

PAUL SPILSBURY

The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible

*Texte und Studien zum
Antiken Judentum*

69

Mohr Siebeck

Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

Herausgegeben von
Martin Hengel und Peter Schäfer

69



Paul Spilsbury

The Image of the Jew
In Flavius Josephus'
Paraphrase of the Bible

Mohr Siebeck

Paul Spilsbury, born 1966; 1994 Ph. D. University of Cambridge; presently Assistant Professor of New Testament at Canadian Bible College, Regina, Canada.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Spilsbury, Paul:

The image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' paraphrase of the Bible / Paul Spilsbury.

– Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998

(Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum ; 69)

ISBN 3-16-146869-4

978-3-16-158683-5 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019

© 1998 by J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), P. O. Box 2040, 72010 Tübingen.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper from Papierfabrik Niefern and bound by Heinr. Koch in Tübingen.

ISSN 0721-8753

For Bronwyn

Preface

The following study represents the convergence of my interests in the Bible as a sacred text and the historical role it has played in the shaping of both individual and group identities. The study also touches on the complex ways in which such identities are formed in diaspora contexts. As a resident of a country other than the one in which I was born, I feel a certain kinship with those who, like Josephus, have had to adjust their perceptions of life to quite new surroundings and new cultures.

And I too, like Josephus, have to acknowledge the assistance of many friends and colleagues along the way, though I trust they will sense that I do so with none of the reluctance or chagrin for which Josephus is well known. The work presented here first took shape in a somewhat shorter form as a doctoral dissertation submitted at the University of Cambridge in 1994. During my sojourn in that delightful city I was guided in my research by Dr William Horbury, to whom I owe an immense debt of gratitude not only for the wealth of scholarly expertise which he unstintingly put at my disposal, but also for his kindness and personal interest throughout the course of my studies. I am also grateful to many others in Cambridge who contributed to my work in a multitude of ways. Among these is Dr Nicholas de Lange who supervised my study for one term, and contributed much else through lectures and seminars.

My examiners, Dr Graham Davies of the University of Cambridge and Dr Tessa Rajak of Reading University also provided much useful insight which has been incorporated into the final product. Dr John Barclay of the University of Glasgow and Prof. L.H. Feldman of Yeshiva University read an earlier draft of the work in its entirety and made many useful comments and suggestions for which I am very grateful. Dr Bob Webb of Regina contributed much by a thorough and perceptive reading of significant portions of the final draft. Mr Brendan Morey of Saskatoon very kindly prepared the index of passages. Finally, I am very grateful indeed to Professors Martin Hengel and Peter Schäfer for including this study in the current series, and to Mr Siebeck and his staff for their professional handling of the publication process.

Along with these mentioned by name is a whole host of unnamed friends and colleagues whose companionship, encouragement and prayers have made the burden of study very much lighter. I don't think I could have survived

without them. Chief among my supporters, has been my wife Bronwyn whose moral support, loyalty and courage have undergirded me and inspired me to bring this project to completion. I dedicate this volume to her with deep gratitude.

I am grateful to the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom for their financial support in the form of an Overseas Research Students Award. Queens' College provided financial aid and generously funded travel to several important academic conferences. I have also been the grateful beneficiary of funds from persons who have expressed a wish to remain anonymous. I tender them my heart-felt thanks.

Regina, Saskatchewan

17 November, 1997

Table of Contents

Preface	VII
Abbreviations	XII
Introduction	1
1. The Image of the Jew	1
2. Josephus the Roman Jew	7
2.1. Curriculum Vitae	7
2.2. The Jews in Josephus' Writings	12
2.2.1. <i>The Jewish War</i>	12
2.2.2. <i>Against Apion</i>	13
3. <i>The Jewish Antiquities</i>	14
3.1. Genre	14
3.2. Audience	16
4. Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible	22
4.1. Josephus' Bible	23
4.2. Traditional Exegesis	25
4.3. Hellenizations	31
5. Method	34
<i>Excursus 1: 'Ιουδαῖοι, 'Εβραῖοι and 'Ισραηλῖται</i>	36
<i>Excursus 2: Jewish Identity in the Diaspora</i>	42
Chapter One: The Patriarchs	51
1. Introduction	51
2. Abraham	55
2.1. The Father of a Race	55
2.2. Abraham in Egypt	62
2.3. Abraham in Canaan	65
2.4. The Binding of Isaac	72
3. Isaac, Jacob and Jacob's Sons	75
3.1. Isaac	75
3.2. Jacob	76
3.3. Jacob's Sons	82

3.3.1. Reuben	82
3.3.2. Judah	84
3.3.3. Joseph	86
4. Summary	92
 Chapter Two: Moses and his Opponents	 94
1. Moses	94
1.1. The Laws of Moses	111
2. Moses' Opponents	113
2.1. Foreign Opponents	114
2.1.1. The Egyptians	114
2.1.2. The Peoples of the Desert	117
2.1.2.1. The Amalekites	118
2.1.2.2. Balak, Balaam and the Midianites	120
2.1.2.2.1. Balaam's Oracles	122
2.1.2.2.2. The Midianite Seduction	127
2.2. Hebrew Opponents	129
2.2.1. Mutiny on the Borders of Canaan	130
2.2.2. The Great Sedition	135
2.2.3. Zimri	141
3. Summary	145
 Chapter Three: From Conquest to Monarchy	 147
1. The Conquest of the Land	147
1.1. Joshua	147
1.2. An Offensive Altar	150
2. Living in the Land	153
3. The Monarchy	160
3.1. The Request for a King	161
3.2. Saul	170
3.2.1. The Offensive Offering	171
3.2.2. The Amalekite Campaign	171
3.2.3. The Slaughter of the Priests of Nob	173
3.2.4. Josephus' Summary Reflections on Saul	174
3.3. David	175
3.4. Solomon	179

3.4.1. The Wisdom of Solomon	179
3.4.2. Solomon's Temple	181
3.4.3. Solomon's Sins	184
<i>Excursus: L.H. Feldman's Portrait of a Sophoclean Solomon</i>	186
4. Summary	187
 Chapter Four: The Divided Kingdom and Beyond	 189
1. The Succession of Kings	189
1.1. The Northern Kingdom	190
1.1.1. Jeroboam	192
1.2. The Southern Kingdom	194
1.2.1. Josiah	195
2. Daniel	201
2.1. Daniel's Prophecies	206
3. Post-Exilic Judaea	209
4. Esther	213
5. Summary	216
 Conclusion	 217
 Bibliography	 231
 Index of Passages	 255
 Index of Modern Authors	 280
 Index of Subjects	 284

Abbreviations

AAU	Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universiteit
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>AJPh</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>AJSR</i>	<i>Association for Jewish Studies Review</i>
ALGJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
<i>Ant</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
<i>APF</i>	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung</i>
<i>Apion</i>	Josephus, <i>Against Apion</i>
<i>ASTI</i>	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BO	Biblica et Orientalia
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BUS	Brown University Studies
BZNW	Beiträge zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBNT	Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series
CBQMS	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Conservative Judaism</i>
<i>CPh</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CPJ</i>	<i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCT	Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition
<i>DBS</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</i>
EF	Erträge der Forschung
ÉPROER	Études préliminaires aux Religions orientales dans L'Empire Romain
<i>ET</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FSRKA	Frankfurter Studien zur Religion und Kultur der Antike
GBLS	Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur und Stilforschung
<i>Gen.Apoc</i>	<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>
HDR	Harvard Dissertations in Religion
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<i>HT</i>	<i>History Today</i>

<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>Hum.Ser</i>	Humanistisk Serie
<i>HUT</i>	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
<i>HZ</i>	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>IOS</i>	<i>Israel Oriental Studies</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JB�</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSPSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>Jub</i>	<i>The Book of Jubilees</i>
<i>LAB</i>	Pseudo-Philo, <i>Biblical Antiquities</i>
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library
<i>LEC</i>	Library of Early Christianity
<i>Life</i>	Josephus, <i>The Life of Josephus</i>
<i>LQR</i>	<i>Law Quarterly Review</i>
<i>LXX</i>	The Septuagint
<i>MGWJ</i>	<i>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
<i>MHUC</i>	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
<i>MT</i>	Masoretic Text
<i>NJ</i>	<i>Nordisk Judaistik</i>
<i>n.s.</i>	new series
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTOA</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PAAJR</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
<i>Pauly-W.RE</i>	Pauly-Wissowa, <i>Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>
<i>SANT</i>	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>SBLDS</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<i>SBLMS</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
<i>SBLSCS</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>SCI</i>	<i>Studia Classica Israelica</i>
<i>SHR</i>	Studies in the History of Religions
<i>SJLA</i>	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity

SLSR	Sage Library of Social Research
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SPB	Studia Post-Biblica
ST	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
SupNT	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TU	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
War	Josephus, <i>Jewish War</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YCS	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZRGG	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>

Introduction

1. The Image of the Jew

The closing years of the first century CE were critical ones for Jewish people living in the Roman world. The subjugation of the revolt in Judaea, along with the destruction of the Temple, raised a host of questions and challenges concerning the nature of Jewish life and identity. The public humiliation of defeat, rubbed in painfully by Titus' triumphal procession through Rome with the holy spoils of Jerusalem, and the indiscriminate imposition of a punitive tax on all Jews in the empire seemed to assert a fundamental dichotomy (even hostility) between "the Jews" and "the Romans". This distinction would, perhaps, have raised few problems for Jews living in communities that, for one reason or another, were already isolated from the outside world. However, for those Jews attempting to live lives integrated into the mainstream of the non-Jewish world, the crisis of 66–70 CE and its aftermath presented perplexing dilemmas. The official opposition between Rome and the Jews implied by the war, and the punishments meted out afterwards greatly increased the need among the Jews for an apologetic that could give an account of themselves in the face of Gentile hostility and suspicion. Who were the Jews and what did they stand for? What was the basis of their laws and traditions? Was their mode of life in some fundamental way at odds with the values and aspirations of Rome? Should they be regarded as perpetual enemies, or could the Judaeian war be regarded as an anomaly irrelevant to Jewish-Roman relations in the long term? These are some of the questions Jewish apologists were confronted with as they tried to reestablish an honourable place for the Jews at the Roman table.¹

The questions raised by the destruction of the Jewish state were not restricted to the external issues of how the Jews might relate to the rest of the world. Some of the most crucial questions related to theodicy. If the Jews were the people of God, how was the disaster that had befallen Jerusalem possible? What were its implications for their status as God's special

¹Note the comment of A. Momigliano on Jewish apologetics: "To study Judaism through its apologetics . . . means to understand it in its efforts to take a stance before the surrounding world and its efforts to define itself in relation to that world" (*Essays*, 58).

possession? Other questions related to the internal structures of Jewish life. How were Jews to live as Jews on a day-to-day basis in the light the non-functioning of the Temple and its priesthood? Could Judaism even survive in such circumstances? These were issues debated by the Jews among themselves as they tried to come to terms with the implications of their recent history for their own essential identity.

In other words, we might say that Jews all over the Roman world were faced with the challenge of redefining Judaism both for themselves and for “outsiders”. They were called upon to draw an “image of the Jew” that would serve at least these two purposes. On the one hand there was the apologetic need to provide an answer to the Roman world concerning the nature of the Jewish people. And on the other hand there was the need for Jews to reformulate their own understanding of themselves in the light of the new realities that shaped their lives. We cannot assume that this challenge was met in the same way by all Jews; or that the “images” presented by different “artists” were all identical. As different individuals and communities grappled with the issues in the specific contexts of their own local circumstances throughout the Roman world, different answers emerged to the fundamental questions they faced. Different images were offered as explanations of what the Jews were really all about.

This was not the first time that Jews had been confronted with the need to explore their essential identity in the context of changing realities, either internal to the Jewish community and external in the world at large. Indeed, recent scholarship has shown how at least since the Persian period, when much of the nation found itself in exile (an involuntary Diaspora) they had been confronted with the need to redefine and fine-tune their emerging sense of identity. D.R. Schwartz has argued that each successive stage of Jewish history required a rearrangement of the basic building blocks of Jewish peoplehood.² Thus, in one period it was physical connection to Abraham that was paramount. In another period it was the monarchy and the Land that defined Jewish identity. In yet another period it was adherence to the Law and the carefully defined cultural agenda associated with it.³ It is the fluidity of the issues contributing to Jewish identity and the complex ways in which they

²D.R. Schwartz, *Studies*, 5 ff.

³It was during the Hellenistic period, Schwartz argues, when it was necessary to define the cultural agenda by which Jews were to govern their lives, that different points of view within Judaism crystallized into opposing schools or sects (*Studies*, 13).

relate to each other under new circumstances and in different environments that makes the study of Jewish identity so interesting. The encounter between the Jewish people and the forces of Hellenism unleashed by Alexander the Great has been a particularly fruitful field of enquiry.⁴ For, here was a new Spirit sweeping the world which was at once both threatening and appealing to the Jews. For some, the Greek language and Greek modes of life and thought offered the Jews a means for constructive engagement with the rest of the world. Hellenism held out an invitation to become citizens of the world. For others, Hellenism was to be shunned as a pagan evil that threatened to destroy the foundations of true religion and erode the pillars of Jewish life. The tensions between these two perspectives were felt not only between communities but also within communities, and sometimes even within individuals. It was in this context of ambiguity and tension that Jews in the Hellenistic period were having to answer the question, 'What is a Jew?' Inevitably the process of self-definition thus constructed led, in time, to the reduction of diversity as emerging definitions of Judaism excluded alternative definitions.⁵ The definition of "Jewishness" became a battle for the soul of the people.

One of the primary resources in this battle was the Bible. As J. Blenkinsopp has argued:

[Biblical] interpretation was not just one of several forms of literary and intellectual activity going on at the time. It was, on the contrary, decisive for the way the community was to understand itself, who was to belong to it, and how it was to go about its business.⁶

During the Second Temple period we find a vast array biblical scholarship of different kinds, all the way from detailed commentary on specific texts to wholesale rewriting of large tracts of the Bible. In each case, these scholars apparently hoped to make sense of the present in the light of the sacred account of the past. That "sacred account of the past", though, was not static or fixed. There was much scope for interpretation and reinterpretation as different individuals and communities scanned the ancient traditions for clues about their own place in the world.

⁴See especially M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*. For a succinct summary of the pertinent issues, see J.M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 88–92.

⁵Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Self-Definition*, vol. 2, ix.

⁶J. Blenkinsopp, "Interpretation", 25.

Clearly, then, even the interpretation of the Bible allowed significant latitude when it came to defining what it meant to be a Jew. This does not mean, however, that the process of Jewish self-definition was entirely without constraints, or that Jewish identities in different communities were so entirely disparate as to render a Jew from Rome unrecognizable to a Jew from Alexandria or Jerusalem. On the contrary, there was an identifiable commonality that united all the different expressions of Judaism at this time.⁷ J. Neusner describes that commonality thus:

That pre-Christian, prerabbinic religion of Israel, for all its variety, exhibited common traits: belief in one God, reverence for and obedience to the revelation contained in the Hebrew Scriptures, veneration of the Temple in Jerusalem (while it stood), and expectation of the coming Messiah⁸ to restore all the Jews to Palestine and to bring to a close the anguish of history.⁹

Other scholars have described this common foundation in terms of basic “elements” or “distinctives” of Judaism. J.D.G. Dunn, for example, describes the “four pillars” of Second Temple Judaism.¹⁰ These were: (1) the belief in monotheism (which is coupled to an antipathy towards the religions of other nations); (2) the conviction that Israel had been chosen by God, and that God had bound himself to Israel by a covenant; (3) the commitment to the centrality of Torah in the life of God’s chosen people. This tenet nurtured a sense of distinctiveness and privilege over against the other nations and led

⁷E.P. Sanders gives an extended discussion of “common Judaism” in *Judaism*, 45–303. See also G.P. Carras, “Paul, Josephus, and Judaism,” 1–23. Carras, who is indebted to Sanders, uses the term “common-denominator” Judaism. This is not to say that there was anything like a strict Jewish “orthodoxy” at this time. For a discussion of this term and its (in)appropriateness for discussion of first century Judaism, see N.J. McEleney, “Orthodoxy;” with responses by D.E. Aune, “Response;” and L.L. Grabbe, “Issues?” See also N.J. McEleney, “Replies to David E. Aune and Lester L. Grabbe.” On the related discussion of the term “normative” Judaism, see J. Neusner, “‘Judaism’ after Moore;” S.J.D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishna*, 134–137; and J.M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 83–88.

⁸On Jewish hopes for the future, see further, E.P. Sanders, *Judaism*, 279–303.

⁹J. Neusner, *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity*, 12.

¹⁰J.D.G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways*, 18–36. Similar discussions may be found in M. Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 11–22; and N.T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 215–243. See also A. Mendelson, *Philo’s Jewish Identity*, 51–75; and S. Stern, *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writings*, 80 ff.

to what Dunn refers to as “focal points of distinctiveness” by which he means, “particular laws, especially ritual practices, which reinforced the sense of distinctive identity and marked Israel off most clearly from other nations, test cases of covenant loyalty.”¹¹ The most significant of these, he argues, were circumcision, Sabbath observance and the food laws.¹² (4) The fourth pillar was the centrality of the Temple in Israel’s religious, political and economic life. Even after the destruction of the Temple, it continued to function as an important focal point for piety and hopes for the future.

J.M.G. Barclay emphasizes “ethnicity” as the bond that united Jews in the Diaspora. He writes: “The evidence indicates that it was ethnicity – precisely the *combination* of ancestry and custom – which was the core of Jewish identity in the Diaspora.”¹³ The evidence to which he refers is made up of five “strands”: (1) the ethnic terminology used by Jews to describe themselves;¹⁴ (2) the Gentile perception of the Jews as an ethnic group; (3) the “resocialization” of proselytes;¹⁵ (4) the importance of marriage within the group; and (5) the education of children in the Jewish way of life.¹⁶

If we move beyond these basic “elements” or “strands” of Jewish identity we find a range of other issues that also served to unite, at least in principle, the different local expressions of Jewishness. Barclay refers to these as “supporting strands” which served to strengthen the “central thread” of Jewish identity.¹⁷ They included the widespread importance among Jews of

¹¹J.D.G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways*, 28.

¹²J.M.G. Barclay lists the following as “practical distinctions” which “marked off Diaspora Jews from their neighbours and thus gave definition to Jewish identity”: the rejection of alien, pluralist and iconic cult; separatism at meals; male circumcision; and Sabbath observance (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 428–442).

¹³J.M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 404. Emphasis Barclay’s.

¹⁴The Jews spoke of themselves as a “nation” (ἔθνος, φῶλον), a “race” (γένος), or a “people” (λαός).

¹⁵On the importance of entrance requirements placed on converts for Jewish identity, see also L. Schiffman, “At the Crossroads.” On the requirements placed on converts to Judaism, generally, see B.J. Bamberger, *Proselytism*; W.G. Braude, *Jewish Proselytizing*; L.H. Schiffman, “Conversion of the Royal House of Adiabene;” “Proselytism;” *Who Was a Jew?* S.J.D. Cohen, “Conversion to Judaism;” “Conversion Ceremony;” “Crossing the Boundary.” See also J.J. Collins, “A Symbol of Otherness,” 165–169. On the subject of Gentile attraction to Judaism, see especially S.J.D. Cohen, “Respect for Judaism.”

¹⁶Barclay discusses each of these strands in some detail on pages 405–413.

¹⁷J.M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 413.

synagogue attendance,¹⁸ and the payment of the Temple tax.¹⁹ On the latter, E.P. Sanders has stated:

If one were thinking of Jews outside Palestine, whether in the rest of the Roman Empire or in Mesopotamia, the Temple tax, along with observance of Sabbath and food laws, would be a major sign of Jewish identity. Paying it marked one as a Jew; not paying it would lead others to think that one had apostatized We may safely say that all Jews who wished to be counted as such paid the tax.²⁰

Then, there were also certain privileges shared by Jews in certain areas and at certain times, such as the right to live according to their laws,²¹ or exemption from military service.²² In the aftermath of the Jewish war, the shared burden and humiliation of the *fiscus Judaicus* also contributed to the definition of Jewish identity.²³

As Jews at the end of the first century CE came to terms with their circumstances, and attempted to carve out for themselves a way of being themselves in the world, all of the above factors would have contributed to their ultimate answer to the question, "What is a Jew?" And, therefore, they provide a context for the primary focus of the present study, namely, the image of the Jew presented by Flavius Josephus.

¹⁸For discussion see, e.g., P. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 12 ff; E.P. Sanders, *Jewish Law*, 79.

¹⁹Cf. *Ant* 14.112–13; 16.162–8, 171–3; Philo, *Embassy* 315–6; Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 28.66–9. On the Temple Tax generally, see further W. Horbury, "The Temple Tax."

²⁰E.P. Sanders, *Jewish Law*, 49.

²¹For a discussion of this point, see P. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 19.

²²Jewish communities often sought exemption from military service so as not to compromise their ability to observe all their customs. Although enlistment in the Roman army was generally voluntary, times of military crisis were inevitably accompanied by mandatory conscription. In was in times such as these that Jews needed some form of exemption (P. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 12 ff).

²³On the significance for Jewish identity of contributions to the *fiscus Judaicus*, see M. Goodman, "Nerva". For a discussion of Goodman's argument, see now also I. Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts*, 2–12.

2. Josephus the Roman Jew

In the present study we seek to understand one particular Jewish answer to the questions raised by Diaspora life; one particular “image of the Jew” offered both to Jews and to non-Jews²⁴ as an accounting of the nature of Jewish identity in the Roman world. Josephus’ image of the Jew is a measure of his own particular social and political agenda, and as such sheds valuable light on his attempt to come to terms with the challenges facing Jews in the latter stages of the Flavian dynasty, especially those who, like him, hoped to find a way to be authentically Roman at the same time as being faithfully Jewish.²⁵ What is especially tantalising in the case of Josephus is the initial impression that we actually know a good deal about him. Unfortunately, however, this “knowledge” is notoriously suspect because of contradictions, special pleading and obvious literary *topoi*. It is to that subject that we must now turn.

2.1. Curriculum Vitae

Such knowledge as we have of Josephus is derived entirely from his own works dating from the late 70’s to the mid-90’s of the first century CE.²⁶ From these works, especially the *Life*, we may establish the following broad outline of his life: Josephus was born in 37 CE²⁷ and spent his early life in Jerusalem where, as the second son²⁸ of an aristocratic and priestly family (*Life* 7), he received a good education (*Life* 8). This basic education was supplemented in his adolescent years by more in-depth study of the various Jewish sects (*Life* 10) and an extended time of instruction under a desert ascetic called Bannus (*Life* 11). After this, he entered public life in Jerusalem and followed the precepts of the Pharisees (*Life* 12). At the age of twenty-six, he went on a diplomatic mission to Rome in aid of certain priests who were to be arraigned on unknown charges before Nero (*Life* 13–16). On his return from a successful trip he found the revolution against Rome already well under way (*Life* 17). During the early stages of the war he was involved as

²⁴The dual nature of the “audience” for whom Josephus wrote is discussed further below.

²⁵On such individuals, see M. Goodman, “The Roman Identity of Roman Jews.”

²⁶*War* is usually dated between 75 and 79, though book 7 may have been written as late as the 90’s; *Ant*: 93/94; *Life*: shortly after *Ant*; *Apion*: 97–100.

²⁷“the year in which Gaius Caesar became Emperor,” *Life* 5.

²⁸This is inferred from the fact that Josephus’ brother was given his father’s name (*Life* 8).

a military leader in Galilee (*Life* 28–406; *War* 2.568–3.288; *Apion* 1.48). Shortly after the outbreak of hostilities, though, he was captured by the Romans at Jotapata (*War* 3.316–391) and used thereafter as an interpreter and informant (*War* 5.325; 6.129; *Apion* 49). He was also used to try to persuade the rebels to give up the fight before it was too late (*War* 5.114, 261, 361 ff, 541 ff; 6.94 ff, 365). After the war he was highly honoured by the new Flavian emperors, not least because of his famous prediction during the last year of Nero that Vespasian would become emperor (*War* 3.399–402). Along with a tract of land in Judaea (*Apion* 422, 425), he was granted Roman citizenship, and a house and pension in Rome (*Life* 423). During this period of Flavian patronage he turned his efforts towards the literary pursuits that produced the four works that make up his extant *corpus*. This was also a time of intense hostility from certain Jewish quarters which resented his conspicuous rise to prosperity (*Life* 424, 428–429).

The difficulties which arise when we consider the details of Josephus' assertions about his life and career are well known. We will touch on them only briefly here.²⁹ We may arrange these problems under three headings. (I) *Early life and education*. Questions have been raised about Josephus' claim to both priestly and Hasmonaean descent.³⁰ His claim to have been a child prodigy would seem to be an obvious literary *topos*, and the times he gives for the period studying the various sects within Judaism do not seem to add up. It is also difficult to know exactly what he means when he says that in his nineteenth year he began to "govern [his] life by the rules of the Pharisees" (*Life* 12). Does this mean he became a "card carrying" Pharisee, or simply that in public life he followed their precepts out of practical necessity?³¹ The true nature of his diplomatic trip to Rome has also raised the suspicions of

²⁹For an excellent survey of all the relevant issues, see S. Mason, *Josephus*, 35–52. See also T. Rajak, *Josephus*, 46–64, 144–173, 185–229; and S. Schwartz, *Judaean Politics*, 4–22.

³⁰The issues are spelled out very well in S. Mason, *Josephus*, 37–38.

³¹S. Mason has argued for the latter ("Was Josephus a Pharisee?"), though this view has not been accepted by all; see, e.g., E.P. Sanders, *Judaism*, 832–833, n. 9. Sanders's basic objection is that the Pharisees, contrary to general opinion, did not yield the measure of political power in Jerusalem in the mid-50s that is required for Mason's position. The whole question of Josephus' attitude to the Pharisees in the *War* over against that in the *Antiquities* has been the cause of much speculation among scholars as well. Many suppose that Josephus' more positive attitude toward this group in later life betrays a desire to ingratiate himself with the incipient rabbinic movement in Palestine around the end of the first century.

some.³² (2) *Involvement in the war*. The enormous difficulties with this part of his life stem from the fact that Josephus gives conflicting accounts of his activities in the *War* and in the *Life*.³³ The situation is further complicated by the fact that other accounts of the war apparently repudiated Josephus' version(s) and accused him of tyranny and brutality during this period.³⁴ Some of these charges Josephus seemed hard pressed to refute.³⁵ The events surrounding Josephus' capture by the Romans are notoriously problematic. For one thing, Josephus appears thoroughly unscrupulous and even cowardly while at the same time almost nauseatingly self-praising. At one moment he openly admits contemplating flight from the Romans (*War* 3.193), and at the next he is urging everybody else to sacrifice their lives (*War* 3.204). Once, we find him pleading with a group of refugees not to commit the impiety of suicide to escape capture by the Romans (*War* 3.361–382), and on another occasion he praises that very action (*War* 7.320–401; see also 3.331). The main difference between these two occasions is that in the former he himself would have had to commit suicide – something he clearly was not willing to do. To make matters worse, he allowed his compatriots to slaughter each other, only to save his own skin at the very last minute by surrendering to the Romans. As if this were not enough, Josephus claims that he was motivated in all of this by a prophetic inspiration, which came to him by virtue of his priestly status,³⁶ revealing that his captor Vespasian would eventually become

³²S.J.D. Cohen has argued (*Josephus in Galilee and in Rome*, 61 f, 186, n. 13) that Josephus covered up the revolutionary implications of the charges brought against his associates.

³³A full-scale treatment of this problem may be found in S.J.D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*. See also the helpful summary in S. Mason, *Josephus*, 40–43.

³⁴Josephus' main accuser was one Justus of Tiberias who had also been involved in the war in Galilee. For a discussion of his version of events, so far as it is possible to reconstruct it from what Josephus says against it, see T. Rajak, "Josephus and Justus of Tiberias," and S. Mason, *Josephus*, 75–76.

³⁵See, e.g., his acknowledgement that he made one of his captives cut off his own left hand (*War* 2.642–644; *Life* 169–173). Josephus presents himself as showing mercy in not having both the man's hands severed.

³⁶Josephus writes: "Suddenly there came back into his mind those nightly dreams, in which God had foretold to him the impending fate of the Jews and the destinies of the Roman sovereigns. He was an interpreter of dreams and skilled in divining the meaning of ambiguous utterances of the Deity; a priest himself and of priestly descent, he was not ignorant of the prophecies in the sacred books" (*War* 3.351–352). On the well established priest-as-prophet tradition in Judaism at this time, see J. Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus."

emperor. Astonishingly, this prediction, if that is what it really was, came true within a matter of two years³⁷ and Josephus' prestige and security were assured.³⁸ (3) *Life in Rome*. The nature and extent of the patronage Josephus received is difficult to establish. It would seem that although he had some kind of imperial support for the writing of the *War*, by the time he completed the rest of his works, in the nineties, he was supported by a patron by the name of Epaphroditus.³⁹ It is unlikely that this person had connections with the court, and we do not know what this implies about Josephus' status in Rome during this period. Also, Josephus' relationship with the Jewish community in Rome is not clear.⁴⁰ Josephus treats those of his own countrymen who opposed him as an insignificant minority, but was this really the case? Or, was Josephus in essence estranged from the Jewish community because of his perceived betrayal of the Jewish cause? This last possibility raises questions about the motivations of Josephus' literary works. Is it possible that rather than being the community-minded apologetic works he

Blenkinsopp argues that however we evaluate Josephus' claim to prophetic inspiration derived from his priestly status, "it makes perfectly good sense in the context of traditional and contemporary understandings of both prophecy and priesthood" (256). The question of prophecy in Josephus has received a good deal of scholarly attention; cf. e.g. D.E. Aune, "The Use of *προφήτης* in Josephus," M.N.A. Bockmeuhl, *Revelation and Mystery*, 82–92; M. Braun, "The Prophet Who Became a Historian," F.F. Bruce, "Josephus and Daniel," G. Dellling, "Die biblische Prophetie bei Josephus," L.H. Feldman, "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus," G.L. Johnson, "Josephus: Heir Apparent?" R. Mayer and C. Möller, "Josephus – Politiker und Prophet," A. Paul, "Le concept de prophétie biblique," W.C. van Unnik, "Die Prophetie bei Josephus," in idem, *Flavius Josephus als Historischer Schriftsteller*, 41–54; G. Vermes, "Josephus' Treatment of the Book of Daniel."

³⁷Jotapata fell in July 67 and Vespasian was acclaimed emperor by the people of Rome in December 69.

³⁸Josephus' prediction was apparently not the only "omen" regarding Vespasian's imminent rise to imperial power. That, at least, is the line given by Flavian propaganda. References to such predictions, including Josephus' are found in Tacitus, *Histories* 1.10; 2.1; 5.13 and Suetonius, *Vespasian* 4. On the usefulness of such omens for the Flavian house, see the discussion of T. Rajak, *Josephus*, 185 ff. Rabbinic tradition attached a similar prediction of Vespasian's ascendancy to Johanan ben Zakkai, the founder of the academy at Jamnia (Yavneh). For a discussion of the relevant sources, see J. Neusner, *A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai*, 157 ff.

³⁹See the discussion this period of Josephus' life in T. Rajak, *Josephus*, 223 ff. On Josephus' relationship with the various emperors, see briefly G.E. Sterling, *Historiography*, 238–240.

⁴⁰See the discussion of M. Goodman, "Josephus as Roman Citizen."

claims them to be, they are really self-seeking attempts to ingratiate himself with the Jewish community in Rome?

This list of questions and problems can almost give the impression that we know even less about Josephus than about those ancient authors (the majority) who wrote nothing about themselves at all. This impression, of course, is a false one; and we should shun the temptation to be overly sceptical about absolutely everything Josephus said. The fact is, we do have a basic outline of his life and career even though we know very little about the details. We should, certainly, approach the study of Josephus with proper caution. This means, in particular, avoiding speculative schemes that rely more heavily on what is *not* known about Josephus than on what is. Perhaps the most important case in point is Josephus' motivations. Much scholarly debate has centred on the question of what inspired him to write as he did. What was he trying to achieve in his various works, given what we know, or think we know, about his character and loyalty to his people? Perspectives based solely on interpretations of Josephus' character can never offer more than mere speculation, and such speculation should be recognized for what it is. A more sure approach is to base one's judgement of Josephus on the content of what he wrote taken as a whole, rather than focusing entirely on what he wrote about himself. So much of what he said about himself, after all, is clouded by literary convention and the pressing needs of the moment (such as, perhaps, the need for political survival in Rome) that we are at a loss to say anything about what Josephus was *really* like.

However, when we read works like the *Jewish Antiquities* and *Against Apion*, it is clear that we are dealing with works of integrity. Both clearly set out to describe and defend the place of Jews in the world. They contain little that may be described as self-seeking or deceitful, or for which the author might deservedly receive opprobrium. Even the earlier *Jewish War*, contrary to the views of some scholars who see it as shamefully pro-Roman, is a defense of the Jewish people who, Josephus argues, were involved involuntarily in the events described. When we approach Josephus from the point of view of his writings, we encounter a faithful Jew constructively engaged in the process of both defending the actions of the Jews in recent history, and making Jewish ways as a whole intelligible to the Greco-Roman world.

We have, therefore, two images of Josephus the Jew. One is of a cowardly, deceitful and self-seeking opportunist. The other is of a courageous Jewish scholar engaged in the literary defense of his people. How do these

two images fit together? Did Josephus have a change of heart after the war, so that the two images are consecutive? Was his later activity just a masquerade intended to obscure his true, evil colours? Were his personal failures in the war aberrations brought on by the pressures of extreme circumstances, so that forever afterwards Josephus was forced to live with the shame of deserting his own better self? Or, did the two images of Josephus always co-exist within the one man? Whatever answer we give to these questions, it is only Josephus' literary creations that are left to us now, and it to these that we must turn for clues as to how Josephus understood Jewish identity in the latter stages of the first century.

2.2. *The Jews in Josephus' Writings*

The primary focus of this study is the first eleven books of the *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus' paraphrase of the Bible. Before we engage in a detailed analysis of that part of Josephus' work, though, it would be well to make a few very brief observations about the way Josephus presents the Jews and Judaism in the *Jewish War* and in *Against Apion*.

2.2.1. *The Jewish War*

Perhaps the most important (and obvious) thing about Josephus' presentation of the Jews in the *War* is that they are a "race" (γένος) that is set over against the race of the Romans. Josephus introduces himself at the beginning of the volume as a "Hebrew by race" (γένοι 'Εβραῖος) (*War* 1.3), and speaks of Jews in other parts of the world as "fellow countrymen" (ὁμόφυλοι, e.g. *War* 1.5,6,9). Members of other races are referred to as ἄλλοφυλοι (*War* 1.12), and he himself is an ἄλλόφυλος as far as the Greeks and Romans are concerned (*War* 1.16). He uses the term πατρίς (*War* 1.10,11) to refer to his home, though it not certain whether this is because he literally came from Jerusalem itself (cf. *War* 1.3), or whether he implies that all Jews, even those in regions to the east of the Euphrates, for instance, would have shared this sense of connection with the traditional "homeland" of the Jews. Under the influence of contrast with Rome, he emphasizes the opposition between Rome and the city (πόλις) of Jerusalem, thus perhaps implying that it is the geographical home of the Jews (*War* 1.11), no matter where they happen to live. Later in the prologue, he refers to "the two Galilees" and Judaea as the regions involved in the Jewish war (*War* 1.22).

That the Jews are a people with a significant national history Josephus indicates, not only by presenting the historical context of the recent war all

the way back to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, but also by alluding to a history of even greater antiquity which he does not now deem necessary to relate in detail (*War* 1.6 ff). The great importance to the Jews of the Temple and the priesthood is indicated by Josephus' proud reference to them in the prologue:

My narrative will proceed to tell of . . . the defences of the city and the plan of the Temple and sanctuary, the measurements of these buildings and of the altar being all precisely stated; certain festival customs, the seven degrees of purity, the ministerial functions of the priests, their vestments and those of the high priest, with a description of the Holy of Holies. (*War* 1.25–26)

The ethnic flavour of this entire description is clear. The Jews are a race with a significant national history and a mother city which is the centre of a national religion overseen by an organized priesthood. This description of the Jews will be elaborated upon and modified in the rest of Josephus' works.

2.2.2. *Against Apion*

Two new features of particular importance emerge in this work. The first is the picture of the Jews as a people under siege. They are not just a recently vanquished people who must endure the vindictive triumphalism of their foes, as was the case in the *War* (cf. 1.2, 7–8), but a people needing to give a comprehensive account of its history, customs and attitudes to the rest of humanity in the face of a hostile and suspicious world. Fully three-quarters of the two-volume work is taken up with Josephus' responses to various charges, calumnies and misunderstandings of Jewish life, institutions and history on the part of a wide range of Gentile writers. The second new element of note is the description of the Jews as a people governed by an ancient and profound constitution (πολίτευμα 2.145, 165, 184, 257; πολιτεία 2.188, 222, 226, 287) derived from the supremely virtuous Moses (2.154–163). This description is itself also apologetic in its aim, for Josephus hopes to show that the charges brought against the Jewish people are proved incorrect by the virtue of their laws and, further, that the Jews “are the most law-abiding of all the nations” (2.150). In fact, loyalty to the laws, even to the point of being willing to die for them (e.g. 2.218–219, 232–235), is an essential characteristic of all Jews (e.g. 2.277), including women, children (2.181) and even “the masses” (2.282).

From these two works, written before and after the *Jewish Antiquities*, we gain a sense of some of the fundamental strokes of Josephus' image of the

Jews. We will expect to find them re-iterated in his paraphrase of the Bible. Our analysis of that portion of the *Antiquities* will aim at a far more detailed description of how Josephus understood and presented the Jewish people.

3. The Jewish Antiquities

3.1. Genre

In the *Jewish Antiquities* Josephus set out to do something that at the time of writing the *War* he had regarded as superfluous. In the preface to that work he wrote:

To narrate the ancient history (ἀρχαιολογεῖν) of the Jews, the origin of the nation and the circumstances of their migration from Egypt, the countries which they traversed in their wanderings, the extent of the territory which they subsequently occupied, and the incidents which led to their deportation, would, I considered, be not only out of place, but superfluous; seeing that many Jews before me have accurately recorded the history of our ancestors, and that these records have been translated by certain Greeks into their native tongue without serious error. (*War* 1.17)

When we get to the preface of the *Antiquities*, though, we find that Josephus has changed his mind. He says of this work:

It will embrace our entire ancient history (ἀρχαιολογία) and political constitution (πολίτευμα), translated from the Hebrew records. (1.5)

He then adds, in what is apparently a reference back to the time at which he wrote the *War*, that he had indeed previously considered writing on the origin of the Jews, their fortunes, their great lawgiver, and the many wars they had waged during the course of their history. He now states, though, that his reason for not tackling that task was its enormous size and his own relative unfamiliarity with the Greek language in which the work would be written (*Ant* 1.6–7). What has ostensibly changed for Josephus by the time of the writing of *Antiquities* is that Josephus now has a patron who is especially curious about the history of the Jewish people from their origins right up to the present time (*Ant* 1.8). He has thus been prevailed upon to provide for a Greek readership a complete history (“archaeology”) of the Jews based on a very close rendition the Jews’ sacred records.

At its most basic level, therefore, the *Antiquities* is presented as a translation of the Bible.⁴¹ He writes in the preface:

The precise details of our Scripture records will, then, be set forth, each in its place, as my narrative proceeds, that being the procedure that I have promised to follow through this work, neither adding nor omitting anything. (1.17)

The promise neither to add nor to omit anything from his account has been subject to much criticism, for a comparison with the Bible itself shows that he has done both. For our purposes here, though, it is significant to note that Josephus wanted his work to be received by his audience as a translation of the Jews' Bible. No doubt, one of his main reasons for this presentation is the sense of authority that would have been associated with an ancient text, and Josephus wanted some of the dignity and venerability of the Bible to rub off on his own work. This would seem to be true even for the second half of the *Antiquities* which is not associated with the Hebrew Bible at all, but is an account of post-biblical Jewish history until the outbreak of the Jewish war. Josephus, however, passes from narrating biblical to post-biblical events without even so much as a comment to indicate this fact to his biblically illiterate readers.

A more accurate generic classification of *Antiquities* would be that of "rewritten Bible".⁴² A number of similar texts were written both before and after the first century CE. They ranged from retellings of specific episodes in the Bible to restatements of extended parts of the Bible. We have already noted the importance of biblical interpretation for the whole subject of Jewish self-definition, and in his personalized presentation of the biblical record, Josephus may be seen to be participating in this process. The foundational nature of the Scriptures in Jewish life required Josephus to use the Bible extensively when giving an account of the Jews. However, rather than providing a literalistic translation something like the LXX, Josephus produced a far more interpreted and tendentious text. He tried to cash in on the

⁴¹Cf. E. Rivkin's comment: "*In nuce*, what we have is a definitive *translation* of scripture, not replacing the Hebrew scriptures themselves but on equal footing with the LXX and actually displacing it" (*The Shaping of Jewish History*, 255).

⁴²On this genre in antiquity, see P.S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament;" B.H. Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible*; D.J. Harrington, "Palestinian Adaptations;" G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded."

enormous potential of the Bible to mould and direct whole communities of people who wished, in some way, to be “people of the book”.

Recently, G.E. Sterling has shown how the *Antiquities* belongs to yet another literary genre – one that in some ways is the most important for understanding what Josephus was trying to accomplish in its composition. This genre is called “apologetic historiography”. Sterling defines this genre thus:

Apologetic historiography is 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.⁴³

Prime examples of such narratives are those of Hecataeus, Berossus and Manetho. The essence of what these authors were trying to achieve was to present their own countries and traditions from the perspective of their own histories, traditions and values. They were thus reacting to the ethnographic writings of “outsiders” who, they felt, described them in ways that were biased, pejorative, and revealed a fundamental ignorance of the subjects they purported to describe. Josephus’ *Antiquities*, Sterling argues, represents the most important Jewish attempt to “carve out a niche for their people within the Hellenistic world.”⁴⁴

This description of the *Jewish Antiquities* is very helpful because it makes sense of the way that Josephus has presented the Jewish people, as well as the way that he has relied on the Jewish Bible as the basis of his work. It also raises the important question of the audience for whom Josephus intended his work. It is to that question that we now turn.

3.2. Audience

An important aspect of our understanding of the full implications of Josephus’ presentation of the Jews in his rewriting of the Bible is the audience for whom he thus presented his people. Was he projecting an image of the Jew onto the minds of a Gentile audience, or a Jewish one, or some combination of the two? In the preface to the *Antiquities* Josephus sets out not only the scope of the work as we have already seen (1.6), but he also indicates what

⁴³G.E. Sterling, *Historiography*, 17

⁴⁴G.E. Sterling, *Historiography*, 19.