

C. W. K.

## JOSEPHUS AS HISTORIAN AND APOLOGIST

Lester L. Grabbe

Josephus' value as a historian has been recognized through the centuries. He is a valuable source for a lengthy period of history, and our only source for certain parts of that period. Yet it has also been long known that Josephus did not write just for a love of learning. The apologetic intent of his writings is recognized by all competent historians.

Not only are Josephus' writings apologetic in intent; they have also been frequently used for apologetic purposes by later writers. As Horst Moehring recently commented: "The writings of Flavius Josephus have at times achieved semi-canonical status, but there exists no orthodox line of interpretation, at least apart from . . . the unscrupulousness with which everybody exploits his writings for whatever purpose may at the moment be in mind. Josephus has truly been all things to all men. . . . there certainly is a great amount of pseudo-history present: the use of Josephus for contemporary apologetic purposes without regard for the intentions of his writings."<sup>1</sup>

It is because of this too-oft appeal to Josephus for purely apologetic purposes that the nature of his writings must be carefully considered. Josephus is not canonical--or even deuterocanonical--but this seems to be forgotten in the heat of polemic or debate. Josephus' value as a historian is in no way enhanced by an uncritical use of his material for dogmatic purposes.

I will proceed in this paper by first giving a brief survey of the sources used by Josephus. Although anything but exhaustive, this survey should set the stage for consideration of the several specific examples which make up the bulk of the paper. These examples illustrate the type of analysis necessary for legitimate use of his works. Finally, a summary recapitulates the general principles which must be taken into account in any use of Josephus.

Sources

Josephus' sources are not unexpectedly many and varied. For the earlier part of the Antiquities his major source is the Bible itself. While he may have known it in the Hebrew original--though his use of the Hebrew text is questioned by some scholars<sup>3</sup>--he mainly used the LXX. (He may have used an Aramaic version in many cases, also.) His chronological figures often follow the LXX rather than the MT. In the main he follows the biblical account of the Persian period, sometimes omitting such embarrassing incidents as that of the golden calf. However, he occasionally supplements the biblical record with haggadic material, these stories sometimes being known also from rabbinic and other literature. His discussion of the legal sections of the Pentateuch may at certain points show halakic tradition which differs from that of the rabbis but which is itself equally as old.<sup>4</sup>

Once beyond the period covered by the Bible itself, Josephus' sources are rather uneven. For much of the Persian period he evidently had very little to go on. Our knowledge today is far more extensive than his. His chronology for this period is extremely erroneous. His sources on the whole seem to be in the category of legend, examples of which will be given below. The Letter of Aristeas, itself primarily legendary and apologetic, is quoted extensively. (Fortunately, we also possess the full text in independent form.) One scholar has proposed some sort of propagandic history for the Tobiads.<sup>5</sup> But Josephus' chronology of the events is palpably false, and his own figures are internally contradictory.

For the period of the Maccabees he is on much safer ground. He depends primarily on I Maccabees, though he evidently had a copy with an incomplete ending. For the later period he uses Polybius and Strabo and some histories now lost, primarily Nicolaus of Damascus. He supplements his material also with oral tradition, some of which was reliable and some of which was not. Nicolaus continued to serve him through the period of Herod the Great. At this point he seems to be at some loss since the following period is treated rather skimpily. As he came up to his own time, the oral tradition was probably more trustworthy. However, even for the war with Rome it is generally felt that he used certain Roman accounts as well as his own observations.<sup>6</sup> Beginning with Books XII he cites a number of documents which he claimed to have seen in the Capitol archives. These will be discussed later.

Only a very brief survey of sources is given here. Naturally, Josephus' historical value varies according to the number and reliability of the sources used. That is to say, each section must be evaluated on its own merits. Blanket assessments are of little value other than as a general guide. It is generally thought that the B.J. is more carefully done and generally more reliable than the later Ant.

### Moses and the Ethiopians

One of the first major supplements to the biblical account given by Josephus is that of Moses' expedition into Ethiopia (Ant. II.x.1ff, §§238ff). According to this story, Moses was sent to defend Egypt against an invasion of Ethiopians. While he was besieging the Ethiopian city, the daughter of the Ethiopian king fell in love with him and delivered the city into his hands, on condition of their marrying. He agreed; she delivered; they did.

The first question one has is, What is Josephus' source for this story? He gives no reference, and the Bible is also silent about such exploits. But we also know of a somewhat similar tradition already in existence before the time of Josephus. This was written by Artapanus who probably did his work in the 2nd century B.C. His account is more lengthy than Josephus' and differs somewhat from it. Much of the text is devoted to the attempts of Pharaoh (given the name Chenephres) to do away with Moses. As Josephus, Artapanus relates that Moses was sent to fight the invading Ethiopians with the hope he would be killed. But he was victorious. On the other hand, Artapanus says nothing about the daughter of the Ethiopian king or a marriage. Some scholars have assumed ~~Moses~~ <sup>Josephus</sup> used Artapanus, but this is rejected by others.

Legends about Moses and the Ethiopians are also found in the later rabbinic literature.<sup>8</sup> Instead of Moses fighting against the Ethiopians, he fights for them to help in retaking their capital from an enemy. Because of his help, he is proclaimed king of the Ethiopians and is obligated to marry the widow of the previous king. On the other hand, all this literature contains a great many details which can only be imaginative embellishments of the biblical record without the slightest basis in reality.

For example, Philo says nothing about contact with Ethiopians. But his Life of Moses contains many statements in the same vein. The silence of the Bible, the lack of any early source, and the tendency to embellish the biblical story all point to Josephus' story of the Ethiopian expedition as simply another fiction of the time, invented as an apologetic device to give the Jews a greater claim to historical fame. When we remember the tantalizing omission of any discussion about Moses' "Ethiopian" wife in Numbers 12:1, the source of such tales seems clear.

Therefore, when we consider Josephus' story in its literary milieu, the most obvious conclusion is the following: Numbers 12:1 had left an exegetical vacuum. Two basic choices were open: (1) identify the woman with Moses' known wife Zipporah, which a good many exegetical sources did, or (2) explain it as a former marriage before the one mentioned in the Bible. But this second alternative needed some background discussion. Thus, the various accounts of an encounter with the Ethiopians. But explanation number 1 is as old as--if not older than--number 2. And there is no evidence that either of them has any historical basis. The Ethiopian story is, of course, well suited for apologetic purposes.

#### Building of the Samaritan Temple <sup>10</sup>

In Ant. (XI.vii.1ff, §§297ff) Josephus tells of incidents in the high priestly line after the death of Eliashib (high priest under Nehemiah). One of these is the defection of Manasseh, brother of the high priest Jaddua. This Manasseh married the daughter of the Samaritan ruler Sanballat. This was looked upon with quite a bit of disfavor, and he received the choice of giving up his Samaritan wife or his temple duties. As a counter offer Sanballat promised to build a temple on Mt. Garizim and make him high priest there, an offer which Manasseh accepted. This event is placed in the time of Alexander the Great.

This story has always occasioned difficulties. The most important is that it so closely parallels Nehemiah 13:28. Although the individual in Nehemiah is unnamed, both are sons of the current high priest and marry daughters of Sanballat. The individual in Nehemiah is a brother of Johanan; in Josephus, he is nephew of Johanan. Since Johanan was already high priest in Nehemiah's time, it is hardly likely that a century separated

his tenure of office from that of his son, even under the most optimistic of conditions. Thus, this slight difference only emphasized the likelihood that Josephus' account is only a variant on that of Nehemiah.

It is true that there was more than one individual by the name Sanballat who governed in Shechem.<sup>11</sup> Though neither of the two known men by that name lived during the time of Alexander, it is certainly in the realm of possibility that a third individual with the same name also lived. But the existence of more than one Sanballat was not necessarily considered the major obstacle even before more than one was known from the records.<sup>12</sup> More important difficulties must be taken care of to accept Josephus' account. Aside from the suspicious repetitions and the chronological difficulty in relation to the line of high priests, there is also the question of Josephus' sources. Up to this point he is clearly relying on the biblical record, as has already been pointed out. Suddenly, within a very few words he has leaped over more than a century to the time of Alexander the Great. As a study of the Ant. has shown, he has little material for the period between the end of the biblical material and the time of the Maccabees. He also fails to mention the event of Nehemiah 13:28 elsewhere. Thus, the recent discoveries have not alleviated most of the problems.

Some of the names in Josephus here appear to be identical with individuals known from the Bible and the Elephantine papyri. He speaks of a certain Persian general Bagoas who was contemporary with Johanan, the father of Jaddau and Manasseh. A Bagoas (Aramaic Bigwai) appears in some of the Elephantine papyri as a contemporary of the Jerusalem high priest Johanan. Also appearing are the names of the sons of Sanballat, Delaiah and Shelemiah. This coincidence of names strongly supports the view that Josephus has confused names and events more than a century apart.<sup>13</sup>

This does not mean there is no historical core to Josephus' story, though even this has been strongly denied by some rather eminent historians of the period.<sup>14</sup> Excavations suggest that the temple on Gerizim was indeed founded at approximately the time of Alexander the Great (though Josephus is clearly confused and self-contradictory even at this part of the narrative!).<sup>15</sup> Nehemiah says nothing about a temple when he describes throwing out the son of the high priest. Although the beginnings of a Jewish/Samaritan split were

already being made in the days of Nehemiah, a radical break did not come until much later. The building of a temple on Garizim did not help, but the final break seems to have taken place when John Hyrcanus destroyed the Samaritan temple about 128 B.C. In any event Josephus seems to have associated the marriage between the son of the high priest and the daughter of Sanballat with the founding of the temple, events actually separated by almost one hundred years.

### Alexander and the High Priest

The story of Alexander the Great's visit to Jerusalem, during which he prostrated himself before the high priest, is certainly an intriguing one. Whether it is historical, though, is another question. Since Josephus was hardly what one could call an eyewitness to the event, what was the source of this story?

This historicity of the event has generally been rejected by modern researchers.<sup>16</sup> The major reason is that the classical histories of Alexander's exploits speak of no such thing. Probably the best history of Alexander is that of Arrian. Although Arrian himself did not write until the early 2nd century A.D., his primary sources were Ptolemy and Aristobulus who both served under Alexander. Arrian can also be supplemented by other accounts such as that of Quintus Curtius, Pompeius Trogus (known to us from Justin's epitome), and Plutarch.

According to Josephus (Ant. XI.viii.3-5, §§317ff) Alexander came to Jerusalem right after the siege of Gaza, with the intent of destroying Jerusalem because the Jews had not sent him help against Tyre as he requested. As already noted, none of the non-Jewish historians mention this event. There is no reason why they should have omitted a reference to it since they record Alexander's campaign in some detail. Nor should even the idea of his doing obeisance to the high priest have been necessarily repugnant. After all they record his honor of the Tyrian deity "Hercules" (he besieged Tyre only because the citizens of the city refused his desire to sacrifice there). Even more significant is his visit to the Egyptian priests at Ammon. This required a journey of several days across desert. Omens are mentioned in connection with it. When he reached it, the priests made predictions about his success, claiming they had received this as an oracle from Jupiter.<sup>17</sup> Thus, it seems

unlikely that a visit to the high priest in Jerusalem would have been omitted for dogmatic reasons.

But there is more than mere silence. The classical historians also give a fairly thorough account of Alexander's activities immediately after the fall of Tyre.<sup>18</sup> He received messengers with an offer of terms from Darius. These Alexander refused. He then went directly on down the Phoenician coast to Gaza which refused his entry. He besieged Gaza for two months, conquered it, and marched straight on to Egypt. If Alexander visited Jerusalem at any time, it would have had to be after his return from Egypt. Yet Josephus says it was right after the conquest of Gaza. Josephus' account is thus basically legendary even if some actual historical visit of Alexander to Jerusalem should have taken place.

This brings up the question of the origin of the story. It probably is no different from the many other Alexander romances in circulation during the centuries after his death. These romances were widespread in both Jewish and non-Jewish circles. One such romance includes a visit to Rome and closely parallels the Jerusalem visit in Josephus. Both have a major ethnic capital, a high priest, the prostration of Alexander to that priest because of a dream, and his having sacrifices offered for himself in the sanctuary. The fact that the two stories seem to be otherwise independent illustrates the adaptation of a common motif in this type of Heldenwanderungs-literatur. Pfister's studies show that the story of the Jerusalem visit is primarily based on the visit to the Ammonian priestly oracle in Egypt (an event recorded by the major classical historians). This view is quite logical from the facts known. There is also the possibility that part of the story has been inspired by decrees of Julius Caesar which gave them rule over the area of Samaria.<sup>19</sup>

This does not necessarily mean that Alexander would have had no contact with the Jews. He most likely did have communications with them, though more probably by letter rather than in person. While even a personal visit to Jerusalem is not impossible, it is unlikely since there is no evidence of his having gone into the interior of any part of Palestine.<sup>20</sup> But even if that there should be some historical core to the story, the details are undoubtedly legendary. (We) may summarize the reasons for considering the story as legendary in the following way:

1. None of the classical historians mention it.
2. It shows many similar characteristics to other legendary events in the Alexander romances which are also manifestly unhistorical.
3. No such visit is indicated in the detailed historical prophecy of Daniel 11.
4. The story is so well suited to apologetic purposes it is already suspect from the beginning.

#### Decrees in Favor of the Jews

Beginning about Book XII and on to the end of the Ant., Josephus cites a number of documents which contain decrees favorable to the Jews. There are different numberings of these since it is not always easy to distinguish between what seems only a reference and what was meant to be an actual quote. Yet the authority of the Roman government is claimed for a number of these. Over the last century scholarship has generally accepted these as authentic decrees.<sup>21</sup> However, a recent article has called them into question. Was Josephus quoting actual documents which he had personally consulted in the Capitol archives; was he quoting forgeries; or was he only passing on what he found in the writings of others without having attempted to ascertain the original sources?

One reason for their acceptance was Josephus' statement that the documents were in the archives for anyone to check.<sup>22</sup> The challenge to "check it for yourself" is a strong one, though it must be admitted that such a challenge cannot do much for us today since the documents cited are no longer extant. Can Josephus be trusted at this point? There are several reasons why he may be untrustworthy here despite a general acceptance of his word up to now:

1. When he claims that the evidence is there for anyone to see for himself, he fails to note the Capitol fire of 69 A.D. which destroyed approximately 3,000 archival tablets (Tacitus, Hist. iii, 71-2; Suetonius, Vitellius 15). According



to Suetonius, Vespasian tried to replace these documents which included various treaties with and grants to other peoples (Vespasian 8). While many of those destroyed were replaced, obviously there were no other copies of a large number.

2. A number of the documents Josephus cites were not likely to have been recorded in the Capitol archives. The purpose of these archives was a very practical one; they were documents important to Rome, serving Roman interests. It is unlikely that anything not serving this function would be kept there. Furthermore, if by chance any documents relating to the Jews had been there, it is not likely that Vespasian would have attempted to replace them, especially considering the Romans were then engaged in a war with the Jews.<sup>23</sup>

3. The senatus consultum was not law, thus being more likely to be forged than actual legal documents. Even more important, we have the statement of contemporary writers that such were actually forged on occasion. Cicero states that these were often forged during his time (De lege agraria II.xiv.37). Some of these found their way into the archives during a time when "all the senatus consulta deposited were forged" ("deinde omnia tum falsa senatus consulta deferebantur," Epistulae ad familiares XII.xxix.2). Plutarch wrote that at one time Cato the Younger accepted a Senate decree as authentic only when the consuls themselves swore to it because of previous quaesters who accepted false decrees (Cato the Younger 17). Caesar supposedly forged senatus consulta quite commonly while Cicero was even himself accused of doing so.<sup>24</sup> Thus, citation of a decree even of the Roman Senate was no proof of authenticity.

4. The data needed to check the archives about a particular document had to be very detailed. One had to know the year it was passed, the month of registration, and the tablet number on which it was recorded. Yet Josephus nowhere notes this information. If he knew it--which he would have had to, to find it in the first place--why didn't he give the references? But, as Moehring notes, "The invitation to check the accuracy of his statements is a literary device on the part of Josephus. He would undoubtedly have been most surprised had anybody ever bothered to take up his challenge."<sup>25</sup>

5. The form of the senatus consultum is well-known. It followed a fixed legal format just as many modern legal documents. One of the essential features was the "mark of approval"

(consuere=Greek edoxen) at the end of each document. Yet the supposed senatus consulta in Josephus do not have this. One might suppose this was an attempt to abridge the document. But when the very emphasis is on the authenticity of the quoted document, why would the mark of approval be omitted? It seems very unlikely it would have been left off if Josephus had consulted the actual document itself.<sup>26</sup>

6. The number of errors which scholars have found necessary to correct to give the documents authenticity is beyond all bounds of credibility: "There is hardly a single document in which modern commentators have not felt obliged to introduce textual emendations, rearrangements of sections of text, or new divisions between documents . . . ." <sup>27</sup> Moehring noted the major conjectural emendations proposed to make sense out of the documents. Only a few are likely to be the result of normal scribal corruption. As he says, "The above list omits textual emendations required by obvious scribal errors and restricts itself to emendations and conjectures which are surgical operations to rescue the authenticity of the document--or to confer some semblance of authenticity to a passage presented by Josephus as a document."<sup>28</sup>

These points have by no means proved the fictitious nature of all the documents which Josephus alleges to quote. Some of them may be authentic. But a blanket assumption of their veracity is unjustified. The points enumerated show reason to use Josephus' material with caution. Each document cited must be carefully examined against the literary and historical background of the times.

A naive acceptance of Josephus at face value is not befitting of any student of history. As Moehring comments, "The question of their authenticity has to be decided in every single instance, and comprehensive, sweeping judgments are out of place. If he did include forged documents, he would only indicate how well he had learnt the tricks of his Gentile audience. It is wrong to read Josephus without always keeping his apologetic purpose in mind."<sup>29</sup>

#### Josephus and the Pharisees

If we were to take Josephus' statement in the Vita at face value, we would assume he had been a Pharisee all his

\* adult life. From his statements in the Ant. we are also led to believe that the Pharisees were the dominant force in the religious governance of the country. This picture has generally been accepted until recently. But now serious doubts have been cast upon the veracity of Josephus' assertions.<sup>30</sup>

The general period of when Josephus wrote each of his writings is not disputed. He wrote the B.J. in the mid-70's; the Ant. about the mid-90's, followed shortly by the Vita. Thus, his autobiography comes at the end of his life, long after many of the events he discusses in it. The Ant. is a full 20 years after the B.J. and does not always agree with the earlier work. One of the areas of disagreement is in the representation of the various Jewish sects, especially the Pharisees.

In the earlier work Josephus mentions the influence of the Pharisees with Alexandra Salome who was herself very pious. Rather than considering that a good thing, Josephus comments: "To them, being herself intensely religious, she listened with too great deference; while they, gradually taking advantage of an ingenuous woman, became at length the real administrators of the state . . . ."<sup>31</sup> When he describes them at greater length a little further on (II.viii.1ff, §§117ff) he says nothing about their being a popular sect or having a great public following. He calls them the "leading sect" (tēn protēn apagontes hairesin) but reserves first place in order, length of description, and favorable language to the Essenes. For these he also notes that their theological views "irresistably attract" (aphukton delear . . . kathientes) all those who once taste their philosophy. This description doesn't quite fit the dyed-in-the-wool Pharisee which Josephus later claims he had been all along! ) ?

Two decades later the picture has changed somewhat. Josephus is no longer writing to the Jews to convince them it is hopeless to revolt further against the Romans. Now he is writing to the Hellenistic world on behalf of the Jews. When he describes the different Jewish sects, he no longer gives overwhelming emphasis to the beliefs of the Essenes, but devotes almost equal space to each group (XVIII.i.2ff, §§11ff). He says the Essenes deserve to be admired; but pride of place in order and favorable description now falls on the Pharisees. Because of their religious views they are described as being "extremely influential" (pithanotatoi) with the people. In

fact all prayers and divine worship are conducted according to their teachings. Furthermore, the Sadducees can do nothing according to their own wishes when they hold office but must submit to the dictates of the Pharisees.

In his Vita Josephus tells us he decided to study the different sects at age 16. He made a thorough examination of each by passing through their courses of rigorous training. Then, he spent three years living with a certain ascetic in the desert. Afterward he adopted the Pharisaic way of life as the best of the lot, this at age 19. This is what Josephus himself tells us.

However, a number of things conflict in this rather disarmingly simple account. First of all, a bit of basic arithmetic shows most of the time between the 16th and 19th years was spent with our friend Bannus the hermit. Although Bannus is not called an Essene, his way of life seems very similar to that of the Qumran community apparently dwelling not too far from his place of abode. For Josephus to spend a full three years with the man shows that his manner of living had some attraction for the youth. Secondly, Josephus could hardly have gone through the full apprenticeship required of the three sects in full three years, much less in the amount of time left over after subtracting his stay with the hermit. The Pharisees required a full year of training; the Essenes, even more. We are not told about the Sadducees, but some time would have been required by them, no doubt.

The obvious preference for the hermit way of life evidenced by Josephus' three year stay in the wilderness does, on the other hand, agree very well with his favorable description of the Essenes in both the B.J. and the Ant. In the first he shows the continuance of the youthful affinity to them, and even in the Ant.--despite some toning down--favorable language is still there. In contrast to his professed Pharisaism, Josephus shows a life-long attraction to the way of life led by the Essenes and those of similar mind.

A careful comparison of Josephus' own accounts, along with a study of the contemporary situation known from other sources, makes a certain conclusion inevitable. In the words of Morton Smith:

It is almost impossible not to see in such a rewriting of history a bid to the Roman government. That government must have been faced with the problem: Which group of Jews shall we support? It must have asked the question: Which Jews (of those who will work with us at all) can command enough popular following to keep things stable in Palestine? To this question Josephus is volunteering an answer: The Pharisees, he says again and again, have by far the greatest influence with the people. Any government which alienates them has trouble. . . . Josephus' discovery of these important political facts (which he ignored when writing the Jewish War) may have been due partly to a change in his personal relationship with the Pharisees. . . . The more probable explanation is that in the meanwhile the Pharisees had become the leading candidates for Roman support in Palestine and were already negotiating for it. . . . Yet the influence of the Pharisees with the people, which Josephus reports, is not demonstrated by the history he records. . . . All this accords perfectly with the fact that Josephus in his first history of the war never thought their influence important enough to deserve mention.<sup>32</sup>

The conclusion is that Josephus is stretching the point a bit about his early adherence to the Pharisees. He was originally a part of the (priestly?) aristocracy. The religious group which he seems most sympathetic to, is the Essenes or those with similar characteristics. But he was one to recognize the times and yield to them. With the council at Yavneh, the Pharisees had made important post-war gains in the politics of Palestine. Josephus saw the way the tide was running and climbed on the boat which seemed most likely to win. As both Morton Smith and Jacob Neusner show, he appears to be doing his bit to gain their favor by appealing to the Romans on their behalf. Of course, this requires a bit of juggling with the facts.

#### Using Josephus for Historical Purposes

This study has assumed the great value of Josephus for historical purposes in understanding the events and religious and social institutions of biblical times. My concentration has been on Josephus as an apologist, however, to show the need to use his material with care and only after a sound

critical analysis of the data in question. The following points outline the general considerations necessary for a legitimate use of Josephus:

1. Utmost caution should be used with any account which lends itself to apologetic purposes. Most of his Vita has to be used with such caution because it is his answer to charges about his earlier activities. One can hardly believe such statements as that he was consulted by the sages at age 14 because of his reputation for knowledge of the law.
2. His underlying sources should always be considered. In some cases he has reliable contemporary historical accounts. At others he has nothing but legendary remembrances or even pure wishful thinking.
3. The period of time being discussed is also quite important. Josephus can hardly be credited with an accurate account of an event hundreds or even thousands of years before his own time (unless clear evidence of a reliable original source can be found). Most of the early part of the Antiquities, except where he followed the biblical account explicitly, is simply late haggadic legend and must be recognized as such.
4. Josephus must also be compared with other writers about the same events or institutions. For example, his accounts of the different Jewish sects must be evaluated along with the Qumran scrolls, other intertestamental literature, and the rabbinic literature. Greek and Roman writers often give parallel accounts of many things, such as the Jewish war with Rome.
5. Josephus' writings must also be internally compared with each other. The B.J. overlaps the last part of the Ant. In some cases he had more or better sources for the later account. On the other hand, sometimes the Ant. reflect a memory shaped by personal biases and present a less trustworthy picture. One prime example of this was his two different accounts of the Pharisees. On the whole, the B.J. is thought more reliable.
6. Greatest care should be used where there is no way of double checking his version.

7. He sometimes records different legal traditions from those found in rabbinic or other sources. This does not necessarily mean his are erroneous. On the other hand, it does not mean that his are more accurate or more original. In some cases he is very likely giving his own opinion for which he may have had no tradition. One should compare all traditions on any point and critically analyze them before deciding that he is more accurate or more original.

8. The general characteristics of ancient historiography must always be taken into account. For example, it was common practice for historians to invent speeches for their characters. Therefore, it would be rather foolish to take such speeches as somehow representative of the very words used by the person. In many cases no speech at all was made on the particular occasion in question, much less one along the lines given by the historian. Thus, such speeches have to be evaluated for their intent and function in ancient times, not our modern concept of word-for-word quotations.<sup>33</sup>

To recapitulate, these are necessary points to keep in mind for the correct historical use of Josephus. Of course, there will always be those who attempt the illegitimate use of his material for purely apologetical or polemical purposes. In the heat of emotion one is likely to seize on whatever serves the immediate purpose without regard for scholarship or historicity. Anything said here or elsewhere is not likely to be heeded by such individuals, even though the points just enumerated are basic to the historic method. There will always be those who will give Josephus, in the words of Moehring, "semi-canonical status." But for those who have scholarship, accuracy, and truth at heart, these points are necessary and relevant. Total objectivity is impossible but one should always make the most conscientious attempt toward it that he can.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>"The Acta Pro Judaeis in the Antiquities of Flavius Josephus," Morton Smith festschrift III, 124.

<sup>2</sup>There are many useful analyses of Josephus' sources. The most recent survey can be found in the new edition of Schürer's History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, vol. 1, edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar. Surveys also include Niese, "Josephus," HERE; G. Hölischer, "Josephus," RE; A. Schalit, "Josephus," EJ; Thackeray, "Josephus," HDB V. More detailed studies of individual parts of Josephus' writings include H. Bloch, Die Quellen des Josephus in seiner Archäologie; G. Hölischer, Die Quellen des Josephus für die Zeit vom Exil bis zum jüdischen Kriege; J. von Destinon, Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der jüdischen Archäologie Buch xii-xvii; H. Lindner, Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum. See also note 5 below.

<sup>3</sup>See recently A. Schalit, "Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews," ASTI 4 (1965), 163-88, though Schalit does not consider Josephus ignorant of Hebrew (e.g., "Josephus," EJ. 258).

<sup>4</sup>While older works have all been out-dated to some extent by the Dead Sea Scrolls, some still useful include S. Rappaport, Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus; M. Olitzky, Flavius Josephus und die Halacha; H. Guttmann, Die Darstellung der jüdischen Religion bei Flavius Josephus; M. Duschak, Josephus Flavius und die Tradition; P. Grünbaum, Die Priester-gesetze bei Flavius Josephus; A. Schlatter, Die Theologie des Judenthums nach dem Bericht des Josefus. On Qumran see most recently L. Schiffman, The Halakhah at Qumran.

<sup>5</sup>Goldstein, Jonathan, "Tales of the Tobiads," Morton Smith festschrift III, 85-123.

<sup>6</sup>For example Niese, op. cit. (see note 2), 572.

<sup>7</sup>A connection through Pseudo-Hecataeus is postulated by Isidore Levy, "Moïse en Éthiopie," REJ 53 (1907), 210-11. However, this opinion is rejected by Rappaport, op. cit. (see note 4), 116. Others who see no direct connection with Artapanus are Niese, op. cit. (note 2), 573; Hölischer, "Josephus" (note 2), 1964; Thackeray, LCL IV, 269 note.



<sup>8</sup>General surveys of the material can be found in the two articles, "Moses," in EJ and JE. See also the following note which discusses a number of sources more specifically.

<sup>9</sup>A recent study on Hellenistic-Jewish historical writings for apologetic purposes is B.Z. Wacholder, "Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles," HTR 61 (1968), 451-81; see also J. Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien (not available to me at the time of writing). Already in the 3rd century B.C. the Jewish historian Demetrius identified the Cushite wife of Num. 12:1 with Zipporah (Eusebius, Evang. Praep. IX.29). The Jewish poet Ezekiel did likewise in his drama Exodos (ibid.). The Targum Onkelos and the Sifrei Bemidbar also give this explanation of the unidentified woman of Num. 12:1. The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Fragmentary Targum both state the woman was not Zipporah. The Codex Neofiti seems unclear at this point (I have seen the passage only in a photograph of Vatican MS). It generally has the same reading as the Fragmentary Targum, but has a different reading where the Fragmentary Targum has "not" (WHLW instead of WH' L'). See also J. Gager, Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism for various descriptions and assessments of Moses about the time of Josephus.

<sup>10</sup>General literature on this subject includes R.J. Coggins, Samaritans and Jews, especially 93ff; H.G. Kippenberg, Garizim und Synagoge, 48ff; J. Purvis, The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect, 98ff; F.M. Cross, "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," HTR 59 (1966), 201-11; H.H. Rowley, "The Samaritan Schism in Legend and History," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, 208-22; "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple," BJRL 38 (1955), 166-98; G.E. Wright, "The Samaritans at Shechem," HTR 55 (1962), 357-66; R. Marcus, "Appendix B. Josephus on the Samaritan Schism," LCL VI, 498-511.

<sup>11</sup>See F.M. Cross article in previous note and "Discovery of the Samaria Papyri," BAR 3, 227-39.

<sup>12</sup>Rowley, op. cit. (1955 article in note 10), 172; also Coggin, op. cit., 96f.

<sup>13</sup>In addition to literature in note 10 above, see A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., 108-24. Papyri 30-32 mention Bigwai as governor over Judah, Johanan as high priest, and the sons of Sanballat as Delaiah and Shelemiah. From the date in nos. 30 and 31, it is known the time was about 408 B.C. Thus, the Sanballat mentioned is undoubtedly the one who opposed Nehemiah. The Bigwai is generally associated with the Bagoas mentioned by Josephus. The high priest Johanan would be the same as the Jonathan mentioned in Nehemiah 12:11 and the Johanan of Josephus. Bagoas and Delaiah reply in no. 32. B. Porten, Archives from Elephantine, 290 note, suggests that Bigwai was a Jewish successor of Nehemiah, and thus not the same as Josephus' Bagoas. However, the indication is that Bigwai had a Persian-appointed office. There seems to be no good reason to deny the likelihood of his being Josephus' Bagoas, though it is possible Josephus is confused about him as well.

<sup>14</sup>E.g. V. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews, who comments: "Many attempts have been made by modern historians to rescue Josephus' chronology, but they cannot be regarded as especially successful. . . . Here is material for research worthy not of the historian, but of the student of literature" (44-5).

<sup>15</sup>As Tcherikover (ibid.) points out, Josephus' story shows Alexander ignorant of Sanballat after having already met him and used his troops in the siege of Tyre. A number of anachronisms and other unhistorical statements add to the general confusion. On the archaeological studies of the Garizim temple, see Coggin, op. cit. (note 10), ch. 4 and the references cited there.

<sup>16</sup>A good survey of the studies up to the mid-1930's is found in R. Marcus, "Appendix C. Alexander the Great and the Jews," LCL VI, 512-32. See also Tcherikover, op. cit. (note 14), and note 19 below.

<sup>17</sup>Details of the story are found in Arrian 3.3.1-4; Quintus Curtius 4.7.5-32; Plutarch, Alexander xxvi; Diodorus XVII.49.

<sup>18</sup>Arrian 2.25.1-3.1.1; Quintus Curtius 4.4.19-7.2.

<sup>19</sup>F. Pfister, Eine jüdische Gründungsgeschichte Alexandrias, 20-30; A. Buchler, "La Relation de Joseph concernant Alexandre le Grand," REJ 36 (1898), 1-26; M. Simon, "Alexandre le Grand, Juif et Chrétien," Recherches d'Histoire Judéo-Chrétienne, 127-203. The idea about Caesar comes from Buchler, 18ff, with whom Marcus, op. cit. (note 16), 530, agrees.

<sup>20</sup>Tcherikover, op. cit. (note 14), 48-50; Buchler, ibid., 6ff.

<sup>21</sup>Moehring, op. cit. (note 1). I am indebted to Moehring for much of the argumentation in this section, though the arrangement and division of material is my own, and I have checked out his references where possible.

<sup>22</sup>Ant. XIV.x.1, §§ 188-9; XIV.x.26, §§ 265-7.

<sup>23</sup>Moehring, op. cit. (note 1), 130f.

<sup>24</sup>Cicero, Epistulae ad familiares IX.xv.4: the unnamed "friend" mentioned here who forges decrees is generally thought to be Caesar, though this has been questioned (see the footnote, ad loc., in the LCL edition); De domo sua xix.50.

<sup>25</sup>Moehring, op. cit. (note 1), 145-6. On the question of checking a document in the archives, see R. Sherk, Roman Documents from the Greek East, 7-10. As he shows, copies of such decrees often had this information copied on them. Yet Josephus never cites such information, which he might have done if he had seen just authentic copies. This indicates he saw neither the originals nor good copies. As Sherk says, "Even the texts he gives may be mere copies of copies" (6).

<sup>26</sup>Moehring, 141-44; O'Brien Moore, "Senatus consultum," RE, Supplementband VI, 802-3.

<sup>27</sup>Moehring, 135.

<sup>28</sup>ibid., 140; 135-40 gives examples which amply bear out this conclusion.

<sup>29</sup>ibid., 156. A recent article on the subject of literary forgery is B.M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," JBL 91 (1972), 3-24. While his major discussion is on the question of pseudepigrapha in relation to the biblical canon, his article contains an introduction to the subject with a rather extensive bibliography, especially on 23-4.

<sup>30</sup>Morton Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," Israel: Its Role in Civilization, 67-81; Jacob Neusner, "Josephus's Pharisees," Ex Orbe Religionum, 224-44 (this also appears in expanded and somewhat rewritten form in chapter 3 of his From Politics to Piety).

<sup>31</sup>B.J. I.v.2, §§ 110-1, translation from Thackeray in LCL II, 53, 55.

<sup>32</sup>op. cit. (note 30), 76-8.

<sup>33</sup>Especially important is Thucydides famous statement about the speeches in his own work, in which he frankly admitted that he invented and put speeches into the mouths of his characters (I.22). This had already been done by Herodotus and was the general practice by all ancient historians. A classic study on the subject (though specifically aimed at the speeches in Acts) is M. Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, 138-85. More recently is Max Wilcox, "A Foreword to the Study of Speeches in Acts," Morton Smith festschrift I, 206-25.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bloch, Heinrich. Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seiner Archäologie (Leipzig, 1879; reprinted Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1968).
- Buchler, Adolphe. "La Relation de Joseph concernant Alexandre le Grand," REJ 36 (1898), 1-26.
- Coggins, R.J. Samaritans and Jews (Growing Points in Theology); Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1975).
- Cowley, A. Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1923; reprinted Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1967).
- Cross, Frank M., Jr. "The Discovery of the Samaria Papyri," Biblical Archaeologist Reader 3 (edited by E. Campbell and D.N. Freedman; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970), 227-39.
- . "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," HTR 59 (1966), 201-11.
- Destinon, J. von. Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der jüdische Archäologie Buch xii-xvii (Kiel, 1882).
- Dibelius, Martin. "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," Studies in the Acts of the Apostles (edited by H. Greeven; London: SCM, 1956), 138-85.
- Duschak, M. Josephus Flavius und die Tradition (Wien: Verlag von Jacob Schlossberg's Buchhandlung, 1864).
- Eusebius Pamphilius. Evangelicae Praeparationis (vols. I-IV; edited and translated by E. Gifford; Oxford, 1903).
- Freudenthal, J. Hellenistische Studien (Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theol. Seminars); Breslau, 1874-5).

- Gager, John G. Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph 16; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972).
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. "The Tales of the Tobiads," Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12; edited by J. Neusner; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1957), Part III, 85-123.
- Grünbaum, Paul. Die Priestergesetze bei Flavius Josephus (Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der philosophischen Doctorwürde; Halle, 1887).
- Guttmann, Heinrich. Die Darstellung der jüdischen Religion bei Flavius Josephus (Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1928).
- Hölscher, Gustav. Die Quellen des Josephus für die Zeit vom Exil bis zum jüdischen Kriege (Leipzig, 1905).
- . "Josephus," RE 18 , 1934-2000.
- Kippenberg, Hans Gerhard. Garizim und Synagoge (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten XXX; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971).
- Lévy, Isidore. "Moïse en Éthiopie," REJ 53 (1907), 201-11.
- Lindner, Helgo. Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums XII; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972).
- Metzger, Bruce M. "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," JBL 91 (1972), 3-24.
- Moehring, Horst R. "The Acta pro Judaeis in the Antiquities of Flavius Josephus," Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12; edited by J. Neusner; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), Part III, 124-58.

Moore, O'Brien. "Senatus consultum," RE, Supplementband VI,  
800-12.

Neusner, Jacob. From Politics to Piety (Englewood Cliffs,  
NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973).

--- . "Josephus's Pharisees," Ex Orbe Religionum (Leiden:  
E.J. Brill, 1972), Part I, 224-44.

Niese, Benedictus. "Josephus," HERE VII, 569-79.

Olitzki, Marcus. Flavius Josephus und die Halacha (Inaugural-  
Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde; Berlin:  
Druck von H. Itzkowski, 1885).

Pfister, Friedrich. Eine jüdische Gründungsgeschichte  
Alexandrias (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie  
der Wissenschaften; Heidelberg: Carl Winters  
Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1914).

Porten, Bezalel. Archives from Elephantine, Los Angeles:  
University of California Press, 1968).

Purvis, James D. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of  
the Samaritan Sect (Harvard Semitic Monograph 2;  
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).

Rappaport, Salomo. Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus  
(Veröffentlichungen der Oberrabbiner Dr. H.P. Chajes,  
Band III; Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann Verlag, 1930).

Rowley, H.H. "The Samaritan Schism in Legend and History,"  
Israel's Prophetic Heritage (edited by B. Anderson  
and W. Harrelson; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962),  
208-22.

--- . "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple," BJRL 38 (1955),  
1966-98.

- Schalit, Abraham. "Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews,'" ASTI 4 (1965), 1963-88.
- . "Josephus," EJ 10, 251-63.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. The Halakhah at Qumran (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity XVI); Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975).
- Schlatter, Adolf. Die Theologie des Judenthums nach dem Bericht des Josefus (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie; Reihe 2; Band 26; Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1932).
- Schürer, Emil. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (vol. 1; new English edition edited and revised by G. Vermes and F. Millar; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973).
- Sherk, Robert K. Roman Documents from the Greek East (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969).
- Simon, Marcel. "Alexandre le Grand, Juif et Chrétien," Recherches d'Histoire Judéo-Christienne (Études Juives VI; Paris: Mouton & Co., 1962), 127-39.
- Smith, Morton. "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," Israel: Its Role in Civilization (edited by Moshe David; New York: Harper & Row, 1956), 67-81.
- Tcherikover, Victor. Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews (transl. by S. Applebaum; New York: Atheneum, 1975).
- Thackeray, H. St. John. Josephus, The Man and the Historian (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929).
- . "Josephus," HDB, Supplementary volume, 461-73.



Wacholder, Ben Zion. "Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles," HTR 61 (1968), 451-81.

Wilcox, Max. "A Foreward to the Study of the Speeches in Acts," Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12; edited by J. Neusner; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), Part I, 206-25.

Wright, G. Ernest. "The Samaritans at Shechem," HTR 55 (1962), 357-66.