

Louis H. Feldman

Torah and Greek Culture in Josephus

1. INTRODUCTION: THE IMPORTANCE OF JOSEPHUS FOR THIS TOPIC.

There is very good reason to believe that the translators who produced the Septuagint had not only a good knowledge of the Hebrew of the Pentateuch, as well as of the tradition of the Oral Torah,¹ but also of the Hellenistic Greek language of the third century B.C.E. Nevertheless, though some have suggested that the translation shows the influence of Greek philosophy, especially Plato,² and even Greek mythology,³ it seems more likely that there is little, if any, synthesis of Greek thought with Jewish biblical thought in that work.⁴ In particular, the very fact that the Septuagint uses the singular *nomos* to render the word "Torah," whereas pagans would always speak of *nomoi* in the plural when speaking of Mosaic legislation is an indication that the translators looked on the Torah as unique and not just another code of law.⁵ In addition, the Septuagint generally avoids, in discussions of the Jewish religion, Greek terms that are used in pagan worship. Thus, it speaks of the *bomas* (altar), *sekos* (sacred enclosure), and *aduton* (innermost sanctuary), which are pagan terms, only with reference to heathenship; on the contrary, when referring to the altar of God, for example, the Septuagint uses the term *thusiasterion*, which has no precedent in pagan literature. Likewise, the Septuagint has a separate word, *mantis*, for a heathen soothsayer as opposed to a true prophet, for which it uses the word *prophetes*. In any case, unless, as few have done, we take the *Letter of Aristeas*, which sup-

posedly tells the story of the translation and depicts a banquet at which the translators spoke, at face value, we have no way of determining what Greek books the translators had read and what effort, if any, they made to synthesize their Jewish and Greek learning.

Following the Septuagint, we know of a number of historians, known to us only from fragments—Demetrius, Eupolemus, Pseudo-Eupolemus, Artapanus, Cleodemus Malchus, Aristeeas, Pseudo-Heecataeus, Theophilus, and Thallus, dating variously from perhaps the third to the first century B.C.E.⁶—who wrote in Greek and who exhibit some knowledge of the biblical text, as well as some supplementary, midrashic-like, material. As examples we may cite Pseudo-Eupolemus' report that Abraham found favor with the king of Phoenicians through teaching his people the movements of the sun and the moon⁷ and Artapanus' account of Moses' successful campaign against the Ethiopians and of the plot of the jealous Pharaoh to assassinate him.⁸ In most cases, however, we are not even sure that they were Jews; and, even if they were, we have no way of knowing what their Greek and Jewish backgrounds were. Likewise, we have fragments of two epic poets, Theodotus (who may be a Samaritan rather than a Jew), who presents a defense of Simcon and Levi's slaying of Hamor as the fulfillment of a divine oracle in revenge for the rape of Dinah,⁹ and Philo the Elder, who presents, for example, a dramatized version of the *'akeidah*,¹⁰ as well as fragments of a tragedy by a certain Ezekiel, dating from perhaps the second century B.C.E., containing, among other things, a dialogue between a mysterious character named Chum and Zipporah in which she justifies marrying a stranger named Moses.¹¹ However, the fragments are few, and we have little indication as to how, if at all, they consciously tried to synthesize their Greek and Jewish learning. Again, we have some fragments of the philosopher Aristobulus,¹² dating from perhaps the second century B.C.E.; but aside from the disputes as to whether he was pagan or Jewish, he gives us, since the fragments are so few, little indication of his Jewish and Greek background. Additionally, Philo gives us an excellent picture of his secular learning, but he says little about his Jewish learning, so that there is even a very real question, despite the fact that he wrote many essays on biblical subjects, as to whether he knew Hebrew at all.¹³ As for Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*, there is scant indication of his Greek background (if any), and numerous questions surround almost every aspect of his work.¹⁴ Other works of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are similarly inconclusive.

Likewise, we are told that Rabban Gamaliel II in the latter part of the first century had a thousand students, five hundred of whom studied Torah and five hundred of whom studied *hokhmat yevanit*

("Greek wisdom": *Sotah* 49b, *Baba Kamma* 82b), but we are given no detail as to the nature of their Greek studies, let alone of the particular works that they read.¹⁵ Similarly, though there is very good reason to think, in view of his dialogues with the Emperor Hadrian and the wise men of Athens (*Bekhorot* 8b) and with the Alexandrians (*Niddah* 69b-70a), that Joshua ben Hananiah had a superior knowledge of the Greek language, nevertheless, we have no indications of the works that he might have read. Furthermore, though we are told of Rabbi Meir's disputations during the second century with the Cynic philosopher Oenomaus of Gadara (*Genesis Rabbah* 68.20), as well as of R. Judah ha-Nasi's discussions at the end of the second century with the emperor "Antoninus" (e.g., *Sanhedrin* 91a-b), we know nothing of the books that they read. Moreover, though we are told (*Hagigah* 15b) that Greek song (presumably poetry) did not cease from the mouth of Elisha ben Abuyah, we are not informed as to which authors particularly influenced him.

Analogies have been noted between rabbinic thought and Greek philosophy, especially Platonism (e.g., the Platonic theory that one has perfect knowledge of the Forms in one's mother's womb [*Meno* 81-86] and the rabbinic view [*Niddah* 30b] that the embryo has been taught all the Torah) and Stoicism, in cosmology, in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and in ethics, but either the alleged similarities are commonplace, or they might have been formulated by any intelligent person.¹⁶ As for parallels in the field of law, although there are nearly two hundred Greek and Latin terms of law, narrowly defined, in rabbinic literature, the vast majority appear only in aggadic contexts. Most amazingly, despite the development of the great system of Roman law at almost the exact time as the development of the great system of Talmudic law, and though a much larger percentage of the legal terms in the Talmudic corpus come from Latin than had been previously thought, not a single one entered the rabbis' active legal vocabulary.¹⁷

As for the distinction between the written and the oral law (found both in Greek thought, in Sophocles' *Antigone* 454-55, for example, and in rabbinic writings), the term "oral law" has a different meaning for Greeks and Jews: for the former it signifies natural law, whereas for the latter it denotes the oral exegesis of the written law.¹⁸ As for methods of rabbinic exegesis, while it is true that such a term as *gez-erub shavab*, the comparison of similar expressions, seems to translate the Greek phrase *kata to ison* or *sugkrisis pros ison* ("decree with the equal"), the Greek and Hebrew terms are used in very different ways.¹⁹ Finally, the fact that there are between twenty-five hundred and three thousand words of Greek origin in the talmudic and mid-

rashic corpus, especially since the vast majority of these words appear in such realms as military affairs, politics, law, administration, trade, items of food, clothing, household utensils, and building materials and almost never in religious, philosophical, or literary passages, tells us only that Greek was widely spoken and widely used in business and governmental contacts in the Land of Israel; it does not tell us much about the influence of Greek literature and other aspects of Greek culture.

All this leaves exactly one author, Josephus, who, in the Tannaitic period, gives us considerable information about both his Jewish and Greek background and from which we are able to draw reasonably secure conclusions as to how he synthesized the two and, to some degree what the reactions of his contemporaries were to his works.

2. JOSEPHUS' JEWISH BACKGROUND

Fortunately, we have Josephus' autobiography, the earliest autobiography that has come down to us from antiquity. He does seem boastful in this work, but it is so apologetic, especially in view of his highly suspicious behavior as a general in the war against the Romans, that he had to be careful lest he expose himself to the charge of hypocrisy in his attacks on his enemies. In particular, the facts that he was subjected to envy by John of Gischala (*Life* 85), that a plot was made against his life while he was general in Galilee (*Life* 104-11), and that his privileged position, under the tutelage of Vespasian and Titus, excited envy (*Life* 423) and even exposed him to a fabricated accusation that he had supplied arms and money to a revolutionary (*Life* 424) would seem to lead us to think that he would be very careful in what he said in his defense.

Josephus (*Against Apion* 1.60) asserts that Jews take pride in the education of their children and that they regard it as the most essential task in life to observe the ancestral laws and practices. In view of Josephus' birth in Jerusalem (*Jewish War* 1.3), which was then the leading center of Jewish learning, and his distinguished genealogy as a member of the first of the twenty-four orders of priests (*Life* 2) and as a descendant of the Hasmonean kings (*Life* 2), it is very likely that we can believe him when he says that he made great progress in his education (*Life* 8), which undoubtedly must have been in Jewish learning, and that he gained a reputation for an excellent memory and understanding. That his education was apparently a traditional one, centered in the written and oral Torah, seems clear from his statement (*Life* 9) that while still a mere boy, about fourteen years of age, he was so pre-

cocious that he won universal applause for his love of letters, inasmuch as the chief priests and the leading men of Jerusalem came constantly to consult him for precise information on various points concerning Jewish legal ordinances.²⁰ That Josephus was well acquainted with all aspects of the Law may be seen in his extensive summary of Halakhah in Books 3 and 4 of his *Antiquities*. Indeed, when a delegation came to the Galilee in order to remove Josephus from his command, they were instructed by the revolutionary leadership in Jerusalem to ask the Galileans why they should be devoted to Josephus, since if the Galileans should insist on his expert knowledge of the laws, the delegation should retort that neither were they ignorant of the customs of their fathers (*Life* 198), the clear implication being that no one could deny that Josephus was actually supremely knowledgeable in Halakhah. It is surely significant that at the end of what is his *magnum opus*, the *Antiquities* (20.262-63), where he summarizes his qualifications for his work, Josephus states that no one else, whether Jew or Gentile, could have been equal to the task of issuing so accurate a treatise for the Greek world. This must refer especially to qualifications for his paraphrase and commentary on the Bible in the first half of the *Antiquities*, since for the post-biblical period a knowledge of Jewish learning would not have given him such an advantage over non-Jewish historians. He then proceeds to give the reason for this boast, namely that his compatriots admit that in indigenous, that is Jewish, learning (*paideia*, "culture"), he far excels all others.

That Josephus must have been acquainted with the written tradition of the Torah is clear from his paraphrase of the Bible in the first half of the *Antiquities*. There is good reason to believe that he had access to three textual traditions, one in Hebrew, two in Greek (the Septuagint and a proto-Lucianic text), and one in Aramaic;²¹ and his use of one or more of these texts appears to have varied from book to book in his paraphrase of the Bible. The fact that he summarizes the *Letter of Aristeas* at such length would seem to indicate that he took seriously that document's claim that the translation of the Septuagint was done so well that it should remain as it was and not be altered (*Ant.* 12.108); and, repeating this thought, he concludes with the statement that the leaders of the Alexandrian community decided that what had been judged to have been done well should remain forever (*Ant.* 12.109).

Josephus also keeps reiterating his strict belief in the literal truth of the Bible. Thus, in his apologetic treatise *Against Apion* (1.42) he states that although many years have elapsed since the Torah was given, no one has ventured to add, remove, or alter even a single syllable, and that every Jew, and this clearly includes Josephus himself

(*Ag. Ap.* 1.42), from the day of his birth, instinctively regards the Scriptures as the decrees of God, abides by them, and is even ready, and cheerfully, to die for them. He himself promises his readers (*Ant.* 1.17) that he will set forth in his *Antiquities* the precise details of the Scriptures and that he will neither add nor omit anything.²² Josephus himself (*Ag. Ap.* 1.51) proudly insists that he is well versed in the philosophy, presumably referring to exegesis, of the biblical writings. According to Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.178), if any Jew—and Josephus obviously intended the reader to understand that it included himself—were asked about the laws, he would repeat them all more readily than his own name. Indeed, he declares (*Ag. Ap.* 2.204), the Law itself requires that children be taught to read and to learn both the laws and the deeds of their forefathers so that they may imitate their ancestors. Every week, he says (*Ag. Ap.* 2.175), Jews—and again Josephus must have expected his readers to include himself—assemble to listen to a portion of the Law. Moreover, Josephus received from Titus (*Life* 418) a gift of sacred books, presumably Sacred Scripture; and he may have had this with him in Rome when he wrote his *Antiquities*. Hence, Josephus would have had an advantage over those authors of New Testament books who sometimes cite the Bible but with no manuscript at hand.²³

Josephus certainly wants his readers to believe that he observed all the laws of the Torah, since he praises Moses, the transmitter of those laws, so highly (*Ag. Ap.* 2.157-59) for providing the Israelites with an abundance of good laws, which he says (*Ag. Ap.* 2.175) are the most excellent and necessary form of instruction. Moses, he says (*Ag. Ap.* 2.166), convinced the Israelites—and the clear implication is that this includes the author, Josephus himself—that no single action and no single thought could be hidden from God. Consequently, no one could bring charges of impiety against him. The proof of the excellence of the laws may be seen in the fact that for the Jew, and this clearly includes Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.183), the only true wisdom consists of refraining from every action or thought that is contrary to the laws of the Torah as originally revealed. Even if pressured by a cruel despot (*Ag. Ap.* 2.277), there is no Jew who is so much in awe of such a person that he has more fear of him than he has of the Torah. Indeed, obedience to the laws of the Torah is the highest justice (*Ag. Ap.* 2.293).

Moreover, Josephus would have us believe that he was careful in observing the minutiae of the Law. This is implicit in his statement (*Ag. Ap.* 2.82) that “throughout our history we have kept the same laws, to which we are eternally faithful.” Since he is here writing an apologetic treatise answering the charges of the leading anti-Semites

among Greek intellectuals, he could hardly afford to make such a statement if he did not include himself among those who kept those laws. He stresses his piety in his indignant defense (*Life* 135) against the charge made by a certain Jesus, the son of Sapphias, who was the chief magistrate of Tiberias, that he had violated the laws of the Torah. That Josephus wished to have his readers believe that he was pious, presumably in his observance of the Halakhah, is clear from his response that he felt bound to acquiesce to the proposal of a certain Ananias (*Life* 290-91) that a public fast should be announced, lest it be thought that he had been contemptuous of such a pious suggestion.

Indeed, the very fact that Josephus on two separate occasions (*Ant.* 3.224-86, 4.190-301; *Ag. Ap.* 2.190-217) presents a summary of the laws of the Torah, which is, one might suppose, really only tangential to the history of the Jews that he was interested in presenting, is an indication of how seriously he personally took them. Significantly, other historians of the time, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy, in their histories of Rome, did not include surveys of the laws of the Romans, and this despite the acknowledged importance of law for the Romans from as early a time as the codification of the Twelve Tables in 451-449 B.C.E. It is likewise significant that Josephus introduced such a survey despite his stated intention (*Ant.* 3.223) to write another separate treatise about the laws. To be sure, Josephus (*Ant.* 4.198) draws a distinction between the laws pertaining to the Jewish polity, which he says he will include in his survey, and those pertaining to the mutual (private) relations of man and man, which he says he will reserve for a separate work. And yet, the fact is that he introduces laws of the latter sort in his survey as well. We may suggest that he introduces this survey for two major reasons. In the first place, since the *Antiquities* is an apologetic work, he sought to elevate the reputation of Moses as the greatest Jewish hero, fully comparable to the heroes of the Greeks and Romans, since in antiquity it was thought that a great nation had to have a great founder. Hence, just as the Greeks had their great lawgivers such as the Spartan Lycurgus and the Athenian Solon, and the Romans had their great lawgiver, Numa Pompilius, and just as the Romans had their great founder, Aeneas, and just as the philosophical schools had their great heroes, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Epicurus, and Diogenes the Cynic, Josephus extols the towering figure of Moses. Secondly, since the beliefs and practices had been subjected to attacks and even ridiculed by such prominent intellectuals as Apollonius Molon and Apion (*Ag. Ap.*, Book 2, *passim*), Josephus regarded it as important to show that the code of Jewish law represents the highest standards of ethics.

3. JOSEPHUS' KNOWLEDGE OF HALAKHAH

That Josephus was well acquainted with the Oral Torah as well would seem to be implied by the fact that after attaching himself successively to the major sects of the Jews—Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes—he began to participate in public affairs, following the school of the Pharisees (*Life* 12).²⁴ Josephus was well aware of the central importance to the Pharisees of the unwritten law and of the crucial difference in this matter between the views of the Pharisees and those of the Sadducees. This seems clear from his statement (*Ant.* 13.207), in explaining the shift of John Hyrcanus from adherence to the Pharisees to adherence to the Sadducees, that "For the present, I wish merely to explain that the Pharisees had passed on to the people certain regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the laws of Moses, for which reason they are rejected by the Sadducean group, who hold that only those regulations should be considered valid which were written down [in Scripture], and that those which had been handed down by former generations need not be observed." Josephus then adds that concerning these matters the two parties came to have controversies and serious differences (*Ant.* 13.298). The fact that Josephus states that he wishes at this point merely to explain the substance of the controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees clearly implies that he was acquainted with much more than the simple statement that the two schools disagreed on this point.²⁵ Since Josephus says (*Life* 191) that the Pharisees have the reputation of being unrivalled experts in the ancestral laws (*ta patria nomima*), associated as he was with the Pharisees, he would have us believe that he too shared in this expertise.

Indeed, there is much evidence that Josephus was aware of an Oral Torah. It is true that there are a number of cases (certainly no more than ten per cent of the whole but of which we shall give some examples) where Josephus' interpretation of biblical law does not agree with the interpretation of the Oral Law that we find codified in the Talmud; and this gives rise to the question as to whether Josephus may not represent an earlier or alternative version of the Oral Law. For example: (1) He identifies "the fruit of goodly trees" (Leviticus 23:40) as the persea (*Ant.* 3.245), a fleshy one-seeded fruit of the laurel family, the most common member of which is the avocado, though elsewhere (*Ant.* 13.372) he refers to it as a citron, whereas the rabbis (*Sukkah* 35a) clearly identify it as a citron; (2) He declares that debtors are absolved from debts in the Jubilee year (*Ant.* 3.282), whereas the biblical text speaks of the remission of debts in the seventh or sabbatical year (Deuteronomy 15:1-11); (3)

He (*Ant.* 4.175) understands the Bible (Numbers 36:3) literally when it declares that if a daughter marries into another tribe the inheritance remains in her father's tribe, whereas the rabbis (*Baba Batra* 112b, *Sifre Numbers* 134, p. 178 ff.) declare that the inheritance is transferred; (4) He says (*Ant.* 4.207), following the Septuagint's understanding of Exodus 22:27,²⁶ that it is forbidden to blaspheme the gods which other people revere, whereas Deuteronomy 7:25 mandates the destruction by fire of the graven images of the heathen; (5) He (*Ant.* 4.209) says that the high priest is to read the laws every seven years, whereas Scripture (Deuteronomy 31:10-13) does not specify who is to read them, and the Mishnah (*Sotah* 7:9) states that it is the king who is read the passage; (6) He speaks (*Ant.* 4.240) of a third tithe (Deuteronomy 14:28-29) for the poor, whereas the rabbis understand this as taking the place of the second tithe in the third and sixth years of the Sabbatical period (*Rosh Hashanah* 12b); (7) He states (*Ant.* 4.248) that if a man betroths a bride in the belief that she is a virgin and it turns out that she is not, she is to be stoned if not of priestly parentage but burnt alive if she is of priestly stock, whereas the Bible (Deuteronomy 22:21) indicates a penalty of stoning in all such cases; (8) According to him (*Ant.* 4.254), the child born of a levirate marriage (Deuteronomy 25:5-10) is the heir to the estate, but the rabbis (Mishnah *Yevamot* 4:7) declare that the levir himself is the heir; (9) He (*Ant.* 4.263) says that the law of the rebellious child applies to sons and daughters and does not mention the necessity of bringing the child to be judged by a court, as prescribed by Scripture (Deuteronomy 21:19), whereas the Bible itself (Deuteronomy 21:18) and the rabbis (Mishnah *Sanhedrin* 8:1) restrict the law to sons alone; (10) He likewise requires (*Ant.* 4.264) the condemned child to be exposed for a day after he has been stoned to death, whereas there is no such statement in the Bible (Deuteronomy 21:21); (11) He (*Ant.* 4.273) declares that a slave woman and her children go free with her in the jubilee year, but the rabbis affirm that the children of a Canaanite slave woman are like herself in all respects (*Kiddushin* 68b-69a), and they are to be regarded as property (*Megillah* 23b); (12) He (*Ant.* 4.278) says that if a man kicks a woman and causes her to have a miscarriage, he is to be fined by the judge, and a further sum is to be given to her husband, whereas Scripture (Exodus 21:22) speaks of one fine only to be determined by the judge; (13) He (*Ag. Ap.* 2.199) says that the sole purpose of sexual relations in marriage is to have children, whereas the rabbis permit such relations during pregnancy, for example (*Yevamot* 12b), and they permit (Mishnah *Yevamot* 6:6) a man to marry a woman incapable of bearing children if he has already fulfilled the commandment "Be fruitful and multi-

ply"; (14) He (*Ag. Ap.* 2.202) declares, without qualification, that a woman is forbidden to have an abortion, whereas the rabbis (Mishnah *Oholot* 7:6) state that an abortion is permissible if the fetus is endangering the life of the mother; (15) He (*Ag. Ap.* 2.207) indicates that for a judge to accept bribes is a capital crime, but there is no such law in the Talmud; (16) He (*Ag. Ap.* 2.215) declares that violating an unmarried woman is a capital crime, without indicating (Deuteronomy 22:23-24) the crucial proviso that this applies only to a betrothed woman; (17) He (*Ag. Ap.* 2.271) maintains that maltreatment (presumably castration) of a brute beast is a capital crime, but there is no such penalty specified in the Bible (Leviticus 22:24) or in the Talmud (*Hugigab* 14b); (18) He (*Life* 65) says that representation of animals is forbidden by Jewish law, and he declares (*Ant.* 8.195) that Solomon violated the Law in making images of bulls under the sea which he had set up as an offering and of lions around his own throne, but the Talmud (*Avodah Zarah* 43b) declares that only a human shape is halakhically forbidden.

On the other hand, there are numerous cases where Josephus seems to be aware of the oral tradition as we know it from the Talmudic corpus. For example: (1) He notes (*Ant.* 3.226) that a lamb that is offered for a sacrifice is to be one year old, as specified also in the Mishnah (*Parah* 5:3); (2) He declares (*Ant.* 3.261) that a menstruating woman is removed from pure things and separated from the public on account of uncleanness, just as the rabbinic tradition states (*Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* 16, pp. 75-76); (3) He (*Ant.* 4.202), like the Mishnah, (*Sanhedrin* 6:4), indicates that blasphemers are stoned and hanged, whereas the Torah (Leviticus 24:14-16) specifies only stoning; (4) He, like the Rabbis (*Berakhot* 27b), speaks (*Ant.* 4.212) of two statutory prayers daily; (5) He mentions (*Ant.* 4.214), as does the Talmud (*Megillah* 26a) that civic bodies are to have seven members; (6) He states (*Ant.* 4.219), as do the Rabbis (*Sifrei* 190, p. 230) that the evidence of women is not acceptable; (7) He declares (*Ant.* 4.224), as does the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 2a, 20b), that a king is to consult the Sanhedrin of seventy-one before engaging in a voluntary war; (8) He reduces (*Ant.* 4.238), as do the Rabbis (*Makkot* 22a), the number of lashes inflicted in the penalty of scourging from forty to thirty-nine; (9) He (*Ant.* 4.253), like the school of Hillel which prevails in rabbinic law (*Gittin* 90a), permits divorce for any reason whatsoever; (10) The penalty of paying double in the case of theft, according to him (*Ant.* 4.271), applies not only if one steals animals, as in the Bible (Exodus 22:3), but also if one steals money, a provision paralleled in the Talmud (*Baba Kamma* 64b); (11) He (*Ant.* 4.274), like the rabbinic tradition (*Tosefta Baba Mezi'a* 2:19), dis-

curring the law of the restitution of lost property, differentiates on the basis of where the object was found, whereas the Bible (Deuteronomy 22:1-3) makes no such distinction; and likewise he mentions (*Ant.* 4.274) public proclamation of the place where it was found, as does the oral tradition (Mishnah *Baba Mezi'a* 2:1), though it is only in the fourth century that we hear of a rabbi (Rava, in *Baba Mezi'a* 22b) who holds this view; (12) He (*Ant.* 4.276) agrees with the oral tradition (Tosefta *Baba Mezi'a* 2:29) in placing the law of pointing out the road to one who has lost his way immediately after the law of lost objects; (13) He (*Ant.* 4.277), like the rabbinic Tosefta (*Baba Kamma* 9:5-6), declares that one is not punished if the person whom he has struck remains alive several days before dying; (14) In his interpretation of the *lex talionis* (Exodus 21:24), he (*Ant.* 4.280) gives the victim the choice of accepting a monetary settlement, similar to the Rabbis (*Baba Kamma* 83b), who, to be sure, prescribe a monetary penalty and declare that the amount is to be fixed by a court; (15) He (*Ag. Ap.* 1.31), in declaring that a priest must marry a woman of Jewish birth who is not a proselyte, is in accord with the Mishnah (*Yevamot* 6:5) which equates a proselyte and a prostitute, whereas the Torah itself (Leviticus 21:7) says merely that a priest may not marry a prostitute; (16) like the Talmud (*Mo'ed Katan* 27b, *Ketubot* 8b), he (*Ag. Ap.* 2.205) indicates opposition to costly shrouds; (17) In saying that Jews do not erect conspicuous monuments to the dead, he (*Ag. Ap.* 2.205) is in agreement with the Jerusalem Talmud (*Shekalim* 2.7, 47a); (18) If the reading of Eusebius (*Praeparatio Evangelica* 8.8, 36) is correct, he (*Ag. Ap.* 2.205) agrees with the rabbinic tradition (*Ketubot* 17a, *Megillah* 29a) in declaring that all who pass by a funeral procession must join it.

We may well ask whether Josephus could have had a written source for his version of Oral Law when the rabbinic version was not written down until the end of the second century by Rabbi Judah the Prince. In reply, we may suggest that the very fact that Philo (*De Specialibus Legibus*), as well as the Dead Sea *Damascus Document*, the *Temple Scroll*, and *Miksat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, do record the laws, including much oral law, in a systematic way should lead us to think that perhaps there was such a written compendium available to Josephus. If Josephus did have a written source, the most likely hypothesis would appear to be that he had a rabbinic document or a written Targum.²⁷ Moreover, we do have evidence that the oral law was put into writing in the Tannaitic period, roughly contemporary with Josephus, since a manuscript of the Talmud (*Avodah Zarah* 8b, MS. Marx-Abramson) declares that Rabbi Yehudah ben Bava, a younger contemporary of Josephus, recorded laws of fines.²⁸

We know that memories in those days were highly cultivated, and, if we are to believe Josephus (*Life* 8), he had, already at an early age, as we have noted, gained a reputation for excellent memory. Still, we may ask whether, if the code was not in written form, Josephus could have remembered it several decades after he had learned it. We must recall that, writing in Rome, Josephus was far removed from the rabbis of the land of Israel whom he might have consulted in matters of doubt. Indeed, there are those who say that Josephus' deviations from rabbinic law are due precisely to the fact that he had forgotten what he had learned long before in Jerusalem.²⁹

If, indeed, Josephus was so well versed in Jewish law, both written and oral, if he was an adherent of the Pharisees, and if he was as pious as he claims, how can we explain his deviations from the oral law? We may suggest that one major reason is that his work is apologetic in nature. Thus, Josephus extends (*Ant.* 4.276) the injunction against putting a stumbling block in front of the blind (Leviticus 19:14, Deuteronomy 27:18) into a law that one must point out the road to those who are ignorant of it. This would seem to be a direct refutation of the charge of such a bitter satirist as his contemporary, Juvenal, who declares (*Satires* 14.103) that Jews do not point out the road except to those who practice the same rites. Josephus likewise declares (*Ant.* 4.283) that those who dig wells are required to keep them covered not in order to keep others from drawing water from them but rather to protect passers-by from falling into them. Here, too, he seems to be answering Juvenal's charge (*Satires* 14.104) that Jews conduct "none but the circumcised to the desired fountain."

Sometimes Josephus seems to have reformulated the law in order to avoid embarrassment in comparison with non Jewish law. Thus, in equating abortion with infanticide (*Ag. Ap.* 2.202), Josephus did not want to have it appear that Jewish law was more lenient than the Noahide law that is applicable to non-Jews, inasmuch as, according to the Talmud (*Sanbedrin* 57b), Noahide law, on the basis of an interpretation of Genesis 9:6, forbids killing a fetus in the womb of its mother.³⁰ Moreover, Josephus apparently felt uneasy that Jewish law on this topic was more lenient than that of Plato (*ap.* Plutarch, *De Placitis Philosophorum* 5.15), who declares that a fetus is a living being.

Again, according to the earlier Roman law (*Lex Cornelia testamentaria*) of 81 B.C.E. the penalty inflicted upon a judge for accepting a bribe was exile, the death penalty not being imposed until 392 C.E.³¹ Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.207), eager that it should not appear that Jewish law was less stringent than that of the Gentiles in such a sensitive area, declares that a judge who accepts bribes suffers capital punish-

ment. Here again, Noahide law did require a death penalty, and Josephus did not want to have it appear that he was less severe.

Moreover, Josephus' omission of the prohibition of converting to Judaism the Ammonites and Moabites until the tenth generation (Deuteronomy 23:4) and the Edomites and the Egyptians until the third generation (Deuteronomy 23:9) seems to be motivated by his eagerness to answer the charge that the Jews are exclusivistic and haters of mankind.³² This apology was particularly important because Jewish success in winning converts during this period³³ depended upon making it clear to everyone that Jews welcomed all those who come to them in true sincerity. Josephus himself (*Ag. Ap.* 2.210) insists that Judaism gives a gracious welcome "to all who desire to come and live under the same laws with us, . . . holding that it is not family ties alone which constitute relationship, but agreement in the principles of conduct." Indeed, Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.282) proudly declares that "the masses have long since shown much zeal to adopt our religious observances, and there is not one city, Greek or barbarian, . . . to which our customs have not spread."

However, Josephus' goal in his formulation of Jewish law was not solely apologetic. Thus, his omission of child sacrifice to Molech (Leviticus 18:21) was far from being due to apologetic purposes, since if Josephus was interested in showing the humanity of Judaism, a prohibition against child sacrifice was certainly one law not to omit, especially since Jews had been accused of a blood libel (see *Ag. Ap.* 2.89-111). Again, if it were for apologetic reasons that Josephus omitted the prohibition of setting up an ashera tree or a pillar (Deuteronomy 16:21-22), Josephus should also have omitted the prohibition against graven images, which he does mention (*Ant.* 3.91, *Ag. Ap.* 2.191) and even emphasizes. Likewise, if it were for apologetic reasons that Josephus omits the reference to sacrifices to foreign gods (Exodus 22:19), he should not have expanded (*Ant.* 4.126-49) the incident of the fornication with the Midianite women. Similarly, the omission of the prohibition (Deuteronomy 18:10-11) against consulting a soothsayer, a sorcerer, or a necromancer is inconsistent with Josephus' anecdote (*Ag. Ap.* 1.200-4) about the Jewish soldier Mosollamus who shot and killed a bird that a seer was observing and who sneeringly asked how any sound information could come from a creature that could not provide for its own safety. Again, the mention of the prohibition of the use of non-Jewish oil (*Life* 74) would seem to play into the hands of those who charged that Jews were haters of mankind. Likewise, Josephus (*Ant.* 4.266) did not omit what would seem to be the embarrassing law (Deuteronomy 23:21) that one may charge interest from a non-Jew but not from a Jew, to which

Josephus adds as a reason, "for it is not just to draw a revenue from the misfortunes of a fellow-countryman."

To these objections we may remark that while it is true that Josephus is addressing his work primarily to non-Jews, as we can see from the proem to the *Antiquities*, Greek was the primary language of large numbers of Jews in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and Rome, and Josephus gives a number of indications that he is directing his work to them as well. Thus, his highlighting of certain episodes, notably the incident of Israel's sin with the Midianite women (Numbers 25:1-9; *Ant.* 4.131-55; Josephus expands it from nine verses to twenty five paragraphs) and Samson's relations with alien women (Judges 14:1-16:31; *Ant.* 5.286-317), is directed, apparently, to those Jews who sought assimilation with Gentiles. Josephus (*Ant.* 4.150-51) vehemently condemns Zambrias (Zimri) and bestows exalted praise upon Phinehas, "a man superior in every way to the rest of the youth" (*Ant.* 4.152), who, after all, might well have been condemned for taking the law into his own hands in putting Zambrias to death without a trial. He likewise condemns Samson (*Ant.* 5.306) for transgressing the laws of his forefathers and violating (the Greek word *parakharassen* is used with reference to debasing of coinage) the Torah by imitating foreign ways, an act which, he says, proved the beginning of his disaster. Moreover, we may note, Josephus makes a point of stressing that the fortunes of Anilaeus and Asinaeus, the first-century C.E. robber-barons who established an independent Jewish state in Mesopotamia, began to deteriorate at the very peak of their success because Anilaeus, who engaged in an affair with a Parthian general's wife, plunged into lawlessness (*Ant.* 18.341) "in violation of the Jewish code at the bidding of lust and self-indulgence." Furthermore, lest he be regarded as having sold out to the Romans, Josephus does not omit but rather adopts cryptic language in referring to Balaam's prophecy of the overthrow of the most famous cities (presumably including Rome) (*Ant.* 4.125), just as he does not omit but deliberately avoids explaining the meaning of the stone which, in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, destroyed the kingdom of iron (*Ant.* 10.210), which the rabbinic tradition understood to refer to the triumph of the Messiah (*Tanhuma* B 2.91-92 and *Tanhuma Terumah* 7).

If Josephus does differ in some points from the rabbinic code, it would seem unlikely that a person who was under constant attack from his fellow Jews would have dared to present such deviations unless he had some ground for his interpretations. One theory would explain his deviations by stating either that he is merely paraphrasing biblical law; in that case the statement (*Ant.* 4.175) that the heritage of Zelophehad's daughters should remain in the tribe is merely a

restatement of the Bible (Numbers 36:8), whereas the Rabbis (*Sifra Emor*, p. 96a on Leviticus 22:3) assert that the law was in force only when the land was divided according to tribes. A second theory states that he reflects the law in force in his own day (in which case Josephus, like Philo presumably, would be very important as a stage in the history of Halakhah prior to its codification in the Mishnah). A third theory would postulate that he reflects sectarian law; a fourth that he is influenced by Philo or by Roman law; a fifth that he is more strict than the rabbinic law (for example, in equating abortion with infanticide [*Ag. Ap.* 2.202], since, apparently, he did not want it to appear that Jewish law was more lenient than the Noahide law that is applicable to non-Jews, inasmuch as, according to the Talmud [*Sanhedrin* 57b], Noahide law forbids killing a fetus in the womb of its mother on the basis of an interpretation of Genesis 9:6, or more lenient than the view of Plato [cited by Plutarch, *De Placitis Philosophorum* 5.15], who declares that a fetus is a living being) or that he is presenting merely good advice rather than legal prescriptions; a sixth that he reflects the law that he believes will take force in the Messianic future.

In explaining these discrepancies, we may cite a parallel in the differences between Josephus' description (*Ant.* 15.410-11) of the Temple as against that of the Mishnah in the tractate *Middot*,⁵⁴ which may be explained by the hypothesis that the Mishnah represents the period before Herod, whereas Josephus depicts the period after him, or that the Mishnah may be setting forth the ideal, if ever the Temple is to be rebuilt in the future, for surely Josephus, who was himself a member of the most eminent of all the priestly families, should have had intimate acquaintance with the Temple's dimensions and description.

As to Josephus' indication (*Ant.* 4.264-65) that the rebellious son is to be exposed for a day after he has been stoned to death and then is to be buried at night, this law is, indeed, unparalleled in Halakhah and may reflect a practice in Josephus' own day.⁵⁵ Again, the fact that there is no Tannaïic parallel to Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 4.274) that the finder of a lost object is to proclaim the place where he found it would suggest that Josephus is reflecting contemporary practice.

Kohler has suggested that Josephus' source for his paraphrase of the laws was an older priestly document similar to the Zadokite (Damascus) Document originally discovered by Solomon Schechter (and later found also in the Qumran caves) and that Josephus' legal material actually represents an older stage of Halakhah, midway between Sadduceeism and Pharisaism.⁵⁶ As evidence, he cites Josephus' formulation (*Ant.* 4.248) of the law that a bride of priestly parentage is burnt alive if it turns out that she is not a virgin when

her husband is led to believe that she was. Elazar ben Zadok mentions that he witnessed the burning of a woman, and the Rabbis (*Sanbedrin* 52b) explain that it must have been a Sadducean *bet din* that imposed such a punishment. Josephus, however, has very negative comments about the Sadducees, namely, that in their relations with their peers they are as rude as with aliens (*War* 2.166), that they accomplish practically nothing (*Ant.* 18.17), and that they are tolerated by the masses only because they submit to the formulas of the Pharisees (*ibid.*). It seems hard to believe, in view of the bitter antagonism between the Sadducees and the Pharisees, with whom, we recall, Josephus identified himself (*Life* 12), that Josephus would be influenced in his interpretation of law by such a group.

Yadin has noted that there are parallels between Josephus' classification of the laws and that of the author of the Temple Scroll from Qumran and has suggested that Josephus may have been influenced by the years (*Life* 9-12) that he spent with the Essenes and with the hermit Bannus.³⁷ Moreover, there are even parallels in points of detail: e.g., both the Temple Scroll (63.5) and Josephus (*Ant.* 4.222) state that the public officers of the nearest town are to wash their hands in holy water over the head of a heifer in expiation for an undetected murderer, whereas the Bible (Deuteronomy 21:6) states that they are to wash their hands over the heifer, without specifying the head. Ginzberg has concluded from the fact that whereas according to both the Hebrew Bible (1 Kings 21:13) and the Septuagint (1 Kings 20:13) there were two false witnesses against Naboth, while Josephus (*Ant.* 8.358) speaks of three, that Josephus is following an earlier Halakah, which required three witnesses (that is, one accuser and two witnesses) in cases of capital punishment, and notes that the Damascus Document (9:17, 22) similarly requires three witnesses in capital cases.³⁸ Alshuler, however, has shown that the parallels in classification, purpose, program, and structure with the Temple Scroll are few and superficial, and that the differences are major.³⁹ As to the procedure in the case of the undetected murderer, Josephus may simply be following the Septuagint, which reads "over the head," or he may be reflecting the actual practice, since the Bible does not specify over which part of the heifer the elders are to wash their hands. Finally, with regard to the number of witnesses, the Bible itself (Deuteronomy 19:15) declares that a matter shall be established through two or three witnesses; and Josephus may reflect a divergent understanding of the peculiar prescription, namely, that in civil cases the number of witnesses required is two, whereas for capital cases three witnesses are needed. Or, alternatively, Josephus may simply be describing the fact that three men rose in witness against Naboth,

without any indication that evidence from three witnesses is required in such a case.

Inasmuch as Josephus mentions Philo by name and identifies him as a philosopher and as the head of the delegation of Jews from Alexandria to the Emperor Gaius Caligula in the year 40 C.E. (*Ant.* 18.259-60), and inasmuch as there are a number of parallels between Josephus and Philo,⁴⁰ and especially in their explanation of the symbolism of the tabernacle and the clothing of the high priest (*Ant.* 3.179-87; cf. Philo, *De Vita Mosi* 2.18.88, 2.21.101-2.24.126; *De Specialibus Legibus* 1.35.172; *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* 9.45-46; *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum* 2.73, 75, 85, 112-14, 117-20),⁴¹ we may be tempted to believe that Josephus drew upon the work of Philo, especially since Philo wrote a lengthy and systematic account of Jewish law (*De Specialibus Legibus*) in four books.⁴² In particular, there are four instances where Josephus' interpretation of the law agrees with Philo's *Hypothetica*: the public reading of the Torah on the Sabbath (*Ag. Ap.* 2.175), the death penalty for abortion (*Ag. Ap.* 2.202), the prohibition of concealing anything from friends (*Ag. Ap.* 2.207), and the prohibition to kill animals that have taken refuge in one's home (*Ag. Ap.* 2.213). While it is true that these are also paralleled in rabbinic sources, the rabbinic parallels are not quite as precise as those in Philo. In particular, we may note the striking parallel in language between Philo (*Hypothetica* 7.9) and Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.213) in connection with the animal that has taken refuge in one's house as a suppliant. To this we may add that Josephus' statement (*Ag. Ap.* 2.199) that sexual intercourse is permitted only if intended for procreation may have been influenced by the practice of the Essenes (*War* 2.161) or by Philo's remark (*De Vita Mosi* 1.6.28) that Moses had sexual relations solely in order to beget children. Moreover, while it is true that the Septuagint also interprets Exodus 22:27 (28) as forbidding the blasphemy of other people's gods, Josephus' reason (*Ag. Ap.* 2.237) agrees with that of Philo (*De Vita Mosi* 2.38.205), namely, that it is forbidden out of respect for the very name "God." Furthermore, Josephus' presentation (*Ant.* 4.285-86) of the law of deposits has some similarities in language to that of Philo (*De Specialibus Legibus* 4.7.30-31), so that a hypothesis of borrowing or of a common source seems plausible.

And yet, although there are some striking points of agreement, the details in which they disagree are also so numerous that we must postulate an additional or a common source. As to the symbolism, the fact that similar interpretations are to be found in rabbinic midrashim indicates that they are not privately known but widely current. Moreover, the conception, shared by Philo and Josephus,

that the whole cosmos is the robe of God (Philo, *De Vita Mosi* 2.24.117; and Josephus, *Ant.* 3. 184) is at least as much Platonic or Stoic as it is distinctively Jewish.

The thesis that Josephus was influenced by Roman law has been broached by a number of scholars: Cohen, Jackson, and Weyl.⁴³ Cohen, commenting on Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 4.272) that if a thief is unable to defray the penalty imposed upon him, he is to become a slave of the aggrieved party, notes that there is no parallel in either the Bible or the Talmud but that there is in Roman law. Jackson has suggested that Josephus' aim in accommodating Jewish to Roman law may have been to smooth his way with his Roman audience. We may reply, however, that Josephus nowhere indicates that he had studied or admired Roman law (and modesty is not one of his virtues, and he did seek to ingratiate himself with the Roman imperial family at least); and, on the contrary, he insists on the unique excellence of Jewish law (*Ant.* 1.22-23; *Ag. Ap.* 2.163).

Josephus is at times more strict than the Rabbis in his interpretation of the law, as notably in the case of artistic representation, where, for example (*Life* 65), he indicates to the Jews of Galilee that he will lead them to destroy Herod the Tetrarch's palace because it had been decorated with images of animals, and where he condemns (*Ant.* 8.195) King Solomon for breaking the Second Commandment by putting the images of bulls and lions in the Temple, whereas the Bible (1 Kings 7:25, 10:20) has no such rebuke. The Rabbis (*Avodah Zarah* 43b), in contrast, declare that all faces are permissible except that of a human. Avi-Yonah attempts to explain the discrepancy by suggesting that Josephus is reflecting the view of the Pharisees and of the masses, whereas the art that has come down to us is that of Sadducean aristocrats;⁴⁴ but this is an unlikely hypothesis since the Sadducees were so few in number (*Ant.* 18.17), were literalists in their interpretation of the Bible, and apparently disappeared with the destruction of the Second Temple, whereas the "liberal" approach to images in art continues and, in fact, becomes more manifest with the passage of time. A more likely explanation for the Rabbis' liberalism is that the masses of the people were liberal in matters of artistic representation despite all rulings, and that the Rabbis had less fear of syncretism and assimilation since there is a tradition (*Yoma* 69b, *Sanhedrin* 64a), cited in the name of Rabbi Judah (second century) or Rabbi Jonathan (beginning of the third century), that all idolatrous impulses had been eradicated from among the people of Israel as early as the beginning of the Second Temple period under Ezra in the fifth century B.C.E., and since we have a corroborative statement in Judith (8:18), dating probably from the Maccabean period in the

second century B.C.E., that idol-worship had disappeared "in our generation." Indeed, Lieberman has observed that the one tractate of the Talmud which deals with idol worship, *Avodah Zurab*, actually features very little ridiculing of idols and that in this respect the Rabbis differ drastically from the church fathers, such as Clement of Alexandria, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Tertullian, Arnobius, and Lactantius, who engage in violent denunciations of graven images.⁴⁵ Apparently, the Rabbis were realists, as they were in their attitude toward magic and charms, which are clearly forbidden in the Bible (Deuteronomy 18:10-11) and which yet are tolerated (e.g., *Sanhedrin* 68a and *Shabbat* 62a). Josephus, on the other hand, had no "constituency" and could afford to maintain an unyielding posture. Moreover, precisely because he was accused of being lax in religious observance, he went out of his way to appear more strict in matters of Jewish law.

4. JOSEPHUS' KNOWLEDGE OF AGGADAH

When Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.54) remarks that he is well versed in the philosophy (*philosophia*) of the sacred writings, he implies that he has knowledge above and beyond the biblical text itself. Since, as Bacher has argued,⁴⁶ during the Tannaitic period there was no clear distinction between Halakhah and Aggadah so far as their relationship to tradition is concerned, we should expect that Josephus, when he claims (*Ant.* 20.263) that he far excelled his compatriots in Jewish learning, wished to have his readers believe that he excelled both in Halakhah and Aggadah. Already the Septuagint, the story of the translation of which Josephus recounts at length (*Ant.* 12.11-118) and the content of which he shows intimate knowledge, contains numerous instances indicating a knowledge of midrashic-like tradition.⁴⁷ For example, the plague of *arob* is understood by the second-century Rabbi Nehemiah to consist of stinging insects (*Exodus Rabbah* 11.3), whereas the Hebrew is generally understood to refer to varied wild beasts, this is also the explanation of the Septuagint (*Exodus* 8:17). That Rabbi Nehemiah derived this from a common tradition rather than from the Septuagint seems more likely in view of the fact that where the rabbis refer to changes made by the translators they always cite actual emendations rather than differences in the understanding of the words of the text (*Megillah* 9a-b, *Sotah* 1.7). Again, inasmuch as the second-century Rabbi Meir states, as does the Septuagint (*Esther* 2:7), that Mordecai had married Esther (*Megillah* 13a), it is more likely that the translators of the Septuagint were

acquainted with this ancient tradition than that Rabbi Meir consulted the Septuagint, since the only references to the Septuagintal traditions in the rabbinic corpus are to the changes made by the translators in individual words in the Pentateuch rather than to passages in the Prophets and the Writings.

What is most directly relevant to our discussion of the relationship of Josephus to aggadic tradition as recorded much later in rabbinic midrashim is the occurrence of such traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls, which are contemporary with him. In a commentary on Genesis 9:25, "Cursed be Canaan, a lowly slave shall he be to his brethren," a fragmentary scroll adds: "He did not curse Ham, but rather his son, for God had blessed the sons of Noah" (4Q252).⁴⁶ The parallel in *Midrash Genesis Rabbah* 36.7 is remarkably similar: "And he said, 'Cursed be Canaan, etc.' Ham sins and Canaan is cursed? A dispute between Rabbi Judah and Rabbi Nehemiah. Rabbi Judah says, 'Because it is written, "And God blessed Noah and his sons," and there is no curse in the place of blessing, therefore, "And he said, cursed be Canaan, etc."'"

Dimant has noted a remarkable affinity of traditions concerning Jeremiah in the Qumran fragment (4Q385^b), dating from about 50-25 B.C.E. and 2 Maccabees 2:1-6, *Paraleipomena Ieremion*, 2 *Apocalypse of Baruch*, and the rabbinic *Pesikta Rabhata* 26 (in particular, that Jeremiah accompanied the deportees only to the river Euphrates). She explains this affinity as due to a common tradition. She remarks that, surprisingly enough, the existence of a lost apocryphon on Jeremiah in Hebrew was postulated long ago by several scholars⁴⁹ working the apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, and midrashic compositions.⁵⁰ Dimant and Strugnell have also noted the affinities of theme and terminology shared by the Dead Sea fragments of Second Ezekiel and the later rabbinic *Hekhaloth* literature, and conclude that they point to an underlying common exegetical tradition.⁵¹

Likewise, Philo also seems to have drawn upon oral tradition, inasmuch as he says explicitly that for his account of Moses he has drawn upon both "the sacred books," that is, the written Bible, and "the elders of the nation" (*De Vita Mosis* 1.1.4), a phrase clearly parallel to Josephus' *ek pateron diadoxhes* (*Ant.* 13.297). The reference is to the supplementary tradition, whether written or, more probably, oral, since he goes on to say that he has interwoven what he was told (that is, the oral tradition) with what he has read (that is, the written tradition).

That Josephus' apparent contemporary,⁵² Pseudo-Philo, in his *Biblical Antiquities* drew upon ancient traditions similar to those upon which Targumim drew is clear from his translation (3.4) of the He-

brew *gopher* by *cedrinis* ("cedar"), which is found in the Palestinian Targum on Genesis 6:14 and in several midrashic sources. There are at least fourteen other such examples. Legion is the number of parallels between Pseudo-Philo and midrashim, as cited by Azariah dei Rossi, Cohn, Ginzberg, Jacobson, and myself.⁵³

Moreover, one of the paintings of the third-century C.E. Dura Europos synagogue depicts Hiel (1 Kings 16:34), a confederate of the priests of Baal, crouching beneath the altar while a snake approaches to bite him; but such a story is not mentioned in a Hebrew source until much later midrashim (*Exodus Rabbah* 15.15, *Pesikta Rabbati* 4.13a) and not fully until the thirteenth-century *Yalkut* (on 1 Kings 18:26). Hence that tradition must have been more ancient.

There has been much debate as to whether Josephus depended primarily upon written or upon oral sources for midrashic-like traditions. Schalit believes that details which involve exposition of specific verses derive from oral traditions, since this is the midrashic style as it was eventually recorded, whereas longer traditions, such as the account of Moses' campaign against the Ethiopians, are taken from written sources.⁵⁴ Since the overwhelming majority of Josephus' changes are, indeed, minor modifications of individual verses, this would indicate the paramount importance of oral sources. Rappaport, on the other hand, believes that Josephus was dependent upon written sources exclusively.⁵⁵ The fact, we may add, that there are numerous details which Josephus shares with his presumed contemporary, Pseudo-Philo,⁵⁶ would seem to indicate a common source. It is impossible to identify this or any other midrashic source, though, as we have indicated above, it is perfectly possible that Josephus did have access to written midrashic sources akin to the *Genesis Apocryphon*, despite the fact that most Scriptural exegesis, whether in synagogal Targumim or sermons or academies, in Josephus' day was still, quite obviously, oral in nature. The important point to be discerned is Josephus' choice of certain midrashic details from whatever source and his reasons for such a choice.

Josephus has a propensity for giving specific names or other such data for vague biblical references—for example, the name of the man who inspired the building of the Tower of Babel, Nimrod (*Ant.* 1.113); the name of Pharaoh's daughter who adopted Moses, Thermuthis (*Ant.* 2.224); and the name of the prophet who rebuked Ahab for releasing Ben-hadad, Michaiah (*Ant.* 8.389). We may guess that this characteristic is due to rabbinic midrashim. But the fact that details of this type are found in such pseudepigraphic works as Jubilees or in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* or in sectarian works such as the Dead Sea Scroll's *Genesis Apocryphon* or in the Samaritan

*Asatir*⁵⁷ would seem to indicate that we are dealing with a Palestinian and not merely rabbinic tradition. Moreover, despite Josephus' statement that the Jews, unlike the Greeks, do not possess myriads of inconsistent books (*Ag. Ap.* I.38), the fact is that the oral tradition does possess numerous varying interpretations of and additions to the biblical stories.

A clue to support the view that Josephus was aware of and relied upon Oral tradition (cf. *Berakbot* 10a, Jerusalem Talmud *Sanhedrin* 10.28b) in his revision of the biblical narrative may be seen in his awareness that King Hezekiah was childless at the time that his sickness befell him (*Ant.* 10.25-27).⁵⁸ Likewise, in his comments about Jehoiachin, Josephus, as we have noted, seems to change the biblical text completely, so that instead of characterizing Jehoiachin, as does the Bible, as one who had done what was evil in the sight of the Lord (2 Kings 24:9, 2 Chronicles 36:9), he is described as being kind and just (*Ant.* 10.100). Remarkably, the rabbinic tradition has only complimentary statements and not a single negative remark about him (e.g., *Midrash Leviticus Rabbah* 19.6).⁵⁹

We have a similar instance in the case of Jehoash (Joash), the king of Israel. The Bible uses the familiar formula that "he did what was evil in the sight of the Lord" (2 Kings 13:11). As if that were not enough, it adds that "he did not depart from all the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, which he made Israel to sin, but he walked in them." The fact that he seized the gold and silver and all the vessels of the Temple in Jerusalem would, we should expect, lead Josephus, who was so proud of his status as a priest, to condemn him utterly. Yet, Josephus has the very opposite view of him, remarking that he was a good man and in no way like his father Jehoahaz in character (*Ant.* 9.178). It is unlikely that Josephus, who writes so extensively about the kings of Judah and Israel, has confused Jehoash with the person of the same name who was king of Judah. Nor is there any indication that Jehoash had repented. On the other hand, there is a rabbinic tradition that Jehoash was rewarded with victory over the Arameans because he had refused to listen to the accusations brought against the prophet Amos by Amaziah (*Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* 16.88).

A similar hint that Josephus was acquainted with a tradition which we find later reduced to writing in the Talmud may be found in connection with Zedekiah. According to the Bible, Zedekiah is clearly condemned for having done what was evil in the sight of the Lord (2 Kings 24:10). On the other hand, the rabbinic tradition, while, to be sure, criticizing him for the egregious crime of swearing falsely to Nebuchadnezzar and not abiding by his oath (*Pesikta Rabbati* 26.129,

Nedarim 65a, *Tanḥuma B* Exodus 33), also cites him as an example of a leader who was virtuous whereas his generation was not (*Arakbtin* 17a). Josephus, like the rabbis, presents both sides of Zedekiah, on the one hand remarking that he was contemptuous of justice and duty (*Ant.* 10.103), and on the other hand mentioning his goodness and sense of justice (*Ant.* 10.120). Interestingly enough, a fragment found among the Dead Sea caves presents the tradition that casts Zedekiah in a favorable light with the statement that "Zedekiah shall enter in that day into the covenant to perform and to cause the performance of all the law" (4Q470).⁶⁰ The fact that traditions known to the writers of the Dead Sea manuscripts and to Josephus turn up later in rabbinic literature can most readily be explained by the hypothesis that both drew upon a common tradition: the hypothesis that the rabbis drew upon Josephus seems unlikely in view of the fact that they never mention him by name, whereas it is the practice of the rabbis to cite their sources when known to them.

Another instance where Josephus may well have been aware of midrashic tradition is his treatment of the passage (Daniel 1:4) which speaks of Daniel and his companions as youths "without blemish," whereas there is a rabbinic tradition, based on the passage (Daniel 1:3) that the king instructed his chief eunuch to educate the youths, that they were eunuchs (*Sarbedrin* 93b). Josephus, apparently aware of the tradition, resolves the problem by omitting mention of their being eunuchs and by stating that they were entrusted to "tutors" (*Ant.* 10.186).

Rappaport cites 299 instances where Josephus parallels midrashic traditions that are not recorded until a later, often a much later, period.⁶¹ To these may be added numerous other instances in Josephus' portrayal of various biblical personalities.⁶² For example, we may note that Josephus was apparently aware of the equation of Esau and Rome (hinted at in *Ant.* 1.275), which is later found also in rabbinic tradition (*Genesis Rabbah* 65.21).⁶³ Josephus is well aware of the tradition, also found in the rabbinic Aggadah (Targum on 2 Kings 4:11, *Midrash Hagadol* [ed. Schechter, 337], *Exodus Rabbah* 31.4, *Tanḥuma Mishpatim* 9), that Obadiah, the steward of Ahab, supported prophets with the money which he had borrowed (*Ant.* 9.47). He likewise is aware of the tradition identifying the widow for whom Elisha performed the miracle with the jar of oil as the wife of Obadiah (*Ant.* 9.47; cf. *Tanḥuma Ki Yissa* 5, *Midrash Mishle* 31.27). The Church Fathers, if we may judge from Eusebius (*Demonstratio Evangelica* 6.18.34-42), were aware of Josephus' knowledge of the oral tradition, since Eusebius there calls attention to the fact that though the earthquake which occurred in the time of King Uzziah (Zechariah 14:5) is

not mentioned in the Book of Kings, Josephus, writing, as he says, on the basis of the *deuterostis*, that is the oral tradition, not only mentions it but describes additional details in connection with that incident (*Ant.* 9.225).

Moreover, the Rabbis themselves, in the reading or translation of certain embarrassing passages from the Bible, declare that in the synagogue the following are to be read but not translated: the incident of Reuben's intercourse with his father's concubine (Genesis 35: 22) and the second account of the Golden Calf (Exodus 32:21-25) (Mishnah, *Megillah* 4:10). Particularly striking is the ruling stated here that the blessing of the priests (Numbers 6:24-26), the incident of David and Bathsheba (2 Samuel 11:2-17), and the beginning of the incident of Amnon and Tamar (2 Samuel 13:1) are not only not to be translated but are not even to be read. Interestingly, Josephus is in accord with the Mishnah in omitting the incident of Reuben and Bilhah, the second account of the Golden Calf, and the blessing of the priests, though he does not omit the incidents of David and Bathsheba and Amnon and Tamar. To be sure, the Rabbis (*ibid.*) expressly declare that the incident of Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) and the first account of the Golden Calf (Exodus 32:1-20) are both read and translated, whereas Josephus omits both. In the Gemara on the above passages, the Rabbis add to the list of passages that are to be read and translated the account of creation (Genesis 1), the story of Lot and his daughters (Genesis 19:31-38), the curses and blessings promised to Israel (Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 27), the story of the concubine in Gibeah (Judges 19-20), the passage from Ezekiel (16:1) about Jerusalem's abominations, and the rest of the incident of Amnon and Tamar (2 Samuel 13:2-22) (*Megillah* 25a-b); Josephus has all of these but does not actually enumerate the blessings and curses and omits the passage from Ezekiel (as he does most prophetic passages). From this we can see that the Rabbis did take the liberty to omit the translation or even the very reading of certain passages; and from the comments of the Gemara on the list we can readily deduce that there were disputes among the Rabbis as to how to deal with specific passages. Here, too, Josephus and the Rabbis appear to be drawing upon a common tradition.

5. JOSEPHUS' KNOWLEDGE OF GREEK CULTURE

The fact that Josephus chose to write his *magnum opus*, the *Antiquities*, in Greek and that he specifically says (*Ant.* 1.5) that he undertook it in the belief that the whole Greekspeaking world would

find it worthy of attention meant that he had to impress his proposed Greek audience with his knowledge of the language and of the literature. Indeed, at the end of his work he confidently asserts (*Ant.* 20.262) that no one else, whether Jew or Gentile, would have been equal to the task of writing such a history as he has just completed so accurately for the Greek world. Though he admits (*Ag. Ap.* 1.50) that he needed assistants in translating the *Jewish War* from Aramaic into Greek, he asserts (*Ant.* 20.263), in concluding his *Antiquities*, that he labored strenuously to master Greek prose and poetry, after having gained a knowledge of Greek grammar, though he also here admits that the habitual use of his native tongue, presumably Aramaic, prevented his attaining precision in the pronunciation of Greek. When he adds (*Ant.* 20.265) that many have laboriously undertaken to master Greek but that scarcely two or three have succeeded, the clear implication is that he is one of these. That he had a good working knowledge of Greek seems evident from the fact that soon after he had completed his twenty-sixth year he was called upon to make a trip to Rome in order to attempt to secure the release of some priests who had been held captive there. He would hardly have been chosen for such a delicate task if he did not have a good knowledge of Greek, since all conversations that he had in Rome were surely in that language. Moreover, he could hardly have succeeded in his mission through his contacts with Aliturus, an actor at court who was of Jewish origin, and with Poppaea Sabina, the Emperor Nero's consort, if he did not have a good command of Greek. Furthermore, his close relations with the generals (and later emperors) Vespasian and Titus were possible only if they shared a common language, Greek. Likewise, his close relationship with his patron, the non-Jew Epaphroditus, to whom he dedicated three of his four works, his *Life* and *Antiquities* (*Life* 430) and his essay *Against Apion* (1.1) and who was the person to whom he expresses his debt (*Ant.* 1.8) in encouraging him to write a history of the Jews, would surely not have been possible if there were a language barrier between them.

That Josephus was acquainted with much of Greek literature is evident from the number of authors that he mentions, particularly in his *Against Apion*, though, admittedly, he may be citing some of them at second hand: the poets Homer (*Ag. Ap.* 1.12), Hesiod (*Ag. Ap.* 1.16), and Choerilus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.172); historians Cadmus of Miletus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.13), Acusilaus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.13), Hellanicus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.16), Ephorus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.16), Timaeus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.16), Herodotus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.16), Antiochus of Syracuse (*Ag. Ap.* 1.17), Philistus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.17), Callias (*Ag. Ap.* 1.17), the authors of Aethiopes (*Ag. Ap.* 1.17), the histo-

rians of Argos (*Ag. Ap.* 1.17), Thucydides (*Ag. Ap.* 1.18), Manetho (*Ag. Ap.* 1.72), Diodorus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.112), Menander of Ephesus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.116), Berosus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.129), Philostratus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.144), Megasthenes (*Ag. Ap.* 1.144), Herodotus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.163), Hecataeus of Abdera (*Ag. Ap.* 1.183), Agatharchides (*Ag. Ap.* 1.205), Hieronymus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.213), Theophilus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.216), Theodotus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.216), Conon (*Ag. Ap.* 1.216), Zopyrion (*Ag. Ap.* 1.216), Aristophanes (*Ag. Ap.* 1.216), Mnaseas (*Ag. Ap.* 1.216), Hermogenes (*Ag. Ap.* 1.216), Euhemerus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.216), Demetrius of Phalerum (*Ag. Ap.* 1.218), Eupolemus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.218), Theopompus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.221), Polycrates (*Ag. Ap.* 1.221), Chaeremon (*Ag. Ap.* 1.288), Lysimachus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.304), Apion (*Ag. Ap.* 2.1), Polybius (*Ag. Ap.* 2.84), Strabo (*Ag. Ap.* 2.84), Nicolas of Damascus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.84), Timagenes (*Ag. Ap.* 2.84), Castor (*Ag. Ap.* 2.84), and Apollodorus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.84); the philosophers Pherecydes of Syros (*Ag. Ap.* 1.14), Pythagoras (*Ag. Ap.* 1.14), Thales (*Ag. Ap.* 1.14), Theophrastus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.167), Clearchus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.176), Posidonius (*Ag. Ap.* 2.79), Anaxagoras (*Ag. Ap.* 2.168), Plato (*Ag. Ap.* 2.168), and the Stoics (*Ag. Ap.* 2.168); and the rhetorician Apollonius Molon (*Ag. Ap.* 2.79). This makes a total of three poets, forty-one historians, eight philosophers, and one rhetorician mentioned by name.

It is clear in his essay *Against Apion* that Josephus had reviewed a great amount of Greek literature looking for references to the Jews, inasmuch as one of the charges of the detractors of the Jews was that the Jews had not been deemed worthy of mention by the best known Greek historians (*Ag. Ap.* 1.2). In this quest one guesses that he was aided by the large library which, according to Suidas (*s.v.* Epaphroditus), had 30,000 volumes, that his patron, Epaphroditus, is said to have possessed. It is surely impressive that Josephus knows (*Ag. Ap.* 1.12) what modern scholarship did not come to recognize until the research of Friedrich Augustus Wolf established it at the end of the eighteenth century, namely that Homer was, indeed, illiterate and produced his poetry orally. It is likewise impressive that he knows that nowhere in all of Homer does he use the word *nomos* (*Ag. Ap.* 2.155); unless he received this information from a handbook, this would seem to imply that he knew Homer's works so thoroughly that he was able to make such a statement without benefit of a concordance. It is, furthermore, impressive that Josephus is actually able to correct the statements of such a noted historian as Ephorus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.67). Indeed, at the beginning of his *Jewish War* (1.16) and again throughout his essay *Against Apion* (e.g., 1.15) he attacks the reliability of the Greek historians, comparing their inaccuracy with the accuracy of the records of the high priests (*Ag. Ap.* 1.36).

Josephus must have known the Greek historiographical tradition well to be able to declare (*Ant.* 1.133) that mention of the river Phut and of the adjacent region Phute is to be found in *most* Greek historians. Josephus himself had to know Greek history well to be able to assert (*Ant.* 4.12) that there is no parallel, whether among Greeks or barbarians, to the sedition of Korah. Likewise, he must have read widely in history to be able to state (*Ant.* 8.284) that such a slaughter was never recorded to have occurred in *any* war of Greeks or barbarians such as that which took place in the slaying of Jeroboam's soldiers by Abijah and his army. We find a similar comparison in Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 11.299) that neither among Greeks nor barbarians was ever so savage and impious a deed ever done as was committed by the priest Joannes in killing his brother Jesus. This is also the case in Josephus' remark (*Ant.* 18.20) that such qualities of character as the Essenes possessed were never found previously among Greeks or barbarians, even for a brief period. If he tells us, as he does (*War* 4.496), that he feels no need to narrate in detail the events of the reigns of Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, since, as he says, they are commonly known and have been described by numerous Greek and Roman historians, the implication is clear that he himself was no less conversant than the average intelligent reader with these chapters of history.

The very fact that Josephus compares the religious groupings of the Jews to the Greek philosophical schools, asserting (*Life* 12) that the Pharisees are a sect very similar to the Stoics (implying that the Sadducees are comparable to the Epicureans) and that the Essenes (*Ant.* 15.37) follow the Pythagorean way of life, is an indication of his philosophical interests and the interests that he expected his audience to have, since such comparisons would hardly appear to be germane to one who viewed Judaism in its strictly religious dimension.

In addition, from the vehemence with which Josephus (*Ant.* 10.277-80) attacks the Epicureans for excluding Providence from human affairs, a criticism which he later repeats (*Against Apion* 2.180), we can see that he was well acquainted with the doctrines of this group. Indeed, on a number of occasions, Josephus appears to be responding to the Epicurean position. Thus, the fact that he chose to conclude his account of Daniel and, indeed, of Book 10 of the *Antiquities*, that is the first half of the entire work, with no fewer than five paragraphs (*Ant.* 10.277-81) to demonstrate how mistaken the Epicureans were in asserting (*Ant.* 10.278) that the world runs by its own movement (*automatos*) without a guide or other power is an indication of how much importance he attached to this lesson on the power of Providence in human affairs.

Josephus had to have read widely in the field of philosophy to be able to make a blanket statement (*Ag. Ap.* 2.168) that nearly all the philosophers appear to have held similar views concerning the nature of God. No philosopher was more popular in the Hellenistic Age than Plato,⁶⁴ and Josephus had to know the dialogues of Plato well to be able to assert (*Ag. Ap.* 2.221) that, on examination, his laws will be found to be frequently easier to follow than the Jewish code. His knowledge of Plato is particularly manifest in the speech which he put into the mouth of Eleazar ben Jair at Masada (*War* 7.344-48) in which the latter speaks of the relationship of body and soul and of the nature of immortality in language closely parallel to that of Plato's *Phaedo*. Moreover, Josephus had to have knowledge of the religious and philosophical beliefs of the Greeks to be able to assert, in describing graphically (*War* 2.155-56) the rewards of the virtuous and the punishments of the wicked (and to name specifically the archexamples of wickedness—Sisyphus, Tantalus, Ixion, and Tityus) in the afterlife, that the Essenes shared these beliefs with the Greeks.

That Josephus was well acquainted with the anthropomorphic nature of Greek religion is evident from his comparison of the depiction of God in the Torah with the portrayal of the gods by the lawgivers of the Greeks (*Ant.* 1.22-23). Inasmuch as most of these references to Greek literature occur in an apologetic work, *Against Apion*, Josephus had to be careful in his statements about the various authors lest they or their successors, in their rebuttals, accuse him of misrepresenting their views.

6. GREEK INFLUENCE IN JOSEPHUS' REWRITING OF BIBLICAL HISTORY

The apologetic aim of Josephus may often be seen in the Hellenization of his narrative, both in language and in ideas, so as to appeal to his Greek-educated readers. In particular, we may note his debt to Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, and Aristotle.

Josephus shows his knowledge of Homer in a number of passages (*Ant.* 7.67; *Ag. Ap.* 1.12, 2.14, 2.155, 2.256). He actually quotes Homer's *Iliad* (14.90-91) when discussing the conspiracy to assassinate Gaius Caligula (*Ant.* 19.92), though, admittedly, he may have found this in the source which he used for the account of the conspiracy.⁶⁵ He often uses distinctively Homeric epithets, in particular *polutropos* ("manifold," "versatile") (*War* 1.347, 7.272, 7.451; *Ant.* 1.8, 2.303, 10.142, 15.179, 15.416, 17.125). In particular, we may call attention to

a phrase clearly reminiscent of Homer when Josephus declares that Isaac was born on the threshold of Abraham's old age (*ept geras oudoi*) (*Ant.* 1.222). The fact that this phrase occurs in the *Iliad* (22.60) in connection with Priam, who addresses his son Hector before the latter goes off to his last fateful battle with Achilles, makes its use in the context of the *'Akedab* all the more poignant and pathetic because of the parallels between the aged fathers, Abraham and Priam, and their promising sons, who are apparently about to die in the flower of youth.

Josephus is clearly indebted to Hesiod in a number of places, especially in his description of the early ages of mankind. Thus, the notion that early man lived free from evils and toil and that old age did not soon overtake him is found in Hesiod's description in the *Works and Days* (90-93), which employs several words found later in Josephus (*Ant.* 1.46).⁶⁶ Josephus elsewhere mentions Hesiod's report that the ancients lived for a thousand years (*Ant.* 1.108) and notes that the historian Acusilaus often corrects Hesiod (*Ag. Ap.* 1.16).

That Josephus was acquainted with the works of Aeschylus is indicated by his use of such a phrase as *apora men ginetai ta porima* ("the practicable things become impracticable") (*Ant.* 1.14), which is clearly reminiscent of the very reverse formulation in the choral passage in Aeschylus (*Prometheus Bound* 904): *apora porimos* ("making possible the impossible"), the only other extant author who used these two words thus in paradoxical juxtaposition.

There is also very good reason for assuming that Josephus knew the works of Sophocles. In particular, we may note that to the biblical account of Moses' death (Deuteronomy 34) Josephus has added lamenting people, a walk to the mountain, companions on Moses' final walk, and "disappearance" (*Ant.* 4.323-26), details which are found in no other post-biblical source, though those sources recount Moses' last hours in far greater detail than does the Bible. And yet, it is precisely these details that are found in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*.⁶⁷

Furthermore, the key incident illustrating Solomon's wisdom is the case of the two mothers who gave birth to children, one of whom died, while both claimed the living child as her own (1 Kings 3:16-28). A notable addition in Josephus' version of this incident is his statement that when no one could see what judgment to give but all were mentally blinded, as by a riddle, in finding a solution, Solomon alone devised a plan (*Ant.* 8.30). There are four distinctive elements in this statement which do not appear in the original (1 Kings 3:23-27), whether in the Hebrew or in the Septuagint or in the Lucianic Greek version: 1) others had attempted and failed to determine who

the real mother was; 2) these others are spoken of as mentally blinded; 3) to solve the question required the use of intelligence; 4) the case is compared to a riddle. What is particularly striking is that all four elements are found in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*.

There is substantial evidence⁶⁸ that Josephus was familiar with the play *Ekragoge* of the Hellenistic Jewish tragedian Ezekiel, which was much influenced by Euripides, both in vocabulary and style as well as in dramatic technique and structure.⁶⁹ In addition, Euripides' influence on Josephus may be seen in the latter's description of Ishmael's dying state, where Josephus employs the same rare word for expiring, *psukhorragoun*, literally "letting the soul break loose," which Euripides uses (*Alcestis* 20 and *Hercules Furens* 123, 324, the latter in precisely this form) (*Ant.* 1.218). There are several striking parallels between Isaac and Iphigenia, notably in the enthusiasm with which they both approach the sacrifice and, in particular, in such a statement as Isaac's, that he could not even consider rejecting the decision of God (*Ant.* 1.232), and Iphigenia's, that she, a mortal woman, could not stand in the way of the goddess (Euripides, *Iphigenia at Aulis* 396). There is pathetic irony in the fact that Abraham seeks happiness only through his son, who, paradoxically, is about to be sacrificed, just as there is irony in the chorus' ode (*Iphigenia at Aulis* 590-91) that begins, "Oh! oh! great happiness of the great!" One may also note Josephus' remarkable addition to the biblical narrative in which God declares that He gave His order to Abraham "from no craving for human blood" (*Ant.* 1.233), which is clearly in contrast to the statement of Artemis, who is said to rejoice in human sacrifices (*Iphigenia at Aulis* 1524-25).

That Josephus is, indeed, influenced by Greek tragedy may be deduced from the fact that, in one of his typical generalizations about human nature, he declares that when men attain power they lay aside their moderate ways "as if they were stage masks" (*Ant.* 6.264). Aware that his Greek readers would appreciate motifs familiar from Greek tragedy, he rewrites the biblical narrative of the Flood by stressing that mankind was full of overweening pride (*hubris*, a key word in Greek tragedy) (*Ant.* 1.73, 100). Likewise, we are told, God tried to tame the Israelites' insolence (*hubris*) before Deborah's judgship began, so that they might be more moderate (*sophronosin*, another key word in Greek tragedy) in the future (*Ant.* 5.200). Over and over again Josephus refers to Jeroboam's outrages against God and the laws as *hubris* (*Ant.* 8.245, 265, 277). Again, Ahasuerus' justification for his dismissal of Vashti is her *hubris* (*Ant.* 11.192-93). If Jephthah and Saul make rash vows they are criticized for losing control of reason (*Ant.* 5.266, 6.117); and, in an explanation so often

found in Greek tragedy, this is said to be due to success or prosperity. Uzziah, he says in words that are almost taken out of a Greek tragedy, was led to sin "by his brilliant good fortune and the greatness of his power" (*Ant.* 9.223). Again, Josephus condemns Haman, in terms familiar from Greek tragedy, for not showing moderation in time of his prosperity (*Ant.* 11.277).

Josephus shows his indebtedness to Herodotus in numerous places, particularly in his description of Moses' march during his campaign against the Ethiopians (*Ant.* 2.243-47). He there gives details about the winged serpents which he put to flight with ibises, a passage which would remind the reader of Herodotus' account (2.75) of the winged snakes which come flying every spring from Arabia towards Egypt and are stopped by ibises which destroy them all. Josephus would seem to be alluding to this passage when he remarks that he will refrain from saying more about the ibises and snakes, "for Greeks are not unacquainted with the nature of the ibis" (*Ant.* 2.247).⁷⁰ Josephus' version of the death of Ahab (*Ant.* 8.409, 418-20) shows his tendency to restate Jewish notions of divine power and prophetic determination in terms of the classical Greek concepts of fate and tragic destiny, as found especially in Greek tragedy and in Herodotus.⁷¹ The ancient reader would also think of Laius and Oedipus who, as much as they tried to avoid the fate about which they had been warned by the oracle, failed to do so. Furthermore, one recalls the statement of the Chorus in Euripides' *Hippolytus* when they behold the blameless Hippolytus in his stricken state. Though they feel anger at the gods (1146), yet, as they know, there is no escape from what must be (1256). Similarly, in Euripides' *Helen* (1301), the Dioscuri declare that they did not save their sister Clytemnestra, "for Moira's compulsion led where it must." One also recalls how, in Herodotus (7.14-18), after a delusive dream warns Xerxes that unless he undertakes the war against Greece he will be brought low as swiftly as he had become great, a similar dream occurs to Artabanus, Xerxes' uncle, warning him against opposing "what must be" (7.17), whereupon Xerxes is convinced that this is a divine warning. Thus we see, as Chrysippus the Stoic put it, that there was no way in all of these cases to avoid the dire predictions because of the necessity that is part of fate.⁷²

The influence of Thucydides may be seen both conceptually and linguistically. As to the former, the most important examples are to be seen in the molding of biblical heroes, notably Moses, in the guise of Thucydides' portrait of his ideal of leadership, Pericles. Just as Thucydides (2.60) underlines Pericles' ability to persuade the masses, so Josephus, who, significantly, omits both of the biblical references

to Moses' speech impediment (Exodus 4:10 and 6:12), stresses (*Ant.* 4.328) Moses' ability to find favor with the masses in every way through speech. Indeed, whereas in the Bible (Exodus 5:1) Moses and Aaron go jointly to Pharaoh, with Aaron presumably as the spokesman, to ask him to free the Israelites, in Josephus (*Ant.* 2.281) Moses goes alone. Moreover, both Thucydides (2.65.4) and Josephus (*Ant.* 3.23, 4.22-23, 26) highlight the fickleness of the masses and their readiness to be swayed by demagogues, whom both despise so greatly. Like Thucydides in his portrayal of Pericles, Josephus emphasizes the constant criticism directed by the masses toward their great leader Moses.

Furthermore, Thucydides stresses that civil strife is the great enemy of stability (3.82-84); and Josephus over and over again mentions this theme, notably in his account of the rebellion of Korah (*Ant.* 4.11-66) and the apostasy of Zimri (Zambrias) (*Ant.* 4.141-55).

One particular instance which will illustrate Josephus' dependence upon Thucydides is his description of the plague that followed David's census. The Bible (2 Samuel 24:10-17) presents no description at all of this plague, whereas Josephus (*Ant.* 7.324-26) presents several details which have a striking resemblance to Thucydides' account (2.48-52) of the great plague which afflicted Athens at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War.⁷³

Drüner, Thackeray, and Shutt have cited Josephus' use of a number of characteristics of style, which are favorites of Thucydides.⁷⁴ In particular, Josephus, in his account of the flight of the Amorites (*Ant.* 4.89-95), has drawn upon Thucydides' description (7.83-84) of the retreat from Syracuse.⁷⁵

Inasmuch as Plato was probably the most important single intellectual force in the process of Hellenization in the East during the Hellenistic period,⁷⁶ it is not surprising, as we have already noted, that Josephus displays his knowledge of Plato in a number of places. Thus he borrows, without specifically mentioning it, from the *Tymaeus* (22B-C) the notion that "in the Greek world everything will be found to be modern, and dating, so to speak, from yesterday or the day before" (*Ag. Ap.* 1.7). He correctly remarks that the philosophy of Plato is addressed only to the few, whereas the Torah's teachings are intended for the many (*Ag. Ap.* 2.168-69). He deliberately combats the idea that God had collaborators in the work of creation (*Ag. Ap.* 2.192), although he mentions the names of neither Plato nor Philo, who held such a view. He cites Plato by name as one admired by the Greeks for his dignity of character and persuasive eloquence but ridiculed by self-styled expert statesmen (*Ag. Ap.* 2.223). That he is acquainted with Plato is clear from his remark that if one examines

Plato's laws, they will be found frequently less demanding than the Jewish code and more closely approximating the practice of the masses (*Ag. Ap.* 2.224). He knows (*ibid.*) that Plato himself has admitted that it is not safe to express the true opinion about God to the ignorant masses (*Timaeus* 28C). His use of the word *demiourgei* in referring to God's creation of animals (*Ant.* 1.32) is presumably intended to remind the reader of Plato's *demiourgos*, the creator of Plato's visible world in the *Timaeus* (40C). He cites the opinion of those who regard Plato's discourses as brilliant but empty (*Ag. Ap.* 2.225). He is aware that Plato banishes the poets, including Homer, from his ideal state in order to prevent them from obscuring with their fables the correct doctrine about God (*Ag. Ap.* 2.256). Finally, he declares that Plato followed Moses in prescribing that all the citizens must study the laws and learn them verbatim, and that foreigners must not be permitted to mix at random with the citizens (*Ag. Ap.* 2.257).⁷⁷

Josephus' knowledge of Aristotle is clear from his extended account of Aristotle's meeting with a learned Jew (*Ag. Ap.* 1.176-83) and from his acquaintance with Aristotelian terminology.⁷⁸

There are still other ways in which Josephus has Hellenized the biblical narrative. Thus, in his words (*Ant.* 1.156), Abraham presents a sophisticated proof for the existence of God, derived from the Stoics, namely that if the heavenly bodies had been endowed with independent power they would have provided for their own uniformity. Since they lack this quality one must suppose a commander who directs them. Moreover, when Abraham journeys to Egypt (*Ant.* 1.161), he is ready, in the spirit of Hellenistic philosophic disputations, to adopt the Egyptian priests' doctrines if he finds them superior to his own, or, if he should win the debate, to convert them to his beliefs.⁷⁹ According to Josephus (*Ant.* 1.167-68), Abraham introduced the Egyptians to arithmetic and transmitted to them the laws of astronomy, which the Egyptians, in turn, passed on to the Greeks.

Moreover, since music was to the Greeks "a second language" of divine origin (Pseudo-Plutarch, *De Musica* 3.1131F-1132A), we should not be surprised that Josephus asserts (*Ant.* 2.346)—without any biblical basis—that Moses composed his song in hexameter verse, thereby indicating that it was in the same epic meter as the great poems of Homer. Similarly, in referring to Moses' final message to the Israelites, Josephus asserts (*Ant.* 4.303) that Moses recited to them a poem in hexameter verse. But Moses in Josephus is not merely a poet and a singer. He is also, on his own initiative (*Ant.* 3.291), the inventor of a musical instrument, a silver trumpet, which makes him comparable to Hermes, the inventor of the lyre, and Athena, the inventor of the flute, in this respect.

7. THE SYNTHESIS OF TORAH AND GREEK CULTURE IN JOSEPHUS

Apparently, if we may judge from the talmudic passage (*Sotah* 49b, *Baba Kamma* 82b) relating that the patriarch Rabban Gamaliel II in the latter part of the first century, contemporaneously with Josephus, had a thousand students, five hundred of whom studied Torah and five hundred of whom studied Greek wisdom (*hokhmat yevanit*), this seemed incomprehensible to the other scholars, who felt that one should study only the Torah day and night. The exception was granted to the patriarch only in order to train people in Greek culture so as to be able to converse with the Roman administrators. Moreover, it is clear that Greek culture was not to be studied in pagan gymnasiums and academies but rather under the careful guidance and in the Torah atmosphere of the patriarch himself. In any case, the norm, as expressed in the Talmud in this very passage referring to Rabban Gamaliel's academy for the study of Greek, is expressed by the proclamation issued by the rabbis during the civil war between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus: "Cursed be the man who would teach his son Greek wisdom." Finally, the Rabbis differentiated strongly between the Greek language, the beauty of which they recognized (*Megillah* 9b), and Greek culture, which they proscribed.

And yet, we may mention Eupolemus, who is regarded by most scholars as a Jewish historian who flourished in Palestine in the middle of the second century B.C.E.,⁸⁰ who wrote in Greek a work on a biblical theme, apparently entitled *Concerning the Kings in Judaea*.⁸¹ We may note his statement,⁸² clearly intended to impress a Greek audience, that Moses was the first wise man, that he invented the alphabet, which, he says, the Phoenicians received from the Jews and which the Greeks received from the Phoenicians.

Even such ultra-pious Jewish sects as the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect apparently had some contact with Hellenism. Thus, the Essenes' stress on the ordering of the world, even before creation, reflects similarities to the hymn to Zeus by the third century B.C.E. Stoic philosopher Cleanthes.⁸³ Noting that astrological fragments have been found among the Dead Sea fragments, Hengel declares that astral and solar theologizing could never have gained significance had it not been for the victorious progress of astrology in the Hellenistic era. He further argues that there are direct points of contact in the military technique of the War Scroll, which he postulates is based on a Hellenistic book of tactics.⁸⁴ Moreover, the form of the Essene community reminds us, in at least some respects, of the law of asso-

ciations in the Hellenistic period.⁶⁵ Indeed, the presence of Greek documents in the Dead Sea caves would indicate that knowledge of Greek had penetrated even the most extreme religious groups. Most strikingly, a manuscript of the Minor Prophets in Greek has been found in the Dead Sea caves.

In addition, the colophon of the Greek book of Esther indicates that the translation was done in Jerusalem in the latter part of the second century B.C.E. It is against this background that we can understand the transformation in that work of Haman into a Macedonian who sought to betray the Persian kingdom to the Macedonians. Furthermore, Hengel points out that the Greek of the additions to this book is substantially better than that of the translated passages.⁶⁶

Josephus, to be sure, alludes to the opposition to the study of Greek culture in his statement at the end of the *Antiquities*. "Our people," he says, "do not favor those persons who have mastered the speech of many nations, or who adorn their style with smoothness of diction, because they consider that not only is such skill common to ordinary freemen but that even slaves who so choose may acquire it. But they give credit for wisdom to those alone who have an exact knowledge of the law and who are capable of interpreting the meaning of the Holy Scriptures" (*Ant.* 20.264). Inasmuch as this sentence comes immediately after the statements that his compatriots admit that he far excels them in Jewish learning while at the same time he excels in his knowledge of the Greek language and literature, he is clearly referring to those who view such an attempt as his own at synthesis of Torah and Greek culture as unacceptable.

Nevertheless, there is evidence that not everyone shared this criticism. In the first place, if the central committee directing the war effort in Jerusalem entrusted Josephus with the command in Galilee, the most populous Jewish area and the most important at the beginning of the war since the Roman governor of Syria would first descend into that area, they apparently did not think that Josephus' knowledge of the Greek language and Greek culture would be a drawback in gaining the favor of the people of Galilee. Moreover, Josephus' contemporary and rival, Justus of Tiberias (*Life* 40), was well versed in Greek and indeed later wrote a history in Greek of the events. His knowledge of Greek culture is indicated by his mention of an anecdote, in his book *The Genealogy*,⁶⁷ relating that, at Socrates' trial for atheism, Plato ascended the platform but was shouted down by the jury. He apparently (*Life* 36-42) had a considerable following in Galilee; and there is no indication that his knowledge of Greek culture was held against him. That he apparently saw no contradic-

tion between his knowledge of Greek literature and his knowledge of the Torah is indicated by the fact, cited by Jerome,⁸⁶ that he also composed commentaries on Scripture.

Furthermore, Josephus (*Life* 189) speaks of Simon the son of Gamaliel I as highly gifted in intelligence, but with no indication that he is the father of the Gamaliel who had the thousand students and with no indication of backlash against his son. Simon, we may note, was influential with the central committee directing the revolutionaries' war-effort (*Life* 190), as we can see from the fact that when John of Gischala sought to have Josephus removed from his command in Galilee, it was to Simon that he sent a delegation, hoping to entreat him to induce the national assembly in Jerusalem to depose him. But there is no indication that Simon or the delegation that approached him used as an argument in seeking Josephus' recall the fact that he was a Hellenizer.

Furthermore, Josephus actively uses his knowledge of Greek culture to confirm biblical accounts. Thus, one of the most serious charges against the Jews, as we see from Josephus' reply, was that the Bible lacked historicity, particularly as to the antiquity of the Jews (*Ag. Ap.* 1.69 ff.). Hence, to refute the claim that the Flood, as described in the Bible, is a myth, Josephus very effectively cites the evidence of non-Jewish writers, namely Berosus, Hieronymus, Mna-seas of Patara, and Nicolas of Damascus (*Ant.* 1.93-94), and asserts that relics of the ark have been preserved in Armenia (*Ant.* 1.95). The fact that Josephus uses same word for Noah's ark (*Iarnaka*, *Ant.* 1.77) which is used by Apollodorus (1.7.2), Lucian (*De Dea Syria* 12), and Plutarch (2.968F) in connection with Deucalion's ark, rather than the Septuagint's word (*ktiboros*, Genesis 6:14), is an indication that he sought to have his reader identify the two floods.

Moreover, anticipating the skepticism that readers might have to the biblical statements concerning the longevity of the patriarchs, Josephus (*Ant.* 1.107-08) cites the evidence of no fewer than ten historians—Manetho, the annalist of the Egyptians; Berosus, the compiler of the Chaldaean traditions; Mochus, Hestiaeus, and Hieronymus, authors of Phoenician histories; and Hecataeus of Abdera, Hellanicus, Acusilaus, Ephorus, and Nicolas of Damascus—who report that the ancients lived for a thousand years, precisely the time limit of the patriarchs. Appealing to his Greek audience, he even gives as one of the reasons why God accorded them a longer life the fact that He wished to promote the utility of their discoveries in astronomy and, geometry (*Ant.* 1.106). He also goes to great lengths to identify the areas settled by the descendants of Noah by the names known to the Greeks (*Ant.* 1.122-47).

Because he apparently realized that there were people who disputed the existence of Abraham, Josephus (*Ant.* 1.158) cites the evidence of the non-Jewish historian Berosus, who is quoted as saying that "in the tenth generation after the Flood there lived among the Chaldeans a just man and great and versed in celestial lore." He further confirms Abraham's historicity and aggrandizes his status by citing (*Ant.* 1.159-60) another non-Jewish historian, Nicolas of Damascus, who speaks of Abraham as actually reigning in Damascus and notes that the name of Abram is still celebrated in that region. Likewise, Josephus cites Menander to confirm the historicity of a drought during the reign of Ahab, even when that non-Jewish author in part contradicts the Bible (*Ant.* 8.324).

Because one of the stock charges against the Jews is excessive credulity (e.g., Horace, *Satires* 1.5.97-103), Josephus tends to downgrade miracles or to present scientific-like explanations of them, or to give the reader the choice as to how to interpret them.⁸⁹ Thus, to make the miracle of the crossing of the Sea of Reeds more credible, he appeals to a parallel incident in Greek history, namely the case where the Pamphylian Sea retired before the advance of the army of Alexander the Great (*Ant.* 2.348).

One device which Josephus, like Philo (e.g., *De Vita Mosis* 2.6.88 and 12.177 ff.), employs in solving difficulties is the use of allegory, a method which had been employed especially by the Stoics in interpreting Homer's and Hesiod's references to the gods. In particular (*Ant.* 3.181-83), he resorts to allegory to explain the tabernacle as symbolic of the earth and the sea, the twelve loaves upon the Temple table as the twelve months, the candelabrum with its seven lamps as the seven planets, the tapestries of four materials denoting the four elements, and the high priest's garments signifying the parts of the universe. Thus the Jews' seemingly irrational rules with regard to the Temple and its cult are made to seem to be in accord with the nature of the cosmos.

Apparently, Josephus was also sensitive to the charge that the Torah was not of divine authorship. Significantly, he omits all six of the passages in the Bible (Genesis 12:6, Genesis 22:14, Exodus 24:4, Deuteronomy 1:1, Deuteronomy 3:11, and Deuteronomy 34:1-12) which are listed by the twelfth century Abraham Ibn Ezra as presenting serious questions as to the authorship of the Torah. Likewise, the Rabbis (*Yoma* 52a-b) list five passages in the Torah, (Genesis 4:7, 49:6-7; Exodus 17:9, 25:33; Deuteronomy 31:16) the grammatical construction of which remains undecided. All are omitted by Josephus.

Furthermore, that the friendship between Solomon and Hiram was important in refuting the charge that Jews hate non-Jews may be seen

from the fact that Josephus devotes a goodly portion of his apologetic treatise *Against Apion* (1.100-27) to reproducing evidence from the Phoenician archives and from the works of Dios and Manetho of Ephesus to illustrate the excellent relations between Solomon and Hiram and to confirm the antiquity of the Temple (*Ag. Ap.* 1.106-8).²⁰ There is good reason, says Josephus, why the erection of the Temple should be mentioned in the Tyrians' records, since Hiram, king of Tyre, was a friend of Solomon and, indeed, had inherited this friendship from his (Hiram's) father (*Ag. Ap.* 1.109-10). Thus, according to Josephus, it is the non-Jew Hiram who inherited the friendship from his father, whereas in the Bible it is Solomon who inherits from his father a friendship with Hiram (2 Samuel 5:11, 1 Kings 5:1). Josephus, for apologetic reasons, exults in this friendship (*Ag. Ap.* 1.110). Hence, whereas in the Bible, Hiram simply sent cedar trees to David (2 Samuel 5:11), Josephus says that Hiram cut down the finest timber from Mount Libanus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.110). That this friendship carried with it a great deal of prestige may be deduced from the fact, proudly noted by Josephus, that the Phoenicians were an ancient people and that Hiram lived more than 150 years before the founding of Carthage (*Ag. Ap.* 2.17-18).²¹ Moreover, in a most unusual digression, Josephus calls special attention to the fact that copies of the correspondence between Hiram and Solomon are to be found not only in the Bible but also in the Tyrian archives (*Ant.* 8.55) and then adds that he has recorded these matters in detail because he wanted his readers to know that he has related nothing more than what is true and that he has not, by inserting into his history various plausible and seductive passages meant to deceive and entertain, attempted to avoid critical inquiry (*Ant.* 8.56). This passage is, of course, reminiscent of Thucydides' implied attack (1.21.1) on Herodotus for composing a work with a view to pleasing the ear rather than to telling the truth, and of his insistence that his own history is not intended as "a prize-essay to be heard for the moment but as a possession for all time" (1.22.4). Josephus then concludes with an apologia for his craft as historian: "Nor should we be indulgently held blameless if we depart from what is proper to a historical narrative; on the contrary, we ask that no hearing be given us unless we are able to establish the truth with demonstrations and convincing evidence."

The fact that, according to Josephus, many of the riddles and problems which Hiram and Solomon sent each other were still preserved in Tyre in Josephus' own day (*Ag. Ap.* 1.111) is important not only in bolstering Solomon's reputation for wisdom but also for stressing the friendship and high respect which a Jewish leader had for a non-Jew, since while it is true that Josephus does assert that

Solomon showed greater proficiency and was the cleverer of the two, it is still quite a compliment for Hiram that he could be compared with Solomon and that Solomon found it interesting and challenging to exchange problems and riddles with him. As further evidence of the historicity of the relations between Solomon and Hiram, Josephus, on two occasions, cites the words of Menander, who translated the Tyrian records from the Phoenician language into Greek (*Ant.* 8.144-46, *Ag. Ap.* 1.116-25).

Moreover, at the beginning of the *Antiquities* (1.11), in recounting the story of the translation of the Torah into Greek, Josephus states that the high priest Eleazar granted the request of Ptolemy Philadelphus to send a delegation to translate the Torah even though he could have refused if it had been against Jewish policy to engage in such a translation. Hence, there was, almost at the very beginning of meaningful contact between Jewish and Greek culture, a precedent for finding an accommodation for the two. It is surely remarkable that with so many enemies constantly looking for points in which to criticize Josephus, no one, at least to judge from his own account, even raises the question as to how he, claiming to be a good Jew, could have found time to devote himself to the acquisition of the Greek language and to mastery of Greek culture. Apparently, the conflict of Torah and Greek culture was not a major issue.

NOTES

1. See Leo Pries, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden, 1948).
2. Alleged Platonisms, such as the translation of *tohu wa-vohu* (Genesis 1:2) by *aporutos kai akataskeuastos* ("unseen and unformed"), hardly prove that the translators believed with Plato that prior to the visible world there existed an invisible world; rather, they were confronted with a phrase whose meaning was very obscure. Again, the translation of *gohonekha* (Genesis 3:14), "your belly," by *toi stethoi sou kai tes kolliat* ("upon your chest and belly") hardly proves that the translators were aware of the Platonic division of the human faculties into the rational, spirited, and appetitive, assigned respectively to the head, the chest, and the abdomen. Indeed, if they had been influenced by Platonism, it would seem more likely that they would have shown it throughout and, in particular, introduced the most famous Platonic theory, that of Forms.
3. Greek elements, such as the references to Titans (2 Samuel 5:18, 22), Sirens (Job 30:29; Micah 1:8; Isaiah 13:21, 34:13, 43:20; Jeremiah 27:39), and the horn of Amalthea (Job 42:14), as well as the metrics of the Book of Proverbs (see Henry St. John Thackeray, "The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs," *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 [1912]: 46-66), occur in books outside the Pentateuch. Indeed, the reference to Titans is not an indication of the acceptance of Greek mythological beliefs, inasmuch as the word Titan then, as now, had non-theological connotations as well, as is pointed out by Ralph Marcus, "Jewish and Greek Elements in the Septuagint," in Alexander Marx et al., eds., *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York, 1945), 227-45.

4. It has been argued (see Charles H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* [London, 1935], 33-34) that the very translation of the word *Torah* by the Greek *nomos* ("law," "custom") represented the introduction of a basic Greek and un-jewish concept, namely, that the Torah is legalistic, in contrast to *physis*, nature or natural law, and that Judaism is controlled by custom (*nomos*), as reflected in Herodotus' famous story (3.38) comparing the way in which the Greeks and the Indians are guided by it in their methods of disposing of the dead. However, one might argue that there is also considerable evidence of the divine origin and nature of the concept of *nomos* in Greek literature of the classical period (e.g., in Sophocles' *Antigone*, 454-55) and thereafter, as we see in the hymn of the third century B.C.E. Stoic philosopher Cleanthes (*ap.* Hans F.A. von Arnim, ed., *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, Vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1903], 121, fragment no. 537), who asserts that the all-powerful Zeus controls the world through *nomos* (see Alan F. Segal, "Torah and Nomos in Recent Scholarly Discussion," *Studies in Religion (Scientiae Religiosae)* 13 [1984]:19-28). Indeed, not even Aquila, though committed to an absolutely literal translation of the Scriptures, could find a better translation for the word Torah.
5. See Elias Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988), 114-15.
6. For the fragments, see Carl R. Holladay, ed., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, Vol. 1: *Historians* (Chico, 1983).
7. Cited by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.17.4.
8. Cited by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.27.7-19.
9. Cited by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.22.8-9a.
10. Cited by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.20.1.
11. Cited by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.28.4c. For the fragments see Carl R. Holladay, ed., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, Vol. 2: *Poets* (Atlanta, 1989).
12. For the fragments see Carl R. Holladay, ed., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, Vol. 3: *Aristobolus* (Atlanta, 1995).
13. See *my Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, 1993), 55. Harry A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), 90, thinks that Philo knew enough Hebrew to be able to check, in the original when necessary, the Greek translation of a given passage; but in view of the fact that in Philo's time the epigraphical and papyrological evidence indicates that Hebrew was almost unknown in Egypt, the burden of proof rests on those who assert that he did know that language. In any case, it seems hard to believe that one who knew Hebrew and wrote in such detail about biblical episodes would not have consulted the original text and at least occasionally have quoted from it, especially when it differed from the Septuagint translation. In particular, we note that Philo (*De Decalogo* 24.121-22 and *De Specialibus Legibus* 3.2.8) follows the Septuagint in placing the prohibition of adultery as the sixth commandment, rather than the extant Hebrew text, which places it seventh. As to the occasional places where Philo has etymologies of Hebrew names that are not found in the biblical text, he may have derived them from an onomasticon such as has been discovered in a papyrus at Oxyrhynchus. See David Rokeah, "A New Onomasticon Fragment from Oxyrhynchus and Philo's Etymologies," *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968): 70-82.
14. See now the magnificent edition, which nevertheless leaves most of the major questions about the work unresolved, by Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1996).
15. The only reference to an extant Greek writer to be found in the rabbinic writings is in the "books of Homer" in the Mishnah (*Yadain* 4:6). The reading, however, is disputed. For the alternate readings see Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1950), 106, n. 39. The matter is thoroughly discussed by Lieberman, in *Hellenism*, 108-13, who, after noting serious objections to the iden-

- ification with Homer, concludes that the reference is, indeed, to Homer, but that the books of Homer were probably not included in the category of "Greek wisdom," and that they were employed in exercises for those children who did not in any case study Torah.
16. See my discussion in *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (above, n. 13), 32-34.
 17. See Daniel Sperber, *A Dictionary of Greek and Latin Terms in Rabbinic Literature* (Ramat Gan, 1984); and Ranon Katzoff, "Sperber's Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms in Rabbinic Literature—A Review Essay," *Journal for the Study of Judaism 20* (1989): 195-206. Samuel Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, Vol. 1 (Berlin, 1899), 231, estimated the ratio of entries of Greek to Latin loanwords in rabbinic texts at one hundred to one, although in the Greek and Latin index in his work, vol. 2, pp. 655-84, the ratio is approximately ten to one. In Sperber's volume the ratio is about three to one. See R. Katzoff, 204.
 18. See my *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (above, n. 13), 32-38.
 19. See S. Lieberman (above, n. 15), 58-62.
 20. Some have thought that this claim to precociousness is a commonplace such as we find in Plutarch (*Theseus* 6.4, *Solon* 2, *Themistocles* 2.1, *Dion* 4.2, *Alexander* 5.1, *Romulus* 8, *Cicero* 2), Quintus Curtius (*History of Alexander* 1), Philostratus (*Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 1.7.11), Pseudo-Callisthenes (*Alexander Romance*), Conon (*Narrationes* 44, where we find the example of Evangelos of Miletus), Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* 1.7.4, where we find the examples of Amphoteos and Akarnan the son of Callirhoe), I Enoch 106. 11 (where Noah blesses God while still in the hands of a midwife), Philo (*De Vita Mosici* 1.5.20-24, 1.6.25-26), and Jubilees (11-12, where Abraham is depicted as a child prodigy). See Charles H. Talbert, "Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15," in *The Divine Hebraman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events Presented to Lou H. Silberman*, ed. James L. Greenshaw and Samuel Sandmel (New York, 1980), 135. Similarly, the Rabbis speak of the precociousness of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, Samson, Samuel, and Elijah. See Charles Perrot "Les récits d'enfance dans la Haggada antérieure au I^{er} siècle de notre ère," *Recherches de science religieuse* 55 (1967): 481-518. Cf. Luke 2:40, 52, where we are told that the child Jesus "grew and became strong, filled with wisdom, and the favor of God was upon him.... And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature and in favor with God and man."
 21. See, e.g., Christopher T. Hogg, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (*AJ* 8, 212-420). *Rewriting the Bible* (Leuven, 1993), especially pp. 2-5.
 22. It seems hardly convincing to say that Josephus is simply not telling the truth, that he is careless, or that he depends upon the ignorance of his readers, knowing how difficult it would be for them to check up on him, with manuscripts being relatively scarce and with there being no indices. After all, since the *Antiquities* was written in Greek, it would appear likely that readers, some of whom were presumably Hellenized Jews, would have access to the Septuagint. Moreover, if we may judge from Pseudo-Longinus' paraphrase of Genesis 1:3 and 1:9-10 (*On the Sublime* 9.9), the Septuagint was sufficiently well known, at least to some intellectuals, so that Pseudo-Longinus, presumably a non-Jew, does not have to bother to identify the "lawgiver of the Jews." It is clear, moreover, from the high praise that Pseudo-Longinus gives to the Bible that he was acquainted with much more from the Bible than this passage alone. Apparently, this kind of programmatic statement, as we see in other historians of the era (e.g. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thucydides* 5 and 8), is intended merely to assure the reader that the historian has done his research honestly. As to the changes which Josephus has made in the narrative portions of the Bible, perhaps what he means when he says that has set forth the precise details of the Scriptures is that he has not modified the Jewish tradition generally, which included the oral tradition as later embodied in the *midrashim*.

23. See Hans Hübner, "New Testament, OT Quotations in the," *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 4 (1992), 1096-1104.
24. This is the translation of *Life 12* by Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition Critical Study* (Leiden, 1991), 347-56.
25. It is true that elsewhere, in summarizing the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees (*War* 2.164-66, *Ant.* 13.171-73, 18.12-17), Josephus focuses on the differences in their attitudes toward Fate and free will and does not specify that the main difference between them was on the question of the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Oral Tradition, though this is implied (*Ant.* 18.16) in the statement that the Sadducees observe only the laws of the Torah. The explanation perhaps for this omission is that Josephus is addressing his non-Jewish Greek audience, who, thinking in terms of the parallel Greek philosophical schools, the Epicureans and the Stoics, focused their attention on the attitude toward free will and determinism. As to the reason why Josephus does mention the difference in the attitudes toward the Oral Torah in recounting the incident in connection with John Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 13.277), the explanation would seem to be that in that case it is precisely the oral tradition that led the Pharisees to present the view, which so angered John Hyrcanus that he shifted religious allegiance, that the penalty for slander was stripes and chains.
26. See also Philo, *De Vita Mosi* 2.26.205 and *De Specialibus Legibus* 1.7.52. Josephus himself (*Ag. Ap.* 2.237) gives the same reason for this tolerance, namely, out of reverence to the very word "God."
27. See Marcus Orlitzki, *Flavius Josephus und die Halakha* (Berlin, 1885), 27, n. 36.
28. Cited by David Goldenberg, *The Halakha in Josephus and in Tannaitic Literature: A Comparative Study* (unpublished dissertation, Dropsie University, 1978).
29. E. g. Bernard Revel, "Some Anti-Traditional Laws of Josephus," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 14 (1923-24), 293-301.
30. See Steven Riskin, "The Halakha in Josephus as Reflected in *Against Apion* and *The Life* (unpublished master's thesis, Yeshiva University, 1970).
31. See Haim Cohn, "Yoshus Flavius ke-Historion shel Dine 'Orshin,'" *Ha Universitah* 18.1 (1973): 28-36.
32. See, e.g., the extremely influential rhetorician Apollonius Molon, who in the first century B.C.E. (*ap. Josephus, Ag. Ap.* 2.258), condemned the Jews for refusing admission to persons with other preconceived ideas about God and for declining to associate with those who have chosen to adopt a different mode of life. Even the historian Hecataeus of Abdera, writing about the year 300 B.C.E. (*ap. Diodorus* 40.3.4), who was, on the whole, very well disposed toward the Jews, characterized the Jewish mode of life as somewhat unsocial (*aparhropon*, "inhuman") and hostile to foreigners (*misxemon*). This alleged hostility to non-Jews reached the point of a blood libel circulated by Apion in the first century (*ap. Josephus, Ag. Ap.* 2.89-102) that when Antiochus Epiphanes entered the Temple in the second century B.C.E. he was hailed with great relief by a Greek who told him how he had been kidnapped and shut up in the Temple, where he was held incommunicado and was fattened up on most lavish feasts. The Greek is said to have soon discovered that this was a practice followed by the Jews each year, and that it would culminate in his being sacrificed in accordance with their customary ritual, after which the Jews would partake of the flesh of the sacrificial victim and swear an oath of hostility to the Greeks. Damocritus (*ap. Suda*, "Damokritos"), a historian in the first century C.E., similarly refers to the sacrifice by the Jews of a stranger (not specifically a Greek). He says that the sacrifice occurred every seventh year and adds that the Jews used to kill their victim by carding his flesh into small pieces.
33. See my *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (above, n. 13), 288-341.
34. See the discussion in my *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (1937-1980) (Berlin, 1984), 438-44.
35. Goldenberg (above, n. 28), 61-66, cites midrashic evidence that executed criminals

- were deliberately left unburied for specific periods of time for expiatory purposes.
36. Kaufmann Kohler, "The Halakhik Portions in Josephus' Antiquities (IV, 8, 5-4)," in his *Studies, Addresses, and Personal Papers* (New York, 1931), 74.
 37. Yigael Yadin, ed., *The Temple Scroll*, Vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1983), 62, 93-94, 305.
 38. Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, Vol. 6 (Philadelphia, 1928), 312, n. 39.
 39. David Alshuler, "On the Classification of Judaic Laws in the Antiquities of Josephus and the Temple Scroll of Qumran," *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 7-8 (1982-83): 1-14.
 40. The parallels are particularly striking between the preface to the *Antiquities* (cf. Philo, *De Opificio Mundi* 1-3, and Josephus, *Ant.* 1.21, on the question as to why the Torah begins with creation rather than with a statement of the laws); the description of Abraham's attack the Assyrians (Philo, *De Abrahamo* 40.233-34; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.177); the interpretation of the name Abel (Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami* 13.74; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.52); and the interpretation of the name Ishmael (Philo, *De Mutatione Nominum* 37.202; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.190). The similarity in interpretation of names may, however, be due to mutual dependence upon onomastica, such as have been found on papyri in Egypt. See D. Rokeah (above, n. 13), 70-82.
 41. On the whole question of Josephus' dependence upon Philo, see my *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (above, n. 34), 410-18; Stuart D. Robertson, "The Account of the Ancient Israelite Tabernacle and First Priesthood in the *Jewish Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus" (unpublished dissertation, Amenberg Research Institute, 1991), 221-82.
 42. Samuel Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law: The Hellenistic Interpretation of Biblical Law in Relation to the Palestinian Halakah* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), 22-23, after comparing the laws discussed by Philo with the same laws as found in the works of Josephus, concludes: "On whole, I believe that Philo, the Alexandrian, knew more about Palestinian law than Josephus, the Judean," and this despite the fact that Philo does not indicate that he was thoroughly versed in Jewish traditions, whereas Josephus boasts that he was. As an example where Philo shows a knowledge of Halakah that is superior to that of Josephus, he cites Josephus' errors (*Ant.* 3.282, 4.273) in expounding the laws concerning the Jubilee, namely in stating that debts are cancelled and that a slave woman and her children go free; but Philo may represent the theoretical law and Josephus may represent the actual practice when the law was in effect. As to the latter case, whether the phrase "wife, also free" refers to a wife acquired prior to slavery or to the liberation of a wife acquired while he was a slave is unclear. Robert P. Gallant, "Josephus' Expositions of Biblical Law: An Internal Analysis" (unpublished dissertation, Yale University, 1988), 248, suggests that Josephus may have been deliberately vague in order to allow for the possibility of interpreting his oversimplified statement in a manner consistent with the complexities of the biblical text.
 43. Bnay Cohen, "Civil Bondage in Jewish and Roman Law," in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (New York, 1945), 113-32; Bernard S. Jackson, *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History* (Leiden, 1975), 3-4; Heinrich Weyl, *Die jüdischen Strafgesetze bei Flavius Josephus in ihrem Verhältnis zu Schrift und Halacha (Mit einer Einleitung: Flavius Josephus über die jüdischen Gerichtshöfe und Richter)* (Berlin, 1900). On the question as to whether Josephus knew enough Latin to be able to follow discussions of Roman law, see Henry St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (New York, 1929), 119-20; David Daube, "Three Legal Notes on Josephus after His Surrender," *Law Quarterly Review* 93 (1977): 191-94; and my *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (above, n. 34), 836.
 44. Michael Avi-Yonah, *Oriental Art in Roman Palestine* (Rome, 1961), 23-27.
 45. S. Lieberman (above, n. 15), 116.
 46. Wilhelm Bacher, *Die Aggada der Tannaiten* 2nd ed., Vol. 1 (Strassburg, 1903), 475-89.

47. See L. Priejs (above, n. 1).
48. See the comments by Moshe J. Bernstein, "4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 45 (1994): 10-11. Nevertheless, Bernstein, p. 11, n. 36, is wary of seeing a connection between Qumranic and rabbinic exegesis, since he believes that the simple-sense nature of the readings makes such hypotheses tenuous. But as the examples begin to multiply with the publication of previously unpublished fragments, the likelihood of a common tradition increases, especially where, as here, the language is similar.
49. Long ago, Louis Ginzberg, "Baruch, Apocalypse of," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. 2 (New York, 1902), 555, argued that the author of *Pesikta Rabhati* had before him an old Hebrew *mishnah*.
50. Deborah Dimant, "An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385^B-4Q385 16)," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, ed. George J. Brooke (Leiden, 1994), 13, 19-20, 28-29.
51. Deborah Dimant and John Strugnell, "The Merkavah Vision in *Second Ezekiel* (4Q385 4)," *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1990): 347.
52. For the date of Pseudo-Philo, see now H. Jacobson (above, n. 14), 199-210.
53. Azariah dei Rossi, *Me'or Einayim* (Mantua, 1573-75); Leopold Cohn, "An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. 10 (1898): 314-32; L. Ginzberg (above, n. 38), Vols. 5-6; H. Jacobson (above, n. 14); and my *Prolegomenon to Biblical Antiquities of Philo* by M.R. James (New York, 1971), lxxviii-lxx.
54. Abraham Schalit, trans. and ed., *Yosefus, Kadmoniot ba-Yehudim*, Vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1944), xxxix-xli.
55. Salomo Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus* (Wien, 1930), xv.
56. See my "Prolegomenon" (above, n. 53), lviii-ixvi, and my "Epilogomenon to Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB)," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 24 (1974): 306-07. I have noted thirty parallels between Josephus and Pseudo-Philo (Alexander Zeroni, "Erwägungen Pseudo-Philos Quellen und Zeit," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 11 (1980): 45, n. 43, has added another) that are to be found in no other work that has come down to us and fifteen cases where Josephus is not alone in agreeing with Pseudo-Philo but where both may reflect common tradition. That, however, the relationship between Josephus and Pseudo-Philo is not a simple matter may be deduced from the fact that I have noted thirty-six instances where they disagree.
57. For parallels between Josephus and Asatir, see Moses Gaster, *The Asatir: The Samaritan Book of the 'Secrets of Moses' together with the Pitron or Samaritan Commentary and the Samaritan Story of the Death of Moses* (London, 1927), 65-79, who has, however, stretched the evidence.
58. Christopher T. Begg, "Uzzekiah's Illness and Visit according to Josephus," *Estudios Biblicos* 53 (1995): 368.
59. Cf. other citations in L. Ginzberg (above, n. 38), Vol. 6, p. 379, n. 132; see my "Josephus' Portrait of Jehoiachin," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 139.1 (1995): 27-30.
60. Eric Larson, "4Q470 and the Angelic Rehabilitation of King Zedekiah," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 210-26.
61. S. Rappaport (above, n. 55), 1-71.
62. See my various articles listed in "Josephus' Portrait of Jephthah," in *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menachem Stern*, ed. Isaiah M. Gafni, Aharon Oppenheimer, and Daniel R. Schwartz (Jerusalem, 1996), 687, n. 3.
63. See my "Josephus' Portrait of Jacob," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 79 (1988-89): 136-33.
64. See Moses Hadas, "Plato in Hellenistic Fusion," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19 (1958): 3-15; *idem*, *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion* (New York, 1950), 72-82.

65. Theodor Mommsen, "Cornelius Tacitus und Clavius Rutilus," *Hermes* 4 (1870): 320-22, suggests that the source is the lost history of Clavius Rutilus; but I have challenged this (see my "The Sources of Josephus' *Antiquities*, Douk 19," *Latomus* 21 [1962]: 320-33).
66. Arthur J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Tübingen, 1989), 37, likewise suggests that it is reasonable to conclude that Josephus had read Hesiod and had him in mind while "translating" the pre-history of Genesis into a language intelligible for his Greek audience.
67. See Howard Jacobson, "Josephus on the Death of Moses," in *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent*, ed. H.D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt (Liverpool, 1993) and, more briefly, James D. Tabor, "Returning to the Divinity": Josephus' Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 225. Christopher T. Begg, "Josephus's Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses: Some Observations," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 692, argues that in the end Josephus negates the whole impression of Moses' disappearance with his closing affirmation that in reality Moses did not "return to the divinity" but simply died. This does not, however, detract from the point that, prior to this "correction," Josephus has described the disappearance of Moses in terms closely parallel to those used by Sophocles.
68. See Howard Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge, 1983), 37-38.
69. Joseph Wieneke, "Ezechielis Judaei Poetae Alexandrini Fabulae Quae Inscribitur Exagoge Fragmenta" (unpublished dissertation, Münster, 1931), and Peter M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Vol. 1 (Oxford, 1972).
70. On Josephus' indebtedness to Herodotus, see also Bernhard Brüne, *Flavius Josephus und seine Schriften in ihrem Verhältnis zum Judentum, zur griechisch-römischen Welt und zum Christentum mit griechischer Wortkonkordanz zum Neuen Testamente und 1. Clemensbriefe nebst Sach- und Namen-Verzeichnis. Anhang: Inhalt nebst Sachregister zu "Josephus der Geschichtsschreiber"* (Gütersloh, 1913), 164-68, who gives a list of 63 words from Book 1 of Herodotus which are distinctive with him and which appear in Josephus. From the other books of Herodotus he counts over 1100 expressions which are used by Josephus. For further parallels, see also Guilelmus Schmidt, "De Flavii Josephi Floriculture Observationes Criticae," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 20 (Leipzig, 1894): 509-10; Sven Ek, *Herodotismen in der jüdischen Archäologie des Josephos und ihre textkritische Bedeutung*, *Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. Acta Societatis Scientiarum Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis*, Vol. 2 (Lund, 1945-46), 27-62, 213, especially pp. 39-49. We have already remarked above that the phrase *epi geratos oudoi* ("on the threshold of old age"), which we cited from Homer, appears also in Herodotus (3.14). In all fairness, we should note that here Herodotus (1.30) actually says something slightly different from Josephus (*Ant.* 1.225), for he speaks of the blessing of living to see grandchildren born to one's sons, whereas Josephus speaks of the hope of seeing one's son uncathed.
71. Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974): 239-62.
72. See von Arnim (above, n. 4), 270-71. Likewise, Hecabe, before giving birth to Paris, dreamt that she had given birth to a firebrand that consumed all of Troy, and consequently exposed the infant, only to have him suckled by a bear, found by a shepherd, and eventually raised to fulfill the prophecy (Apollodorus 3.12.5; Hyginus, *Fabula* 91). Again, an oracle foretold that the son of Danae, the daughter of King Acrisius of Argos, was destined to kill Acrisius, whereupon he shut her up in an underground chamber, only to have Zeus visit her and beget a child, Perseus, who, indeed, fulfilled the prophecy (Apollodorus 2.4.1; Hyginus, *Fabula* 63).
73. Samuel S. Kottick, *Medicine and Hygiene in the Works of Flavius Josephus* (Leiden, 1994), 156-60.

74. Hans Drner, *Untersuchungen über Josephus* (Munich, 1896), 1-35; H. Thackeray (above, n. 43), 110-14; Robert J.H. Shutt, *Studies in Josephus* (London, 1961), 68-75. H. Thackeray, pp. 105-17, goes so far as to posit a "Thucydidean back" whose assistance to Josephus is particularly evident in Books 17-19 of the *Antiquities*, as well as an assistant steeped in the works of Sophocles for Books 15 and 16 of the *Antiquities*. We may question this theory for the following reasons: (1) Josephus' statement (*Ag. Ap.* 150) that he used fellow-workers for the sake of the Greek occurs in his discussion of the composition of the *War*, where H. Thackeray, p. 106, ironically is forced to admit that he cannot pinpoint the nature and extent of their help, though, of course, we may add, it was not uncommon in antiquity for an author to indicate a source where he employed none and to fail to indicate it where he did use it; (2) There are Sophoclean and Thucydidean traces throughout the *War* and the *Antiquities*, as Elclanan Stein, *De Woordenkeuze in het Bellum Judaicum van Flavius Josephus* (Amsterdam, 1937), has shown; (3) The presence of many of the Sophoclean and Thucydidean phrases in the other Greek works of the period, notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus, as David J. Ladouceur, "Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus" (unpublished dissertation, Brown University, 1977), has pointed out, shows that they characterize first-century Greek rather than reflect the proclivities of a special assistant; (4) The fact that Josephus used Strabo in Books 13-15 shows that there is not a sharp dividing line, as Thackeray contends, between Josephus' work ending in Book 14 and the assistant's work, commencing in Book 15; (5) If Josephus used an assistant for the *Antiquities*, we would have expected him to use one for *Against Apion*, which was completed not long afterwards and which, by Thackeray's own admission, shows great literary skill, but for the writing of which he postulates no assistant. (6) The *Antiquities* was written after Josephus had been in Rome for twenty years. If he had had any contact with the Jews of Rome, it was, most probably, in Greek, to judge from the inscriptions of the Jewish catacombs from that period. Hence, he had hardly the same need for assistants for the *Antiquities* as for the *War*. Most likely Josephus himself was at that time making a special study of Thucydides, for example, and hence the Thucydidean phraseology. See my review of Henry St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian*, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 545-46. Others who have criticized Thackeray's assistant hypothesis are George C. Richards, "The Composition of Josephus' *Antiquities*," *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1939): 36-40; Robert J.H. Shutt, *Studies in Josephus* (London, 1961), 30-35, 50-77; André Pelletier, *Flavius Josephus. Adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristote. Une réaction atticisme contre la koinè* (Paris, 1962), 251 ff.; Tessa Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and His Society* (Philadelphia, 1984), 62-63, 233-36; Por Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance* (Sheffield, 1988), 152-34.
75. H. Thackeray (above, n. 43), 111.
76. See M. Hadas (above, n. 64).
77. On Josephus' indebtedness to Plato, see further B. Brüne (above, n. 70), 194-98.
78. See the numerous examples cited by B. Brüne, 210-14.
79. See my "Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 99 (1968): 143-56.
80. See C.R. Holladay (above, n. 6), 93. To be sure, Josephus (*Against Apion* 1.218) mentions Eupolemus in his discussion of Greek, that is, pagan, historians who wrote about Jewish affairs. But Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.13.7, and Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 36, speak of him as a Jewish author; and Jacob Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien: Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdische und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke* (Breslau, 1874), 82-130, has argued, both on the basis of Hebraisms in his language and of his treatment of biblical history, that he lived in Palestine. See also Ben Zion Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati, 1974), 15. They note his considerable knowledge of and devotion to the Temple in Jerusalem.

81. This is the title given by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1.23.153.4.
82. Cited by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, *ibid*.
83. See Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period I* (Philadelphia, 1974), 216-47.
84. See Martin Hengel, "Qumran und der Hellenismus" in *Qumran. Sa piété, sa théologie, et son milieu*, ed. Matthias Delcor (Paris, 1978), 333-72.
85. Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Fribourg, 1986), has presented a point-by-point examination of the organization of the Qumran community and has noted congruences with the rules of seventeen religious associations (*thiasoi*) and guilds of the Hellenistic Roman world, notably those of Ptolemaic Egypt, ranging from the third century B.C.E. to the second century C.E.
86. Martin Hengel, in collaboration with Christoph Markschies, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaism in the First Century after Christ* (London, 1989), 25.
87. Cited by Diogenes Laertius 2.41.
88. Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 14.
89. See my *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (above, n. 34), 477-80.
90. The correspondence between Solomon and Hiram and their friendship are also cited and discussed at length by Eupolemus (*ap.* Eusebius, *Præparatio Evangelica* 9.34.1-20).
91. On the great value attached to antiquity in ancient times see my *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (above, n. 13), 177-200.