n263,  
 p.243, 2n552, 2n646, 2n759  
 5.5.5 2n778  
 5.6.1 1n658  
 5.6.2-4 1n575  
 5.8.1 1n1057, 2n367, 2n370, 2n396  
 5.8.2 2n297, 2n359, 2n457  
 5.8.3 2n489  
 5.8.4 2n322  
 5.9.1 2n292, 2n296  
 5.9.2 2n253  
 5.12.1 1n1057  
 5.12.2 xli
- Theophrastus, *Characteres*  
 16.7 2n815
- Thucydides  
 1.3.3 1n53  
 1.5-8 1n248  
 1.5 1n248  
 1.7 1n239  
 1.21 1n59, 1n75  
 1.22 1n100  
 1.22.3-4 1n102  
 1.22.3 1n99  
 1.22.4 1n215  
 1.70.2 2n721  
 1.97.2 1n72  
 1.144 2n1044  
 2.36.1 1n91  
 2.37 2n1049  
 2.39 2n935, 2n1044  
 2.39.1 2n771, 1n1055  
 2.41.1 1n91  
 4.38 2n937  
 5.26 1n194
- Tibullus  
 1.3.15-18 2n1136
- Ulpian, *Digest*  
 50.15.1 p.67
- Valerius Maximus  
 1.3.3 p.77  
 2.2.3 2n275  
 2.6.1 2n1044  
 4.7.4 p.9, p.365  
 5.1.10 1n311  
 8.14 2n477
- Varro  
*Apud* Augustinme, *Civitas Dei* 4.27, 31;  
 6.5-6; 18.12, see ad loc.  
*Apud* Censorinus p.10
- Virgil  
*Aeneid*  
 Bk 1 1n417  
 2. 159 1n100  
 2.195 1n100  
 Bk4 1n417  
 5.254-57 2n1100

- 8.675-713 2n194, 2n210  
 8.698-700 1n777  
 8.707-8 2n211  
 9.607-8 p.367  
 10.466-72 2n995
- Vitruvius  
 9.8.1 2n39, 2n41
- Vita Aesopi*  
 103 1n388
- Xenophon  
*Anabasis*  
 2.4.12 1n485
- Cyropaedia*  
 5.9.19 1n463  
 7.5 1n499
- Hellenica*  
 2.3.17 1n627
- Memorabilia*, 2n1059  
 1.1.1-2.8 2n1066  
 1.1.1 2n1061  
 1.1.2-5 2n1062  
 4.8.1 2n1062
- Symposium*  
 8.34 2n1097
- Ps.-Xenophon  
*Lacedaemonion Politeia*  
 1 2n1096  
 7 2n930  
 8 2n626  
 9 2n936  
 10 2n921  
 13 2n935  
 14.4 2n1044, 2n1045  
 15 2n922

## INSCRIPTIONS AND PAPYRI

- Inscriptions  
*CIJ*  
 690 2n438  
 1385 2n447
- CIL*  
 6.1887 1n3  
 6.9454 1n3
- IG*  
 1.104 1n93
- OGIS*  
 1.54 2n163  
 194 2n214  
 737 2n406
- SIG*  
 1.527 2n340  
 3.985 2n812
- Papyri  
*BGU*  
 1132 2n116  
 1151 2n111  
 VIII.1730 2n214
- Cowley Papyrus*  
 33 2n499, p.346n10
- CPJ*  
 10 1n707, 2n67  
 18-32 2n149  
 20 2n841  
 24 2n841  
 30 2n116  
 127 2n168  
 128 1n128  
 132 2n167  
 141 p.347  
 142 2n116  
 143 1n128
- 144 1n128  
 150 2n238  
 151 2n124  
 153 1n737, 2n122, 2n124, 2n138,  
 2n233, 2n234, 2n235, 2n238,  
 2n254  
 156 2n238  
 427 1n128  
 438 p.346  
 443 p.346  
 450 p.346  
 520 1n977, p.346
- P. Lond.*  
 24 2n512
- P. Oxy.*  
 14.1681 2n104
- P. Rainer (=Potter's Oracle)* p.345,  
 p.346  
 I.1.7 1n1029

## JUDEAN TEXTS

## OLD TESTAMENT/HEBREW BIBLE

- Genesis*  
 1 2n757, 2n760  
 1:2-4 2n761  
 1:5 xxv  
 1:26 2n764  
 3:16 356, 2n806  
 10 1n275  
 11:28 1n283  
 15:13 1n1007  
 15:16 1n1007  
 34 2n801  
 37 1n981  
 39-50 1n981  
 40:15 1n330  
 41:12 1n330  
 41:53-57 1n307  
 42-49 1n929  
 42:2 1n842
- 42:6 1n300, 1n773  
 45:4-20 1n330  
 46:31-34 1n329  
 46:35 1n329  
 47:1-6 1n329
- Exodus*  
 1:10 1n824  
 1:11-14 126, 1n818  
 2 1n947  
 2:10 1n966  
 3:6 2n887  
 3:21-22 1n322, 1n1042  
 4:6-7 1n951  
 4:16 1n946  
 4:20 p.351  
 6:4 2n887  
 6:16-20 1n1007
- 7:1 1n946  
 11:1-2 1n322  
 12:35-36 1n322  
 12:37-38 1n325  
 12:40 1n1007  
 12:43 2n848  
 15:23-25 2n83  
 17 2n75  
 17:1-7 2n83  
 20:4-6 2n264  
 20:4 2n44, 2n261  
 20:8-11 1n708  
 20:12 2n830  
 20:14 2n810  
 20:15 2n840  
 20:23 2n757  
 20:25 1n667  
 21:15 2n832



*(Exodus cont.)*

21:16 2n840  
 21:17 2n831, 2n832  
 21:22-23 2n812, 2n813  
 21:22 2n811  
 22:7-15 2n839  
 22:16-17 2n802, 2n1107  
 22:17 2n803  
 22:19 2n863  
 22:21 2n843  
 22:25 2n841  
 22:27 1n544, 2n958  
 22:28 2n777  
 22:29 2n820  
 22:30 2n865  
 23:4-5 2n866  
 23:4 2n857  
 23:8 2n837  
 23:10-11 2n686  
 23:13 2n969  
 24:15-16 2n82  
 24:18 2n82  
 25-27 2n44  
 25:18-20 2n40, 2n44  
 25:23-40 2n378  
 25:29 2n379, 2n390  
 25:31-40 1n669, 2n380  
 25:39 1n669  
 26:37 2n38  
 27:20-21 1n670  
 28:39-42 1n673  
 29:38-42 2n268, 2n374  
 30:1-10 2n379  
 30:1-5 1n669  
 30:7-8 1n670  
 30:17-21 2n377  
 34:11-16 1n652  
 34:28 2n82  
 36-38 2n44  
 37:7-9 2n44  
 37:17-24 1n669, 2n380  
 37:25-28 1n669

*Leviticus*

1:10 1n553  
 2:4 1n553  
 5:22 2n839  
 10:9 1n674  
 11 2n863  
 12:2-8 2n368, 2n790  
 13-14 1n952, 2n792  
 13:45-46 1n953  
 13:45 1n954  
 13:46 1n952  
 14:4-7 1n957  
 14:8-9 1n956  
 14:10-32 1n957  
 14:33-53 1n955  
 15:1-15 1n955, 2n792  
 15:16-18 2n791  
 15:16 2n792  
 15:19-24 1n955, 2n366, 2n792  
 15:25-30 2n792, 2n815  
 15:31 1n952  
 18:6-18 2n804  
 18:19 2n797

18:22 2n796  
 18:23 2n863  
 18:29 2n798  
 19:3 2n830  
 19:11 2n840  
 19:13 2n833  
 19:14 2n852  
 19:27 1n571  
 19:32 2n834  
 19:33-40 2n843  
 19:35-36 2n875  
 20:10 2n810  
 20:11-14 2n804  
 20:13 2n796, 2n798  
 20:15-16 2n863  
 20:17 2n1101  
 20:18 2n797  
 21 1n126  
 21:1-4 2n827  
 21:7-8 1n125  
 21:7 1n126, 1n143  
 21:10-11 2n789, 2n827  
 21:13-15 1n126  
 21:16-23 1n959  
 22:24 2n1088  
 22:27-28 2n865  
 24:1-4 1n670  
 24:13-16 2n880  
 25:3-4 2n686  
 25:35-37 2n841  
 25:37 2n841

*Numbers*

5:2 1n952  
 12:9-15 1n951  
 15:32-36 1n708  
 16:15 p.351  
 18:15-16 2n820  
 18:20-32 1n631  
 19:1-22 2n828  
 19:10-22 2n789  
 19:13 2n789  
 19:15 2n828  
 19:18-19 2n828  
 19:20 2n789  
 21 2n74, 2n75  
 22:22-35 1n542  
 22:22-30 2n314  
 25 2n75  
 28:2-8 2n268, 2n374  
 28:3-8 1n673

*Deuteronomy*

4:2 1n171  
 5:8-10 2n264  
 5:11 1n544  
 5:14 2n863  
 5:16 2n830  
 5:19 2n840  
 6:4 2n640, 2n887  
 6:6 2n701  
 6:7 2n822  
 10:11 2n843  
 11:18 2n701  
 11:19 2n822  
 11:21 2n887

13:1 1n171  
 14 2n863  
 15:7-8 2n1142  
 16:18-20 2n742  
 16:19 2n837  
 16:21 1n672  
 17 2n638  
 17:8-13 2n742  
 17:12 2n777  
 20:19-20 2n856  
 21:10-14 2n858  
 21:18-21 2n879  
 21:18 2n831  
 21:22-23 2n853  
 22:1-3 2n839  
 22:6-7 p.357, 2n865  
 22:22 2n810  
 22:23-27 2n809  
 22:28-29 2n801, 2n1107  
 23:2 2n1088  
 23:19-20 2n841  
 24:7 2n840  
 24:10-11 2n839  
 25:4 2n314, 2n863  
 25:13-16 2n875  
 27:5-6 1n667  
 27:18 2n852  
 27:21 2n863  
 27:25 2n837  
 27:26 2n881  
 28:27 1n800  
 31:10-13 2n690  
 31:11 2n715  
 31:16 2n887  
 32:17 2n1062  
 33:10 2n740  
 34:10 2n1151

*1 Samuel*

8:7 2n638

*2 Samuel*

5:11 1n372

*1 Kings*

3 1n378  
 5 1n372, 1n379  
 5:1 1n372  
 5:2-12 p.67  
 5:6 1n373  
 5:9 1n373  
 5:11 1n374  
 6-7 2n45  
 6:1 2n64  
 6:38 1n419  
 7:48-50 1n669  
 9 1n372  
 9:10-14 p.67  
 9:11-13 1n376  
 9:14 1n373  
 10 1n378  
 10:1-3 p.67  
 10:1 1n377  
 10:24 p.67  
 16:31 1n412  
 18:27-28 1n402

- 2 *Kings*  
 3:19 2n856  
 3:25 2n856  
 16:4 1n672  
 25 1n439  
 25:8 1n505  
 25:27-30 1n487, 1n488
- 1 *Chronicles*  
 9:10-13 1n632
- 2 *Chronicles*  
 2:3-16 p.67  
 2:3 1n372  
 2:8 1n373  
 2:16 1n373  
 4:1 1n667  
 4:19-22 1n669  
 8:1 1n376  
 9:1-4 p.67  
 9:23 p.67
- Ezra*  
 1:1 1n507  
 2:36-39 1n632, 2n385  
 3:8 1n507  
 6:9-10 2n268  
 6:10 2n269  
 6:15 1n508
- Nehemiah*  
 7:39-42 2n385
- 9:6 2n438  
 10:37-39 1n631  
 11:10-14 1n632
- Esther*  
 3:13 1n626
- Psalms*  
 15:5 2n841  
 146:6 2n438
- Proverbs*  
 3:27 2n838  
 11:1 2n875  
 16:11 2n875  
 25:21 2n851  
 31:20 2n1142
- Isaiah*  
 26:19 2n888
- Jeremiah*  
 3:6 1n672  
 3:13 1n672  
 9:25-26 1n563  
 9:26 1n571  
 16:4 2n853  
 22:19 2n853  
 25:12 1n441  
 29:10 1n441  
 43:13 2n38  
 46:2-12 1n450
- 52:12 1n505  
 52:29 1n505  
 52:31-34 1n488
- Ezekiel*  
 18:8 2n841  
 18:13 2n841  
 18:17 2n841  
 27:12-25 1n246  
 27:17 1n252  
 37:1-4 2n888  
 44:21 1n674  
 44:22 1n125, 1n126  
 44:23-24 2n740  
 45:10-12 2n875  
 47:1 2n37
- Daniel*  
 5 1n496  
 7:9 2n834  
 9:2 1n441  
 9:25 1n506  
 12:2-3 2n888
- Amos*  
 8:5 2n875
- Zechariah*  
 1:12 1n441
- Malachi*  
 2:7 2n740

## APOCRYPHA AND SEPTUAGINT

- Baruch*  
 1.11 2n269  
 4.1 2n1112
- Judith*  
 11.13 1n631
- 1 *Maccabees*  
 1-2 2n896  
 1 2n297  
 1.20-23 2n298  
 1.21-23 1n669  
 1.21-22 2n378  
 1.22 2n379, 1n390  
 1.31-35 2n298  
 1.54 2n283  
 2.25 1n652  
 2.32-41 1n708  
 2.45 1n652  
 4.46 1n169  
 4.47 1n667  
 4.48-51 2n425  
 4.49 2n378  
 4.61 1n662  
 5.44 1n652  
 5.68 1n652  
 7.33 2n268  
 8.17-20 1n747  
 9.27 1n169  
 9.50-52 1n662
- 2 *Maccabees*  
 1.5 2n189  
 1.7-8 2n297  
 1.8-9 2n425  
 1.10 2n166  
 1.19 1n655  
 3.12 2n280  
 3.24-34 2n186  
 4.23-29 2n298  
 4.47 2n1079  
 5.5-11 2n297  
 5.15 2n280  
 6-7 1n178, 2n896, 2n942  
 6.28 2n895  
 6.31 2n895  
 7.5 2n895  
 9.1-29 2n517  
 15.12 1n130
- 3 *Maccabees*  
 1.3 2n168
- 1.6-9 2n164  
 3.8-10 2n237  
 3.9 1n130  
 3.25-5.10 2n184  
 5.19 2n185  
 5.26 2n185  
 5.34 2n185  
 5.45-6.21 2n185  
 6.18-20 2n186  
 6.22-29 2n188  
 6.25 2n149  
 6.30-40 2n183, 2n189  
 6.36 2n189  
 7.3 1n130  
 7.18-20 2n183, 2n189
- 4 *Maccabees* 1n178, 2n896, 2n942  
 2.6-14 2n947  
 2.8 2n841  
 2.14 2n856, 2n860, 2n866
- Sirach*  
 Prologue 1n166  
 3.1-6 2n830  
 4.4-5 2n1142  
 6.8-12 2n836  
 7.33-34 2n827  
 8.6 2n833  
 13.15-20 2n740  
 22.22 2n836

- 27.16-21 2n836  
42.4 2n875  
45.17 2n740
- Tobit*  
1.6 2n1112
- 1.17-18 2n853  
2.7 2n853  
4.3 2n853  
4.17 2n827  
8.7 2n797  
12.12-13 2n827
- Wisdom of Solomon*, 1n378, p.168  
11-19 2n517  
13-15 2n1021  
13.1-9 2n755  
14.15-21 2n258  
18.4 2n1112

## OTHER SECOND TEMPLE LITERATURE

- Aristeas (Letter of)* p.93, 1n615, 1n634, 1n745, p.168, 2n151, p.245, 2n1030, p.340, p.360, p.361  
9-11 2n154, 2n156  
9 2n157  
12-27 2n152  
12-13 1n626  
12 2n156, 2n158  
13-15 2n147  
13 2n149  
14 1n626, 2n152  
20 2n153  
23 2n152  
28-172 1n628  
28-40 2n156  
28-32 2n154  
31 1n236, 338 (*bis*)  
33 2n153  
36 2n147, 2n149  
38-40 2n154  
40 2n156, 2n158  
43 2n156, 2n157, 2n158  
45 2n269  
83-106 1n661  
84-85 1n666  
92-95 1n667, 1n673, 1n674  
95 2n386  
105 1n663  
107 1n658  
112-16 1n658  
128-71 1n634  
131 2n665  
152 2n796  
173 2n156  
187-311 p.360  
210 2n642  
228 2n830, 2n835  
234-35 2n665  
234 2n767, 2n788  
301-17 2n156  
301 2n153  
311 1n171  
312-16 1n236  
312 1n18, 2n154  
317 2n154  
319-20 2n153
- Aristobulus* (pp.10, 93, 244, 245, 2n656, 2n1030, 2n1146)  
*apud* Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*:  
8.9.38-8.10.17 2n82  
8.10.7-17 2n764  
8.10.17 2n650  
9.6.6-8 2n648, 2n1036  
13.12 2n753, 2n754
- 13.12.1-16 2n490  
13.12.1-7 2n648  
13.12.1 1n547  
13.12.4 2n1036  
13.12.6-7 2n654  
13.12.8 2n665  
13.12.11-16 2n1136
- Artapanus* (pp.10, 49, 126, 1n981, 2n598)  
*apud* Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*:  
9.18.1 2n490  
9.23.2-3 2n490  
9.27.1-37 p.49  
9.27.4-6 2n490  
9.27.6 1n946  
9.27.10 2n512  
9.27.34 1n322  
9.27.34-35 1n1042
- 2 Baruch* p.78  
48.24 2n769
- Dead Sea Scrolls*  
4QMMT C 1n167  
4Q242 p.78, 1n503  
4Q320-25 2n385  
4Q320-321 2n387  
4Q323 2n388  
4Q324 2n388  
4Q328-30 2n385
- Demetrius*  
*Apud* Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*  
9.21 1n745  
9.21.13 1n329  
9.29 1n745
- Eupolemus* pp.10, 49, 1n747, p.244  
*Apud* Clement, *Stromata*  
1.23.153.4 1n48  
*Apud* Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*  
9.26.1 2n490  
9.30-34 p.67 (*bis*)  
9.33.1 1n372  
9.34.7 1n669  
9.34.18 1n374, 1n398  
9.34.19 1n732
- Ps.-Eupolemus* p.10  
*Apud* Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*  
9.17.2-3 1n283  
9.17.3 2n490  
9.18.2 2n490
- Ezekiel, Exagoge*, p.126, 2n598
- 4 Ezra*, p.78  
14.44-46 1n156
- Hypothetica* p.245; see Appendix 5  
*passim*  
*Apud* Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*  
8.6.1-7.20  
6.1 1n283, 2n599  
6.2-9 2n598, 2n620  
6.2-4 2n530, 2n623  
6.2 2n600, 2n601, 2n1187  
6.3 2n612  
6.4 2n600, 2n605  
6.8 2n607  
6.9 1n172, 2n896, 2n924  
7.1-2 2n831, 2n870, 2n873, p.368  
7.1 2n703, 2n750, 2n796, 2n837, 2n878, 2n1103  
7.2 2n830, 2n874, 2n879  
7.3-5 1n553  
7.3 2n805, 2n806, 2n849  
7.6 2n838, 2n839, 2n849, 2n851, 2n876  
7.7 2n812, 2n8132, 2n825, 2n853, 2n863, 2n1088  
7.8 2n836, 2n849, 2n851, 2n858, 2n875  
7.9 2n749, 2n849, 2n862, 2n864, 2n865  
7.10-14 2n690, 2n693  
7.10 2n692  
7.11 2n686, 2n698  
7.12-13 1n132  
7.12 2n692  
7.13 2n740  
7.14 2n698, 2n699, 2n700, 2n715  
7.20 2n1136
- Jubilees*  
32.15 1n631  
50.12 1n708
- Philo the elder* 1n746
- Ps.-Phocylides* see Appendix 5  
*passim*, xxiv, xxvi, p.245  
3 2n796  
6 2n840  
8 2n830  
13 2n839  
14-15 2n875  
29 2n1142  
38 2n856

52 2n880	199-200 2n800	3.185-86 2n796
83 2n841	208-9 2n832	3.237 2n875
84-85 2n865	213-14 2n796	3.593-94 2n830
99 2n853	218 2n835	3.596-600 2n796
140 2n866	220-22 2n833	3.764 2n796
175-217 2n795	228 2n788	3.765-66 2n811
175 2n799		4.34 2n796
179-83 2n804	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	5.60-62 p.347
184 2n812, 2n813, 2n815	2 2n292	5.68-70 p.347
185 2n811	8.14-22 2n292	5.418-33 2n769
186 2n797, 2n813		5.430 2n796
188 2n863	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i> , 2n463	
189 2n797	2.27 2n801	<i>Testament of Issachar</i>
190-91 2n796	2.281-82 2n812	2.3 2n797
198 2n801		

## JOSEPHUS

*Against Apion*

N.B. Since the entire commentary deals with *Against Apion*, these references pertain to passages cited in the introduction and appendices only.

1.1-2.133	lxiii, n168	1.35	lvi	1.73-75	lxii, n160
1.1-5	xvii, xix, xxi, xxix, xxxi	1.36	xlvi, lxiv, n173	1.73	xxii, xxxiii, n49, xlvi, lvi, n139, lvii
1.1-2	xxii, xxiii	1.37-42	liv, lvi	1.73	lxvii
1.1	xxii, xxvii, xxix, xxix, n38, xlvi, ln114, lv, lvi, lvi, n138, lvii	1.37-41	xlvi, lviii	1.74	xxx
1.2-3	xlvi	1.38-42	lxii, n160	1.75-102	lxv
1.2	xvii, viii, xxvi, xxxi, xxxi, n44, xlvi, lii, lvi, n138, lxx	1.40	xlvi	1.75-90	p.341, p.342
1.3-5	xlvi	1.42-43	p.363, p.366	1.75-82	p.335
1.3	xvii, xxix, xxxi, xxxiii, n49, xxxv, lxiv, n173	1.42	xxii, lvi, lvii, lviii, p.355	1.76	p.345
1.4-5	xviii	1.44-45	xxx	1.78	lxiv, n173, p.345
1.4	xviii, xxxiii, n49	1.46-57	liii	1.82-90	lxii, n160
1.5	xxx, xlvi, lvi, n138	1.46	lxiv, n173	1.82-83	p.336
1.6-218	xvii, xix, xx, xxi, xxxi, xxxiii	1.47-56	xviii, xxii, xxvii, xxxi, lii	1.82	xliv
1.6-68	xviii	1.48	xlvi	1.83	lxiv, n173, p.335, p.336
1.6-59	xviii	1.50	xxx	1.84-90	p.335
1.6-56	xviii, xxi, xxix, xxxi, lviii, lxx, lxxi, lxxi, n195	1.51	xlvi, n106, xlvi, li	1.86	p.345
1.6-27	liv, p.362, p.365	1.52	xxx	1.90	lvii, n143, pp.342, 345, 346
1.6-26	xviii, xxii, lxii, n160	1.53-56	xviii, xxii	1.91-92	lvi
1.6	xxii, xxxi, lxvii	1.53	xxx, xxxiv, n53	1.91	p.335
1.15-27	xlvi	1.54-55	xlvi	1.93	xxix, xxxi
1.15	xxx, xxxiii, n49	1.54	xxiii, xxix, n38, lvi, n139, lix, lx	1.94-97	p.335
1.16	xlvi	1.57-59	xxi	1.94	pp.336, 342, 346
1.18	xxx, lxiv, n173	1.57	xviii, xxv, n19	1.98-101	p.335
1.23	xxxiii, n49	1.58-59	xvii, xviii, xix, xlvi, n104	1.102	lxiv, n173, pp.335, 336, 347n12
1.24-27	p.365	1.58	xviii, xxxi, xlvi, xlvi	1.103-4	lxii, n160
1.25	xxx	1.59	xviii, xxix, xxxi, xxxii, lv, ln138	1.104	xxx, liv, n129, lvi, lvi, n140
1.26	xxx, n44	1.60-68	xviii, xxi, lvii, lx, p.363	1.105	xxxiii, n49, lvii, p.335
1.27-46	xviii	1.60	lvi, lvii, lix, lx, p.367	1.106-27	xviii, xxi, lxii, n160
1.28	lix	1.65-68	p.365	1.106	xxii, xxxi, lvi, n138, lxvii
1.30-36	lviii	1.66	xliv, p.363	1.107-26	lxii, n164
1.30-35	lvi, n139	1.68	lvi, n138, lix	1.108-11	lviii
1.30	lix	1.69-218	xviii, xxi, xxxi	1.109	lviii
1.32-33	lvii	1.69-72	xxi	1.112-20	xxxiii
1.32	lvi, n138	1.69	xxx, xxxi, n44, lxx	1.112	xxx, lxiv, n173
1.34	xlvi	1.70	xxx	1.114	xliv
		1.71	lvi, n138, lvi	1.115	xxx
		1.72	xxx, xxxii	1.116	xlvi, lvii
		1.73-160	xix, xlvi		
		1.73-105	xviii, xxi, lxii, n160		



(Josephus, <i>Against Apion</i> cont.)	1.214	xxxi	1.304-20	xviii, xxi
1.127	xxiii, xxix, n38, xxxi, lvi, lvii,	1.215-18	xxi, lxii, n160	1.304-11
1.128-60	xviii, xxi, lxii, n160	1.215	xxix	1.305-11
1.128	xxii, lvii, lxxvii	1.217	xxix, xxxi, lvii	pp.341, 343
1.129	xxxi, xlvii, lvi, n139, lix	1.218	lvii, p.353, p.360	1.305-6
1.130	xlvi	1.219-2.286	xx, xxi, xxxii	p.342
1.131	xlvi	1.219-2.144	xviii, xix	1.305
1.132	lvi, n138, lviii	1.219-320	xvii	lvi, n138, p.342
1.135-42	lxii, n164	1.219-26	xxi	1.310
1.135-41	lvii	1.219-22	xxxii	lvii, n143
1.136-37	lxii, n160	1.219	xviii, xix, xxii, xxxi, lxxvii	1.312-20
1.137	lvi, n138, lxiv, n173	1.220-22	xxxiv	1.313
1.139	lxiv, n173	1.220	xxxii	lv, in138, lxiv, n173
1.144	xxiii	1.221-22	xxxii	1.314-18
1.145	lviii	1.222	xxv, n19	1.314
1.146-54	lxii, n160, lxii, n164	1.223-26	p.364	1.315
1.146	lix	1.223	xxxii	lviii
1.150	lxiv, n173	1.227-320	xxxii	1.316-317
1.154	lvii, lviii	1.227-87	xviii, xxi	lvi
1.160	xxix, xxxi, xlvi, n104, lvi, n138, lvii	1.227-31	xxi	1.316
1.161-218	lxxi, n195, p.339	1.227	xxxii	1.317
1.161-214	xviii, xix, xxi, lxx	1.228-92	p.341	1.319
1.161	xxii, xlviii, lvi, n138, lxxvii	1.228-51	pp.341, 343	1.320
1.164	lvi, n139	1.228-29	p.335	2.1-144
1.165	p.359	1.228	lvii, lviii, n143	xvii, xviii, xxi, xxiv, xxx, xxxii, xxxiii, lxvi, p.364
1.166	lvi, n138	1.229	lvi, n140	2.1-7
1.167	xlvi, lvii	1.232-51	xxi, lxv, p.341	2.1-2
1.168-71	xliv	1.232-49	p.335	xxix, xxix, n39, xxx, xxxii
1.168-70	p.348	1.232-39	p.345	2.1
1.169-71	xxiii	1.235	lxiv, n173, p.342	xviii, xxii, xxvii, xxix, xxxi, xlvi, lxxvii
1.172-74	lxii, n160	1.237	p.345	2.2
1.172	xlvi, lvi, n138	1.238-39	p.336	xviii, xix, n7, xxix, xxxi, xxxiii, n49, lxiv, n173
1.175-82	p.339	1.238	lxiv, n173	2.3-5
1.176-82	lxii, n160	1.239	p.345n7	2.4
1.176	lxiv, n173	1.241	p.342, p.345n7	xxxii
1.177-81	lix	1.246	lxiv, n173	2.5
1.179	lvi, n139, lvii, n143, lxi, lxiv, n173	1.248-49	p.345	xxxii, xxxiii, n49
1.182	p.366	1.248	p.342	2.7
1.183-204	lxvi, p.338, p.343	1.250	lvi, n139, pp.335, 336, 342, 345, 346	xxxii
1.185	lvi, n138, p.340	1.252-87	xxi	2.8-32
1.187	p.339	1.252-53	lvi, n140	2.8
1.188	p.339	1.252	lvi, n139, lvi	lvi, n139
1.190-93	p.339	1.253	xxxiii, n49, lvin138	pp.341, 343
1.190-91	p.366	1.254-77	p.336	lxiv, n173
1.192-95	lvii	1.265	lvi, n139	p.343
1.193	xliv, p.339	1.273	xliv	pp.341n2, 349
1.194	lvi, n138, lxiv, n173, p.339	1.275	xxxii, n45, lvi, n139	lxiv, n173
1.195	lvii, n143	1.278	lvi, lvi, n140	p.342
1.197-204	lxii, n160	1.279-86	xliv	2.21
1.197-99	lviii	1.279-83	xxiii	lvii, n143, lxiv, n173
1.198	p.339	1.279	xxxii	2.22
1.200-204	p.339	1.279	xxxii	2.23-39
1.200	xxxii, lxiv, n173	1.288-303	xviii, xxi	2.25
1.205-12	lxvii	1.288-92	xxi, 343	2.27
1.205-11	xliv	1.288	xliv, in96	2.28
1.205	xxxii	1.289-90	p.345	2.28
1.209-212	xxiii, xliv	1.290	p.342	2.30
1.209-10	p.347	1.291	p.341	2.31
1.210	lvii	1.292	pp.342, 345	2.32
1.212	xxv, n19, xliv, lvii, p.366	1.293-303	xxi	2.33-78
1.213	xxxii, n44, xlvii	1.298-302	lvi, n140	2.33-64
		1.298	xxv, n19, lvi, lvi, n139	2.33-47
		1.299	xliv	2.33-42
		1.300	p.345	2.33
		1.301	xxv, n19	2.33
		1.303	xxxiii, n49	2.34
				2.37
				2.40
				2.41
				2.42-64
				2.42-47
				2.42
				2.43
				2.45-47
				2.45
				2.47
				2.49
				2.50
				2.52-113
				lv, lxi, lxii, lxiii, n168, lxiv

- 2.53 xxxi, n44  
2.56-60 xlvii, xlviii, p.363  
2.56 xxxii  
2.59 xlvii  
2.60 lxiv, n173  
2.61-64 xxiii  
2.62-62 p.363  
2.61 xxii, xxxi, n44, p.363  
2.62-64 p.363  
2.62 xxxi, n44  
2.63 xxxii  
2.65-67 xlvi  
2.65-66 p.364  
2.65 p.347n11  
2.66 p.364  
2.67 lvii  
2.68 xxxii  
2.69-70 p.364  
2.71-78 xlv  
2.71-72 p.364  
2.71 xxxii  
2.73-78 p.363  
2.73-77 xxiii  
2.73-74 p.363  
2.73 xxii, xxxii, lxxi, p.349  
2.74-75 p.363  
2.74 xlviii, lxxi, p.365  
2.75 xlviii, lxiv, n173  
2.79-144 xxi  
2.79 xxxii, lviii, pp.350, 352  
2.80 p.350  
2.82 xxii, xlvii, lviii, n146, p.363  
2.84 xxxi, n44  
2.86 lxiv, n174, 364  
2.88 xxxii  
2.89-96 xlili  
2.89 xxxii  
2.90 xxxii  
2.102-9 xxiv, lviii  
2.102 lviii  
2.103 lvi  
2.107 xxxi, n44  
2.111 xxxii  
2.112-14 p.350  
2.112 p.350  
2.117 xxxii  
2.121-22 lvi  
2.121 xxiii  
2.123 lii, lvii, lix, p.366  
2.125-34 xxiii, xlv, lxxi, pp.363, 364  
2.125-26 p.363  
2.126 lxiv, n173  
2.128 p.364  
2.129 p.345  
2.131 lviii, n146, lxxi, p.363  
2.132 xxxii, lvi  
2.134 xxii  
2.135-36 lix, n150, p.363  
2.135 lxiv, n173  
2.136 xxiii, xxix, n38, lvi  
2.137 xxv, n19, xxxii, xlv, pp.342, 349  
2.138 xxxii, xxxiii, n49, lvi, n139  
2.139 p.364  
2.142 xxxii, xlv  
2.143 xxxii  
2.144 xix, n5, xxxi, xxxii  
2.145-296 xlix, lxvi  
2.145-286 xvii, xviii, xix, xix, n5, xx, xxi, xxiii, xxiv, xxv, xxvi, xxvi, n25, xxx, xxxii, xxxiii, n50, xxxv, xliii, xlv, n99, xlvii, liii, lvii, n143, lviii, lix, n150, lxxi, n196, pp.358, 359, 360, 362  
2.145-86 xlv  
2.145-50 xix, xx, xxi  
2.145 xix, xxii, xxiii, xxxii, xlv, lviii, lviii147, lxvii, p.355  
2.146 xxii, lix, n150, pp.361, 366  
2.147 xix, xx, xxxi, xxxii, xlvii  
2.148 xix, xxiii, xxviii, xxxii, xlv, pp.349, 362, 366  
2.149 xxxiii, n49  
2.150 xx, xxxiii, xliii, pp.358, 363  
2.151-286 xx, xx, n8  
2.151-89 xx, xxi, xxiii, p.360  
2.152-56 p.353  
2.154-56 lviii  
2.156 xix, xx, xxxii  
2.157-62 p.360  
2.157-61 p.355  
2.157 p.355n11  
2.158-59 xxviii  
2.159 lvi, n138, p.355n11  
2.160 p.355  
2.161-63 lviii  
2.161 xx, xxiii, xxxii, p.355  
2.163-228 liv, p.355  
2.163-218 lxii, n160  
2.163-89 p.355  
2.163-65 lxii  
2.165-68 xxv, lviii, lxxi  
2.165-67 lx, n152  
2.165-66 p.355  
2.165 xxiv, n16, xxvn19, lviii, lix, n149, p.360  
2.166-68 xxiv  
2.166-67 pp.359, 360  
2.167 xxv  
2.168 xxxi, n44, xlvii, xlviii, lix, lix, pp.353, 359, 360  
2.170 lix, lix, n150, pp.360, 366, 367  
2.171-78 xxxii, lviii  
2.171-75 pp.365, 366  
2.173 lvi  
2.174 xxv, xlv, p.367  
2.175 p.356n12  
2.175-78 xxiv, lix, n150, pp.355, 356  
2.178 lvi, pp.356n12, 368  
2.179-81 xxii, xxiv, p.361  
2.180-82 xxv  
2.180 p.363  
2.182-83 pp.361, 365  
2.182 xx, xxxii, p.363  
2.183 xxxiii, n49  
2.185-88 lviii  
2.185-87 p.361  
2.185 lviii  
2.189 p.363  
2.190-218 xx, xxi, xxiv, xxxii, xxxiii, lxii, pp.353, 355, 356, 359, 361, 367, 368  
2.190-98 pp.355, 361  
2.190-92 xxiv, xxv, lix, pp.359, 361  
2.190 pp.355, 359  
2.192-98 xxv  
2.192 p.359  
2.193-98 xxviii, lviii  
2.193-94 lviii  
2.193 xxviii.n36, xl.n85, lx.n153, p.359  
2.194 xxxiii, n49  
2.195 p.367  
2.196 xxiv  
2.199 pp.357, 368  
2.199-214 p.357  
2.199-208 p.361  
2.199-204 p.367  
2.200 lxiv, n173, pp.357, 367  
2.201 pp.356, 357  
2.202-3 xxv  
2.202 xxv.n19, lvi, pp.355, 357  
2.204 lvi, p.367  
2.205-6 p.357  
2.205 xxv, pp.357, 359, 367  
2.206 pp.357, 368  
2.207 pp.356, 368  
2.208 xxiv, pp.356, 367  
2.209-14 xlv, p.361  
2.209-11 p.355  
2.209-10 lii, lix, p.361  
2.209 lvi, p.361  
2.210 lix, pp.359, 368  
2.211 xxiv, xlv, pp.356, 357  
2.213 xxix, liii, pp.357, 359  
2.214 p.368  
2.215-17 pp.356, 368  
2.215 pp.357, 368  
2.216 pp.355, 356, 363  
2.218-219 lix, p.366  
2.218 xx, n9, p.361  
2.219-86 p.361  
2.219-35 xx, xxi, xxxii, p.366  
2.219 xix.n5, xx.n9, p.355  
2.220-24 lviii  
2.220-23 p.365  
2.224 p.353  
2.220 xix, n5  
2.225-35 lviii, lix, pp.355, 366  
2.225-31 xlvii  
2.225 p.366  
2.226 p.355n10  
2.227 p.366  
2.229-30 p.367  
2.231 p.366  
2.232-35 xlv, pp.355, 366  
2.233 p.363

(Josephus, <i>Against Apion</i> , cont.)	2.291-92	p.369	1.93-95	1n45, 1n734
2.234 xxv, xliv, pp.363, 367	2.291	p.367	1.93	1n432, 2n1011
2.235 lxiv, n173	2.292	p.365	1.94	92, 1n734, 1n738, 2n402
2.236-86 xx, xxi, xliv, p.361	2.293-94	p.369	1.106-7	1n434
2.236-70 lix	2.294	xxii, lx, pp.355, 355n10, 366, 367	1.106	2n496
2.236-57 xlviii			1.107	49, 1n293
2.236-38 xx, xxxii, xxxiii, xliii	2.295	xxxiii, xlvi	1.108	1n57
2.236 xx, n10	2.296	xxii, xxvii, xxix, xxxi, xxxiii, xxxv, xlvi, xlviii, xlviii,n108, lvi,n138	1.121	2n534
2.237 p.359			1.122-47	1n433
2.238 xxxiii, n49, xlvi, n104, p.358			1.124	1n275
			1.144-46	1n429
2.239 xlviii, lix, p.365	<i>Antiquities</i>		1.144	1n433
2.240-54 p.360	1-11	2n154	1.148-49	1n8
2.240-49 p.365	1-5	2n385	1.148	1n9
2.242 lix	1-4	xxv	1.151-68	1n283
2.248 xxv, n19, p.363	1.2	1n101, 1n102, 1n104, 1n109	1.151-59	1n429
2.250-54 p.365			1.155	2n496
2.250 xlviii	1.5	1n2, 1n219, 1n291, 2n534	1.158	1n283, 1n427
2.251-53 p.363			1.159	p.92, p.338, 1n612, 1n615, 1n741
2.252 xlviii, lxxi, p.365	1.6	xxvi,n25, xxix,n38, 2n537, 2n672	1.161-68	p.49
2.254-57 p.360	1.7	1n201	1.164-65	2n810
2.255-75 xxxii	1.8-9	xxii, xxvii, 1n3	1.165-68	p.10
2.255 xx, xxxii, p.359	1.10-12	2n154	1.166-68	2n496
2.256-57 p.353	1.10-11	xxiii	1.166	2n229
2.257 lviii, lix, p.359	1.10	1n202, 2n159, 2n905	1.180	1n327, 1n574
2.258 xx, xxxiii, xxxii, pp.349, 361	1.11	2n296, 2n845	1.192	xxv,n21, 1n143, 1n331
	1.12	1n22, 1n157	1.200	2n796
2.260 lix	1.13	1n8, 1n13	1.203	xxix,n38
2.261 lii, p.366	1.14-26	2n639	1.207-9	2n810
2.262-67 xlvii	1.14	xxvi,n25, 2n457, 2n711, 2n718, 2n721, 2n739	1.209	2n885
2.262 xx, xxxii, p.368			1.214	xxvn21
2.263 lxiv,n173			1.216	p.92
2.265 xxv,n19	1.15	xxiv, 2n543, 2n639, 2n643, 2n644, 2n650, 2n964, 2n1018, 2n1035	1.225	2n711, 2n749
2.270 xx, xxxii			1.231	2n831
2.271-75 lix			1.240	1n731
2.272 p.366	1.16	1n8, 1n13, 1n360, 2n49, 2n579, 2n924	1.246	2n1047
2.273-5 p.355			1.258	2n749
2.273 p.366	1.17	1n14, 1n169, 1n171	1.283	2n711
2.274-75 p.365	1.18-26	2n751	1.322-23	2n366
2.275 p.365	1.18-21	xxiv, 2n622	2-4	2n528, 2n619
2.276-77 p.368	1.19	xxvin25, 1n811, 2n650, 2n766	2.7	2n1176
2.276 pp.355, 356			2.23-24	2n622
2.277-86 pp.359, 361	1.20-21	2n665	2.25	2n6, 2n885
2.277 lvii, lvii,n143, p.359	1.20	xxvi,n25, 2n711, 2n767	2.32-33	1n330
2.278 xx, xxxii	1.21	xxvi,n25, 2n537, 2n765	2.41-44	2n810
2.279 xxxi,n44	1.22-23	2n643	2.44-47	2n142
2.280 xxxiii,n49	1.22	xxvi,n25, 2n764, 2n964, 2n1018, 2n1102	2.52	2n885
2.281 lix, lxiv,n173, pp.353, 359, 367	1.23	xxvi,n25, 2n629, 2n767	2.68-78	1n330
	1.24	2n539, 2n650, 2n1030, 2n1035	2.89-90	1n773
2.282-86 xxviii, xliv, xlix, liii			2.91	2n33
2.282 xliv, p.359			2.93-94	1n307
2.283 pp.366, 367, 369	1.25	xxv, xxv,n21, 2n159	2.94	p.49, 2n232
2.285-88 xxxiii	1.27-33	2n760, 2n765	2.95	1n929
2.285 xx, xxxii	1.27-28	2n761	2.146	2n838
2.287-96 xvii, xxi, xxxiii	1.27	2n764	2.171	1n326
2.287-95 xix, xxix, xxxi	1.29-32	2n762	2.177	xxiii, 1n9, 2n1165
2.287-88 xix, xlvi,n104	1.29	xxv, xxv,n21	2.186	1n329
2.287 xix, xxii, xxiv, xxix,n38, xxxii, xxxiii,n49, xlvii	1.32	2n757	2.188	2n33
	1.33	2n87	2.193	p.49
2.288 xxxi, xxxiii, xliii, lvi,n138	1.45-47	2n885	2.201-5	1n818
	1.49	2n805	2.201-2	1n773
2.289-95 lxxi	1.61	2n496	2.201	2n102
2.289-90 xxxiii	1.64	2n496	2.202-3	2n1176
2.289 xix, lvi	1.72	2n488	2.202	p.49
2.290-91 xix	1.82-88	1n8, 1n434	2.204	1n1007
2.290 xxxi,n44, xxxiii	1.82	1n13		

2.205	1n978, 2n598	3.113	2n44	3.318	2n447, 2n1134
2.211	2n691	3.115	2n37	3.320-21	2n622
2.216	1n946, 2n598	3.123	2n38, 2n44, 2n771	3.320	2n620
2.228	1n966	3.126	2n44	3.322	2n620
2.229-31	2n598	3.139-43	2n378	3.327	2n374
2.234	1n978	3.143	xxv, xxv,n21	4	xxiv, 2n749
2.238-53	p.49, p.126, 1n946, 2n598	3.144-46	2n380	4.1-175	2n74
2.239-40	1n939	3.147-48	2n379	4.2	2n606, 2n620
2.268	2n619	3.150	2n379, 2n390	4.3	2n610
2.272	2n619	3.151-58	2n370	4.10	2n608
2.274	2n619	3.159-78	2n372	4.11	2n600
2.276	2n619	3.178	2n777	4.14	2n735
2.282	p.49	3.179-87	xxv	4.16	2n610
2.284-87	xxiii, 2n530	3.179-80	xxiii, 2n552, 2n771	4.17	2n736
2.314	p.49, 1n321, 2n603	3.180	1n946	4.19	2n735
2.317	1n325, 2n600	3.184-87	2n372	4.22	2n610
2.318	1n1007	3.188-90	2n606	4.24	2n735
2.320-3.62	2n600	3.190-91	2n609, 2n735	4.25	2n608, 2n735
2.327	1n159, 2n1151	3.190	2n606, 2n615	4.28	2n735
2.329-37	2n620	3.191	2n641	4.40-46	2n609
2.332	2n600	3.198	2n379	4.40	2n438
2.338-44	1n336	3.199	1n670	4.41	2n619
2.347	1n14	3.205	xxv, xxv,n21	4.42	2n615
2.348	1n34	3.212-13	2n609	4.45	2n620, 2n905
2.268	2n598	3.213	2n620, 2n905	4.47	2n620, 2n711
3-4	361, 2n600, 2n605, 2n606, 2n608, 2n609, 2n614, 2n615, 2n620, 2n684	3.218	xxvn21, 1n169	4.57	2n379
3	2n381, 2n604, 2n782	3.222-23	2n620	4.60	2n620
3.1-10	2n601	3.222	2n620	4.66	2n735
3.1-8	2n83	3.223	xxv, xxv,n21, 2n702	4.67-75	xxv,n24
3.5	2n603	3.224-86	xxv,n24, 2n749	4.68	1n631
3.12	2n605, 2n641	3.224-57	2n775, 2n778	4.73	1n553
3.13-21	2n620	3.224	2n782	4.78-81	2n828
3.13	2n608	3.230	xxv, xxv,n21	4.85-95	2n75
3.14-20	2n641	3.233	2n782	4.93	2n857
3.19	2n711	3.236	2n865	4.99	2n603
3.23	2n711	3.237	2n268	4.101	2n488
3.33	2n601	3.240	2n1137	4.102	2n1090
3.33-38	2n83	3.241	2n1011	4.105	2n749
3.39-60	2n75	3.244-86	2n1157	4.106	2n620
3.49-50	2n76	3.257	xxv, xxv,n21	4.107-11	2n314
3.49	2n1176	3.259-60	2n684	4.109	1n542
3.50	2n603	3.259	xxv, xxv,n21	4.114-17	2n463, 2n620, 2n711
3.58	2n1176	3.261	2n366, 2n792	4.115-16	1n654
3.59	2n857	3.262	2n789, 2n828	4.116	1n133
3.60	2n1151	3.263	2n791, 2n792, 2n816	4.118-19	1n152
3.68	2n615	3.264	xxv,n21, 1n953, 1n957	4.122	1n589, 2n620
3.73-74	2n598, 2n609	3.265-68	xxiii, 1n951	4.125	2n463
3.74	1n159	3.266-67	1n958	4.129-55	2n804, 2n844
3.75-98	2n82	3.269	2n790	4.130	2n620
3.76-78	2n83	3.274	2n804, 2n810	4.131	2n848
3.78	2n603, 2n791	3.275	2n796, 2n797, 2n798	4.133	2n848
3.81	1n14	3.276-77	1n125	4.137-38	xxiii, 2n1041, 2n1042
3.84-88	2n641	3.276	1n143, 2n858	4.145-49	2n683
3.84	2n534, 2n620	3.277	1n126	4.146	1n150, 2n610
3.85	2n620	3.278	1n960	4.147	2n531
3.88-101	2n620	3.279	1n674	4.149	2n610
3.91	2n44, 2n264, 2n751	3.286	2n620	4.157-58	2n609
3.93	2n620	3.288	2n600	4.159-62	2n75
3.94	xxv,n21	3.296	2n83	4.159	2n76
3.95	2n82	3.297	2n615	4.162-64	2n603
3.98	2n606	3.298	2n606, 2n620	4.165	1n159, 1n169, 2n1151
3.102-50	2n44	3.302	2n620	4.177-78	2n606
		3.313	2n620	4.180-83	2n620
		3.316	2n608, 2n619	4.180	2n619, 2n636, 2n639, 2n640, 2n643
		3.317-22	2n607	4.181-82	2n665
		3.318-19	2n848		



(Josephus, <i>Antiquities</i> , cont.)	4.316	2n606	8.143	1n377, 1n378
4.183	2n620	4.318-19	2n620	8.144-49
4.184	2n534, 2n781	4.319	2n620	1n381
4.185	2n636	4.320	2n1151	8.144-46
4.190	1n133	4.321	2n606	8.144
4.193	2n620	4.326	1n161	p,67, 1n367, 1n395,
4.194	2n606, 2n615	4.327-31	2n598	1n477
4.196-301	xxiv, 2n749, 2n1157	4.328	2n605	8.145
4.196-97	1n171	4.329	1n152, 1n159, 2n1151	1n399, 1n400
4.196	2n620	4.331	2n620	8.146
4.197	2n550, 2n620	4.616	1n202	1n402, 1n403
4.198	xxv, xxvii	5	2n75	8.147-49
4.200-1	2n769	5.58	1n372	8.147
4.200	1n667	5.135	2n636	8.148
4.203	2n787	5.219	2n1131	8.157
4.205	1n631	6.25	2n636	8.160-62
4.207	2n958	6.36	1n172, 2n635	8.166-67
4.209-11	xxiv, 2n690	6.38	2n638	8.180-81
4.209	2n715	6.43	2n749	8.191-92
4.210	2n701, 2n824	6.263	2n622	8.195
4.211	2n822	6.265	1n190	2n45
4.212	2n787	7.39	2n838	8.227
4.214-18	2n742	7.61	2n52	2n622
4.216	2n837	7.67	1n327, 1n574	8.232
4.219	2n805	7.68	1n424	2n530
4.223-24	2n635, 2n638	7.96-106	2n483	8.253-62
4.223	2n688	7.113	2n52	1n556
4.229-30	2n683	7.159-61	2n483	1n75, 2n482
4.233	2n314	7.309	2n857	8.260
4.240-43	1n631	7.315	2n857	8.261
4.241-43	2n641	7.365-67	2n385	8.262
4.243	2n782, 2n787	7.366	2n385	xxiii, 1n554, 1n556,
4.244-59	2n799	7.367	2n385	1n557, 1n558, 1n563
4.244	2n807, 2n810	7.380	2n606	8.271
4.245	2n807	7.382	2n636	8.280
4.246	2n803	7.393	2n291	8.297
4.251-552	2n801, 2n802, 2n809	8.1-2	p,170	8.314
4.252	2n803, 2n807, 2n1107	8.23-24	2n496	8.317
4.257-59	1n143, 2n858	8.35	1n237	8.324
4.260-65	2n831, 2n832	8.37	1n237	1n394, 1n406, 1n412
4.261-62	2n831	8.42-44	2n496	8.335-50
4.261	2n797	8.46-49	1n369	2n1077
4.262	2n830	8.50-54	1n379	9.3
4.265	2n853	8.50	1n372	2n622, 2n837
4.266	2n841	8.51-54	1n370	9.4
4.268-69	2n839	8.52	1n373	2n742
4.271-72	2n840	8.54	1n373, 1n374	9.14-15
4.275	2n866	8.55-56	1n379, 1n422	2n857
4.276	2n852	8.55	p,67, 1n367	9.36
4.278	2n812, 2n814	8.57	1n374	9.41
4.285	2n839	8.58	1n373	2n856
4.286	1n152, 2n885	8.61-98	2n45	9.46
4.287	2n742	8.61-62	1n13, 1n420, 1n425	2n28
4.290-91	2n1088	8.61	1n424, 2n64	9.138
4.290	2n814	8.62	1n406, 1n419	9.283
4.292	2n716	8.77-78	2n45	p,67, 1n367, 1n394,
4.295	2n620	8.90	2n378	1n395, 1n477
4.296-97	2n1090	8.104	2n378	1n394, 1n395
4.299	2n856	8.107-8	2n622	9.284-88
4.302	xxv, n21, 1n331	8.111	2n753	9.284
4.304	1n123	8.116-17	xxiii, 2n771	9.287
4.305	2n37	8.117	2n1042	1n404
4.309	2n715	8.127	1n133	10
4.312	2n534	8.141-49	xxiii	10.8
4.314	1n78, 2n769	8.141	1n373, 1n374	10.17-22
4.316-17	2n619	8.142	1n376	10.19
				10.35
				10.58
				10.59
				10.72
				10.84-150
				10.84-86
				10.98
				10.101
				10.104
				10.106-7
				10.107-8
				10.112
				10.114
				10.124
				10.131
				10.141
				10.144-48
				10.145
				10.147-48
				1n13

10.149	1n440	12.1-10	2n120, 2n147	12.265	2n385
10.151-53	1n146, 1n628	12.1-9	1n712	12.274	1n707, 2n950
10.154	1n460	12.4	1n711	12.277	1n708
10.184	1n441	12.5	1n712	12.285	2n848
10.190	2n684	12.5-7	1n697	12.303	2n848
10.194-99	1n429	12.5-6	1n694, 1n695, 1n704	12.309	2n857
10.207	2n463	12.5	1n696	12.319	2n425
10.208-10	1n503	12.6	xxiii, 1n696, 1n704,	12.321	1n618
10.210	2n463		1n713	12.325	2n425
10.218	1n171, 1n291	12.7-9	2n143	12.328	2n857
10.220-26	1n445	12.8	2n116, 2n149	12.331	1n282
10.220	1n448	12.11-118	xxiii, 2n151	12.336	1n126
10.221	1n450	12.11	2n152	12.358-90	2n301
10.222	1n456, 1n457	12.12-36	1n745	12.358	2n880
10.225	1n467, 1n468	12.12-16	2n154, 2n156	12.359	2n301
10.226	1n470	12.12	2n157	12.381	2n488
10.227-28	xxiii, 1n428, 1n477	12.17-27	2n156	12.387-88	2n33
10.227	1n480	12.17-18	2n158	12.414-19	2n489
10.228	1n479, 1n509	12.17	p.340, 1n748	12.415	1n747
10.229-32	1n428	12.20	1n219	13.1-2	p.170
10.229-31	1n484, 1n488	12.24-33	2n152	13.4	2n939
10.229	1n487	12.25-33	2n153	13.55	2n164
10.231	1n487, 1n489, 1n491,	12.29	2n152	13.62-75	2n167
	1n496	12.34-39	2n156	13.62-73	1n132, 2n33, 2n769
10.233	1n460	12.36	lvii, n145	13.65	2n167
10.234-35	2n181	12.40-41	2n153	13.66	1n672, 2n229
10.247	1n497, 1n499	12.45	1n642, 2n149	13.67	1n648
10.250	2n1150	12.48-49	2n154	13.70	1n648
10.257	2n1150	12.49	2n698	13.72	xxix, n38
10.272-81	1n503	12.50	2n156, 2n158, 2n164	13.74-79	2n166
10.277-80	xxiv, 2n709, 2n711,	12.53	2n156, 2n157, 2n158	13.75	1n681
	2n751, 2n753	12.57-84	1n373	13.77	2n280
10.278	2n646, 2n752	12.58	2n153	13.137	2n488
11.1	1n441	12.70	2n1022	13.163-65	2n489
11.9	2n848	12.77	2n1022	13.171-73	2n707
11.14-15	1n460	12.86	2n156	13.173	xxix, n38
11.87	2n771	12.89-90	2n154	13.191-92	2n205
11.111-12	2n635	12.89	1n635	13.207	2n405
11.119	2n268	12.100	360n23	13.218	2n291
11.120ff.	1n163	12.102	2n153	13.223-24	2n419
11.130	2n689	12.109	1n171	13.236-49	2n291
11.184ff.	1n163	12.110-13	2n156	13.243	2n488
11.184-301	1n642	12.110	2n154	13.242-45	2n164
11.212	xxiii, 1n133, 2n1041,	12.114-17	2n153	13.243	2n291
	2n1042	12.114	2n154	13.244	2n291
11.216	2n613	12.118	2n160	13.245	2n1042
11.217	2n1041	12.119-26	xxiii	13.251	2n303
11.267	2n185	12.119-24	2n127	13.255-56	2n146
11.291-92	2n185	12.119	2n116, 2n127	13.257-68	2n447
11.296	1n163, 1n167	12.122-24	2n254	13.259-64	2n489
11.297	1n628	12.124	2n129	13.261	1n952
11.302-3	1n628	12.125-26	2n128, 2n227	13.264	1n952
11.304	1n167	12.125	2n552	13.265-70	2n938
11.306	1n126	12.135-57	2n301	13.275-81	2n146
11.313-45	2n119	12.139	1n133	13.284-87	2n142
11.317-18	2n143	12.145	2n367	13.285	2n33
11.329-36	2n181	12.187	2n803, 2n804	13.286-87	2n302
11.331	2n777	12.225-27	2n938	13.292	1n143, 1n148, 2n46,
11.336	2n164	12.237	1n137		2n858
11.338	2n146	12.243	2n488	13.294	2n870
11.339	1n648, 2n145	12.245	1n616, 2n563	13.298	xxix, n38
11.341	2n102	12.246-50	2n297, 2n298, 2n307	13.299	1n169
11.347	1n628	12.248	1n618	13.318-19	2n477
12-20	xxiii	12.250	2n378	13.319	2n302, 2n304
12.1-118	p.360	12.253-56	2n942	13.324	2n419
12.1-11	1n626	12.255-56	2n940	13.344	2n304

(Josephus, <i>Antiquities</i> , cont.)	15.89	2n195, 2n199, 2n200	17.121	2n28
13.345-46	2n323	15.90-91	2n201	17.130
13.347	2n302	15.91-95	2n205	17.149-63
13.348-52	2n142	15.92	2n206	17.152-53
13.415-19	2n489	15.93	2n204	17.158-59
13.426	1n190	15.94	2n208	17.162
13.430	2n1124	15.96-103	2n207	17.250-99
14.1-3	1n109, 1n171	15.97	2n208	17.309
14.2-3	1n101	15.99	2n208, 2n209	17.399
14.14-18	p.343n4	15.104	2n205	18.11
14.34-76	1n138	15.139	1n1062	18.13
14.35-36	2n302	15.223	1n534	18.14
14.63	2n950	15.227	2n1144	18.16
14.65-68	1n720	15.254-55	2n447	18.18
14.66	1n618, 2n1137	15.256-58	2n194, 2n205	18.21
14.68	xliv,n98, 2n302	15.320-22	1n132	18.23-24
14.71-73	2n292	15.328-41	2n264	18.23
14.72	2n378, 2n379	15.333	2n419	18.24
14.88	2n405	15.373-79	1n169	18.53
14.104	2n302	15.391-425	2n360	18.55-62
14.105-9	2n293	15.410-15	2n365	18.55-59
14.112	2n302	15.411-16	2n372	18.57
14.114-18	1n654, 2n150, 2n302	15.417-19	2n369	18.65-80
14.117	2n111	15.417	2n367	18.82
14.127-48	2n216	15.418	2n367, 2n368, 2n372	18.118
14.131	2n167	15.419	2n369	18.121-22
14.133	2n149	16.14	2n164	18.128
14.138	2n302	16.27-60	2n128, 2n254	18.131
14.139	2n302	16.27	1n130	18.136-37
14.144-48	2n489	16.32-34	2n254	18.138
14.144	2n217	16.41-42	xxiii	18.145-54
14.145-48	2n217	16.42	2n1042	18.150
14.185-323	p.168	16.43	2n691, 2n693	18.176
14.185-267	xxiii	16.44	1n17	18.243
14.187	1n17, 2n121	16.48	2n217	18.256-309
14.188	2n122, 2n124	16.52	2n216	18.257-60
14.190-222	2n217, 2n489	16.53	2n217	18.257-58
14.192-93	2n216	16.60	2n254	18.257
14.195	2n129	16.63	1n130	18.259
14.208	2n129	16.82	1n202	18.261-88
14.225-30	2n128	16.86	xxxv,n58	18.266
14.226	1n708	16.100-26	xxxiv,n52	18.310-79
14.234	2n128	16.100	xxxiv,n53	18.319-23
14.237	2n128	16.101	xxxiv,n53	18.319
14.240	2n128	16.104	xxxiv,n53	18.340-52
14.258	2n838	16.108	xxxiv,n53	18.351
14.259	2n128	16.112	xxxiv,n53	18.352
14.262-64	2n128	16.113	xxxiv,n53	18.354
14.265-67	2n217, 2n489	16.117	xxxiv,n53	19.30
14.267	2n129	16.119	xxxiv,n53	19.111
14.313	1n282, 2n129	16.121	xxxiv,n53	19.172-74
14.319-22	1n282	16.134	xxxiv,n53	19.223
14.324	2n204	16.160-78	p.168, 2n254	19.278-91
14.366-67	1n960	16.162-66	2n218	19.278
14.487	1n618	16.167-73	2n218	19.280-91
14.488	2n164	16.170	2n141	19.280-85
14.490	2n487	16.174-78	2n233, 2n1042	19.281
15	2n363	16.175	2n1041	19.283
15.9-10	2n302	16.183-86	2n545	19.285
15.22	1n132	16.184	1n104	19.290
15.26-27	2n258	16.232	2n1144	19.297
15.28-29	2n796	16.253	n1144	19.300-11
15.39	1n132	16.365	n832	19.300
15.74-79	2n205	17.26	1n459	19.303
15.88-110	2n194	17.28	xxvii,n29	19.355
15.88	2n204, 2n205	17.76-77	2n1144	

19.357	2n258	63	1n631	1.1-3	1n15, 1n18, 1n185,
20	1xi,n157, 2n635	79	2n742		1n191
20.17-96	2n846	80	1n631, 2n837, 2n858	1.1	1n193, 2n1179
20.17	2n447	92	1n305	1.2	xxxvii, 1n104, 1n214
20.35	2n447	128	2n857	1.3	xlvi, n108, 1n193,
20.37	2n847	149	2n447		1n194, 1n220
20.38	2n447	180	1n239	1.5	1n266
20.97-98	2n530	188	1n662	1.6	li, 1n100, 1n104
20.139	2n447	196-98	2n740	1.7-8	1n214
20.140	1n209	204	1n662	1.7	1n187
20.141-43	2n804	213	1n376	1.9-13	1n729
20.143-46	xxvii,n29	235	1n239	1.10	2n1187
20.145-46	2n447, 2n450	258	1n782	1.11	2n141
20.147	1n209	259	2n858	1.13-16	xxii, p.9, 1n15, 1n18,
20.154	1n190	260	2n610		1n98, 1n165, 1n201
20.160	2n530	270	2n1048	1.13	1n101, 1n201, 1n214
20.167	2n530	286	1n126	1.14	1n589
20.181	1n631	291	1n166	1.15-16	1n99
20.188	2n530	302	2n610	1.16	p.365, 1n69, 1n90
20.206-7	1n631	336-67	xx, xxvii, liii, p.9,	1.17	1n202, 1n748, 1n749,
20.211-18	xxvii,n29		1n191, 1n211, 1n214		1n968
20.213	1n130	336-39	1n98	1.18	1n152, 1n169
20.216	2n90	336	1n104, 1n213, 1n214,	1.19-20	1n136
20.224-51	1n146, 1n628, 2n635,		1n228	1.25	2n1187
	2n732	338	1n99	1.26	2n362, 2n364, 2n382
20.224-30	1n146	339	1n99, 1n216	1.27	2n1187
20.230	1n424, 2n64	340	1n109, 1n215	1.33	2n33
20.231-32	1n146	342	1n226	1.34-35	2n896
20.233-34	1n146	350	1n215	1.42-56	1n98
20.233	1n441	357-58	1n214	1.47-56	1n184
20.234	2n635	357	1n185, 1n190, 1n217	1.50	2n419
20.235-51	1n146	358	1n198, 1n226	1.60	1n707
20.236	2n33	359	xxvi, 1n208	1.61	2n291
20.238	2n732	361-66	1n204	1.68-69	1n169
20.241	2n732	361-63	xlvi, n106	1.69	2n1062
20.250	2n480	361	1n204, 1n205, 1n212	1.84	2n1062
20.251	2n635, 2n732	362-66	1n211	1.110-11	2n696
20.259	xxix,n38, 1n2, 2n1157	362	li, 1n207, 2n209	1.131-58	1n138
20.261	1n146	365-67	1n213	1.131-40	1n137
20.262-66	1n12	365	1n212	1.142	2n378
20.262-65	1n201, 1n221, 1n290,	366	1n203	1.146-48	p.92
	1n578	367	1n212, 1n228	1.146	1n708
20.263-64	lvii, 1n1068	393	1n767	1.148	2n541
20.263	1n202	412	xxiii, xxix,n38	1.152-53	2n292
20.264	2n530	413	xxix,n38	1.152	2n379, 2n390
20.266	xxvii,n30, 2n543	414	1n126, 1n143, 1n195,	1.156	2n419
20.267	xxvi, xxix,n38, 1n2,		1n196	1.169-70	2n635
	2n1157	415	1n126, 1n132, 1n197,	1.175	2n225
20.268	xxv, xxv,n21, xxv,n23,		2n113	1.179	2n293
	xxvi, 1n331, 2n646	416-17	1n198	1.187-92	2n216
		416	1n197	1.190	2n167
<i>Life</i>		422-29	xxxvii	1.191	2n149
1-6	xlvi, n108, 1n220	422-25	l	1.200	2n217
1-2	2n773	422-23	1n201	1.243	2n204
1	1n127	423	2n130	1.269	1n1062
2	2n385	425	1n214, 2n1150	1.270	1n960
3-5	1n128	427	1n126, 1n127	1.282-85	2n217
6	1n128, 1n135	429	xxvii, l, li, li, n115, lx,	1.359-67	2n194
14	2n684		1n214, 2n1087	1.359-65	2n205, 2n206
27	xxiii, xxix,n38	430	xxvii, xxvii,n30,	1.359	2n196, 2n204
31	2n419		xxix,n38, xlvi, n106,	1.361	2n208
40	1n98, 1n101, 1n201,		1n2, 1n3, 2n1157	1.386-97	2n213
	1n208, 1n214, 1n215,			1.389-97	2n194
	2n530	<i>War</i>		1.390	2n204, 2n205
44	1n282	1.1-7	1n188	1.403-141	2n264
52	2n141	1.1-6	1n5	1.403	2n613



(Josephus, <i>War</i> , cont.)	2.316-92	1n195	3.452	2n555
1.409	2n419	2.324	2n548	3.475-79
1.414	2n266	2.341	2n367	2n555
1.415	1n618	2.345-401	1n443, 2n137	3.475
1.433	1n126	2.356-57	2n489	3.479
1.439-40	2n194	2.360	2n463	3.480
1.440	2n206	2.377	2n542	3.498
1.453	2n885	2.384-87	2n458	3.515
1.470	2n1124	2.390-91	2n463	4.45-47
1.483	2n800	2.392	1n707	4.85
1.487	2n1124	2.397	2n137	4.96
1.489	2n1124	2.398-99	1n654	4.105
1.548	2n1124	2.409-17	2n268	4.128-33
1.633	2n137	2.417	2n740	4.132
1.643	2n1124	2.433	2n954	4.133
1.648-55	1n175, 2n264	2.456	1n708	4.155
1.648-50	2n896	2.459	1n282	4.178
1.648	2n954	2.463	2n1134	4.179
1.650	2n890	2.478	1n282	4.182
1.653	2n890	2.487-88	2n115, 2n116	4.262
1.657	1n575	2.487	2n105, 2n242	4.278
2	p.366n4	2.488	2n111, 2n122	4.298
2.1	2n826	2.489-98	2n235	4.317
2.30	1n1062	2.489	2n105	4.320
2.36	2n137	2.495	2n111	4.324
2.39-79	1n139	2.499	2n488	4.332
2.84	1n387	2.503	1n376	4.338
2.112	1n429	2.517	1n708	4.374
2.117-18	2n639	2.560	2n1134	4.374
2.118	2n954	2.565	2n530	4.381-82
2.119-61	xxii,n14	2.570-71	2n742	4.391
2.119	2n159	2.580	2n137, 2n541	4.414
2.121	2n805	2.582	2n885	4.424-25
2.122-23	2n835	2.591	2n684	4.443-48
2.128	1n1033, 2n37, 2n1070	3.3	2n1124	4.561-62
2.134	2n850	3.6	2n137	4.476-85
2.139	2n537	3.14-15	2n555	4.496
2.140	2n707	3.22	2n555	4.504
2.141-391	1n194	3.25	2n555	4.558
2.141	2n835	3.28	2n711	4.622-29
2.148	1n1033, 2n1070	3.35-58	1n658	4.622
2.150-53	2n896	3.38	1n376	4.630-56
2.151-58	p.366, 2n887, 2n890	3.71	2n137, 2n457	4.656
2.151-53	2n893	3.86	2n683	4.656-63
2.151	1n645	3.107	2n137	5
2.152-53	xxii, 1n175, 2n940	3.108-9	1n22	5.8
2.152	2n896, 2n942, 2n1124	3.149	2n555	5.17
2.153	2n887, 2n889	3.152-53	2n555	5.38
2.154-58	2n818	3.176	2n555	5.60
2.156	2n580	3.209-12	2n555	5.88
2.161	2n797	3.228	2n555	5.104
2.162	2n707	3.335	2n69	5.107
2.163	2n890	3.354	2n463	5.111
2.164-65	2n707	3.356	p.366, 2n542	5.114
2.165	2n887, 2n890	3.361-82	1n906	5.121
2.169-77	xxii, 1n175	3.372-75	2n890	5.159
2.169-74	2n254, 2n264	3.374	2n890, 2n891	5.184-247
2.179	2n137	3.377	2n853	5.186
2.184-203	2n254, 2n264	3.396	2n463, 2n541	5.190-92
2.194	2n252	3.397-98	1n195	5.190-92
2.197	2n266, 2n268	3.398	1n196	5.193-94
2.221	1n516	3.399-402	1n169, 1n196	5.194
2.259	2n530	3.402	2n137	5.195-206
2.261	2n530	3.405	1n878	5.198-200
2.264	2n530	3.415	2n488	5.199
2.312-14	1n708	3.438-42	1n198	5.200
				5.201-6
				5.201
				5.203

5.204-6	2n369	6.5-7	2n856	7.107	2n129
5.204	2n368, 2n430	6.13-14	2n541	7.110-11	2n127
5.207	2n363	6.17	2n555	7.110	2n122
5.208	2n431	6.33	p.367, 2n542	7.123-62	xxxvi
5.210	2n431	6.42	2n542	7.123	p.168, 1n997
5.213	2n771	6.43	2n137	7.148-49	1n669
5.215-19	2n371	6.94	2n374	7.148	2n378
5.215	2n430	6.96	1n200	7.158-59	2n257
5.216	2n378	6.98	1n198	7.185	2n1062
5.217	1n669, 2n378	6.100	2n775	7.211	2n856
5.218	1n669, 2n379	6.101-2	2n254	7.213	2n555
5.219	2n371	6.103-5	2n822	7.218	xxxvii,n68
5.220-21	2n372	6.109	1n152	7.244-51	2n1079
5.225	1n667	6.122	2n362	7.252-406	2n896
5.226	2n370	6.124-26	2n367	7.259-74	2n702
5.227-28	2n370	6.143	2n555	7.264	2n570, 2n684
5.227	1n952, 2n363, 2n366, 2n368, 2n369	6.152	2n555	7.300-302	2n194, 2n204
5.228	1n959	6.200	2n10, 2n548	7.320-88	1n906
5.229	1n674, 2n370, 2n371	6.224	1n305	7.323	2n639
5.231-36	2n372	6.252	2n372	7.327-33	2n457
5.236	2n372	6.260	2n294, 2n382	7.334	2n858
5.261	1n200	6.261	2n372	7.341-88	xxii, 1n175
5.285	2n555	6.267	2n280	7.341-57	2n818, 2n890
5.306	2n541	6.269-70	1n420	7.343	2n822, 2n700
5.315	366, 2n542	6.282	2n372	7.351-57	1n607
5.316	2n555	6.288-300	2n410	7.357	2n1125
5.317	2n530	6.293	2n432, 2n433	7.377	2n858
5.324	2n555	6.299	2n374	7.379	2n480
5.325	1n199	6.303	2n1062	7.385	2n858
5.361-420	1n200	6.324	2n129	7.388	2n542
5.361	1n200	6.328-40	2n235	7.406	2n542
5.365	2n542	6.333-35	2n254	7.410	2n639
5.366	2n137	6.333	2n129	7.416-19	xxii, 1n175
5.367	2n463	6.341	2n129	7.417-19	1n178
5.395-96	2n292	6.350	2n555	7.417	2n541, 2n555
5.401	2n457	6.407	2n855	7.418-19	2n942
5.402	2n280	6.418	1n177	7.418	2n28, 2n639
5.405	2n254	6.419	1n178, 2n684	7.420-36	2n33
5.408	2n458	6.423-27	1n664	7.420-32	2n769
5.416	2n280	6.426	2n366	7.420-21	2n769
5.458	2n542	6.435-47	2n769	7.421-36	2n167
5.460	2n116	6.435-42	2n479	7.421	2n235
5.514	2n853	6.438-39	1n327	7.422-32	1n132
5.523	2n856	6.438	1n574	7.425	2n488
5.541-47	1n198	7.4	2n280	7.428-29	2n37
5.564-65	2n383	7.43-45	2n127	7.432	2n749
5.566	2n552	7.45	2n1134	7.447-50	l
6	2n294	7.46	2n884	7.451-53	2n517
6.2-3	2n853	7.53	1n133	7.455	1n694
		7.70	2n570		

## PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA

<i>De Abrahamo</i>	30-33 2n693	76-80 1n777
135-36 2n796	40-47 2n778	78 2n231
	59-62 2n796	80 2n231
<i>De Aeternitate Mundi</i>	76 2n701	81 2n753
19 2n648	89 2n37	84-85 2n438
		106-7 2n830
<i>Apology</i> p.354n4	<i>De Decalogo</i> 2n749, p.354, p.360	111-18 2n831
	51 2n830	119-20 2n830
<i>De Vita Contemplativa</i>	52 2n665	119 2n665, 2n830
8-9 1n777, 2n231	69 2n834	
25 1n166	71 1n959	

- Quod Deus* 188 2n283  
7-9 2n788 191 2n280  
192 2n896
- De Ebrietate* 193 2n127  
130 2n778 194 2n124  
198 2n280
- In Flaccum* p.168, 2n240  
4-5 1n238  
5-6 17 2n238  
20 2n14  
29 2n238, 2n242  
41-52 2n252  
45-47 1n654  
53 2n127  
55-72 2n114  
55-56 2n111  
56 2n111, 2n500  
57 1n238, 2n224  
72 2n114  
74 2n122  
86-94 2n114  
86 p.355n10  
92-93 2n238  
122 2n111  
135-45 2n14  
135 2n14  
146-91 2n517
- Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres*  
162 2n875
- Hypothetica* – see separate entry
- De Josepho*  
43 2n797
- Legum Allegoriae (Leg)*  
1.48-52 1n672
- Legatio ad Gaium (Legat)* p.168  
4 1n283  
54 2n245  
115 2n681  
117 2n896  
120 2n105, 2n238  
127 2n111  
129 1n238, 2n224  
132 2n111  
133-34 2n252  
133 2n265  
139 2n231  
143-58 2n122  
153-58 2n254  
155 2n256  
156-57 2n693  
156 2n35, 2n159  
157 2n127, 2n256, 2n267, 2n268  
160 2n238  
161 2n254  
163 2n231  
166 2n242, 2n309  
170 2n105, 2n242  
172 2n245  
184ff. 2n252
- 188 2n283  
191 2n280  
192 2n896  
193 2n127  
194 2n124  
198 2n280  
199-202 1n1040  
205 2n238, 2n242, 2n309  
208-10 2n896  
208-9 2n889  
209-10 1n172  
210 2n689  
212 2n367  
214 1n654  
215 2n555, 2n896 (*bis*)  
226 1n654  
233-36 2n896  
240 2n254  
280 2n268  
281-84 1n654  
285 2n130  
290 2n759  
291 2n268  
298 2n254  
301 2n254  
306 2n371, 2n372, 2n771  
308 2n889, 2n896  
310 2n701  
311-14 2n254  
312-13 2n691, 2n693  
317 2n267, 2n268  
318 2n769  
322 2n254  
346 2n283  
349 2n127  
350 2n124  
353 2n552  
355 2n252  
357 2n265  
361 2n500  
363 2n127  
369 2n889, 2n896
- De Vita Mosis* xxiv, 2n528, 2n598,  
2n1151  
1.2 1n18, 2n351, 2n445, 2n1136  
1.4 2n32  
1.5 1n283  
1.7 1n1008  
1.17 1n966  
1.27 1n946  
1.28 2n797  
1.29 2n678  
1.140-42 2n603  
1.141-42 1n322  
1.147 1n325  
1.154 2n541  
1.175 2n1151  
1.201 2n1151  
1.241 2n847  
1.307 2n1090  
1.324 2n847  
2.1 2n1  
2.5 2n786
- 2.12-24 2n1110, 2n1134, 2n1187,  
p.359  
2.13 2n1187  
2.14 2n1112  
2.17 2n1122  
2.21-22 2n1136  
2.23-24 2n1137  
2.27 2n1136  
2.34 1n171  
2.40 1n283  
2.48 2n678  
2.94 2n371  
2.101-5 2n378  
2.101 2n379  
2.102-3 2n380  
2.216 2n691, 2n693  
2.140 2n678  
2.166 2n606  
2.176 2n847  
2.183-85 2n1131  
2.187-291 2n1151  
2.205 2n958  
2.216 2n159  
2.224 1n283  
2.278 2n847  
2.291 2n606
- De Mutatione Nominum*  
7 1n811
- De Opificio Mundi*  
58 2n763  
72-75 2n764  
75 2n764  
90-127 2n1136  
100 2n651  
128 2n701  
170-72 2n644, 2n707  
170 2n709
- De Praemiis et Poenis*  
6 2n884  
23 1n432  
53 2n665  
80-84 2n658  
82-84 2n678  
152 2n847
- Quod omnis Probus liber sit*  
1 2n1  
57 2n648  
81-82 2n693  
93-96 1n607  
114 2n929
- Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum*  
2.5 2n957, 2n958
- Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin*  
3.47-48 2n512
- De Sacrificiis*  
101 2n752

- De Somniis*  
 1.123-26 1n708  
 1.188 2n644  
 1.218 1n647  
 2.127 2n159, 2n693
- De Specialibus Legibus* 2n749, p.354,  
 p.360  
 1.1-3 2n501  
 1.2 2n512  
 1.3 1n563  
 1.20 2n756  
 1.22 2n757  
 1.30 2n701  
 1.32 2n552  
 1.36-50 2n646  
 1.51-53 2n447, 2n845, 2n1051  
 1.52 2n847  
 1.53 2n958  
 1.54-57 2n777  
 1.59 2n701  
 1.66-67 2n767  
 1.67 2n669  
 1.73 1n1057  
 1.74-75 1n672  
 1.80-81 1n899  
 1.80 1n959  
 1.82-97 2n771  
 1.97 2n771  
 1.98-100 1n674  
 1.101-11 1n125  
 1.101 1n128, 1n135  
 1.110 1n126  
 1.111 1n126  
 1.116 2n777  
 1.137-40 2n820  
 1.137 2n817  
 1.156 2n364  
 1.168-69 2n771  
 1.168 2n782  
 1.172-76 2n779  
 1.192-93 2n778  
 1.198-99 2n370  
 1.227 2n753  
 1.249 1n674  
 1.256-66 2n828  
 1.257-61 2n788  
 1.261 2n789  
 1.269-72 2n788  
 1.271-80 2n767
- 1.273-79 1n667  
 1.299 2n749, 2n750  
 1.309 2n447  
 1.313 2n701  
 1.314 2n824  
 1.316-17 2n847  
 1.329 2n752  
 2.2-8 2n438  
 2.13 2n340  
 2.16-17 2n438  
 2.16 2n340  
 2.50 2n796  
 2.53 2n752  
 2.60 2n686  
 2.62-63 2n691, 2n693  
 2.69 2n315  
 2.73 2n847  
 2.74-78 2n841  
 2.125-26 2n804  
 2.167 2n771  
 2.228 2n834  
 2.229-30 2n831  
 2.232 2n832  
 2.235 2n830  
 2.237-38 2n833  
 3.9 2n797  
 3.11 2n810  
 3.12-28 2n804  
 3.13-14 2n1087  
 3.32-33 2n797  
 3.34-36 2n797  
 3.37-42 2n796  
 3.63 2n791, 2n861  
 3.66-68 2n803  
 3.69-71 2n801, 2n1107  
 3.72-78 2n809  
 3.72 2n802, 2n803  
 3.76 2n809  
 3.108-9 2n812  
 3.110-19 2n811  
 3.113 2n797  
 3.117 2n861  
 3.118 2n814  
 3.131 2n742  
 3.164 2n687  
 3.181-83 2n1103  
 3.205-9 2n828  
 3.205-7 2n789  
 3.205 2n829  
 3.207 2n819
- 3.208-9 2n788  
 4.23 2n856  
 4.30-38 2n839  
 4.48 2n752  
 4.62-67 2n837  
 4.134-35 2n665  
 4.100-102 2n947  
 4.124 2n947  
 4.149 2n701  
 4.159 2n669, 2n847  
 4.178 2n447, 2n845, 2n1051  
 4.183-92 2n742  
 4.191 1n674  
 4.193-94 2n875  
 4.196 2n862  
 4.203 2n861  
 4.223-25 2n858  
 4.226-29 2n856
- De Virtutibus* 2n749, 2n860, p.360  
 1-4 2n952  
 9 2n753  
 21 2n861  
 35 2n705, 2n769  
 65 2n661  
 82-160 p.360  
 82-87 2n841  
 84 2n842  
 95 1n631  
 96 2n840  
 102-8 2n447, 2n845  
 106 2n845  
 110-15 2n858  
 116-20 2n860, 2n866  
 116 2n861  
 125-30 2n865  
 125-27 2n860  
 131-32 2n811  
 137-39 2n812  
 140-41 2n860  
 140 2n862  
 142 2n865  
 150-54 2n856  
 160 2n861, 2n862  
 179 2n847  
 182 2n447, 2n845  
 183-84 2n658  
 212-19 2n447, 2n845  
 215 2n646  
 218-19 2n847

## RABBINIC LITERATURE

- Mishnah*  
*m. Baba Mesi'a*  
 1-2 2n839  
 5.1-11 2n841  
*m. Baba Qamma*  
 6.6 2n425  
*m. Bikkurim*  
 4.6 2n837
- m. Gittin*  
 4.5 2n799  
*m. Hulim*  
 12.1-5 2n865  
 12.5 2n862  
*m. Kelim*  
 1.8 2n364, 2n366, 2n368, 2n370,  
 2n790
- m. Ketubbot*  
 2.9 1n143  
*m. Middot*  
 1.4 2n372  
 1.6 2n372  
 1.8-9 2n389  
 2.1-2 2n365  
 2.3 2n430  
 2.5-6 2n369  
 2.5 2n368, 2n372



(Rabbinic literature, *m. Middot*, cont.) 10.1 1n173, 2n887  
 2.6 2n370  
 3.4 1n667  
 4.3 2n372  
 5.3-4 2n372  
*m. Nedarim*, 1n553  
  
*m. Nega'im*  
 11 1n955  
 12-13 1n955  
 14.1 1n956  
  
*m. Niddah*  
 7.4 2n815  
  
*m. Pesahim*  
 5.1 2n375  
  
*m. Qiddusin*  
 4.4-5 1n135  
  
*m. Sanhedrin*  
 7.4 2n798  
 8.1-5 2n832

*m. Sukkah*  
 5.2-4 2n37  
 5.2-3 2n425  
 5.8 2n388

*m. Tamid*  
 1.1-2 2n374  
 1.1 2n389  
 3.7 2n432  
 3.9 2n390  
 5.1 2n388

*m. Yebamot*  
 6.5-6 2n797

*m. Zebahim*  
 12.1 1n959

*Tosefia*  
*t. Ta'anit*  
 2.1 2n385

*Jerusalem Talmud*  
*y. Sanhedrin*  
 18a 2n754  
  
*y. Ta'anit*  
 68a 2n385

*Babylonian Talmud*  
*b. Baba Batra*  
 14b 1n156

*b. Berakot*  
 18a 2n827

*b. Sabbath*  
 110b 2n1088

*b. Sanhedrin*  
 90b-92a 2n887

## EARLY CHRISTIAN TEXTS

### NEW TESTAMENT

*Matthew*  
 5:33-37 2n438  
 6:7-8 2n787  
 6:21-48 2n880  
 7:7-11 2n787  
 22:23-33 2n887  
 23:15 2n447  
 27:19 2n188

*Mark*  
 1:21-22 2n693  
 1:40-45 2n740  
 6:17-29 p.37  
 7:6-13 1n553  
 7:10-13 p.93  
 7:11 1n553  
 12:18-27 2n887

*Luke*  
 1:1-4 1n5  
 1:3 1n3  
 1:5-8 2n385  
 4:16-19 2n693  
 19:21 2n839  
 20:27-38 2n887  
 24:44 1n166

*John*  
 4:13-15 1n543

*Acts*  
 1:1-2 2n1  
 2:11 2n447  
 2:44 2n835  
 4:24 2n438  
 4:32 2n835

6:5 2n447  
 13:42 1n516, 2n693  
 13:43 2n447  
 15:21 2n693  
 16:13 2n35  
 17:2 2n693  
 17:21 1n108  
 17:22 2n473  
 17:25 2n753  
 18:4 2n693  
 23:2-5 2n777  
 23:6-10 2n887

*Romans*  
 1:19-20 2n755  
 1:26-27 2n796  
 1:26 2n863  
 2:22 p.126, 1n1044  
 12:15 2n827

*1 Corinthians*  
 6:9 2n796  
 9:9-10 2n862  
 9:25 2n882  
 10:20 2n1062  
 14:34 2n806

*2 Corinthians*  
 12:11-12 2n956

*Galatians*  
 1:6 1n29  
 2:2 1n83  
 2:6 1n83  
 2:9 1n83  
 3:10 2n881

*Ephesians*  
 5:22-24 2n806  
 5:24 2n805

*Philippians*  
 2:7 2n999

*Colossians*  
 3:18-19 2n806

*1 Thessalonians*  
 2:14-15 2n439, 2n1042

*1 Timothy*  
 1:10 2n796  
 1:11 2n752  
 1:15-16 2n94  
 2:11 2n806  
 6:15 2n752

*2 Timothy*  
 3:15 2n701

*Hebrews*  
 7:24 2n1184  
 9:2-4 2n378

*1 Peter*  
 3:1-6 2n806

*Revelation*  
 1:8 2n754  
 10:6 2n438  
 21:6 2n754

## OTHER EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

- Augustine  
*De civitate Dei*  
 4.27 2n262, 2n963  
 4.31 2n253, 2n262, 2n295, 2n963  
 6.5-6 2n963  
 6.10 2n262, 2n263, 2n757  
 6.11 1n707, p.243, 2n1145  
 7.5 2n262  
 18.12 1n977
- Barnabas  
 4.3-5 xl,n85  
 9.6 1n563  
 16.3-4 xl,n85, 2n769
- Clement of Alexandria  
*Stromata*  
 1.14-20 p.93  
 1.14.62 1n530, 2n48  
 1.15.70.2 p.93  
 1.15.72.5 p.93, 1n593  
 1.22 p.93  
 1.101.5 2n58  
 1.114.2 pp.68, 72  
 5.14.113 p.338  
 6.2.26.7 1n71
- Ps.-Clement, *Homilies* (p.168, 2n7)  
 4-5 2n964
- Didache*  
 2.2 2n811, 2n815
- Eusebius  
 For the citations of *Apion*, see table at  
 lxii, n160
- Chronicon*  
 21.3-25.25 p.78  
 22.18 1n455  
 70.3-74.6 p.50  
 123d 2n146
- Historia ecclesiastica*  
 1.7.14 1n135  
 2.18.6 xxxvi,n61  
 3.9.2 liii  
 3.10 p.11  
 6.25 1n156
- Praeparatio evangelica*  
 For citations of Artapanus, Demetrius,  
 Eupolemus, Ps.-Eupolemus, *Hypo-*  
*thetica*, Philo the elder, see ad loc.  
 8.5.11 xxxvi,n61  
 8.7.21 xxx  
 8.8.1-55 p.245, 2n631  
 8.8.56 liv,n131  
 8.10.19 xxxvi,n61  
 8.11.1 xxxvi,n61  
 9.2 p.93  
 9.4-9 liv,n131, p.93
- 9.8.1-2 p.343  
 9.9 1n567  
 9.19.1-3 2n275, 2n530, 2n550  
 9.19.3 1n981  
 9.22 1n733  
 9.34.19 1n398  
 9.35-36 1n663  
 9.40 p.78  
 9.41 p.78  
 9.41.1 1n480  
 9.41.4 1n494, 1n502  
 9.42 p.93  
 10.6.15 xxx  
 10.7.1-21 p.11  
 10.10-12 p.50  
 10.10 1n333, p.78, 1n760  
 10.10.15 2n592, p.343  
 10.10.16 2n31, 2n58, 2n104  
 10.13 p.50, 1n299  
 10.13.13 pp.48, 67, 78  
 10.14.1 p.67
- Jerome  
*Epistulae*  
 70.3 xxx
- Adversus Jovinianum*  
 2.14 xxx,n42
- Preface to Vulgate* 1n156
- De Viris Illustribus*  
 13 xxx
- Justin  
*I Apology* 2n552
- Dialogue*  
 46 2n791
- Minucius Felix, *Octavian*  
 9.3 p.351  
 10.4 2n457  
 28 p.351  
 30.2 2n811  
 33.4-5 liii
- Origen  
*Contra Celsum* xxxvi  
 1.6 2n530  
 1.12 2n511  
 1.14 1n39  
 1.15 1n18, p.92, 1n545, 1n693,  
 p.338  
 1.16 xxix, liv  
 1.19 1n432  
 1.20-26 2n530  
 1.20 1n45  
 1.22-26 p.343  
 1.22 1n564  
 1.37 2n11  
 1.71 2n530
- 2.32 2n530  
 2.55-56 2n82  
 3.5-8 p.126  
 3.5-6 p.343  
 4.11 xxix, 1n432  
 4.30 2n11  
 4.31 1n18, 2n490, p.343  
 4.37 p.343  
 4.39 2n1036  
 5.41 1n564  
 4.42 1n432  
 4.36 liv,n129  
 4.48-51 2n1030  
 4.88-97 1n691  
 5.11 2n1069  
 5.14 2n964  
 5.22 2n769  
 5.23-24 2n964  
 5.27 2n1087  
 5.34 2n513  
 5.41 1n929, 2n513  
 5.42 liv,n129  
 5.47-48 1n564  
 5.48 1n215  
 5.61 2n704  
 6.4 1n777  
 6.19 2n1030  
 6.74 2n11  
 6.78-80 1n39  
 6.80 2n1087  
 8.38 2n958  
 8.53 2n490  
 8.55 2n811  
 8.69 2n457
- Tatian  
*Ad Graecos*  
 28 p.168  
 31 p.10, 1n53  
 36-41 p.49  
 36 1n53, p.78, 1n428  
 37 p.68, 1n394, 1n733  
 38 1n288, 1n321, 1n333, 2n31,  
 2n58, 2n592, p.343  
 39 1n360
- Tertullian  
*Apologeticus*, 2n245  
 9 2n811, 2n1087  
 9.8 2n811  
 14 2n964  
 14.2 2n986  
 14.4 2n1001  
 14.7 2n1061  
 16.1-3 p.351  
 19-20 liv, p.50  
 19 xxix, p.50, p.67, p.78  
 19.3 1n333  
 25-26 2n457  
 25 2n480

*Ad Nationes*  
1.13 2n1136  
1.14 p.351

Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum*  
3.16 p.41  
3.20-22 p.78  
3.20-21 liii, liv, p.49  
3.20 p.41

3.21 1n336, 1n369  
3.22 p.67, 1n396  
3.24-28 p.50  
3.29 liv, p.41, 1n432

## INDEX OF PLACES AND NAMES MENTIONED BY JOSEPHUS

*References are to book and section of Josephus' text*

- Abbalos, 1.157  
Abdaeos, 1.157  
Abdastartos, 1.122  
Abdelimos, 1.157  
Abdemounos, 1.115, 1.120  
Abibalos, 1.113, 1.117  
Acusilaus, 1.13, 1.16  
Aegyptus, 1.102, 1.231  
Agatharchides, 1.205, 1.208, 1.212  
Akencheres (I), 1.96  
Akencheres (II), 1.97  
Alexander, 1.183, 1.184, 1.185, 1.192, 1.194, 1.200, 2.35, 2.37, 2.42, 2.44, 2.62, 2.72  
Alexandria, 1.48, 2.7, 2.32, 2.33, 2.34, 2.44, 2.49, 2.55, 2.60, 2.63, 2.67, 2.68, 2.78, 2.135, 2.136  
Alexandrians, 2.29, 2.32, 2.38, 2.41, 2.56, 2.64, 2.65, 2.69  
Amenophis (I), 1.95  
Amenophis (II) 1.96  
Amenophis (III), 1.97  
Amenophis (IV), 1.230, 1.232, 1.236, 1.240, 1.243, 1.245, 1.251, 1.254, 1.263, 1.266, 1.274, 1.276, 1.277, 1.288, 1.289, 1.291, 1.292, 1.295, 1.297, 1.300  
Amesses, 1.95  
Ammon, 1.306, 1.312  
Anacharsis, 2.269  
Anaxagoras, 2.168, 2.265  
Andreas, 2.46  
Antigonos, 1.185, 1.213  
Antioch, 1.206, 1.207, 2.39  
Antiochenes, 2.39  
Antiochus, 1.17  
Antiochus Epiphanes, 1.34, 2.80, 2.83, 2.84, 2.90, 2.91, 2.97, 2.120  
Antiochus (the Pious), 2.82  
Antony, 2.58  
Apachnas, 1.80  
Apion, 2.2, 2.6, 2.9, 2.12, 2.17, 2.23, 2.25, 2.28, 2.32, 2.33, 2.36, 2.37, 2.41, 2.42, 2.48, 2.49, 2.50, 2.56, 2.60, 2.62, 2.69, 2.73, 2.78, 2.79, 2.80, 2.85, 2.88, 2.91, 2.93, 2.100, 2.109, 2.112, 2.115, 2.116, 2.120, 2.124, 2.125, 2.126, 2.130, 2.132, 2.133, 2.138, 2.142, 2.143, 2.144, 2.148, 2.295  
Apis, 1.246, 1.263  
Apollo, 2.112, 2.117, 2.162  
Apollodorus, 2.84  
Apophis, 1.80  
Arabs, 1.82  
Arabia, 1.133, 2.25  
Arcadians, 1.22  
Argives, 1.17, 1.103  
Argos, 1.17, 1.103, 2.16  
Arsinoe, 2.57  
Aristaeus, 2.46  
Aristophanes, 1.216  
Aristotle, 1.176, 1.178, 1.182  
Artaxerxes, 1.40, 1.41  
Asia, 1.64, 1.90, 1.145, 1.150, 1.181, 2.128, 2.133, 2.228  
Assis, 1.81  
Assyrians, 1.77, 1.90, 1.99  
Astarte, 1.118, 1.123  
Astharymos, 1.123  
Athenians, 1.21, 1.221, 2.130, 2.172, 2.262, 2.265, 2.266, 2.269  
Athens, 2.131  
Auaris, 1.78, 1.86, 1.237, 1.242, 1.243, 1.260, 1.261, 1.262, 1.296  
Baal (II), 1.156  
Baalbazeros, 1.121  
Babylon, 1.33, 1.131, 1.132, 1.137, 1.138, 1.142, 1.149, 1.152, 1.153, 1.158, 1.192, 1.194, 1.206  
Babylonians, 1.28, 1.133, 1.136, 1.144, 1.145, 1.149  
Balatoros, 1.157  
Balezoros, 1.124  
Baslechos, 1.157  
Beon, 1.80  
Berosus, 1.129, 1.130, 1.134, 1.143, 1.145  
Bituminous Lake, 1.174  
Bocchoris, 1.305, 1.306, 1.307, 2.16  
Borsippa, 1.152  
Borsippians, 1.151  
Bubastis, 1.78  
Cadmus the Milesian, 1.10, 1.13  
Caesar (the Great), 2.37, 2.58, 2.61  
Caesar (Augustus), 2.60, 2.61  
Callias, 1.17  
Carmania, 1.153  
Carmel (Mount), 2.116  
Carthage (Karchedon), 1.108, 1.121, 1.125, 1.126, 2.17, 2.18  
Castor, 1.184, 2.84  
Chaboulon, 1.110  
Chaldeans, 1.8, 1.14, 1.28, 1.71, 1.128, 1.129, 1.131, 1.133, 1.138, 1.143, 2.1  
Chaeremon, 1.288, 1.293, 1.294, 1.297, 1.299, 1.300, 2.1  
Chebron, 1.94  
Chelbes, 1.157  
Choerilus, 1.172, 1.174  
Clazomenae, 2.265  
Cleans, 2.135  
Clearchus, 1.176, 1.182, 1.183  
Cleopatra, 2.49, 2.50, 2.51, 2.52, 2.56  
Coele-Syria, 1.135, 1.179  
Colchians, 1.169, 1.170  
Conon, 1.216  
Crassus (M. Licinius), 2.82  
Cretans, 2.172  
Cyprus, 1.99  
Cyrene, 2.44, 2.51  
Cyrus, 1.132, 1.145, 1.150, 1.152, 1.153, 1.154, 1.158, 1.159  
Danaus, 1.102, 1.103, 1.231, 2.16  
Darius, 1.154  
David, 2.132  
Deleastartos, 1.122  
Delphi, 2.131  
Demetrius, 1.184, 1.185, 1.206  
Demetrius (of Phalerum), 1.218, 2.46



- Diagoras (of Melos), 2.266  
 Dios, 1.112, 1.115  
 Dora (Dorii), 2.112, 2.114, 2.116  
 Dorians, 2.112  
 Dositheos, 2.49  
 Draco, 1.21  
  
 Ednibalos, 1.157  
 Egypt, 1.33, 1.81, 1.84, 1.85, 1.86, 1.88, 1.89, 1.92, 1.94, 1.98, 1.100, 1.101, 1.102, 1.103, 1.104, 1.132, 1.133, 1.135, 1.137, 1.194, 1.223, 1.228, 1.229, 1.232, 1.234, 1.236, 1.239, 1.241, 1.247, 1.252, 1.257, 1.258, 1.260, 1.261, 1.262, 1.272, 1.273, 1.275, 1.276, 1.278, 1.280, 1.289, 1.291, 1.296, 1.298, 2.6, 2.16, 2.19, 2.25, 2.28, 2.29, 2.37, 2.41, 2.44, 2.48, 2.132, 2.157, 2.289  
 Egyptians, 1.8, 1.14, 1.28, 1.61, 1.63, 1.70, 1.73, 1.92, 1.93, 1.169, 1.170, 1.223, 1.235, 1.243, 1.244, 1.246, 1.248, 1.251, 1.252, 1.253, 1.263, 1.270, 1.275, 1.279, 1.297, 1.298, 1.305, 1.306, 1.314, 1.317, 2.1, 2.8, 2.10, 2.21, 2.27, 2.30, 2.31, 2.41, 2.61, 2.65, 2.66, 2.67, 2.69, 2.70, 2.72, 2.86, 2.99, 2.123, 2.128, 2.133, 2.137, 2.138, 2.139, 2.140, 2.141, 2.289  
 Eirene, 2.55  
 Eiromos, 1.158, 1.159, 2.18, 2.19  
 Eleans, 2.273  
 Epaphroditus, 1.1, 2.1, 2.296  
 Ephesus, 2.39, 2.131  
 Ephorus, 1.16, 1.67  
 Ethiopia, 1.246, 1.248, 1.251, 1.263, 1.277, 1.292, 1.297, 1.300  
 Ethiopians, 1.169, 1.170, 1.246, 1.266  
 Euhemerus, 1.216  
 Eupolemus, 1.218  
 Europe, 2.128  
 Evil-Merodach (Eueilmardouchos), 1.146  
 Ezekias, 1.187  
  
 Galatae, 1.67  
 Galileans, 1.48  
 Galilee, 1.110  
 Gaza, 1.184, 1.185, 1.186, 2.116  
 Gerastartos, 1.157  
 Germanicus, 2.63  
 Greece, 1.10, 1.13, 1.172  
 Greeks, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.12, 1.14, 1.15, 1.20, 1.21, 1.27, 1.28, 1.44, 1.58, 1.61, 1.63, 1.66, 1.69, 1.116, 1.129, 1.161, 1.174, 1.319, 2.69, 2.74, 2.89, 2.95, 2.96, 2.99, 2.101, 2.110, 2.121, 2.123, 2.130, 2.138, 2.154, 2.161, 2.168, 2.172, 2.221, 2.223, 2.239, 2.252, 2.255, 2.259, 2.269, 2.270, 2.275, 2.281, 2.282  
  
 Harmais, 1.98, 1.100, 1.101, 1.102  
 Harmesses Miamoun, 1.97  
 Hecataeus, 1.183, 1.186, 1.190, 1.205, 1.213, 1.214, 2.43  
 Heliopolis, 1.261, 1.265, 2.10  
 Heliopolitans, 2.10, 2.13  
 Hellanicus, 1.16  
 Heracles, 1.118, 1.119, 1.144  
 Hermaeos, 1.231  
 Hermippus, 1.163  
 Hermogenes, 1.216  
 Herod, 1.51  
 Herod Agrippa II, 1.51  
 Herodotus, 1.16, 1.66, 1.73, 1.168  
 Hesiod, 1.16  
 Hieronymus, 1.213, 1.214  
  
 Hierosolymites, 1.264, 1.296, 1.311  
 Hiram (Eiromos), 1.109, 1.113, 1.114, 1.115, 1.117, 1.121, 1.126  
 Homer, 2.14, 2.155, 2.256  
 Hykoussos (king-shepherds), 1.82  
 Hyperochides, 1.177, 1.178  
  
 Iannas, 1.80  
 Iberia, 1.144  
 Iberians, 1.67, 2.40  
 Idumea, 2.116  
 Idumeans, 2.112  
 India, 1.179  
 Indians, 1.179  
 Ionia, 2.39  
 Isis, 1.289, 1.294, 1.298  
 Ithaca, 2.55  
 Ithobalos, 1.123, 1.156  
 Itycaioi, 1.119  
  
 Jerusalem (Hiersolyma), 1.33, 1.48, 1.90, 1.94, 1.108, 1.114, 1.120, 1.126, 1.132, 1.145, 1.179, 1.196, 1.197, 1.209, 1.228, 1.230, 1.241, 1.262, 1.270, 1.271, 1.275, 1.311, 2.12, 2.19, 2.48  
 Joseph (Iosepos), 1.92, 1.290, 1.299  
 Judea, 1.32, 1.90, 1.179, 1.195, 1.228, 1.310, 2.21, 2.25  
 Judeans, 1.1, 1.42, 1.71, 1.72, 1.137, 1.165, 1.171, 1.174, 1.179, 1.187, 1.192, 1.197, 1.228, 1.251, 1.292, 1.300, 1.302, 1.305, 1.313, 2.7, 2.16, 2.19, 2.25, 2.27, 2.28, 2.32, 2.33, 2.35, 2.38, 2.43, 2.44, 2.53, 2.54, 2.55, 2.56, 2.60, 2.63, 2.68, 2.77, 2.80, 2.84, 2.94, 2.100, 2.101, 2.104, 2.112, 2.113, 2.114, 2.277  
 Julius Archelaus, 1.51  
  
 Kalliphon, 1.164  
 Kencheres, 1.97  
  
 Laborosoardochochos, 1.148  
 Lagus, 1.185, 1.210, 2.37, 2.44  
 Libanos, 1.110, 1.113, 1.118  
 Libya, 1.125, 1.144, 2.44  
 Locrians, 2.154  
 Lycurgus, 2.154, 2.225  
 Lysimachus, 1.304, 2.16, 2.20, 2.145, 2.236  
  
 Macedonia, 1.206  
 Macedonians, 2.35, 2.36, 2.69, 2.133, 2.138  
 Macronians, 1.170  
 Manetho, 1.73, 1.74, 1.87, 1.91, 1.93, 1.103, 1.104, 1.105, 1.228, 1.251, 1.252, 1.260, 1.262, 1.270, 1.278, 1.287, 1.288, 1.294, 1.296, 1.300, 2.1, 2.16  
 Medes, 1.64, 1.99  
 Media, 1.141  
 Megasthenes, 1.144  
 Memphis, 1.77, 1.246  
 Menander (the Ephesian), 1.116  
 Mephres, 1.95  
 Mephramouthosis, 1.95  
 Merbalos, 1.158  
 Methousastartos, 1.122  
 Mettenos, 1.125  
 Minos, 2.161  
 Misphragmouthosis, 1.86, 1.88  
 Mnaseas, 1.216, 2.112  
 Molon (Apollonius), 2.16, 2.79, 2.145, 2.148, 2.236, 2.255, 2.258, 2.262, 2.270, 2.295

- Moses (Moyses), 1.40, 1.130, 1.250, 1.153, 1.265, 1.279,  
 1.282, 1.290, 1.299, 1.309, 2.10, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15,  
 2.25, 2.28, 2.145, 2.168  
 Mosollamos, 1.201, 1.203  
 Mytynos, 1.157  
  
 Nabonnedos, 1.149, 1.151, 1.152, 1.153  
 Naboupolassaros, 1.131, 1.135, 1.136  
 Nebuchadnezzar (Naboukodrosorus), 1.132, 1.135, 1.136,  
 1.137, 1.146, 1.154, 1.156, 1.159  
 Neriglisaros, 1.147  
 Nicolas (of Damascus), 2.84  
 Nile, 1.235  
 Ninos, 2.267  
 Noah, 1.130, 1.131  
  
 Onias, 2.49, 2.50, 2.52, 2.53  
 Oros/Or, 1.96, 1.232  
 Osarseph (Osarsephos/Osarsiph), 1.238, 1.250, 1.265, 1.286  
  
 Paapios, 1.232, 1.243  
 Palestine, 1.171  
 Parthenios, 1.170  
 Pelusium, 1.101, 1.274, 1.291, 1.297, 1.302  
 Persia, 1.150  
 Persians, 1.13, 1.18, 1.40, 1.64, 1.132, 1.158, 1.172, 1.194,  
 2.129, 2.133, 2.269  
 Peteseph, 1.290  
 Phelles, 1.123  
 Pherecydes of Syros, 1.14  
 Philistus, 1.17  
 Philo, 1.218  
 Philostratus, 1.144  
 Phoenicia, 1.61, 1.99, 1.133, 1.135, 1.143, 1.194, 2.116  
 Phoenicians, 1.8, 1.10, 1.28, 1.63, 1.70, 1.106, 1.112, 1.126,  
 1.137, 1.143, 1.169, 2.1, 2.17  
 Phritobautes, 1.289, 1.295  
 Pisistratus, 1.21  
 Plato, 2.168, 2.223, 2.224, 2.225, 2.256, 2.257  
 Polybius (of Megalopolis), 2.84  
 Polycrates, 1.221  
 Pompey (the Great), 1.34, 2.82, 2.134  
 Posidonius (of Apamea), 2.79  
 Protagoras, 2.266  
 Ptolemy (son of Lagus), 1.183, 1.184, 1.185, 1.186, 1.210,  
 2.37, 2.44  
 Ptolemy (Philadelphus), 2.45  
 Ptolemy III (Euergetes), 2.48  
 Ptolemy Philometor, 2.49, 2.51  
 Ptolemy Physcon, 2.51, 2.53, 2.54, 2.56  
 Pygmalion Phygmalion, 1.125  
 Pythagoras, 1.14, 1.162, 1.164, 2.14, 2.168  
  
 Rathotis, 1.96  
 Ramesses, 1.98, 1.245, 1.288, 1.292, 1.300, 1.301  
 Rampses, 1.231, 1.251  
 Red Sea, 1.201  
 Romans, 1.48, 1.49, 1.51, 1.66, 2.40, 2.41, 2.57, 2.72, 2.73,  
 2.76, 2.125, 2.134  
 Rome, 1.50, 1.66  
  
 Sabines, 2.40  
 Saite, 1.78  
 Salitis, 1.77  
 Samaritans, 2.43  
 Scythians, 1.64, 2.269  
  
 Seleucia, 1.207  
 Seleucus, 1.206, 2.39  
 Semiramis, 1.142  
 Sesostris, 2.132  
 Sethos, 1.98, 1.101, 1.231, 2.245  
 Sicilians, 1.17  
 Sinaeus, 2.25  
 Socrates, 2.135, 2.263, 2.264  
 Solomon, 1.108, 1.109, 1.110, 1.111, 1.114, 1.115, 1.120,  
 2.12, 2.19, 2.132  
 Solon, 2.154  
 Solyman (hills), 1.173, 1.174  
 Solymites, 1.248  
 Spartans (Lacedaemonians), 1.221, 2.130, 2.172, 2.226,  
 2.227, 2.228, 2.259, 2.262, 2.273  
 Strabo (the Cappadocian), 2.84  
 Stratonicce, 1.206, 1.208  
 Syria, 1.89, 1.133, 1.135, 1.143, 1.174, 1.186, 1.194, 1.206,  
 1.213, 1.251, 1.266, 1.276, 1.277, 1.292, 1.300, 2.33, 2.48  
 Syrians, 1.137, 1.169, 1.170, 1.171, 1.179  
  
 Tartarus, 2.240  
 Tethmosis, 1.94, 1.231, 1.241, 2.16  
 Thales, 1.14  
 Thebaid, 1.85  
 Thebans, 2.273  
 Theodotus, 1.216  
 Theophilus, 1.216  
 Theophrastus, 1.166  
 Theopompus, 1.221  
 Thermodon, 1.170  
 Thermus, 2.50  
 Thmosis, 1.96  
 Thoummosis, 1.88  
 Thracians, 1.64, 1.165  
 Thucydides, 1.18, 1.66  
 Timaeus, 1.16, 1.17, 1.221  
 Timagenes, 2.84  
 Timaios, 1.75  
 Tisithen, 1.290  
 Titus, 1.48, 1.50, 2.82  
 Trojans, 1.12  
 Troy, 1.11  
 Typhonian, 1.237  
 Tyre, 1.117, 1.144, 1.156, 1.159  
 Tyrians, 1.70, 1.107, 1.108, 1.109, 1.111, 1.167  
 Tyrrhenians, 2.40  
  
 Varus (Publius Quintilius), 1.34  
 Vespasian, 1.48, 1.50  
  
 Xerxes, 1.40, 1.172  
  
 Zabidos, 2.112, 2.113, 2.114  
 Zaleukos, 2.154  
 Zeno, 2.135  
 Zeus, 1.118, 1.255, 2.162  
 Zopyrion, 1.216

## INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN WORDS

Important Josephan vocabulary is here listed where it is given significant commentary (with further cross-references).

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>ἄθεος: 2n552<br/> ἀκρίβεια: 1n119, 2n559, 2n693<br/> ἀναγραφή: 1n35<br/> ἀναμίγνυμι: 1n799, 1n885<br/> ἀπαράιτητος: 2n703<br/> ἀπολογία: xxxiv-xxxvi, 2n545<br/> ἀπόνοια: 2n555<br/> ἀργία: 1n707, 2n1175<br/> ἀρετή: 2n1116<br/> ἀρχαιολογία: 1n2<br/> ἀρχαιότης: 1n22, 1n524</p> <p>βάρβαρος: 1n231<br/> βλασφημία, βλασφημέω: 1n16, 2n20</p> <p>γένος: lvi, n138, 1n6, 1n30, 1n588, 1n882, 2n97<br/> γότης: 2n530<br/> γραμμ-root: 1n35</p> <p>διαβολή: 1n751<br/> δικαιοσύνη: 2n540, 2n749<br/> δόξα: 2n629, 2n657<br/> δυσμένεια: 1n16, 1n753</p> <p>ἐλέγχω: 2n5, 2n1194<br/> ἐμμένω: 1n174<br/> ἐξουσία: 1n89, 1n150, 2n683, 2n1020<br/> ἐπιμέλεια: 1n36<br/> ἐπιμίγνυμι: 2n1038<br/> ἐπιχειρέω: 1n55</p> | <p>εὐσέβεια: 2n537, 2n611, 2n749</p> <p>ζηλ-root: 1n534, 1n783, 2n1049, 2n1125</p> <p>θανάτου περιφρόνησις: 2n542<br/> θαυμα-root: 1n568, 1n577, 2n42, 2n91, 2n160, 2n903<br/> θεοκρατία: 2n638</p> <p>Ἰουδαῖος: lx-lxi, 1n7</p> <p>καρτερία: 1n607, 2n541, 2n922<br/> κατηγορία, κατηγορέω: 2n18<br/> κοινωνία: 2n538, 2n749, 2n783, 2n1173</p> <p>λοιδορία, λοιδορέω: 1n20, 1n1067, 2n16</p> <p>μανθάνω: 1n48<br/> μαρτυρία, μαρτυρέω: 1n365, 1n675<br/> μεταβάλλω: 2n578<br/> μετατίθημι: 2n578<br/> μετακινέω: 2n578<br/> μισάνθρωπος: 2n553</p> <p>οἰκειότης: 2n847<br/> ὁμόνοια: 2n704, 2n1141</p> | <p>πείθω: 2n576<br/> πίστις: 1n17, 1n476, 2n629<br/> πολιτεία: 2n534, 2n1032<br/> πολίτευμα: 2n534<br/> πολυτέλεια: 2n1131<br/> πόνος: 2n541</p> <p>σάββατον: 2n67, 71<br/> συγγραφεύς: 1n97, 2n3<br/> συμφωνία: 2n669<br/> συντίθημι: 1n189, 1n380, 1n970, 1n995<br/> σωφροσύνη: 1n609</p> <p>τεκμήριον: 1n107, 1n144</p> <p>φαῦλος: 1n214, 1n578, 1n713, 2n14, 2n99, 2n955<br/> φιλανθρωπία: 1n626, 1n958, 2n129, 2n539, 2n749, 2n860, 2n934, 2n1052<br/> φυλάττω: 1n242, 2n597</p> <p>ψευδ-root: 1n23, 1n72, 1n363, 1n879, 1n1020, 2n23</p> <p><i>accuso</i>: 2n18<br/> <i>mentio</i>: 2n23<br/> <i>tribus</i>: 2n385</p> |
|--|--|--|

## INDEX OF MODERN SCHOLARS

References are given by the same system as for Ancient Texts (Index 1)

- Alexander, L.C., xxxiv,n50, xlvi,n103,  
1n1, 1n3, 1n5, 1n19  
Amir, Y., 245, 2n638, 2n639, 2n694  
Applebaum, S., 2n150  
Arlenius, A.P., lxiii  
Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., and Tiffin,  
H., lxxviii,n185  
Attridge, H.W., 2n457, 2n711  
Attridge, H.W. and Oden, R.A.,  
xlii,n92, 9, 67, 1n38  
Aune, D.E., 1n169  
Aziza, C., pp.336, 342, 344, 1n327
- Baer, R.A., 2n805  
Balch, D.L., xxxiv,n54, p.364n1,  
2n806  
Balsdon, J.P.V.D., p.9, p.366n3  
Barber, G.L., 1n72  
Barclay, J.M.G., xxxiii,n50,  
xxxvii,n64, xxxvii,n68,  
xxxviii,n70, xxxviii,n72, xli,n87,  
li,n116, lii,n120, lii,n122, lvi,n141,  
lxix,n189, lxx,n193, lxxi,n196,  
pp.11, 94, 126, 127, 168, 169, 243,  
245, 358n20, 359n21, 362, 363,  
364, 365, 1n9, 1n149, 1n262,  
1n282, 1n359, 1n602, 1n627,  
1n707, 1n768, 1n777, 1n799, 2n7,  
2n18, 2n21, 2n66, 2n71, 2n83,  
2n89, 2n102, 2n114, 2n124, 2n127,  
2n128, 2n149, 2n150, 2n167,  
2n168, 2n184, 2n227, 2n233,  
2n234, 2n262, 2n450, 2n457,  
2n469, 2n552, 2n759, 2n1135,  
2n1136, 2n1165  
Bar-Kochva, B., lxvi, pp.338, 339,  
340, 347n12, 351, 352, 1n480,  
1n481, 1n598, 1n599, 1n603,  
1n605, 1n607, 1n614, 1n615,  
1n616, 1n626, 1n628, 1n631,  
1n632, 1n635, 1n636, 1n642,  
1n645, 1n652, 1n653, 1n655,  
1n656, 1n657, 1n658, 1n662,  
1n663, 1n664, 1n670, 1n671,  
1n677, 1n678, 1n685, 1n693,  
1n708, 1n710, 1n1018, 1n1029,  
1n1049, 2n144, 2n146, 2n274,  
2n275, 2n412, 2n414, 2n550  
Barnes, T.D., xxxvii,n63, 2n480  
Barrett, C.K., 2n1  
Barth, F., lxi,n158  
Barton, C.A., 1n166, 2n542, 2n784  
Barton, S.C.B. and G.H.R. Horsley,  
2n812  
Bauckham, R., p.169, 2n366, 2n368,  
2n375, 2n376, 2n377, 2n379, 2n385,  
2n386, 2n387, 2n391, 2n430, 2n432
- Baumgarten, A.I., 1n38, 1n553  
Beard, M., p.92  
Beard, M. et al., 2n821  
Beard, M., North, J. and Price, S.,  
2n336, 2n656, 2n961, 2n963,  
2n1007, 2n1019  
Beaulieu, P.-A., 1n499, 1n502  
Becher, I., 2n194  
Beckerath, J. von, 1n296, 1n298,  
1n308, 1n337  
Beckwith, R., p.11, 1n156, 1n165  
Begg, C.T. and Spilsbury, P., 1n450,  
1n453, 1n488  
Bekker, I., lxiii, 1n19, 1n649, 1n661,  
1n698, 1n967, 2n594, 2n951  
Belkin, S., xxiv,n17, 245, 357n15,  
2n864, 2n890  
Berger, K., xxxiv,n52  
Bernays, J., p.353n1, 2n839, 2n851,  
2n853  
Berthelot, K., pp.48, 126, 348, 350,  
352, 357n16, 360, 362, 364,  
1n311, 1n626, 1n777, 1n1039,  
1n1042, 2n102, 2n129, 2n274,  
2n291, 2n323, 2n439, 2n538,  
2n539, 2n553, 2n554, 2n847,  
2n860, 2n1042, 2n1044, 2n1052,  
2n1173  
Bhabha, H.K., lxix, lxix,n188, 12, 246  
Bickerman, E.J., pp.94, 351, 352,  
1n263, 2n298, 2n322, 2n323,  
2n336, 2n338, 2n340, 2n402,  
2n407, 2n412  
Bietak, M., 1n304, 1n308  
Bilde, P., xix,n5, xx,n11, lii,n121,  
1n149, 1n169, 1n191, 1n196  
Bloch, R., xli,n89, 2n530  
Bohak, G., p.346n9, 1n977  
Bollansée, J., 1n536, 1n538, 1n539,  
1n540, 1n541, 1n545, 1n546  
Bonneau, D., 2n225  
Boswell, J., 2n811  
Bowersock, G., xlii,n92, 9, 67, 1n38,  
2n542  
Boyarín, D., 2n542  
Boysen, C., lxii,n162, lxiv,n173, 2n6,  
2n206, 2n213, 2n226, 2n255,  
2n263, 2n291, 2n323, 2n342,  
2n348, 2n349, 2n357, 2n395,  
2n401, 2n402, 2n403, 2n474,  
2n1063  
Boys-Stones, G., xlii,n93, 125, 128,  
1n18, 1n973, 1n981, 2n38  
Braun, H., 1n845, 1n855  
Briquel-Chatonnet, F., p.68, 1n388,  
1n391  
Briscoe, J., 2n175
- Brown, P., 2n814  
Bruce, F.F., 2n463  
Burkert, W., 2n746, 2n747  
Burnet, J., 2n1061  
Burstein, S.M., 79, 1n428, 1n430,  
1n457, 1n470, 1n489, 1n696  
Busink, Th.A., 2n363, 2n372  
Büttner-Wobst, T., lxii,n164
- Cadbury, H.J., 1n3  
Calabi, F., lxxv,n176, lxxv,n178, 2n459,  
2n815  
Cameron, A., 2n811  
Campbell, R.A., 2n833  
Cancik, H., 2n638  
Cardauns, B., 2n963  
Carleton Paget, J., xl,n85  
Carras, G.P., pp.353, 353n1, 357n16  
Carson, A., 2n805  
Carter, J.M., 2n210  
Cartledge, P. and Spawforth, A., 2n925  
Castelli, S., 2n749  
Catastini, A., p.50  
Cataudella, Q., 1n635  
Chapman, S.B., p.11  
Childs, P. and Williams, P.,  
lxviii,n185  
Clark, K.W., 2n769  
Cohen, S.J.D., xxiv,n17, lvi,n139,  
lx,n154, lxi,n158, lxvi, 1n107,  
1n128, 1n171, 1n214, 1n373,  
1n563, 1n592, 2n164, 2n447,  
2n512, 2n847, 2n1134  
Cohn, L., pp.353, 353n3, 1n2, 2n7  
Collins, A.Y., 1n988  
Collins, J.J., p.338, 2n234  
Collins, N., 2n154, 2n157  
Colson, F.H., pp.353n1, 353n2, 354n9,  
2n830  
Cotton, H.M. and Eck, W., xxxvii,n64,  
1n111, 1n112, 1n113, 1n115, 1n3,  
1n207  
Cramer, F.H., p.77,  
Crouch, J.E., pp.353, 353n2, 2n865
- Dawson, D., 2n1030  
Decharme, P., 2n964, 2n1070  
De Jonge, M., 2n463  
De Lange, N.R.M., p.344  
Delia, A., 2n104, 2n118, 2n124,  
2n138, 2n227  
Delling, G., 2n958  
Derrett, J.D.M., 1n553  
Dietrich, B.C., 2n995  
Dihle, A., 1n717  
Dillery, J., 2n7  
Dindorf, W., lxiii, 1n52, 1n400



- Dochhorn, J., 1n406, 1n410, 1n418, 1n419
- Doering, L., 1n719
- Doran, R., 1n635, 1n651
- Dormeyer, D., xx,n11
- Droge, A.J., p.10, 1n18, 1n34, 2n490, 2n496, 2n648, 2n776, 2n1119
- Droge, A.J. and Tabor, J.D., 1n175
- Du Toit, D.S., 1n946
- Eddy, S.K., 1n773, 1n845, 2n468
- Edmondson, J., Mason, S. and Rives, J., 362
- Eissfeldt, O., p.68, 1n384
- Elledge, C.D., 2n890
- Edwards, M., Goodman, M. and Price, S., xxx,n43, xxxvi,n62,
- Esler, P., lv,n137, lxi,n158, 1n6
- Fantham, E., xlv,n100, 1n207, 1n3, 2n1196
- Faraone, C.A., 2n530
- Fascher, E., 2n552
- Feeney, D.C., 2n656, 2n963
- Feldman, D.M., 2n812
- Feldman, L.H., xxv,n23, liv,n129, pp.127, 344, 351, 366n4, 1n3, 1n125, 1n126, 1n 161, 1n169, 1n171, 1n202, 1n219, 1n291, 1n601, 1n674, 1n946, 1n952, 1n1007, 2n41, 2n447, 2n496, 2n598, 2n635, 2n732, 2n769, 2n832, 2n958, 2n1134, 2n1151
- Feldman, L.H. and Levison, J.R., lxvi
- Finley, M.I., 1n88
- Fish, S., lxvii,n182
- Fitzmyer, J.A., 1n553
- Flower, M.A., 1n758
- Frankfurter, D., pp.168, 345, 345n6, 346n9, 1n977, 1n1030
- Fraser, P.M., p.335, 1n696, 1n735, 1n1018, 2n111, 2n113, 2n116, 2n117, 2n142, 2n172, 2n189, 2n227, 2n228, 2n238, 2n247, 2n402
- Frede, M., xxxvi,n62, xlii,n93, 1n973, 1n981
- Frier, B.W., 10
- Gabba, E., pp.336, 344, 1n327
- Gafni, I.M., lvii,n144, 1n133
- Gagarin, M., 1n93
- Gager, J.G., pp.336, 338, 339, 342, 344, 1n628, 1n631, 1n871, 1n946, 2n82, 2n144, 2n530
- Gambetti, S., p.168, 2n234
- Garland, R., 2n1060
- Garnsey, P., 2n224
- Garvey, A.F., 1n353
- Gauger, J.-D., pp.338, 339, 2n144
- Gauthier, P., 2n1042
- Gerber, C., xix,n5, xix,n6, xx,n11, xxiv,n17, xxvi,n26, xxxiii,n48, xxxiii,n50, xlv,n99, xlv,n101, xlvii,n107, lii,n122, liii,n124, lviii,n148, lxxv,n176, pp.353, 353n2, 355, 355n11, 356n13, 356n14, 357n16, 357n18, 360, 360n24, 1n3, 1n169, 2n523, 2n534, 2n537, 2n538, 2n539, 2n540, 2n566, 2n598, 2n612, 2n619, 2n622, 2n628, 2n629, 2n635, 2n638, 2n639, 2n640, 2n642, 2n646, 2n665, 2n666, 2n694, 2n699, 2n724, 2n733, 2n740, 2n749, 2n754, 2n769, 2n770, 2n771, 2n790, 2n794, 2n815, 2n843, 2n870, 2n886, 2n892, 2n905, 2n908, 2n954, 2n1037, 2n1073, 2n1116, 2n1140, 2n1173, 2n1183
- Giangrande, G., lxiii, lxiv,n173, 1n461, 1n462, 1n823, 2n6, 2n76, 2n474, 2n874
- Gianotti, G.F., 1n461
- Gibbs, S.L., 2n39, 2n41
- Gleason, M., 2n796
- Goldhill, S., lxx,n190, 12
- Goldstein, J., 2n298
- Goodman, M., xxviii,n35, xxviii,n36, xxxvi,n61, xxxviii,n70, xxxviii,n73, xl,n86, xliii,n94, xlv,n101, 1n110, lii,n120, lii,n122, lx,n155, lxvi, pp.245, 338, 362, 1n18, 2n447, 2n704, 2n846
- Gorman, P., 1n547
- Goudriaan, K., 2n92, 2n238
- Graf, F., 2n530
- Grainger, J.D., xl,n86
- Grant, M., 2n200, 2n215
- Grant, R.M., lxii,n159, 1n396
- Gray, R., 1n123, 1n169
- Green, A.R., p.68, 1n418, 1n419
- Gregory, A., 2n259
- Griffin, J., 2n204
- Griffin, M., xxxvii,n65, xxxvii,n67, xxxviii,n71, xxxix,n76, xxxix,n79, xxxix,n80, xl,n84
- Griffiths, J.G., pp.345, 351, 1n811, 1n825, 1n829, 1n835, 1n966, 1n977, 1n988, 2n465, 2n514
- Grimal, N.C., 2n468
- Gruen, E.S., xxii,n13, xli,n87, xliii,n94, xlv,n101, lii,n119, lii,n122, lvii,n144, lxvi, pp.9, 127, 168, 243, 336, 338, 344, 346, 346n8, 347n12, 349, 365, 366n3, 366n4, 1n18, 1n133, 1n316, 1n327, 1n648, 1n748, 1n871, 1n981, 2n73, 2n122, 2n124, 2n184, 2n227, 2n234, 2n238, 2n253, 2n322, 2n607, 2n1019, 2n1163
- Gutschmid, A. von, lxx, lxxv,n177, 1n50, 1n54, 1n120, 1n128, 1n141, 1n145, 1n154, 1n158, 1n162, 1n163, 1n165, 1n191, 1n198, 1n210, 1n211, 1n213, 1n215, 1n234, 1n235, 1n251, 1n254, 1n258, 1n290, 1n292, 1n296, 1n297, 1n303, 1n308, 1n310, 1n313, 1n315, 1n316, 1n317, 1n321, 1n323, 1n324, 1n330, 1n331, 1n333, 1n337, 1n338, 1n339, 1n340, 1n342, 1n344, 1n348, 1n350, 1n353, 1n356, 1n366, 1n368, 1n373, 1n376, 1n384, 1n387, 1n390, 1n395, 1n396, 1n399, 1n400, 1n402, 1n403, 1n405, 1n407, 1n408, 1n409, 1n410, 1n413, 1n414, 1n416, 1n418, 1n419, 1n423, 1n428, 1n430, 1n435, 1n437, 1n442, 1n444, 1n448, 1n450, 1n453, 1n456, 1n457, 1n458, 1n461, 1n464, 1n465, 1n467, 1n470, 1n474, 1n480, 1n487, 1n489, 1n492, 1n495, 1n498, 1n506, 1n508, 1n510, 1n512, 1n515, 1n516, 1n519, 1n520, 1n521, 1n523, 1n534, 1n542, 1n543, 1n545, 1n553, 1n558, 1n564, 1n565, 1n567, 1n570, 1n573, 1n574, 1n583, 1n585, 1n586, 1n587, 1n597, 1n599, 1n600, 1n607, 2n7
- Haaland, G., xxviii,n35, xxxix,n76, lix,n150, pp.245, 362, 363, 365, 1n238, 2n159
- Haarhoff, T.J., p.9, 366n3
- Habicht, C., 2n298
- Hahn, J., 2n769
- Hahn, S., 2n787
- Hall, E., lxx,n90, 1n231, 1n566, 2n323
- Hall, J.M., lv,n135
- Hall, S., p.364
- Hannestad, N., 2n259
- Hansen, G., lxiii, 1n461
- Hardwick, M.E., liii,n126, liv,n128, liv,n130, liv,n131, p.49
- Harnack, A. von, 2n552
- Harris, W.V., 2n821
- Harrison, J.R., 2n831
- Harrison, T., lxx,n190
- Hartog, F., 2n1079
- Harvey, G., lvii,n145, lxi,n158
- Hayes, W.C., 1n308
- Hayward, C.T.R., 1n670
- Heinemann, I., pp.336, 344, 353n3, 354n7, 357n16, 2n767, 2n797, 2n811, 2n830
- Helck, H.W., lxvi, p.335, 1n343, 1n848
- Hengel, M., 1n593, 2n35, 2n825
- Hennig, D., 2n221
- Hezser, C., 2n821
- Hilgard, A., 1n52
- Höffken, P., p.11, 1n158, 1n166, 1n168, 1n169
- Hölbl, G., 2n172
- Holladay, C.R., pp.87, 338, 359n21, 1n48, 1n645, 1n732, 1n733, 1n745, 1n746, 1n747, 2n512, 2n648, 2n754
- Hölscher, G., xxiv,n17
- Honigman, S., 2n124, 2n227, 2n233, 2n1042

- Horbury, W., 2n425  
 Horbury, W. and Noy, D., 2n35, 2n115, 2n117, 2n165, 2n189, 2n225, 2n265  
 Hornblower, S., lxvi, 1n724, 1n725  
 Hudson, J., lxiii, 1n108, 1n254, 1n350, 1n659, 1n1045, 2n165, 2n432, 2n922, 2n1063  
 Hughes, D.D., 2n323  
 Hughes-Hallett, L., 2n194  
 Hutchinson, J. and Smith, A.D., lv  
 Huxley, G., 1n565, 1n566, 1n573
- Ilan, T., 2n799  
 Inowlocki, S., 1n171, 1n295, 1n557, 1n583  
 Isaac, B., xli, n91, p.365n2, 1n754, 2n102, 2n323  
 Iser, W., lxvii, n182
- Jablónski, P.E., 2n71  
 Jackson, B.S., 2n880  
 Jacobs, A.S., lxx, n192  
 Jacobson, H., 2n7, 2n190, 2n345, 2n494  
 Jacoby, F., pp.335, 336, 338, 339, 351, 1n80, 1n267, 1n268, 1n334, 1n356, 1n394, 1n428, 1n612, 1n615, 1n636, 1n697, 1n725, 1n759, 1n820, 1n839, 1n1018, 2n36, 2n37  
 Jaeger, W., 1n593  
 Janne, H., 2n286  
 Jeremias, J., 1n126, 1n128, 1n632, 2n385, 2n386  
 Johnson, S., 2n184  
 Jones, B.W., xxxvii, n67, xxxvii, n69, xxxviii, n71, xxxviii, n74, xxxviii, n76, xxxix, n77, xxxix, n78, xxxix, n79, xxxix, n80, p.168, 2n265  
 Jones, C.P., xxvii, n29, xxvii, n31, xxvii, n33, p.364n1, 1n3  
 Jones, K.R., lxvi, 2n7, 2n18, 2n94, 2n104  
 Jonquière, T., 2n787
- Kamlah, E., p.245, 2n749, 2n772, 2n776  
 Kapparis, K., 2n812  
 Kasher, A., xx, n11, xlv, n101, lxv, lxv, n179, 168, 338, 339, 1n677, 2n111, 2n116, 2n127, 2n225, 2n227  
 Katzenstein, H.J., p.68, 1n371, 1n383, 1n384, 1n385, 1n396, 1n397, 1n402, 1n403, 1n407, 1n408, 1n410, 1n412, 1n414, 1n415, 1n419, 1n512, 1n513, 1n515, 1n517, 1n520  
 Keeble, K., xxxvi, n61, p.362  
 Kirk, G.S., 1n52  
 Klawans, J., 2n788  
 Koenen, L., p.345, 1n825, 1n1029  
 Kokkinos, N., xxvii, n29, 1n209, 1n210  
 Kovacs, J.L. and Rowland, C., lxvii, n183  
 Kraeling, C.H., 2n127
- Krauter, S., 2n1042  
 Krieger, K.-S., xxvii, n31, 2n160  
 Kückler, M., 2n836, 2n839, 2n851, 2n853  
 Kuhrt, A., p.79, pp.353, 353n2, 356n14, 357n16, 1n428, 1n430, 1n446, 1n474, 1n475, 1n502  
 Kushnir-Stein, A., xxvii, n29
- Labow, D., xix, n5, xx, n11, lxii, n160, lxii, n164, lxiii, n168, lxiii, n170, lxiii, n171, lxv, lxv, n176, pp.68, 79, 335, 337, 338, 1n3, 1n49, 1n119, 1n214, 1n215, 1n300, 1n315, 1n316, 1n317, 1n321, 1n328, 1n336, 1n337, 1n338, 1n342, 1n348, 1n353, 1n373, 1n447, 1n464, 1n483, 1n491, 1n509, 1n513, 1n516, 1n520, 1n542, 1n557, 1n573, 1n648, 1n655, 1n802, 1n863, 1n871, 1n952, 1n973, 1n1018, 1n1025, 1n1034, 1n1062  
 Lambers-Petry, D., lii, n121  
 Lane Fox, R., 1n892  
 Langlands, R., p.367  
 Laqueur, R., pp.335, 336, 1n207, 1n208, 1n214, 1n315, 1n316, 1n356, 1n394, 1n871, 1n879, 2n402  
 Launey, M., 2n116  
 Lebram, J.C.H., p.11  
 Leiman, S.Z., 1n165  
 Leonhardt, J., 2n788  
 Levick, B., 1n197  
 Levine, L.I., 2n35  
 Levinskaya, I., 2n35, 2n1134  
 Levison, J.R. and Wagner, J.R., xix, n5, xx, n11  
 Levison, J.R., 2n826  
 Lévy, H., 1n574  
 Lévy, I., 2n104, 2n161, 2n189  
 Lewy, H., pp.338, 339, 1n455, 1n584, 1n599, 1n607, 1n635, 1n636, 1n655, 1n665  
 Lieberg, G., 2n963  
 Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., 2n265  
 Lilja, S., 2n796  
 Lindemann, A., 2n812  
 Lindner, H., 2n463  
 Lindsay, D.R., 2n629  
 Ling, R., 2n258  
 Liver, J., p.68  
 Lloyd, A.B., p.345, 1n53, 1n292, 1n558, 1n559, 1n837, 2n38, 2n313, 2n514  
 Loomba, A., lxviii, n185  
 Loraux, N., 1n91  
 Lord, A.B., 1n54  
 Luce, T.J., 1n104, 1n213  
 Lüderitz, G., 2n447  
 Lund, A.A., p.368n5  
 Luther, H., 1n3
- Macaulay, T.B., 1n601  
 McDonald, L.M. and Sanders, J.A., 11, 1n166  
 MacDowell, D.M., 2n580, 2n925, 2n1045
- Macfie, A.L., lxix, n186  
 MacKenzie, J., lxix, n186  
 McLaren, J.S., 2n639  
 Mader, G., xxxv, n55, 1n84, 1n202  
 Malaise, M., p.168, 1n977  
 Malkin, I., lv, n135  
 March, J., 2n969  
 Marcus, J., 2n688  
 Marcus, R., p.344, 1n402, 1n457, 1n470  
 Marincola, J., 9, 1n69, 1n102, 1n185, 1n193, 1n204, 1n213, 1n226  
 Marrou, H.I., 2n672  
 Martin, D., 93, 1n702, 2n796  
 Mason, S., xviii, n3, xix, n5, xxii, n14, xxvi, n27, xxvii, n29, xxviii, n35, xxxiii, n50, xxxvii, n64, xliv, n98, xlv, n101, xlvi, n107, 1n111, 1n112, li, n115, li, n116, li, n121, lii, n122, lix, n150, lxi, n158, pp.11, 169, 245, 362, 366n4, 1n3, 1n83, 1n101, 1n107, 1n119, 1n138, 1n156, 1n166, 1n196, 1n204, 1n205, 1n208, 1n214, 1n228, 1n376, 1n633, 1n782, 1n1062, 2n131, 2n159, 2n198, 2n385, 2n419, 2n463, 2n635, 2n732, 2n846, 2n847, 2n858, 2n890, 2n891  
 Matthews, S., 1n783  
 Mattingly, D.J., lxx, n190  
 Mattingly, H., xxxviii, n73  
 Mayer-Schärtel, B., 2n805, 2n806  
 Meeks, W.A., 2n1151  
 Mendels, D., pp.68, 335  
 Meyer, E., pp.68, 71, 335, 336, 1n315, 1n316, 1n317, 1n321, 1n333, 1n335, 1n337, 1n341, 1n343, 1n353, 1n356, 1n802, 1n803, 1n830, 1n848, 1n871  
 Meyer, R., p.11  
 Millar, F., xxxvii, n63, pp.67, 167, 2n480  
 Mitteis, L. and Wilcken, U., 2n512  
 Modrzejewski, J.M., pp.127, 346n10, 1n768, 2n149, 2n167  
 Moessner, D., 1n217  
 Momigliano, A., pp.336, 357n15, 1n75, 1n263, 1n266, 1n316, 1n317, 1n566, 1n879, 2n59, 2n154  
 Moore, S.D., lxix, p.246, 2n796  
 Moore, S.D. and Segovia, F.F., lxx, n191  
 Moore-Gilbert, B., lxviii, n184, lxviii, n185, lxix, n188, 246  
 Mørkholm, O., 2n298  
 Motzo, B., pp.353, 357n15, 2n55  
 Mras, K., lxii, lxii, n161, 2n631, 2n762, 2n854  
 Müller, J.G., lxv, lxv, n177, p.351, 1n353, 1n656, 2n37, 2n78, 2n164, 2n193, 2n232, 2n286, 2n462, 2n566, 2n638, 2n669, 2n778, 2n911, 2n1096, 2n1121  
 Mussies, G., 1n983  
 Musurillo, H.A., lxiii, n97, 167

- Naber, S.A., lxiii, 1n19, 1n85, 1n145, 1n180, 1n297, 1n310, 1n350, 1n390, 1n399, 1n400, 1n410, 1n413, 1n415, 1n423, 1n444, 1n620, 1n641, 1n655, 1n659, 1n761, 1n775, 1n823, 1n961, 1n997, 1n1051, 2n6, 2n36, 2n61, 2n71, 2n161, 2n165, 2n174, 2n263, 2n291, 2n354, 2n393, 2n401, 2n403, 2n458, 2n462, 2n951, 2n1063, 2n1135
- Neitzel, S., 2n7, 2n71
- Neusner, J., 2n769
- Newsom, C.A., xxxv,n57
- Niebuhr, K.-W., pp.353, 353n2, 356n14, 357n16, 358n19, 2n863
- Niehoff, M., 1n981, 2n238
- Niese, B., xxix,n41, xxx, lxii, lxii,n161, lxii,n162, lxiii, lxiii,n167, lxiii,n169, lxiii,n171, lxv, 1n11, 1n19, 1n33, 1n85, 1n108, 1n120, 1n123, 1n128, 1n134, 1n145, 1n147, 1n198, 1n254, 1n285, 1n292, 1n296, 1n308, 1n310, 1n313, 1n316, 1n323, 1n330, 1n350, 1n351, 1n366, 1n368, 1n390, 1n399, 1n403, 1n407, 1n408, 1n409, 1n410, 1n413, 1n415, 1n418, 1n423, 1n444, 1n456, 1n467, 1n498, 1n528, 1n547, 1n591, 1n615, 1n620, 1n641, 1n649, 1n651, 1n655, 1n659, 1n661, 1n676, 1n680, 1n682, 1n761, 1n821, 1n822, 1n823, 1n831, 1n854, 1n861, 1n869, 1n906, 1n908, 1n914, 1n961, 1n962, 1n978, 1n997, 1n1012, 1n1051, 2n6, 2n36, 2n61, 2n71, 2n100, 2n117, 2n165, 2n182, 2n263, 2n291, 2n323, 2n326, 2n357, 2n395, 2n401, 2n403, 2n435, 2n456, 2n488, 2n493, 2n494, 2n499, 2n514, 2n551, 2n608, 2n613, 2n626, 2n654, 2n655, 2n664, 2n676, 2n718, 2n762, 2n766, 2n772, 2n774, 2n778, 785, 2n793, 2n795, 2n804, 2n805, 2n813, 2n822, 2n825, 2n827, 2n836, 2n842, 2n881, 2n892, 2n897, 2n899, 2n917, 2n929, 2n934, 2n950, 2n951, 2n960, 2n974, 2n988, 2n1026, 2n1063, 2n1092, 2n1099, 2n1128, 2n1135, 2n1139, 2n1154, 2n1181
- Nissinen, M., 2n796
- Nodet, E., 1n3, 1n13, 1n1007
- Norden, E., 2n755
- O'Connor, D., 1n296, 1n313, 1n317
- O'Niell, J.C., xxiv,n17
- Ollier, Fr., p.366n4, 2n472, 2n921
- Oppenheimer, A., 2n870
- Oren, E.D., 1n298
- Ostwald, M., 2n585
- Otto, W., 2n172, 2n175, 2n512
- Otto, W. and Bengtson, H., 2n172, 2n189
- Pavis D'Esurac, H., 2n224
- Pearce, S., 2n238
- Pearson, L., 1n73, 1n77, 1n78
- Pépin, J., 2n964
- Petersen, H., xxv,n23, 1n331
- Petrochilos, N., pp.9, 366n3
- Pilhofer, P., p.11, 1n8, 1n53, 2n573, 2n721, 2n1119, 2n1128
- Plescica, J., 2n438
- Pomeroy, A.J., 2n517
- Pomeroy, S., 2n811
- Powell, B., 1n52
- Pratt, M.L., lxix,n187, 335
- Préaux, C., 2n224
- Price, J., xlv,n100, 1n111
- Price, S.R.F., xxix,n40, xxx,n43, xxxv,n56, xxxvi,n62, 2n266
- Pucci ben Zeev, M., p.336, 2n122, 2n128, 2n217, 2n254, 2n268
- Quirke, S., 1n1033
- Raaflaub, K.A., 2n581, 2n587
- Rajak, T., xxiv,n16, xxxvi,n62, lii,n118, pp.11, 49, 246, 1n2, 1n3, 1n171, 1n175, 1n201, 1n202, 1n204, 1n214, 2n137, 2n534, 2n540, 2n635, 2n638
- Ranke, H., 1n832, 1n983
- Rankin, H.D., 1n266
- Rawson, E., pp.9, 10, 366n3, 366n4, 2n921
- Redford, D.R., p.335, 1n292, 1n296, 1n297, 1n298, 1n299, 1n301, 1n304, 1n308, 1n312, 1n313, 1n317, 1n318, 1n321, 1n337, 1n343, 1n349, 1n796, 1n813, 1n818, 1n988, 1n1025, 2n37
- Reinach, T., lxiii, lxv, lxv,n180, lxvi, p.338, 1n11, 1n19, 1n33, 1n84, 1n85, 1n123, 1n141, 1n145, 1n149, 1n163, 1n165, 1n210, 1n216, 1n285, 1n292, 1n315, 1n316, 1n317, 1n321, 1n331, 1n350, 1n356, 1n390, 1n399, 1n400, 1n403, 1n407, 1n410, 1n413, 1n415, 1n418, 1n423, 1n441, 1n444, 1n455, 1n456, 1n498, 1n526, 1n541, 1n547, 1n605, 1n615, 1n620, 1n635, 1n636, 1n641, 1n655, 1n659, 1n682, 1n710, 1n715, 1n717, 1n761, 1n775, 1n801, 1n802, 1n812, 1n831, 1n832, 1n834, 1n858, 1n861, 1n862, 1n907, 1n934, 1n978, 1n980, 1n981, 1n997, 1n1007, 1n1009, 1n1018, 1n1025, 1n1045, 1n1051, 1n1054, 2n6, 2n36, 2n38, 2n39, 2n40, 2n41, 2n61, 2n71, 2n76, 2n78, 2n81, 2n100, 2n104, 2n117, 2n161, 2n165, 2n174, 2n182, 2n213, 2n226, 2n232, 2n246, 2n255, 2n263, 2n286, 2n291, 2n296, 2n342, 2n349, 2n351, 2n353, 2n354, 2n393, 2n401, 2n403, 2n425, 2n432, 2n434, 2n435, 2n437, 2n447, 2n458, 2n459, 2n551, 2n603, 2n655, 2n754, 2n764, 2n774, 2n793, 2n795, 2n804, 2n813, 2n822, 2n829, 2n834, 2n848, 2n862, 2n874, 2n899, 2n917, 2n950, 2n951, 2n988, 2n1063, 2n1092, 2n1128, 2n1135, 2n1139
- Reinhold, M., p.365n2, 1n311, 2n102
- Rengstorf, K.H., lxiv, 1n553
- Reynolds, J.M. and Tannenbaum, R., 2n1134
- Richardson, J.S., 2n131
- Richlin, A., 368, 2n796
- Richter, G.M.A., 2n258
- Rives, J., xl,n85, 2n323, 2n480, 2n769, p.368n5
- Romilly, J. de, 2n463
- Rosenfeld, B.-Z., 1n237
- Rowe, C., 2n721
- Rowe, C. and Schofield, M., lx,n151, 2n634, 2n908
- Ryle, H.E., 1n165
- Sack, R.H., 1n502
- Said, E.W., lxviii, lxix, lxix,n186
- Samuel, A.E., 2n172
- Sanders, E.P., 2n363, 2n364, 2n370, 2n372, 2n374, 2n375, 2n385, 2n386, 2n430, 2n638, 2n740, 2n742, 2n788, 2n789, 2n791, 2n828
- Sardar, Z., lxix,n186
- Schäfer, P., xli,n87, lxvi, pp.127, 336, 344, 351, 352, 1n316, 1n317, 1n768, 2n37, 2n322, 2n338
- Schaller, B., 1n631, 338, 339
- Schäublin, C., lxvi, pp.11, 12, 245, 360n24, 1n53, 1n91, 1n96, 1n107, 1n108, 1n248, 2n473, 2n493, 2n638, 2n697, 2n748, 2n1037, 2n1049, 2n1170
- Scheller, M., 2n71
- Schibli, H.S., 1n61
- Schimanowski, G., 1n719
- Schlatter, A., 2n751, 2n760
- Schnabel, P., p.79, 1n428
- Schofield, M., lx,n151, p.92, 2n652
- Schreckenberger, H., xxviii,n37, xxix, xxix,n39, xxx, liii,n123, liii,n124, liii,n125, liii,n126, liv,n130, lv,n132, lv,n133, lxii,n160, lxii,n161, lxii,n162, lxii,n163, lxii,n164, lxii,n165, lxiii,n167, lxiii,n168, lxiii,n169, lxiii,n170, lxiii,n171, lxiv, lxvi, p.10, 1n934, 1n997, 2n36, 2n78, 2n116, 2n207, 2n686, 2n817, 2n1092, 2n1104
- Schröder, B., xxxv,n55, 1n646, 2n717
- Schürer, E., xxvii,n28, xxvii,n29, pp.336, 338, 354n8, 1n126, 1n137, 1n138, 1n1018, 2n7, 2n18, 2n144, 2n149, 2n225, 2n268, 2n275, 2n385, 2n425, 2n512

- Schwartz, D.R., xxxvii,n64, lx,n156, 1n748, 1n749, 2n486, 2n523, 2n635, 2n732, 2n847
- Schwartz, S., xxiv,n17, xxiv,n18, xxv,n20, xxv,n22, p.360n23
- Schwyzler, H.-R., 1n973, 1n981
- Scott, J.C., p.169
- Scott, J.M., lvii,n144, 1n133
- Scott, K., 2n265
- Segal, C., 1n54
- Sevenster, J.N., pp.336, 344
- Shahar, Y., liii,n124, 2n302
- Shavit, Y., p.93
- Sherwin-White, A.N., 2n130, 2n131
- Shrimpton, G.S., 1n758
- Shutt, R.J.H., 1n202, 2n178, 2n222, 2n232, 2n235, 2n239, 2n269, 2n296, 2n313, 2n326, 2n363, 2n751
- Sickinger, J.P., 1n92
- Siegert, F., Schreckenberg, H. and Vogel, M., xx,n11, lii,n119, lxii,n162, lxii,n163, lxii,n164, lxii,n165, lxiii, lxiii,n168, lxiii,n169, lxiii,n172, lxxv,n176, 1n143
- Sievers, J., 2n890
- Smallwood, E.M., xxvii,n29, xxxviii,n70, xl,n83, 2n124, 2n367, 2n552, 2n1135
- Smallwood, E.M., 2n18, 2n122, 2n127, 2n268, 2n292, 2n293, 2n769
- Smelik, K.A.D. and Hemelrijk, E.A., p.365n2, 1n777
- Smith, A.D., lv,n137
- Solmsen, F., 1n977
- Sonnabend, H., p.365n2, 1n311, 2n102
- Southern, P., xxxvii,n67, xxxviii,n74
- Sperling, A., 2n7, 2n93, 2n104
- Speyer, W., p.351
- Spiegelberg, W., p.345
- Spilsbury, P., xxiii,n15, lv,n134, lx,n152, 2n463
- Spivak, G.C., lxix,n187
- Steindorff, G., 1n3
- Sterling, G.E., pp.79, 335, 338, 353n1, 353n2, 354n4, 354n5, 1n3, 1n428, 1n480, 1n745
- Stern, M., xli,n89, liii,n124, lxvi, pp.93, 336, 338, 339, 343, 351, 1n315, 1n381, 1n394, 1n403, 1n419, 1n447, 1n480, 1n558, 1n563, 1n567, 1n592, 1n628, 1n635, 1n653, 1n655, 1n676, 1n697, 1n710, 1n733, 1n736, 1n738, 1n739, 1n802, 1n855, 1n863, 1n948, 1n975, 1n977, 1n1028, 1n1029, 1n1049, 2n81, 2n110, 2n144, 2n146, 2n167, 2n304, 2n319, 2n323, 2n367, 2n385, 2n512, 2n550, 2n811
- Stowers, S., xxxiv,n52
- Stricker, B.H., p.352
- Surgirharajah, R.S., lxx,n191
- Syme, R., xxxviii,n74
- Szegedy-Maszak, A., 1n551
- Takács, S.A., p.168, 1n783, 1n977
- Talbert, R.J.A., 2n93, 2n420
- Taubes, J., 2n638
- Tcherikover, V., pp.336, 351, 1n621, 1n710, 2n67, 2n115, 2n116, 2n118, 2n119, 2n122, 2n124, 2n127, 2n128, 2n146, 2n149, 2n167, 2n172, 2n189, 2n224, 2n225
- Te Velde, H., pp.345, 352, 1n829
- Terrian, A., 2n860, 2n864
- Thackeray, H. St.John., lxiii, lxiv, lxv, 1n33, 1n84, 1n85, 1n107, 1n108, 1n128, 1n134, 1n141, 1n145, 1n163, 1n165, 1n202, 1n215, 1n231, 1n234, 1n251, 1n254, 1n285, 1n292, 1n297, 1n310, 1n316, 1n331, 1n350, 1n353, 1n390, 1n397, 1n399, 1n400, 1n402, 1n403, 1n407, 1n408, 1n410, 1n413, 1n415, 1n418, 1n423, 1n444, 1n470, 1n498, 1n541, 1n547, 1n605, 1n635, 1n636, 1n651, 1n655, 1n659, 1n676, 1n715, 1n761, 1n800, 1n823, 1n832, 1n854, 1n891, 1n906, 1n908, 1n938, 1n972, 1n978, 1n980, 1n997, 1n1009, 1n1018, 1n1024, 1n1045, 1n1050, 2n6, 2n28, 2n36, 2n39, 2n40, 2n61, 2n71, 2n78, 2n100, 2n161, 2n165, 2n174, 2n182, 2n197, 2n213, 2n225, 2n226, 2n232, 2n239, 2n246, 2n263, 2n269, 2n291, 2n296, 2n311, 2n319, 2n326, 2n334, 2n342, 2n349, 2n354, 2n374, 2n379, 2n387, 2n393, 2n401, 2n403, 2n404, 2n425, 2n432, 2n434, 2n435, 2n443, 2n458, 2n459, 2n462, 2n488, 2n499, 2n507, 2n523, 2n551, 2n654, 2n697, 2n746, 2n764, 2n766, 2n774, 2n793, 2n795, 2n805, 2n813, 2n815, 2n822, 2n827, 2n829, 2n834, 2n850, 2n873, 2n951, 2n960, 2n988, 2n994, 2n1063, 2n1092, 2n1135, 2n1139, 2n1181, 2n1184, 2n1196
- Thoma, C., 2n733
- Thomas, J., p.357n17
- Thompson, K., xxxviii,n70
- Thraede, K., p.10, 2n490, 2n557
- Tiede, D.L., 2n490
- Tigerstedt, E.N., p.366n4, 2n472, 2n921
- Todd, S.C., 2n471
- Tosato, A., 2n638
- Trebilco, P., 2n128, 2n227
- Troiani, L., xxviii,n34, lxxv, lxxv,n176, p.50, 357n15, 1n208, 1n210, 1n214, 1n267, 1n293, 1n300, 1n315, 1n316, 1n322, 1n331, 1n388, 1n444, 1n542, 1n559, 1n599, 1n636, 1n733, 1n738, 1n832, 1n842, 1n983, 1n1007, 1n1018, 2n4, 2n30, 2n59, 2n65, 2n104, 2n214, 2n273, 2n313, 2n554, 2n635, 2n782, 2n834, 2n928, 2n969
- Trüdinger, K., p.347
- Unger, E., 1n460, 1n464, 1n465, 1n466, 1n469, 1n471
- van der Horst, P., xxiv,n19, lxiv, p.357n17, 1n973, 1n977, 1n978, 1n980, 1n982, 1n983, 2n7, 2n71, 2n788, 2n796, 2n800, 2n811, 2n830, 2n833, 2n840, 2n841, 2n853, 2n958
- VanderKam, J.C., 2n733
- van Henten, J.-W., pp.345, 366, 1n175, 1n175, 1n829, 1n832, 2n194, 2n465, 2n542
- van Henten, J.-W. and Abusch, R., xxxiii,n50, 345, 1n304, 1n546, 1n829, 1n988, 1n1009, 2n169
- van Henten, J.-W. and Avemarie, F., 1n175, 1n180, 2n542, 2n895
- van Seters, J., p.68, 1n298, 1n301, 1n304, 1n308, 1n313, 1n314, 1n395
- van Unnik, W.C., lvii,n144, 1n133, 1n171, 2n746, 2n748, 2n749, 2n750, 2n754, 2n915, 2n918
- Vanusia, P., lxx,n190
- Veltman, F., xxxiv,n52
- Veltri, G., 2n154
- Verbrugghe, G.P. and Wickersham, J.M., 1n428
- Vermes, G., p.357n15, 2n749, 2n754, 2n826
- Vermes, G. and Goodman, M., 2n704
- Vischer, L., p.351
- Viviano, B.T., 2n822
- Vlastos, G., 2n1060
- Volkman, H., 2n194
- Wacholder, B.Z., pp.10, 67, 340, 1n398, 1n731, 1n745, 1n748, 2n56, 2n58, 2n144
- Waddell, W.G., lxvi, pp.335, 336, 1n293, 1n315, 1n331, 1n350, 1n353, 1n361, 1n800, 1n861, 1n871, 1n938, 1n1025
- Wagner, G., 2n93, 2n104
- Wallace-Haddrill, A., p.9
- Walter, N., pp.338, 340, 1n635, 1n655, 2n146
- Wander, B., 2n1134
- Wardman, A., p.9, 336n3, 1n75, 1n84
- Weaver, P.R.C., 1n3
- Webster, D.L., lxx,n190, 2n638
- Wehrli, F., 1n580, 1n581, 1n593, 1n607
- Weill, R., pp.335, 336, 1n316, 1n317, 1n321, 1n871
- Weingärtner, D.G., 2n221
- Weiss, H., 1n719
- Wendland, P., pp.353, 354n5, 357n15, 2n512
- Wenschkewitz, H., 2n767

- West, 1n64  
Whiston, W., lxiv, 1n231, 1n402,  
2n232, 2n235, 2n326  
Whitmarsh, T., lxx,n190  
Wilcken, U., 2n167, 2n214, 2n221,  
2n512  
Wildung, D., 1n813  
Will, E., 1n699  
Williams, M.H., xxxvii,n69,  
xxxviii,n70, xxxviii,n72,  
xxxix,n79, xxxix,n81, xl,n82,  
xl,n83, li,n116, lxxviii,n185, 1n133,  
1n1037, 2n447, 2n552, 2n1135,  
2n1136, 2n1137  
Williams, T., 2n851  
Willrich, H., pp.336, 338, 2n104,  
2n146, 2n161, 2n172, 2n189  
Wilson, S.G., 2n450  
Wilson, W.T., pp.353, 356n14,  
357n17, 2n796, 2n800  
Winkler, J., 2n796  
Wiseman, D.J., p.79, 1n437, 1n439,  
1n446, 1n449, 1n450, 1n451,  
1n452, 1n460, 1n466, 1n471,  
1n485, 1n489, 1n491, 1n505  
Wiseman, T.P., p.9  
Wolf, G., p.11, 1n52, 1n54  
Woodman, A.J., p.9  
Woolf, G., lv,n135, 364  
Wright, N.T., 2n888, 2n890  
Yavetz, Z., xxxvii,n64, p.344  
Young, F., xxxv,n55  
Young, R.J.C., lxxviii,n185, lxxix,n186,  
lxxix,n187, p.246  
Yoyotte, J., pp.127, 336, 344, 346  
Zanker, P., 2n194, 2n259