

# Main Trends in Modern Josephus Research

Per Bilde

Aarhus

## 1. Introduction

A critical and analytical overall survey of more recent Josephus research is still lacking (cf. also Feldman, 1984a, p. 885). True enough, there is an excellent bibliography by Schreckenberg, so far in two volumes, which contains a nearly complete registry of all literature on Josephus up to and including 1977-78. A third volume of this bibliography, written by Feldman, comprising the literature from 1978-79 to 1984, and a supplement to the two first volumes is on its way (cf. Feldman, 1984a, p. 19). However, as a matter of course, this bibliography is primarily a registration and it does not attempt to depict the history and development of the research. Nor is an attempt of this kind available from editions and translations of Josephus' works, neither in the Loeb edition nor in the Michel-Bauernfeind edition of Bell., where one might have expected to find it. It is most astonishing, however, that nor do any of the more numerous recent monographical investigations contain an adequate critical review of the modern research. Of course, some of them do contain valuable sections on the history of the research. This applies to Farmer (1956), Lindner (1972), Schalit (1973), Attridge (1976) and S.J.D. Cohen (1979) as well as Michel-Bauernfeind, who in volume III contributes a brief chapter on the present state of Josephus research. However, none of these presents the missing overall survey, only thematic reviews of parts of the research history. Unfortunately, neither do the most recent general works, van

Unnik (1978), Rajak (1983), Attridge (1984) and Moehring (1984) fulfil this need. The same applies to Feldman's large synthetizing works, partly the critical review of Josephus research from 1937-1980 (1984a), and partly the general survey of the main problems in Josephus research in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, (ANRW), II, 21,2 (1984b). Neither in 1984a nor in 1984b does Feldman undertake a critical analysis of modern Josephus research as a whole. He organizes the literature thematically. He records and criticizes it, but he makes no attempt to detect the main trends in the research. He does not adopt a definite point of view with regard to modern research and—apart from a short section in 1984b, pp. 860-862—makes no attempt to present an overall evaluation of modern Josephus research.

I have, therefore, felt compelled to work out my own analysis and account of the more recent history of Josephus research. It has been published previously in a different and in part more comprehensive version (Bilde, 1983, pp. 20-61). Naturally, the following survey is based on this version, but it has been shortened, slightly reworked and supplemented by a section about the very latest research from the period 1980-1984. I emphasize the fact that this is a survey and concerns the main trends in the history of the research. A few areas in the research are not at all dealt with. This applies to, e.g., the literature on *Testimonium Flavianum*.

*Literature:* Reference is made to Farmer, 1956, pp. 24-44; Michel-Bauernfeind, III, pp. XX-XXVI; Lindner, 1972, pp. 1-20; Schalit, 1973, pp. VII-XVIII; Attridge, 1976, pp. 3-27; S.J.D. Cohen, 1979, pp. 3-23; Feldman, 1984a, pp. 16-19, and 1984b, pp. 763-765, and Bilde, 1983, pp. 20-61, esp. pp. 20-22, where the necessity for a critical analytical survey covering the more recent Josephus research as a whole is discussed more thoroughly. The literature on Testimonium Flavianum has been examined, i.a., in Bilde, 1981, esp. pp. 103-107.

## 2. The earlier research

As we know, Josephus soon won an eminent position in the Christian civilization. Bell. was read by many Christians to be an account of the fulfilment of the prophecies Jesus made about the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Added to this are the brief passages in Ant. concerning Jesus (18,63-64), John the Baptist (18,116-119) and Jesus' brother James (20, 200-203), which have been of so great importance for the church. Therefore, in the Christian church, Josephus received recognition as a crypto-Christian Nicodemus character, a kind of Jewish Churchfather similar to Philo, or a kind of fifth evangelist. In late antiquity and the Middle Ages of Europe he was respected and esteemed as a great author and historian. For example, a man like Hieronymus could describe Josephus as the Jewish Livius (Epist. 22,35,8). During this period, admiration of him was nearly uncritical, and the work of scholars consisted primarily in carrying on the tradition by constantly creating new editions and translations.

The first slight signs of a critical attitude appeared at the end of the Middle Ages, when one gradually began to take note of and comment on Josephus' deviations from the text of the Old Testament in his rendering of the Biblical history in Ant. 1-11. This tendency increased in the 16th and 17th centuries when the first doubts about the genuineness of Testimonium Flavianum arose. The attack on this "Christian" kernel text gave rise to a violent

furor and developed into an enormous literary controversy which raged throughout most of Europe from the 17th to far into the 19th century (cf. e.g., Berggren and Serenius). In the 18th century and especially in the 19th, the critical research gradually prevailed and was increased greatly along with general developments of critical research in the fields of the humanities and Biblical studies which took place during this time.

*Literature:* For a closer analysis of the early, uncritical Josephus research, reference is made esp. to Feldman, 1984a, pp. 21-24; Schreckenberg 1968, 1972, 1977 and 1980, pp. 179-181; van Unnik, 1978, pp. 17-18, and Vidal-Naquet, pp. 30-35. The use of Josephus in antiquity (the early church) and the Middle Ages is thoroughly treated by Bardy, R.M. Grant and above all by Schreckenberg (1984). Modern representatives for this uncritical standpoint are Bernstein and Rosenzweig.

## 3. The classic conception of Josephus

Scepticism towards Testimonium Flavianum, and soon thereafter towards the passages about John the Baptist and James the brother of Jesus, went hand in hand with the detection of unpleasant tendentious features in the writings, first of all a servile flattery of the Flavians, and then the massive apologetics for the Jewish people and, last but not least, for Josephus' own morally suspect career. These features were considered to be incompatible with objective historical writing which Josephus otherwise purports to be his aim. Graetz and Jost are especially named in this connection. Added to this, were intensive investigations of the important source problem which becomes particularly urgent in Ant. and Ap. von Destinon tackled the question of the sources of Ant. 12-13, and came to the conclusion that Josephus had not personally incorporated the original sources but, on the contrary, it must be presumed that he adopted them in a revised version from an account similar in kind to Ant., a so-called *middle source*. von Destinon found the decisive evidence for this hypothesis in the numerous formulae of references

in Ant. 12–13, which according to this scholar are not confirmed by other corresponding passages in the same work were they are so to speak "fulfilled" (cf. pp. 18 ff.). According to von Destinon, Josephus does not take Bell. into consideration in Ant. 12–20 either, although he had earlier described the same period in Bell. (cf. pp. 9 ff.). Instead, in Ant. 12–20, independently of the earlier account, once again he is assumed to have utilized the same earlier middle sources which he had used already once in Bell. So, Josephus was no longer to be looked upon as a writer of history working independently. All of a sudden he was reduced to the status of a rather unimaginative pen-pusher who had merely plagiarized the works of others and pieced together the stolen goods without adding much thought to the matter. With this, the so-called *anonymous hypothesis* ("Anonymus Hypothese") or hypothesis of anonymity had been launched. It was not Josephus himself, but the anonymous authors of the middle sources which he used who were responsible for and had the credit for his historical writings (cf. p. 39).

The moralizing criticism of Josephus (Graetz and Jost) and von Destinon's anonymous hypothesis appear combined into one distinctive conception of Josephus in Hölscher's classic article in Pauly-Wissowa from 1916. Hölscher regards Josephus not merely as an editor of source material which had already been collected, but as a compiler who created nothing independently and one who owes everything which is worthwhile in his works to his sources. Apart from his lack of originality, according to Hölscher, Josephus is also untrustworthy, e.g., when he claims to have translated the Biblical scriptures (Ant. 1,5, 17, etc.):

Der eitle Schriftsteller hat sich mit fremden Federn geschmückt. Die Frage muss also gestellt werden, ob er bei seiner Arbeit den Bibeltext überhaupt aufgeschlagen hat (col. 1953).

Hölscher claimed that the Greek translation of the Biblical scriptures as well as the learned exegesis of the Biblical material was derived by Josephus from elsewhere (cols. 1951–1962). The same applies to the material from the Greco-Roman authors (cols. 1964–1967). Josephus' works have mainly consisted of:

Abschreiben, Exzerpieren, Paraphrasieren und Kombinieren von Vorlagen (col. 1962).

According to Hölscher, in Ant. 13–17, Josephus uses a compilation by a "Jewish Nicolas forger" (cols. 1970–1982), and in Ant. 18–20, presumably a "Jewish middle source" (cols. 1983–1994). Finally, Hölscher regards Josephus as a tendentious hireling, since Bell. is described as being a work of propaganda which was ordered by the Emperor:

Die Darstellung unseres vom Kaiser bezahlten Literaten ist danach durchaus Tendenzdarstellung (col. 1943).

To Hölscher, Josephus' weakness of character on one hand and his inability as an author and historian on the other are two sides of the same matter. It is claimed that Josephus has plagiarized and copied texts from others because he is a dependent and weak character. He has twisted and deceived because his aim is to make apologies on his own behalf and explain away his cowardice and his betrayal of his people.

Thus, an entirely new view of Josephus was launched, a view which soon settled into a massive negative attitude which was to leave its mark on all aspects of Josephus research as well as the research which uses Josephus as an historical source. This is the *classical conception of Josephus* which was founded in the latter half of the 19th century and culminated in the first decades of the 20th. However, it did not cease to exist, although as time went by it acquired a different form under influence of other schools of thought. The most important names which we may connect with the classical conception of Josephus are Norden, Bentwich, Laqueur, Weber, Eisler, Foakes-Jackson, Schalit, S.J.D. Cohen and Trisoglio.

This classic conception of Josephus is also to be found behind the attempts to show a single Roman source behind Bell., at least as it was originally suggested by Schlatter, Norden and Weber. It was assumed that this source was either the imperial "commentarii" (cf. Vita 342, 358 and Ap. 1,56) and/or an historical dissertation on the Jewish war no longer extant, written either by Antonius Julianus (Schlatter

and Norden) or a Flavian work, now lost (Weber). Furthermore, it was argued that it was from a work—purely hypothetical—like this from which Josephus was supposed to have derived, not to say stolen, all the outstanding descriptions of the conduct of the war, of all the localities of Judaea and of the siege of Jerusalem as contained in Bell. Thus, the tendency of this thesis is also to reduce Josephus' own contribution and importance as an author to the role of a copyist, a compiler and an editor.

*Literature:* In general, reference is made to Feldman, 1984a, pp. 99–102, and Bilde, 1983, pp. 23–25. With regard to the question of the possibility of a Roman source behind Bell., references is made to Feldman, 1984a, pp. 378–380, and 1984b, p. 840, as well as Bilde, 1983, pp. 28–30. The view which Graetz and Jost applied with regard to Josephus has been expressed respectively in III,2, pp. 483–500 and 553–560, and I, pp. 435–450.

#### 4. Criticism of the classical conception of Josephus

As early as the beginning of the 20th century, new signals were seen in Josephus research. Scholars like Bloch, Drüner, and Niese opposed von Destinon's anonymous hypothesis. Drüner attempted to demonstrate that the formulae of references in Ant. 12–13 closely correspond to those which also occur throughout his writings, and that in practically all cases these can be located (pp. 70–94). Furthermore, that it must have been Josephus himself who had utilized and interpolated 1 Macc., and thus, this book was not, as presumed by von Destinon, already present as an interpolation in an anonymous source which Josephus merely copied (pp. 35ff). Ultimately, Drüner contests von Destinon's assertion that Ant. is independent of Bell. According to Drüner, the opposite is the case, and he attempts to establish that in Ant., Josephus purposely revises and re-edits the previous version presented in Bell. (pp. 51–56).

Drüner's work was carried on by other scholars. Täubler (1916), Petersen and Altschuler continued the analysis of the formulae of refer-

ences in Ant., and tried to explain them all as Josephus' own references to passages either in works already existing or to works which had been planned. As early as in 1896, Drüner's teacher, Niese, the editor of Josephus, rejected the anonymous hypothesis by pointing out the extent of the linguistic and stylistic unity which is characteristic of Ant. (1896, pp. 218ff. and 235), an opinion which was later to be widely adopted.

Eventually, when the thesis of Josephus as the passive copyist had been set aside, the conception of Josephus as an active forger—a creative villain—became more prevalent in the classic conception of Josephus. In 1920, this theory received an entirely new dimension by Laqueur who launched the *biographical criticism of tendency*. Here, the opposition to the anonymous hypothesis, which was founded on source criticism, is fully displayed. Even the title of the book, *Der jüdische Historiker Josephus*, clearly indicates Laqueur's emphasis. He maintains that source criticism has failed precisely because it neglected to investigate the tenor of Josephus (p. 129). Instead of the automatic, source orientated division of Josephus' works based on external, formal criteria, Laqueur demands an interpretation and understanding of Josephus as an ardent, creative human being who has had an intention with his writings (pp. 56–57, 129, 132, 218 and 241–242).

On this basis, Laqueur conducted a series of investigations of Ant. 14, which showed, i.e., that Josephus cannot have used an anonymous source but must have used Bell. as his foundation, and that in Ant., he merely "tendentiously" revised the version in Bell. (pp. 128ff.). Laqueur found confirmation of this insight in other parts of Ant. According to Laqueur, the revision in Ant. reflects major changes in the personal life of Josephus, which he unambiguously regards as negative. Laqueur perceives all of Josephus' writings as being the result of a career which finds no equal in egotism, mendacity, fraud and treachery. He uses all of the basest qualities to describe Josephus, and all of the most suspect motives are said to have incited his works. On the basis of this negative perception of Josephus' person and based on

his theory of Josephus' gradual, unpredictable development, Laqueur founded his hypothesis of "Die Werdegang des Josephus" (pp. 245-278): Josephus began as a law-abiding priest having an important position in Jerusalem (p. 247). However, he abused his office as emissary in the north in the year 66-67, to set himself up as a tyrant in Galilee from where the kernel of Vita, the "Rechenschaftsbericht" (statement of affairs), was sent to the government in Jerusalem (pp. 96ff. and 248-249). After his treasonable surrender to the Romans, Josephus changed roles again and then acted as "der officiosus der römischen Politik" (p. 256). Josephus remained in this office until he lost imperial favour under the reign of Domitian (p. 259). He was then forced to alter his course again and became engaged by the publisher Epaphroditus as a Jewish expert and propagandist:

So nimmt denn der Verleger Epaphroditus den Josephus als Autorität auf dem Gebiet des Judentums unter seinen Schutz und unterstützt ihn bei der Abfassung der Arch. durch Gewährung äusserer Existenzmittel (Arch, I,8) (p. 259).

This enabled Josephus to combine his secure income with an effort to rehabilitate himself in the good grace of his Jewish countrymen:

Egoismus und natürliches Nationalgefühl konnten nunmehr Hand in Hand gehen und brauchten sich nicht mehr zu kreuzen (p. 260).

When the work of Justus of Tiberias was finally published (ca. 100), and Justus proved to be superior to Josephus as an orthodox expert on Jewish affairs, Josephus was "dismissed" by Epaphroditus (pp. 272-274). Thereupon, Josephus turned—"Gewissensskrupel gab es für Josephus nicht" (p. 274)—to the Christians and added *Testimonium Flavianum* (Ant. 18, 63-64) in order to make Ant. more readable and thereby promote the sale of the book to a wider Greco-Roman public (pp. 274-278).

Laqueur's fanciful theories on the life history of Josephus and on the various and sharply divided "phases of trends" in his writings should not, however, prevent recognition of the fact that in principle this scholar has made correct observations. It is absolutely necessary to

search for and uncover the intentions and the aim which are the driving forces in Josephus' works. Nor is it wrong to place them in relationship to his life history as far as it is possible to reconstruct it with a reasonable degree of certainty. Therefore, in principle, Laqueur's approach is correct (cf. also Feldman, 1984a, p. 102).

However, criticism of the anonymous hypothesis continued. It also influences the book from 1929 by Thackeray, the editor and translator of Josephus. Like Bloch, Drüner, Niese and Laqueur, Thackeray attempts to show that in Ant. Josephus himself has treated his source material (pp. 58-59). According to Thackeray, moreover, Josephus has compiled and interpolated the official documents contained in Ant. (pp. 70-71). At the same time, Thackeray rejects Laqueur's ideas about the kernel of Vita being a "statement of affairs" sent by Josephus to the Jewish rebellious government in Jerusalem, since a kernel of this nature cannot with certainty be separated from Vita (pp. 17-19). Likewise, he rejects Laqueur's interpretation of Josephus' life (pp. 20-21). Instead of, or perhaps along with, the "cold, egoistic selfishness," Thackeray credits Josephus with objective interests. In fact, for the first time in the history of critical research, Thackeray makes an attempt to assume and formulate a political standpoint taken by Josephus. Thus, according to Thackeray, it is unreasonable to deny Josephus' patriotism (p. 21). Like many other Jews, he was a confirmed opponent of the Revolt, but circumstances forced him to become involved (pp. 10-13 and 21-22). After his capture, during the siege of Jerusalem, Josephus was untiring in his efforts to avoid the ultimate catastrophe (p. 22). After the fall of the city, he devoted himself to the cause of his people (p. 22). Albeit Bell. is a work of Flavian propaganda (pp. 27ff.), at the same time Josephus served his country and his people by that which he wrote:

He was no mere hireling; his own deepest convictions told him that the only road to amelioration of his nation's unhappy lot lay in submission to the empire (p. 29).

Therefore, Thackeray sees no contradiction, but a firm unity in Josephus' writings:

His fine apologia for Judaism, the *contra Apionem*, crowns his services to his race. He has surely earned the name of patriot (p. 22).

For this reason Thackeray also rejects the assertion of Laqueur that *Ant.* comprises something definitely new in comparison to *Bell.*—that *Ant.* was supposed to be a Jewish apology, whereas *Bell.* was considered to be pro-Roman and thoroughly Flavian. According to Thackeray, it is true enough that in writing *Ant.* Josephus had been released from his alliance with the Roman political propaganda, and now comes forth clean and purely as a Jewish historian and apologist:

But this severance of Roman ties and adoption of another and more patriotic theme do not, to my mind, indicate any abrupt change of attitude (p. 52).

But nor was Thackeray completely able to free himself from the classical conception of Josephus. This is clearly evident in the famous *assistant hypothesis*. According to Thackeray, the "assistants" ('*synergoi*') mentioned in *Ap.* 1,50 have a considerable share of the credit for the services rendered by Josephus' writings (p. 100), although Josephus ungratefully neglects to mention them in his preface to *Bell.* (p. 105). These assistants have indeed made great contributions, not only in *Bell.* (cf. *Ap.* 1,50), but also in *Ant.*, especially in *Ant.* 15–19 (pp. 106ff.). According to Thackeray, *Ant.* 15–16 and 17–19 are by and large written by two assistants, the "Sophoclean" (15–16) and the "Thucydidean" (17–19) (pp. 109–118). But in *Ant.* 20 and in *Vita*, we find Josephus in his "purest" form (p. 115).

Thackeray's assistant hypothesis won the support of many scholars, not least because it was regarded by some of them as a suitable substitute for the castaway anonymous hypothesis. This can be said to apply to scholars like Geltzer, Hengel, G.A. Williamson, M. Grant, Schalit, Goldstein and Ulrich. Nevertheless, the assistant hypothesis—no more than the earlier theory—was not allowed to remain uncontested. On the basis of linguistic and stylistic investigations, the Thucydidean features found in Josephus were interpreted already by Drüner as being a deliberate effort on

the part of Josephus to imitate his great Greek predecessor (pp. 2ff. and 34). But apart from that, Elchanan Stein was one of the first scholars to advance a thorough criticism of Thackeray's presentation of the assistant hypothesis. On the basis of lexicographical investigations, Stein showed that all of the books in Josephus' works are very uniform lexicographically and stylistically. He traces quotations from and allusions to a great number of Greek authors, and astonishingly enough these are distributed by from two to four occurrences on each and every page of Josephus' works. Thus, according to Stein, the literary even quality of the works has been attested to such an extent that Thackeray's assistant hypothesis must be rejected (p. 128). For Stein, the role of the assistants must be regarded as more humble, since they must be presumed to have acted as proof-readers rather than as creative writers (p. 128).

Likewise, Richards has criticized Thackeray's assistant hypothesis on linguistic-stylistic grounds. The "sophoclean" periods appear to overlap the "Thucydidean" (p. 39), and according to Richards, *Ant.* 17–19 by and large seem to employ the same vocabulary as the other books of *Ant.* (p. 40). Therefore, Richards, as well as Drüner, Stein and Brüne, attributes the numerous allusions and references to Greek literature, especially Thucydides, to Josephus himself. Richards assumes that Josephus alone translated *Bell.* from the Aramaic into Greek,

...and the placed the MS in the hands of assistants who systematically revised it, rewriting where necessary. No other hypothesis is possible; for no assistant could have been found sufficiently familiar with both Aramaic and literary Greek—at least it is highly improbable—and we have no reason to disbelieve Josephus when he says he translated his original treatise (p. 36).

Consequently, Richards and Stein arrived at the same conclusion, namely, a rejection of Thackeray's hypothesis and a limitation of the activities of the assistants to *Bell.*, where, according to Josephus' own information in *Ap.* 1, 50, they contributed linguistic assistance.

Criticism of the assistant hypothesis as advanced by Stein and Richards was followed up

by several other scholars, especially Schutt (1961, pp. 30-35 and 59-77), Pelletier (pp. 251ff.), Rajak (1983, pp. 62-63 and 233-236) and Feldman (1984b, p. 860). According to the criticism advanced, there appears to be no basis for a stylistically founded separation of certain parts of the writings which could be attributed to the "assistants" mentioned in Ap. 1,50. Their aid cannot be ascertained in any of the other works than Bell. where Josephus himself informs us about them, and even there it has not been possible to determine the parts for which the assistants might have been directly responsible. Therefore, the debate on the assistant hypothesis points in the same direction as the criticism of the anonymous hypothesis. Indications are that Josephus was personally responsible for his writings, both with regard to their contents and their literary form. In the words of Petersen:

The whole hypothesis assigns to too hypothetical persons what is more easily attributed to the author himself (pp. 260-261, note 5).

Thus, in the first half of the 20th century, a new trend in Josephus research can be observed. The classical conception of Josephus gradually gives way to the foundation of a new main conception. The decisive factor in this development is that one gradually extricates oneself from the hypercritical and strongly moralizing attitude of the 19th century. Gradually, one becomes less concerned with Josephus' moral character, and this opens the way towards the understanding of hitherto unnoticed or misinterpreted national apologetic features in his writings. At the same time, one observes a showdown with the excessive faith in literary criticism of sources in the 19th century, and correspondingly a new interest in Josephus as an actively creative author.

*Literature:* For the history of research during this period, reference is made to Feldman, 1984a, pp. 102-104, and 1984b, p. 860; Michel-Bauernfeind, III, pp. XX-XXIV, and Bilde, 1983, pp. 25-36. Aside from the scholars mentioned, attempts to show that in Ant., Josephus uses and revises Bell. are made by Horowitz, pp. 31-34; Niese, 1896, pp. 218ff., Schlatter, 1923, p. 59, and Täubler, 1916, pp. 222-223. Thackeray's assistant hypothesis is also rejected by other scholars,

e.g., Attridge, 1976, p. 39, and 1984, p. 212; Justus, pp. 135-136; Ladouceur, 1983, p. 35; Lindner, 1974, p. 255; Moehring, 1959, p. 304, and Trisoglio, p. 1040, note 128.

## 5. The classical conception of Josephus in recent years

One cannot, however, establish any date for the demise of the classical conception. It lives on in the periods before and after the Second World War, and it still exists and makes itself heard today by a scholar like S.J.D. Cohen as a significant standpoint in Josephus research. In addition to S.J.D. Cohen, the most important scholars of this period who maintain the classical conception are Bentwich, Eisler, Foakes-Jackson, S, Rappaport, Schalit and G.A. Williamson. However, on a closer analysis of the works of these authors, it becomes evident that actually only a very few of them—characteristically enough the older generation—persist in adhering to the unabbreviated classical standpoints. Most of them belong rather to a position similar to that of Laqueur and Thackeray. Regardless how different these two scholars are, they both contest the anonymous hypothesis and against its adherents they agree in acknowledging Josephus' contribution as a creative author. This recognition is also found among the younger generation of scholars mentioned above, but with the same negative indications as those of Laqueur, which makes it justifiable for us to discuss them together in this section. This applies above all to the scholars who have carried on independent investigations of Josephus' works.

As an example, one can name S. Rappaport. His detailed comparison between Ant. and corresponding Rabbinical material goes to show that to a high degree Josephus himself was actively interpreting and, from the literary point of view, creative in rendering the Haggadic type of paraphrase of the Old Testament found in the first part of Ant.:

Wenn nun auch Jos. seine positiven Angaben höchstwahrscheinlich nur schriftlichen Angaben

entnommen hat, so hat er doch aus seinen Quellen ein neues, eigenartiges Werk geschaffen, eine neue Bibel, mit apologetischer Tendenz gegen die Heiden (pp. XXVI-XXVII).

Insofar as Rappaport demonstrates and emphasizes these features in *Ant.*, however, his investigations point beyond his point of departure and basic view. They also point beyond Laqueur whom Rappaport otherwise follows in this work. For, not only do Josephus' egotism and basic material needs, but also his theological or ideological intentions move into our view.

Something similar applies to Schalit, one of the foremost Josephus scholars of our time. He has translated and analyzed *Ant.* He has worked intensively on *Vita* in several articles. He has made original contributions towards the understanding of the official documents so often cited by Josephus. Not least, in his monograph on Herod the Great, he has made exhaustive studies of Josephus as an historical source and in doing so evaluated the question of Josephus' historical reliability in the light of the results of modern Palestinian archaeology. Moreover, Schalit has presented a comprehensive account of Josephus in the most recent edition of *Encyclopaedia Judaica* as well as in the Josephus anthology from 1973, edited by himself. Finally, in his *otium* as emeritus professor, he has published a comprehensive comparative analysis of Josephus' prophecy concerning Vespasian's imminent future position as emperor.

This life's work is fundamentally influenced by the classical conception of Josephus, yet in such a way that the attitude towards Josephus is modified and variegated as the work progresses. In the earliest contributions, there are only a few nuances and the attitude towards Josephus is unambiguously deprecatory (cf., e.g., 1933b, pp. 73-75, 81-83, 88, 91 and 95). However, in the comprehensive introduction to the Hebrew translation of *Ant.*, it is emphasized that this major work of Josephus has a Jewish apologetic aim (pp. XVIII-XIX and LXXV-LXXXII), that Josephus independently drew upon various sources (pp. XXVI ff.), that *Ant.* 1-10 is independently arranged (pp. XLIX ff., esp. LVII) and is influenced by literary ambition (LVII-LVII and LXIII). At

the same time, however, the classical theme of Josephus' dependence on others is maintained on several points (pp. XXII-XXIV, XLIV-XLV, LX-LXII and LXIV-LXVI). The summary article in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* is once again strongly influenced by the negative attitude to Josephus as a person (pp. 253-254). In like manner, in the spirit of Weber, Bell. is denounced as being an unoriginal work (p. 257) intended to kowtow to the Flavians and exonerate himself from the treason he committed (p. 255). As for *Ant.*, Josephus' weakness as an historian is pointed out. Everything considered, in this article, Josephus only gets by as an outstanding man of letters (pp. 262-263). Viewed in this way, Schalit's introduction to his research anthology from 1973 seems astonishing. True enough, here again, we find that Josephus' moral weakness, his borrowed feathers, and his slavish dependence on his sources are emphasized (p. VIII), like Thackeray's assistant hypothesis is confirmed (p. XIV). But here, this traditional evaluation is set in relief by an unusually severe criticism of the classical conception of Josephus, especially by Willrich (pp. XIII-XIV), Hölscher (p. XIV), Eisler (pp. XVII-XVIII) and Laqueur (p. XVIII). Furthermore, now, Schalit makes reservations against the criticism of Josephus as an apostate and renegade (pp. IX-X and XVIII). Finally, he makes the following comments on the question of Josephus' reliability as an historical source:

Wie erstaunlich richtig in den Hauptzügen sein Darstellung [about the Essenes] ist, haben wir erst in den letzten fünfundzwanzig Jahren durch die epochemachenden Funde am Toten Meer gelernt (p. XV).

Schalit also introduces his research summary by remarking that as yet the final judgement of Josephus is by no means pronounced (p. VII). This duality of the evaluation of Josephus is also present in Schalit's exciting analysis of Josephus' emperor prophecy. Here, Josephus is characterized again—in contradiction to Yohanan ben Zakkai—as a Jewish renegade and Flavian tool (pp. 214 and 277-279). He is said to have lied about the time of the prophecy (pp. 259, 288 ff. and 299, cf. 262). Finally, in the opinion of Schalit, it was sheer vanity, eagerness for recognition and fear of death which



drove Josephus to "fabricate" his "prophecy," when the time was ripe (pp. 278 and 320). However, in opposition to this classical conception of Josephus, and rather loosely connected with the views just mentioned, there is a series of observations of a completely different kind. Here, with regard to political position, Josephus is placed on line with Yoḥanan ben Zakkai and other adherents of the moderate party in Jerusalem (pp. 264 ff.). According to Schalit, from the start and all throughout the War, Josephus had the same negative attitude towards the Revolt. He also recognizes Josephus as a loyal religious Jew (p. 327, note 142) who had a genuine faith in the Messiah (p. 268). He was merely—just as Yoḥanan ben Zakkai—in disagreement with the militant nationalists theologically and politically (pp. 268 ff.). When—in spite of the efforts made by the peace party—the Revolt broke out, according to Schalit, Josephus was swept along by the events while at the same time he constantly pursued his main political goal, a peaceful settlement with Rome. Ultimately, Schalit emphasizes that this actually was a policy which Josephus pursued in agreement with the moderate party in Jerusalem (pp. 264 ff. and 277–279).

Thus, throughout his comprehensive writings, Schalit does not present a coherent portrayal of Josephus as being driven by genuine political and theological convictions on one side and his weak character on the other. Like S. Rappaport's work, Schalit's interpretation of Josephus must be said to point beyond the fundamental conception from which it originated.

S.J.D. Cohen's investigation of Bell. and Vita is one of the most important contributions in more recent research. Cohen should also be discussed in this chapter since his view of Josephus is fundamentally influenced by the classical conception of Josephus, first and foremost by Laqueur (1979, pp. 16–20, 55–57, 88 and 234, note 2) and Drexler (1979, pp. 20–21, 99–100, 182, note 3 and 188, note 6), while at the same time in a few aspects, it points beyond the classic standpoints.

The problem which Cohen tackles in his important investigation from 1979, is that after the Revolt, Josephus lives in Rome under

entirely different circumstances, and it is here that he writes an account of the events of the War in Galilee in 66–67 (pp. 1–2). His point of departure is the two partly contradictory accounts in Bell., and Vita (pp. 3–8). In order to solve this problem Cohen employs a methodologically very sound approach. First, assisted by earlier research, he reviews the manner in which Josephus makes use of his sources (pp. 24–66). On this basis the relationship between Bell. and Vita is analyzed (pp. 67–83). Then, Cohen examines the main motives and trends of Bell. and Vita (pp. 84–100 and 101–180). This thorough preparation forms the basis for an historical reconstruction of the events which occurred in the first phase of the Revolt, in particular Josephus' activity in Galilee during the winter of 66–67 (pp. 181–231).

The results of Cohen's endeavours can be summed up briefly as follows. Josephus normally renders his sources loyally. He does not invent new material, but freely recreates and supplements the sources, although this is often done in a "sloppy" manner (p. 47. However, see also Feldman, 1982, p. 98, and Rajak, 1984, p. 121, both of whom reject this evaluation). The same applies to the relationship between Ant. 13–14 and Bell. 1. (pp. 50–51). The relationship between Ant. 15–16 and Bell. 1 is, however, entirely different. Here, there are two different renderings of the same source. In Bell., it is used thematically with a pro-Roman and pro-Herodian tendency, whereas in Ant. 15–16 (and 17), it is arranged chronologically and given a more complex tendency (pp. 52–58). Also in Ant. 18–20 and Bell. 2, a common source has been used which, according to Cohen, is Josephus' original rough draft, his 'hypomnema', to Bell. (pp. 58–66). In the relationship between Bell. 2–3 and Vita, Cohen once more traces the difference between a thematic text (Bell.) and a chronological text (Vita) as the rendering of a common source material which Cohen presumes to be Bell.'s 'hypomnema' (pp. 67–83). According to Cohen, in the thematic rendering of the source, Bell. is influenced by a defence of the Romans (pp. 85–86) as well as Josephus' vain apology of himself and for his aristocratic associates (pp. 98–100). Vita, on the other hand, is influenced

by a Pharisaic and nationalistically coloured desire to court the new rabbinian leaders of Judaism in Jamnia (pp. 140 ff.).

Having completed these preparatory studies, Cohen believes that he is in a position to maintain that—in line with order aristocrats—Josephus, in 66–67, actually was a wholehearted supporter of the Revolt (pp. 183 ff. and 206–214), at least until the fall of Jotapata (pp. 228–232). It was not until then that Josephus betrayed when instead of doing his duty and dying, he surrendered and began to serve the Romans (p. 229). In Rome, Josephus served his Roman patrons while at the same time he attempted to justify himself and moreover—vain as he was (pp. 229 f.)—to portray himself in as favourable light as possible (pp. 232ff.). However, when Domitian came to power an inexplicable change in Josephus' attitude took place. Suddenly, he became more "religious", pro-Pharisaic and nationalistic, cf. Bell. 7, Ant. and Ap. (pp. 236–240). Thus, according to Cohen, in Josephus' writings one can detect

...the development of the historian from a Roman apologist to a religious nationalist (p. 240).

The great work which Cohen has done to build up his thesis must be defined as a further development of Laqueur's ideas of Vita being based on an earlier "statement of affairs" and of the development stages in Josephus' life. At the same time, Cohen combines these ideas with the presumption of Drexler and others that in 66–67 Josephus was wholehearted supporter of the Revolt. Just like Laqueur, Cohen utilizes strong psychological methods in assuming such transitions in Josephus' life and outlook, transitions which in spite of Laqueur's and Cohen's efforts cannot easily be justified on the basis of Josephus' works. In particular, the thesis of Josephus' change of attitude under the reign of Domitian and the presumption of the corresponding differences between Bell. 1–6 on one side and Bell. 7, Ant., Vita and Ap. on the other strikes one as being far from convincing. It is purely and simply incomprehensible that Cohen can maintain that Bell. 1–6 is unambiguously pro-Roman and personally apologetic, when works like those of Thackeray, Farmer and Lindner have been available for a num-

ber of years, works in which the existence of entirely different motives for Bell. have been supported. Indeed, it is surprising that Cohen takes so little interest in Josephus' real political and theological points of view, which have otherwise been prominent in research during recent years. This objection is somewhat confirmed by Cohen himself, who towards the end of his work suddenly finds it necessary to write about Josephus' political aim both with Bell. 1–6 (pp. 234–235) and with Bell. 7, Ant. and Vita (pp. 236–237). However, these statements are immediately retracted and substituted by the familiar references to Josephus' personal apologetics (pp. 235–236 and 237–238). This leads us back to Laqueur and the classical conception and on this premise it is simply impossible to understand Josephus' writings. The steps forward made by Cohen are his methodology, his investigations of sources and his meticulous thoroughness. On the other hand, his main thesis cannot be described as progress.

S. Rappaport's, Schalit's and S.J.D. Cohen's important contributions to Josephus research clearly demonstrate that both the anonymous hypothesis and Laqueur's standpoints in their original form have been definitely abandoned. The deprecatory attitude to Josephus, his person and life history remains and with this the consequent negative interpretation of the aim in his works which we recognize from Graetz and Jost. But here again, there are many more shades of meaning than previously observed. For example, it is interesting to observe Schalit's and Cohen's diametrically opposed interpretations of Josephus' attitude to the Revolt in Jerusalem and Galilee in 66–67. However, it is most important that all three of the above-mentioned scholars recognize that Josephus' position and intentions exceed that which can be said to reflect an elementary, egoistic instinct for survival.

A similar trend in the research can be observed in Lindner's works. He has attempted to revive and develop Schlatter's thesis on Bell. as being dependent on an earlier Roman, perhaps Flavian, work of history. The radical change in the situation of the research is reflected already in the title of the book, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im*

*Bellum Judaicum, Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage.* For as a programme, he places an investigation of Josephus' own view of history as a fundamental prerequisite for progressing further on the question of the sources of Bell. In Lindner's opinion, Josephus is an utterly conscious editor, thinking in historical and theological lines, of the Roman source which by the way, Lindner treats much more cautiously than Schlatter and Weber. Whereas Schlatter pointed to that Antonius Julianus (cf. also Norden), whom Josephus mentions in Bell. 6, 238, and identifies the latter with one Antonius Julianus, who according to Minucius Felix wrote about the Jews (1893, pp. 98 ff., and 1923, pp. 43 ff. and 67), Weber was convinced that Josephus' source for Bell. was an official Flavian historical work based on Vespasian's and Titus' own "commentarii" (pp. 106, 196 and elsewhere). Against this, Lindner clearly sees that the hypothesis of a Roman source behind Bell. merely constitutes a working hypothesis even though, in his opinion, this is mandatory (p. 17). Likewise, he refrains from identifying the hypothetical Roman source. Furthermore, particularly in his detailed analysis (pp. 99-125), Lindner assigns considerably larger parts of Bell. to Josephus than is done by Schlatter and Weber. First and foremost, he reproaches them for underplaying Josephus' own thoughts and his aim with Bell. (pp. 17-18, 77, 84 and 98). Finally, in accordance with this Lindner determines that the main prerequisite for proceeding with the criticism on Bell. from the literary point of view must consist in establishing a closer understanding of "das Proprium des Josephus" (pp. 1-20). But in this way, the question of whether Bell. may have had Roman sources has been put in an entirely new way, and the connection with the anonymous hypothesis and the classical Josephus conception has been broken off.

A position corresponding to that Lindner is taken by Nikiprowetzky in the article he published in 1971 about Eleazar's speeches in Bell. 7 as compared with the pervading apologetical tendencies in Bell. This work is less clear than Lindner's, but the point is the same. Sifting out the Roman source material in Bell., the existence of which Nikiprowetzky is also

convinced of (pp. 483-486), requires a careful analysis of Josephus' own political and particularly theological interpretation of the Revolt (pp. 473 ff. and 490).

*Literature:* For a closer description of this phase of the history of the research concerning Josephus, see Bilde, 1983, pp. 29-30 and 36-41. The thesis that Josephus was originally a staunch supporter of the Revolt, has been maintained by, i.a., Graetz, III, 2, pp. 485-486; Prager, pp. 3-10; Baerwald, pp. 14-16, 23, 41-42 and 59; Luther, pp. 7-8, 15-16, 20-25 and 33; Rühl, pp. 298 and 302; Drexler, pp. 299 ff.; Eisler, 1929-1930, I, pp. XXXVIII and XLI; J.Gutmann, p. 396, and Klausner, V, pp. 167 ff. It has to be mentioned also that Moehring, 1984, pp. 917-944, violently contests Schalit's analysis of Josephus prophecy to Vespasian (1975).

## 6. The modern conception of Josephus

Having reviewed these modern representatives of the classical conception of Josephus, we have already transgressed the boundaries of this basic conception and touched upon a new which may be characterized as *the modern Josephus conception*. This was introduced as early as at the end of the 19th century by scholars like Bloch, Drüner and Niese and was considerably furthered by Laqueur and particularly by Thackeray. This conception has two characteristic features. It focuses on Josephus' own creative contribution. And it takes an interest in how our Jewish historian was motivated in literary, theological and political respects. The modern conception of Josephus increases in strength during the 30's, and after the Second World War it reached its full development in a long series of larger and smaller contributions.

### a. Literary point of view

Rehabilitating Josephus as an independently creative author began in the linguistic and literary field as has already been observed in the

course of our discussion of the criticism of the anonymous and assistant hypotheses. That which recurs throughout these investigations, especially those by Niese and Thackeray and later by Elchanan Stein, Richards and Shutt (1961), is the demonstration of the uniform linguistic and stylistic features in Josephus' writings. Therefore, it is not likely that essential parts of his writings might stem from anonymous sources or assistants.

These conclusions were later confirmed by analyses such as Pelletier's of Josephus' rendering of the Aristeeas letter and Franxman's of Josephus' treatment of Gen. in Ant. According to Pelletier, Josephus has followed his source loyally, while at the same time he has carried out a consistent re-editing of the material with regard to its form and contents (pp. 251-274). With regard to the contents, the paraphrasing is guided by a Jewish apologetic interest (pp. 206 and 170-173), and in its literary form, it is influenced by a concern for the composition (pp. 251-253) and by the will to create a uniform style, vocabulary and grammatical form (pp. 253-261). Thus, Pelletier's work presents itself as a substantial documentation to prove Josephus' independence as an author, and therefore, reservations against the assistant hypothesis are taken (p. 257).

Franxman investigates how Josephus in Ant. 1-2 deals with his prototype in Gen. It is somewhat difficult to place his investigation in a summary of the research because Franxman does not take a clearly defined standpoint, and he makes his investigation without presenting it in relationship to the research as a whole. A resumé of Franxman's results can be made as follows. Josephus complies with his source meticulously regarding material and sequence (pp. 9, 122, 169, 195, 216, 246 and 287). At the same time, however, he does make changes in several instances. He supplements and expands his source. He omits some material and juxtaposes other. He reformulates the material, elaborates on it, adds speeches and makes changes in the composition (pp. 22-26, 36 and 285-286). These changes are made by a guiding apologetic interest (p. 5), by Josephus' inclination towards moralizing (pp. 19 and 152) and by his interest in catching the reader's at-

ention (p. 286). After comparison with parallel material in the pseudepigraphical and Rabbinical literature as well as that represented by Philo, Franxman stresses the point that Josephus' rendering of Gen. testifies to originality and independent thinking (p. 286-287). If we disregard the fact that Franxman gives little attention to the linguistic problems, his work may be said to be on a par with that of Pelletier with regard to the choice of subject, method and results.

In 1934, Braun published an investigation which was to mark a new epoch in Josephus research. Here, Braun transgresses the boundary between analysis of the literary and that of the contents of the given work. In his book, Braun conducts a penetrating analysis of Josephus' paraphrase in Ant. 2,39-59 of the story of Gen. 39,6-15 about Joseph and Potiphar's wife. Braun shows that Josephus' paraphrase of the story is an exciting (p. 9) and independent (p. 27) version of a theme which was popular in the Hellenistic period, the virtuous man's refusal of an erotic temptation (1934, pp. 25-28, 61, 85-87 and 113, and 1938, p. 90). Indeed, it is particularly interesting that in Bell. 1,431-444, and Ant. 15,202-236, Josephus' narrative about Herod and Mariamme contains a series of features which correspond to the narrative about Joseph and Potiphar's wife (1934, pp. 15 and 108-109). This also applies to the story of Manóah, Samson's father, and his wife in Ant. 5,276 ff. (1934, pp. 17-20). But, to Braun, this brings up the whole question of Josephus' art as a story-teller:

Gibt es eine jos. Erzählungskunst, die sich einheitlich über die verschiedenen Bücher und Quellschichten hinweg erstreckt? (1934, p. 118).

In my opinion, this work of Braun signified a step forward in Josephus research which compares to the contributions of Laqueur and Thackeray. In spite of obvious connections to trends in research made previously, especially Drüner, Niese and Laqueur, and to the philologically orientated investigations which were to come later in the 30's, Braun contributed something new to the research. The earlier scholars were not at all aware of this aspect in Josephus' writings, and the philological re-

search of the 30's is far more interested in the linguistic and literary formal dimension of Josephus than in the narrative stylistic. With Sprödowsky as a debatable exception, it took a long time before Braun's significance in Josephus research was clearly recognized. It was not until long after the Second World War that Braun's perceptions really came across, especially in the works of Moehring (1957, 1959 and 1973) and Feldman (1968a and b, 1970, 1976 and 1982). But in the 70's and 80's, the work with Josephus' talent as a story-writer flourished on the inspiration of Braun to become one of the most fruitful areas in the research. In addition to the scholars already mentioned, reference can be made to works by A.A. Bell, N.G. Cohen, S.J.D. Cohen (1982), Downing (1980a and b), Hata, Justus, Ladouceur (1983), Paul and van Unnik (1974).

*Literature:* Reference is made to Feldman, 1984a, pp. 125-130, 139-191 and 208-210, and 1984b, pp. 788-805, and Bilde, 1983, pp. 41-43. Sprödowsky (and perhaps Morel and Ed. Stein) can be considered as an exception, insofar as he (they) like Braun perceives the Hellenistic features in Josephus' writings. Nevertheless, Sprödowsky (and the others) should be identified with the classical Josephus conception, since he attributes these features, not to Josephus himself, but to Hellenistic-Jewish schools of tradition, possibly an Alexandrian source (pp. 5-6).

#### *b. Political and theological aspects*

The question of Josephus' ideological position and aim was neglected in the classical conception of Josephus which only permitted ideas on his apologetic forgeries, the purpose of which was to flatter the Romans, appeal to the Flavians and justify his own moral insufficiency. In the long run, however, it proved impossible to overlook the national-apologetic features and intentions which influence the writings, especially those of Ant. and Ap. For this reason, there has always been a number of scholars—before the Second World War especially Thackeray—who emphasized Josephus' role as a national Jewish apologist. However, these scholars, e.g., Franxman, Pelletier, Schalit and Shutt,

have not presented a closer analysis of this motive. It remains as a marginal note in their works. All in all, when it comes to the question of a closer analysis and account of Josephus' position and standpoint, the earlier research did not make much progress. In my view, we must wait til 1956 before we find decisive breakthroughs in this area, namely, the two works by Braun and Farmer.

Farmer goes a step further than Thackeray since he is not content to establish that Josephus had sincere apologetic motives and in this way endeavoured to serve his people. Out of an unusually strong will to understand Josephus and familiarize himself with his situation, Farmer attempts to reveal—not Josephus' tarnished character and sinister distortions—but his ideological mission, the theological and political universe which was his world, and which must be presumed to have guided him in his works. Farmer perceived of Josephus as a Jewish apologist precisely in his defence of Rome and the Flavians (p. 16). Like the captivated Greek historian Polybius, Josephus in Rome tried

... to serve his defeated nation by defending and glorifying Rome and by interpreting Rome's victory over his native land as providential (p. 16).

Moreover, according to Farmer, aside from consoling and strengthening his defeated countrymen in this way, it was Josephus' aim to defend the Jewish people in the Diaspora and their rights (p. 17 with reference to Bell. 7, 112-113 and Ant. 12, 121-124). Farmer shows that Josephus tries to achieve this, i.e., by distinguishing between the rebels and the Jewish people as a whole (pp. 18-19). In addition to this, perhaps tactical, political apology, there is a theologically orientated criticism of the rebels which, according to Farmer, Josephus describes as sinners against and enemies of God (pp. 9 and 18-21). Farmer compares this attitude of Josephus to the revolters with Isaiah's and Jeremiah's criticism of the national militant forces in Israel in their time:

By placing this kind of interpretation upon the war, Josephus was able to serve his Roman masters and at the same time make a distinction between the great majority of his Greek-speaking brethren

and their sinfully rebellious coreligionists in Palestine, a distinction that would serve to justify the continuation of imperial privileges to nonbelligerent Jews throughout the Empire (p. 19, cf. p. 9).

Thus, Farmer, like Thackeray, has a keen eye for the ambiguousness in Josephus' writings. The feeling for this ambiguousness was lacking in the research before then. Having grown out of his ambiguous personal situation before and after his capture in 67, it is, however, fundamental for Josephus.

Braun's brief, easily read, but highly informative article from 1956 has a similar programmatic character, but it goes even further than Farmer's book. Like Farmer (p. 5), Braun calls for a new evaluation of Josephus (p. 53). Like Farmer, Braun asserts that Josephus' aim in Bell. was to defend the Jewish people as well as the Flavian emperors. In this connection, Braun advances the following thesis, which does in fact lie in continuation of the views taken by Farmer and Thackeray:

But he was able to undertake this task without doing violence to his conscience as a historian or as a Jew (p. 53).

However, this thesis is substantiated by the epoch-making assertion which transgresses positions taken by earlier research, that it is only justifiable to understand Bell. as a profoundly personal writing and as expressing an attempt to solve a profound personal problem, the destruction of the Temple (p. 56). Therefore, the works of Josephus should be read as a theodicy, as an attempt to redeem and justify God: In the year 70, in reality, it was not Rome, but God who triumphed. The fall of the Temple was predicted in the same manner as is the restoration of Israel (pp. 56-57).

In continuation of his work in the 30's, which dealt with the literary uniformity of Josephus' writings, Braun has—as no one else before—attempted to show, in his brief article from 1956, that the works of Josephus are sustained by an idea. The character of Josephus and the personal motives which may have been behind his activities before, during and after the War are consistently set aside, and instead all efforts are made to encircle the true

core of his writings. This conception of Josephus, which agrees with that maintained by Farmer and, in part, Thackeray, earned just as little spontaneous acceptance as was the case with Braun's new views on Josephus' talent as a narrator. However, there are indications in the most recent history of Josephus research to show that Braun's view of Josephus' basic attitude will be accepted in the same manner as his view on Josephus' talent as a story-teller has already done.

This new view may be traced already in the introduction to Michel-Bauernfeind's important edition of Bell. from 1959-1969. Here, the authors criticize the classical conception of Josephus (III, pp. XX-XXVI), and insist that serious consideration be given to Josephus' own account of his surrender to the Romans (I, p. XVI). In line with Schalit, but in a more favourable light, they compare Josephus with Yoḥanan ben Zakkai (I, p. XVIII), and on this basis they emphasize that Josephus should not be seen as an apostate nor as a traitor. Consequently, they deny all doubt about the genuineness of Josephus' Judaism (I, pp. XV and XVII). They stress the importance of being conscious of Josephus' priestly and aristocratic heritage (I, pp. XV-XVI and III, p. XXVI) and that for this reason he had to oppose the rebels. They place Josephus in the "pragmatic" historiographical school which was inspired by Polybius (III, p. XXII). However, at the same time, they stress Josephus' independence in his relationship to this school, since he is not, as they are, primarily interested in the eternal importance of the historical events, but his interest lies in the account of the factual historical events in which their significance becomes apparent:

Hier darf Josephus' Selbständigkeit und der Umfang seiner Bildung keinesfalls unterschätzt werden (III, p. XXIII).

Thus, whereas the Hellenistic historiography attempts to surmount the experience of an historical crisis by adhering to the theory of the eternal laws of history, Josephus makes the same attempt by stressing the idea that history is guided by the plan and providence of God ('pronoia') (III, p. XXV).

Hereby, Michel-Bauernfeind refuse to substantiate the interpretation of Josephus on the basis of an opinion about his character. Instead, like Farmer and Braun, their point of departure is taken from Josephus' own tragic, historical experiences. This does not signify that they are free from criticizing Josephus. Bell. is criticized for partiality and inaccuracy (I, p. XX), and Ant. is characterized as a dependent work (I, p. XXVI). They also interpret Josephus' prophecy to Vespasian as the future emperor (Bell. 3, 399-402 and 6, 312-313) as a breach against the Jewish Messianic hope (I, pp. XVI-XVII). However, in the history of the research it is of decisive importance that Michel-Bauernfeind attempt to determine the factual political and theological motives which were driving forces in Josephus' life.

In the research which followed these tendencies were displayed in several ways. The important question about Josephus' attitude to the Jewish hope for the future was treated, i.a., in two articles by Bruce and de Jonge. A major text for illustrating this question is Ant. 10,210 where Josephus comments on Daniel 2, 34-35 and 44-45. According to Bruce, here, Josephus implies partly that the fourth kingdom which is mentioned in Daniel is Rome, and partly that also this kingdom will fall and be replaced by the kingdom of the Messiah in Israel:

At the end, it may be suggested, his patriotism triumphed and he foresaw his people's vindication (p. 160).

In his article, de Jonge goes a step further in the same direction. On the basis of Josephus' interpretation in Bell. 6, 312, that the oracle is speaking about Vespasian, de Jonge asks whether Josephus can actually be said to have betrayed the Jewish Messianic faith:

Die Antwort muss, so meine ich, negativ lauten: Josephus gab dem in Bell. 6,312 von ihm angeführten Wort eine nicht-messianische Interpretation—und doch kannte er eine mit seinem Volk verbundene Zukunftserwartung auf längerer Sicht (p. 210).

Bell. 5, 362-419, especially 5, 367, actually show that, according to Josephus, God has not given supremacy to Rome for eternity but only

for "now" ('nyn') (p. 211). According to de Jonge, the same view is found in Ant. 10, 210, which was paraphrased above, and in Ant. 4, 114-117, where Josephus renders Bileam's prophecy (pp. 211-212). Thus, according to de Jonge, Josephus' writings are actually influenced by a clear eschatological Messianic anticipation:

Es ist nicht deutlich, dass Josephus für ein Israel, das Gott gehorsam ist, eine glorreiche Zukunft erwartet. Das Römerreich ist nicht das letzte (p. 212).

Using the earlier research as a point of departure, especially that of Morel and Michel-Bauernfeind, in 1971, Nikiprowetzky presented his, before mentioned, thorough-going analysis of Eleazar's speeches on Masada (Bell. 7, 320-336 and 341-388). His purpose was to distinguish between that which was tradition and that which was editing (pp. 461 and 465-466). Here, in line with Farmer (1956) and Schalit (1975), Nikiprowetzky demonstrates that in his editorial formulation of the Roman material behind Bell., Josephus indirectly conducts bitter theological polemics with the rebels (pp. 469 and 473 ff.). The rebels and Josephus were fundamentally at variance precisely on the interpretation of the decisive prophecies, especially those which are contained in the Book of Daniel. Each of these two parties had their own soteriology and eschatology (pp. 474-481). Furthermore, Nikiprowetzky maintains that for Josephus the core of this controversy was of theological-apologetic nature. Nikiprowetzky, like Braun (1956), determines that the aim of Josephus was that of a theodicy: God was not responsible for the disaster in the year 70 (p. 473). Thus, Nikiprowetzky, in line with Farmer and Braun, attempts to show that Josephus' severe criticism of the rebels was not merely driven by opportunism and a bent towards self-justification, indeed not even by nationalistic apologetic motives alone, but also by a principal theological standpoint which, according to Nikiprowetzky, can most readily be derived from the long speeches in Bell. (p. 489, cf. also Vidal-Naquet, 1978, pp. 13-21).

The same method and the same mission characterizes Lindner's significant work from

1972 which has already been reviewed. He too intends to revive the criticism of sources (p. VII), but believes that this can only be done by a concentration on "das Proprium des Josephus" which was unknown in the classical criticism of sources (pp. 1-20). By doing so, Lindner makes a pioneer effort to close the gap between the criticism of sources and the criticism of tendency, by viewing the latter as an indispensable prerequisite for renewed progress of the former. Lindner tries to accomplish this task by analysing precisely the great speeches in Bell. Here, side by side with rational political arguments he reveals a theological, "heils-geschichtlich" method of approach (pp. 28-30, 41 ff. and 98). In this way, Josephus perceives Rome as a tool in the hands of God to punish Israel (p. 30). At the same time, however, Josephus adheres to the idea of the selection and future redemption of Israel (pp. 41 ff.). By this, Lindner places Josephus in the apocalyptic tradition (pp. 44 and 142-144). In tune with Michel-Bauernfeind, Lindner characterizes Josephus as being a Hellenistic-Roman historiographer and a "jüdisch-heilsgeschichtlicher Interpret" (p. 134). In particular, Lamentations are asserted to have had an effect on Josephus' historical writing, and along with Michel-Bauernfeind, Lindner says:

dass Josephus neben den Schuldgrundsätzen der hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung eine alttestamentliche Grundkategorie der Geschichtsbewältigung durchzuhalten versucht (p. 136, cf. Michel-Bauernfeind, III, p. XXV).

Finally, according to Lindner, it is important that this interpretation of history influences Bell. throughout and moreover can be traced in Vita (pp. 144-146).

In many respects, Lindner's investigations of Bell. are equivalent to Attridge's work from 1976 concerning Ant. 1-10 (cf. Attridge, pp. 4 and 20-21). In agreement with the rest of the more recent research, Attridge rejects the theory that Josephus in Ant. reproduces anonymous middle sources (pp. 37-38 and 69-70), or that he is essentially dependent upon his assistants (p. 39). For this, Ant. is all too homogeneous linguistically and thematically (pp. 38-40). Thereafter, Attridge devotes his investigation to the thematic contents of Ant.

and shows that Ant. 1-10—in agreement with the Preface (Ant. 1, 14, 20 and 23)—is dominated by a very definite concept of God (pp. 67-107). In Ant. 1-10, Josephus is maintained to have presented a revision of the Old Testament covenant theology to a universalistic oriented retribution theology as that which characterizes Deuteronomy (pp. 78 ff.). Moreover, Attridge shows that the very theme of God's "active retributive justice intervening in the affairs of men" (p. 98) dominates and unifies "the whole Biblical paraphrase of the Antiquities" (p. 104). By means of a comparison with the Books of Chronicles, the Book of Jubilees, 2 Maccabees and Pseudo-Philo, Attridge finally shows that Josephus' theology as it is demonstrated in Ant. is unique (pp. 27, 155 and 183). At the same time, in line with Braun and Michel-Bauernfeind, he attempts to show that this theology seems to have been determined by Josephus' own personal experiences, partly during the War in 66-70 and partly during the Diaspora after the year 70:

It was the personal experience of Josephus as much as anything else which was responsible for his particular brand of covenant theology (p. 183, cf. 149 and 169).

According to Attridge, Josephus thereby adds his own Jewish theocentric influence to the traditional Hellenistic historiography the forms and categories of which he otherwise uses (p. 183). Therefore, Ant. 1-10 may be said to represent "a very individual production" (p. 184).

Thus, in line with essential parts of modern Josephus research, Attridge stresses the formal consistency in Josephus' writings as well as that of their contents. He emphasizes that Ant. is carried by a definite theological line of thought and this is founded in Josephus' own life experience. Finally, he underlines that Ant. represents an original unification of Jewish and Hellenistic historiography (pp. 183-184).

*Literature:* Reference is made to Bilde, 1983, pp. 43-49. Moreover, the scholars and theses mentioned are reviewed and commented on in varying length by Schreckenberg (1968 and 1979) as well as Feldman (1984a).



## 7. Josephus research, 1980–1984

In the above sections, I have displayed a fairly schematic interpretation of the history of research on Josephus. It cannot be excluded that the categories chosen for the interpretation—the classical and the modern conceptions of Josephus—are too disparaging. On the other hand, it is important to try to trace a development and find a main tendency in the research, and for this purpose categories of this kind are indispensable. But naturally, they must not be forced nor taken out of the blue sky. According to the interpretation which we have presented, the modern conception of Josephus find its culmination in the mid-70's, and if one were to adhere to the implicated—almost Hegelian—theory, the research of Josephus would thus have found its proper fundamental position. On this background, it is an important task to investigate how the research actually has developed since then. Does the implicit theory presented hold? Can the modern conception of Josephus really be said to have come through definitively? Actually, the fact is that the classical conception of Josephus has never been entirely overcome. And with S.J.D. Cohen's great work from 1979 it has again shown itself as a living and strong position in modern research. Nor can one ignore the possibility that entirely new signals may appear in scholarly work concerning Josephus. Therefore, in order to expose and elucidate these questions it is important to gauge the temperature of the very latest research. What is the picture of the international debate on Josephus in the mid-80's? With this objective in mind, in this section we will attempt to form a general view of the literature on Josephus which has appeared during the five years from 1980 to 1984.

The abundance of publications on Josephus during this period has grown at the same rate of speed as it has in other fields of classical research in the humanities. In order to avoid drowning in the mass of investigations and to retain a certain perspective, we are again forced to select, interpret and schematize. I have decided to do this in the following manner. In the first place, far from all publications will be mentioned, but only the most important

and distinctive of those with which I am acquainted. In the second place, the survey will be divided into a series of topical headings. However, the decisive factor is the fundamental view of Josephus. Therefore, in the third place, I will put the emphasis on reviewing, characterizing and evaluating the research made in these years according to their contribution to the debate on this question.

The following summary is based on about 50 selected works. Naturally enough, the majority of these works concern the use of Josephus in the disciplines of Judaica, the archaeology and topography of Palestine as well as the foundation of Christianity. This part of the summary will be made brief, and more importance will be given to the publications which concern Josephus directly, partly his works, literary methods, theology and historiography, and partly his person and political position. Therefore, we will give somewhat more attention to these contributions, but, as mentioned, the main emphasis will be given to those which represent a principal basic standpoint. The summary concludes with an attempt at drawing up the balance sheet and making a general evaluation.

*Literature:* Research in the period from 1980–1984 has only to a limited degree been registered in Feldman's new bibliographic works. In 1984a, pp. 2–3, Feldman complains a little about the enormous growth of the literature on Josephus, and he concludes:

In addition to the *Desiderata* listed at the end of this study, we may be forgiven for expressing the hope—or prayer—that one of the wealthier foundations will establish a fund to give grants on similar conditions (to remain silent, cf. Cicero, *Pro Archia* 10,25), or, at the very least, on the condition that scholars will read what has been written in their field before they embark with pen in hand (1984a, p. 3).

Since Feldman wrote these wise words, the growth of new literature on Josephus has by no means declined.

### a. *The use of Josephus*

The work of applying and utilizing Josephus' works increases rapidly, an increase which has to do with the general progress in fundamental Josephus research. In the 80's as in the 70's,

it is particularly the two wide fields, the archaeology of Palestine (in its broadest meaning) and the Jewish Revolt against Rome in 66-70 (74), which dominate. Within the fields of archaeology and topography, the works of Geva, Hohlfelder et al., Netzer (1981), Pixner and Schmitt testify to how important and rewarding it is to include and utilize Josephus in these disciplines. In a number of cases, it is shown that the archaeological results confirm Josephus' account, cf., esp., Hohlfelder et al. However, the decisive factor in these dissertations lies in a different area. By combining the study of Josephus with archaeological results and topographical observations, these scholars often succeed in solving a number of very specific problems. One example is the location of Bethsaida Julias (Pixner), another is the debate concerning the so-called third wall in Jerusalem (Schmitt).

Gichon's article lies on the boundary between topography and history and thus it forms a transition to the other works on the Jewish War and its prehistory by S. J. D. Cohen (1982), Goodman, Horsley (1981 and 1984), Ladouceur (1980), Rajak (1983) and U. Rappaport. With these scholars, the work of the 60's and 70's on the different Jewish groupings and the main characters of the Revolt, the causes and events of the War and independent questions such as Masada was carried on further. In contrast with the works on archaeology and topography, the fundamental source for the above mentioned works is almost exclusively Josephus' texts. Therefore, in works of this kind, scholars move closer to the basic problems in Josephus research. This applies especially to S.J.D. Cohen (1982), Ladouceur (1980) and Rajak (1983) to whom we will revert in the following.

For quite a number of years the Galilee problem has played a particular role in investigations of ancient Judaism and the birth of Christianity. This debate can be said to have reached a clarification, especially with Freyne's great work from 1980, although we still find opinions to the effect that Galilee was a particularly rebellious anti-Roman area (cf. Migliario pp. 128-129). However, it is important for us to note that this debate too is based on Jose-

phus, primarily on his account in *Vita*. The works listed in my bibliography by Armenti, Feldman (1981), Freyne and Malinowski testify to this. However, out of these only Freyne's work is of interest to us here, because this scholar was the only one to go into the actual research about Josephus in Galilee and his two accounts about this in *Bell.* and *Vita*. We will return to Freyne's work in following sections.

The works concerning Galilee naturally lead on to the use of Josephus for elucidation of the New Testament and the birth of Christianity. This subject has been neglected to an astonishing degree for quite a number of years. Apparently, the interest in this field still concentrates on the spurious brief text about Jesus, in *Ant.* 18, 63-64; a debate which is left out here since I have treated it in detail in a previous work (cf. Bilde, 1981). However, there are indications that a renewal is on its way. Perhaps the work on the Galilee problem seems to contribute less to the understanding on the birth of Christianity than many had anticipated. Nor does Schreckenberg's work from 1980 with his classical choice of subject (the relationship between Luke and Josephus) indicate any real progress. On the other hand, Horsley (1984) and especially Downing's interesting analyses do so. Horsley, like many others before him, compares Jesus with the national Messianic movements which are mentioned in Josephus. However, Downing breaks new ground by his attempts (1980a and 1982) to show that Luke and Josephus articulate the same heathen theism and moralism which one can find in a Dionysius from Halicarnassus. The same applies to his attempts to demonstrate that Luke and the other evangelists edit their material in a manner which reminds one of *Ant.* (1980b). In this respect, Downing goes far in his literary and theological analysis of *Ant.* and *Bell.*, and with this points forward to the problems to be discussed in the following.

Finally, there is a whole series of investigations which illustrate topics within ancient Judaism, dealing with Josephus' and the contemporary Rabbinical interpretation of the Bible (cf. Jacobs, Runnalls and Schwartz (1981)), the sabbatical year (Blosser), prophecy (Aune), the Temple in Leontopolis (Hayward) and the doc-

uments cited by Josephus (Rajak (1984), Saulnier and Schäublin). With these works, in many cases, we are already far into topics such as Josephus' literary methods and theology. For example, Runnalls argues in favour of the idea that Josephus in his extra-canonical account of Moses in Ethiopia is independent of his Hellenistic-Jewish predecessor Artapanus, whom we know from Eusebius (pp. 137 ff.), indeed that it may even be interpreted as a carefully worked out Palestinian-Jewish orientated polemic directed precisely against Artapanus' version (p. 154). Aune shows that Josephus does not reserve the designation "prophet" as used for the prophets in the Old Testament, but regards the phenomenon of prophecy as a living reality which also existed in the time after the Exile (pp. 419-420, cf. Michel, 1954). In line with this, he demonstrates that Josephus sees a close relationship between prophecy and history and therefore regarded himself as a prophet (pp. 420-421).

Thus, it is seen that the work on utilizing Josephus in several cases inevitably influences Josephus research in the proper sense of the word, and that it is able to make important contributions to this research. This applies to the fields of archaeology and topography which can testify to Josephus' historical reliability. But it particularly applies to the other disciplines. Here, scholars like S.J.D. Cohen (1982), Downing (1980a and 1982), Freyne (1980), Ladouceur (1980) and Rajak (1983) have made valuable contributions, and therefore they will be dealt with again in the following sections.

#### *b. Bell*

In the period under investigation, two major investigations of Bell. have appeared, namely, Michel (1984) and Schreckenberg (1984). Besides, from the hands of Rajak (1983) and Attridge (1984), two extraordinarily comprehensive contributions to the discussion of Josephus' first work are available. Finally, there are two minor contributions to the discussion of Josephus' rendering of the Masada story in Bell. 7 by S.J.D. Cohen (1982) and Ladouceur (1980).

Michel reviews all the great speeches in Bell. from a formal point of view as well as where their contents are concerned. From the formal point of view, he describes them as successful (pp. 959 and 963). They are not tailored to the same pattern, but they all take their situations and contexts seriously (pp. 965 and 966, cf. 945-947). As far as their contents go, an historical and pragmatic (political) point of view recurs in the speeches. With varying emphasis, they are combined with cultic and priestly traditions and with elements from wisdom literature (p. 965), and apocalyptic (p. 966) and Deuteronomical features (p. 970) are traceable. In general terms, according to Michel, we witness a Hellenization of the Jewish traditions as far as formal expressions go, whereas in their substance, they are retained (p. 960). Thus, as far as form and contents go, the speeches in Bell. are marked by coherence just as a clear connection from them to Ant. may be shown. For instance, Michel recovers the "Deuteronomistic" programme of Ant. (1,14, 20 and 23) in Bell. (p. 970). Theologically, Michel places Josephus in the priestly rather than the Pharisaic tradition (pp. 960 and 971). Politically, he places him on line with Yohanan ben Zakkai and in opposition to the "Zealots" (p. 972).

Michel's work continues that of Michel-Bauernfeind, his own previous articles, and Lindner's dissertation on Bell. (1972). Thus, it clearly places itself within the modern conception of Josephus.

Schreckenberg's investigation is not primarily an analysis of Bell., but rather of the influence and interpretation of Bell. in Christian antiquity and during the Middle Ages. Continuing and to some extent repeating his works from 1972 and 1977, Schreckenberg demonstrates in every detail and with an overwhelming documentation how Christian theologians and authors all the way up to the 19th century have abused Josephus. Against his own intentions, he has been used in a polemic and apologetic fashion, primarily in the fight of the church against Josephus' own Jewish people (pp. 1112, 1131, 1135, 1159 and 1191). Schreckenberg shows how in this context Josephus' influence has been immensely important. Meanwhile,

Schreckenberg brings his own view of Bell to bear. He dissociates himself from Jewish apologists like Schalit (1975) and Baer (pp. 1113 and 1115) and presents a well balanced view of Josephus and Bell. which agrees well with the modern conception of Josephus (cf., esp., p. 1114).

S.J.D. Cohen (1982) does not deal with Bell. in general, but with Josephus' literary method in Bell. 7. Therefore, this article is reviewed later under the section with this heading. The same applies to Ladouceur (1980), but inasmuch as here the literary analysis is linked with time and history, we shall review it and make a brief comment at this juncture.

Ladouceur mentions that in Hellenistic literature, it was a *topos* to render the death of one's enemies in a melodramatic way, cf. "The Dying Gaul" (p. 247). However, according to the author, this is scarcely the place where we may find the key to Bell. 7 (p. 259). Instead, he argues that Eleazar's speech in Bell. 7 should be analysed in connection with Josephus' own speech about the suicide in Bell. 3, 362-382 (pp. 247 ff., cf. Vidal-Naquet, 1978). According to Ladouceur, Josephus transforms Eleazar into a Hellenistic philosopher of the Stoic-cynic type (pp. 252-253). And it should be noted that he does this for political reasons which were prevalent at the time (pp. 253 ff.). In the 70's, an opposition to the Flavians arose, based on a philosophy of this nature, and several members of this opposition verily committed suicide for political reasons. Whereas in his own speech, Josephus rejects this position, he does identify it with the Jewish rebels in Bell. 7 (p. 257). Thus, the speeches in Bell, 3 and 7 are not historical (cf. Vidal-Naquet, 1978), but

seem to reflect the interests of the environment in which he composed the War far more than the actuality of a choice of life and death some years earlier in Judea (p. 260).

With this point of view, all due credit is paid to Josephus' literary creativity. At the same time, it does remind us of the Laqueur-Cohen school with its ideas concerning the decisive dependence on the situation under which the works of Josephus were committed to writing. However, like the assumptions of the authors

mentioned, it must be said that it rests on a foundation which is too feeble. The connection with the (known) historical situation in Palestine has here been weakened too much in favour of the hypothetical situation in Rome.

Rajak's book is not least a book about Bell., and in general, Josephus' account of the Jewish War is regarded here as a Jewish influenced (pp. 78-79), historically trustworthy (pp. 106-107, 127, 138 and 141-142) and original work (pp. 9 and 89). According to Rajak's investigations, neither the Aramaic nor the Greek editions exhibit any pronounced Flavian influence (pp. 185 ff.). Exceptions to this evaluation are a few parts of Bell., especially Bell. 7 (pp. 203-204 and 216 ff.). Nor is Bell. regarded as being re-edited by Josephus' assistants to any particular degree (pp. 62-63), no more than the work seems to be particularly dependent on the imperial "commentarii" (pp. 215 ff.). Finally, it is also emphasized that the main political and theological tendency in Bell. is the same as that of the other works (pp. 66, 79, 154 ff., 224-226 and 229).

Against this, Attridge (1984) is a clear opponent, which actually surprises the reader when one takes his work from 1976 into consideration. However, the explanation seems to be simple. In the intervening time, S.J.D. Cohen's monograph (1979) was published, and judging from the rendering and the footnotes this has played an important role in Attridge's change of direction. He agrees with Cohen on the question of the dating of Bell. (pp. 192-193), its relationship to Vita (pp. 187-192) and its sources (pp. 190 and 193). In his review of the tendencies in Bell. (pp. 195-210), most important stress is placed on Josephus' boasting (pp. 195 and 209-210), his placing the blame for the fall of Jerusalem on the Jewish rebels (pp. 196-200), and Bell.'s pro-Flavian flattery, especially of Titus (pp. 200-203 and 210). In this connection, it is maintained that the account by Sulpicius Severus on the Roman attitude toward the destruction of the Temple (*Chronica* 2, 30, 6-7) should be given preference to the account by Josephus which is understood as an expression of flattery towards Titus (p. 202). However, Attridge also emphasizes the theological reflections which influence

Bell. throughout the entire work (pp. 203–206), and the appeal for sympathy towards the suffering Jewish people which is also a prominent feature of this work (pp. 207–209). Finally, Attridge maintains that while Josephus' ideas on Divine Providence—a fundamental theme in Bell.—are Greek in their formulation, actually, they are basically genuinely Jewish (pp. 204 and 205). The review of the theological contemplations in Bell. are summed up as follows:

The history of the revolt thus has a clear theological dimension rooted in Biblical historiography, although it is not without precedent in Hellenistic historiography (p. 206).

Thus, although Attridge does make some concessions to Cohen, to a great extent, he adheres to the standpoint which he took in his dissertation in 1976.

### c. *Ant.*

Important investigations of *Ant.* are made by Amaru, Feldman (1982), Rajak (1982), Runnalls and Attridge (1984). By reviewing Josephus' alterations and reinterpretations in the "translation" of the Biblical Scriptures in the *Ant.*, Amaru encompasses Josephus' own view of the land of Israel and God's promises of this land to the people. In short, according to Amaru, it appears that Josephus suppresses or completely removes the Biblical references to the covenant (pp. 205, 209 and 211) and the promises concerning the land of Israel (pp. 207–208 and 216). Josephus does not dwell on the prophets' words on the Promised Land, but on their pronouncement of the Day of Judgment (p. 224). He interprets the Diaspora and the Exile as a consequence of the sins and disobedience of the Jewish people (p. 219), and he strongly emphasizes the conditional nature of the promises (pp. 211, 216 and 226). Moreover, Josephus reinterprets the contents of the promises, and first and foremost, he removes the Messiah from the eschatology (p. 228). Amaru considers the reason for this to be Josephus' conflict with the "Zealots" (p. 229). Furthermore, Amaru discovers important elements

of this new interpretation of the Biblical eschatology in Bell. (pp. 210 and 222), just as with regard to *Ant.* she refers to Attridge's investigation from 1976 (p. 210).

In this article from 1982 about Josephus' portrait of Saul, Feldman continues his series of investigations on Josephus' "Hellenistic" renderings of the famous Biblical characters (Abraham, Esther and Solomon; cf. section 6, a). According to Feldman, in his description of Saul, Josephus emphasizes the apologetic and agitatorical traits which have special appeal to Greek readers—a handsome appearance, good family and the traditional virtues: wisdom, courage, self-discipline, justice and piety (pp. 59 ff.). At the same time, Josephus stresses the dramatic, psychological and tragic features in the narrative, just as he is fond of interpolating fictitious speeches and objective excursions. By doing so, and with his biographical interest in the great personality (p. 52), Josephus ties in with Isocrates' rhetoric and Aristotle's "scientific" (and biographical) schools of historical writing of which the best known author in the generation before Josephus is Dionysius from Halicarnassus (pp. 46–52). To a high degree, the features mentioned recur in Josephus' portrayals of Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Samson, David and Solomon (pp. 60, 64 and 96). Thus, according to Feldman, Josephus is literarily and historically consistent (pp. 64, 79 and 98). At the same time, Feldman describes Josephus' portrayal of Saul as an original (p. 55) and meticulous work (p. 98), a conclusion which Feldman compares to those reached by Attridge (1976) and Franxman. This verdict also leads on to an exceptionally severe criticism of S.J.D. Cohen's thesis about Josephus' "sloppiness":

In short, those who find a sloppiness in Josephus are merely saying that because they have been unable to discover any consistency there is none in Josephus. We may suggest that if such scholars will spend more time analyzing his work they may find less capriciousness than they had originally attributed to Josephus (p. 98).

Rajak (1982) takes it upon herself to investigate to what extent *Ant.* is Greek and/or Jewish from a literary point of view. She compares *Ant.* with a number of related works in

the Greco-Roman period and rejects the possibility that *Ant.* might be related to Dionysius from Halicarnassus' "Archaeology" (pp. 466–467). *Ant.* is more closely related to the works of Livius and Diodorus Siculus (pp. 466 ff.), but to an even greater extent to the Hellenistic Orientals Manetho, Hecataeus of Abdera and Berossus (pp. 472–473). Nevertheless, *Ant.* distinguishes itself from all other works by its unique project, to "translate" and render the Bible (pp. 473 and 476–477). This is something unprecedented in Greco-Roman literature and much more closely related to the Jewish Targums (p. 474). With her two works from 1982 and 1983, Rajak has established herself as the most important advocate of the modern conception of Josephus.

Runnals has already been reviewed above. At this point, we may merely establish that in his analysis, this author shows that Josephus' version of the narrative concerning Moses' campaign in Ethiopia is an independent rendering having a clear Palestinian-Jewish theological tendency (pp. 149 and 154).

One turns to Attridge (1984) with great expectations, since as previously mentioned, in his thesis from 1976, this author presented an analysis of the theology of *Ant.* which may be placed within the modern conception of Josephus. How then does the author evaluate *Ant.* in 1984? *Ant.* is dated to the year 93–94, and the theory that there were two editions is rejected (p. 210). In the evaluation of Josephus' treatment of his sources, his linguistic and stylistic renewal in formulating them, and the tendencies and theology he expresses herein, Attridge reiterates the modern conception of Josephus (pp. 211–226). The moral of *Ant.* is seen as stated in 1,14, and the entire work as assembled and unified by the ideas expressed here concerning the providence and justice of divine retribution (pp. 217, 218, 222 and 224). Thus, by and large, Attridge adheres to his analysis from 1976. *Ant.* is primarily evaluated as being a work of Biblically inspired historiography (pp. 218 and 225). At the same time, it is said that in *Ant.*, one finds the same theological basic view as in Bell.:

The didactic features of the *Antiquities* serve to express Josephus' biblically based, but hellenisti-

cally conceived, theology of history. The whole work can be viewed as an attempt to paint a picture of the meaning of history already sketched in the *War...* (p. 225).

Not until the very last is this concession to S.J.D. Cohen (1979) taken into consideration, that *Ant.*

...may well have been designed to serve the interests of the rabbinic circles at Jamnia ... (p. 226),

but this reserved admission is immediately retracted (pp. 226–227). So, in all essential respects, Attridge retains his position from 1976.

#### d. Vita

Vita brings us right into the fundamental question concerning Josephus' person and political standpoint. Migliari's great investigation revives a particularly Italian variant (cf. Motzo) of Laqueur's and S.J.D. Cohen's view of Vita and Josephus in Galilee, although both of these scholars are severely criticized on the way (pp. 96–101). Basically, Vita is viewed as a thoroughly tendentious and falsified response against a series of violent attacks on the part of Justus of Tiberias against Josephus (pp. 95–98 and 104–108). Therefore, the account in Vita concerning Josephus in Galilee is rejected in favour of the way it is presented in Bell. (pp. 117–126 and 127). On this basis, it is presumed that Josephus originally was an ardent rebel (pp. 126–127, 132 and 135). It was not until Jotapata that he became aware of the realities and changed his view (p. 133), and thereafter with just as much ardour he used all his energies to work for a reconciliation between Jerusalem and Rome and between the Jewish and the Hellenistic civilizations (pp. 93 and 136). Furthermore, Migliario asserts that Vita—as all of Josephus' other works—was addressed to a Jewish audience (pp. 96 and 136), especially to the Jews in Rome where Josephus' position had been threatened because of the attacks made by Justus (pp. 97–98 and 136–137, cf. Rajak, 1973, pp. 355 and 357). The author does in fact presume—as Case had done before—that in 95–96, Domitian instigated a

persecution of the Jews (pp. 94 and 136), and in this precarious situation, Justus threatened Josephus' integrity and thereby his position as spokesman for the Jews in Rome. On this basis, Vita must be understood to be Josephus' defence of himself and his position (pp. 96 and 136-137).

Freyne maintains a variant of the same conception. Along with S.J.D. Cohen, whom Freyne generally follows, Bell. is chosen in preference to Vita when it comes to Josephus' political position (p. 241), although in another context it is said that the historical truth must lie somewhere between these two contradictory accounts (p. 89, cf. Attridge, 1984, pp. 190-191). According to Freyne, this truth is that Josephus was not even an ardent and sincere rebel, even though he was not moderate either (p. 83), but primarily he was an opportunistic and conceited fool (pp. 242 and 89). Therefore, his defence of Galilee was a sad affair (pp. 84-85). Not only are Freyne's viewpoints inspired by Cohen, actually they are far more extreme and are more closely related to the most adamant supporters of the classical conception of Josephus such as Hölischer, Weber and Laqueur.

Attridge (1984) takes a similar point of view (pp. 185-192). The account in Bell. is given preference as being closest to historical truth (pp. 188 ff.), although Attridge makes the same reservations as Freyne (pp. 190-191). Primarily, the account in Vita is taken to be a prolonged defence against Justus' attack (pp. 188-190), which Attridge has no difficulty in tracing in Vita's "apologetics" (pp. 189-190). For Attridge, the historical truth is that originally Josephus was a supporter of the Revolt (p. 191). But as an emissary in Galilee, he transgressed his competence as a member of the commission constituted by three men and unlawfully established himself as the military leader in the province, since he joined up with a group of mercenaries or the Galilean rural populace (p. 191). In so doing, Josephus is supposed to have been driven by opportunism and by personal ambition (p. 191). Along with Migliario, Attridge concludes that at Jotapata Josephus did in fact acquire a new view concerning Rome (p. 192).

Faced with these three views Rajak (1983) by and by large represents the position which I have expressed, partly in my own study of the texts, and partly in the preceding reviews of Schalit and the modern conception. According to Rajak, Vita may be said to be an act of defence against Justus (pp. 12-14 and 146), but this defence is far from being characteristic of the entire book (pp. 152 ff.). The differences between Vita and Bell. concerning Josephus' political position is explained in a context with the varying nature of the two works, their dating and their aim (pp. 154 ff.). These differences are not in the nature of principle, and with regard to their view of Rome and the Jewish Revolt, the underlying point of view is identical (p. 154). It is assumed that from the beginning Josephus opposed the Revolt, and the choice of words in Vita is therefore assumed to be closer to historical truth although, as mentioned, they are not viewed upon as conflicting with those of Bell. (p. 147).

#### e. Ap.

In the literature of the ancient world, Balch shows the existence of a pattern of eulogy, a persistent *topos* of the favoured 'enkōmion', panegyric of a nation, a city or of a person (pp. 102-106). We recover this pattern with Dionysius from Halicarnassus (about Rome) (pp. 107 ff.), and Balch goes on to show that likewise it is adopted by Josephus in Ap. 2, 145-295 where it is brought to bear about the Jewish people (pp. 114-122). However, to some extent, Josephus deviates from the pattern (p. 117) and even, in Ap. 2, 147, he stresses that it has never been his intention to write anything like an 'enkōmion' (p. 120). Unfortunately, Balch does not relate his work in its connection with other research, nor does he draw any further conclusions thereof. He does, however, maintain that in Ap. 2, it is Josephus' aim to make an impression on an educated heathen audience, thereby convincing them of how exquisite Judaism is (p. 121).

Schäublin deals with the same part of Ap. and shows how here and in other places of his works, Josephus conducts a veritable cultural

campaign against the Greek civilization (pp. 316–317). Against both Athens and Sparta as centres of the ancient world, Josephus emphasizes and compares Jewish historiography, culture and religion (pp. 319–321 and 324–334). At the same time, it becomes apparent that in his choice of words, Josephus is dependent upon Greek literature, especially Plato's work, *The Laws* (pp. 321–323 and 335–341).

Oddly enough, Vermes (1982) deals with the same texts (Ap. 2, 164–219, the paragraphs on the "Jewish constitution"). He takes an interest in Josephus' relationship to Judaism and arrives at the conclusion that in these texts, Josephus appears as a Pharisaic interpreter (p. 301) of the Torah as being a theocratic constitution (p. 291), the essence of which is love of mankind ('philanthrōpia') (p. 299). Furthermore, Vermes is of the opinion that when Josephus stresses the priestly hegemony we are reminded of similar features in the Qumran literature (p. 295). Apart from that, the text is evaluated as the earliest known Jewish systematic and theological dissertation (pp. 293 and 307). Finally, it is asserted that Josephus has given his account its obviously Greek form so as to solicit sympathy for Judaism among his educated heathen readers (pp. 301–302).

The same view of Ap. is also found with Attridge (1984) (pp. 227–231). Here, it says that in Ap. Josephus explicitly presents the most important basic thoughts which, on earlier occasions, he has rendered narratively in Bell. and Ant. (p. 227). This is done in an attractive Greek form and with the purpose of making Judaism comprehensible in the Greco-Roman world (p. 230). According to Attridge it succeeded:

If there is any originality in the apologetic program of Josephus, it lies in this subtle redefinition of the interpretative categories used to make Jewish tradition comprehensible (p. 231).

#### f. Josephus' literary method

Balch has demonstrated how in Ap., Josephus uses a classic literary pattern, but in a free and critical manner. S.J.D. Cohen (1982) shows that in his account of the Sicarii's collective

suicide on Masada, in a similar way, Josephus follows common literary patterns and *topoi* (pp. 386–392 and 393 ff., cf. also Ladouceur, 1980, pp. 247–253). Therefore, Josephus' account is scarcely reliable (p. 393). This is confirmed partly by a comparison with the archaeological results which Cohen interprets differently than was commonly practiced earlier (pp. 393–395, cf., e.g., Feldman, 1975), and partly by a literary analysis (pp. 395–398). Therefore, it surprises the reader that after all Cohen can end his article with a favourable evaluation of the historical reliability of the account (pp. 399–401). Moreover, this evaluation is extended to cover its literary quality (p. 405). As was the case with the monograph from 1979, it would appear that Cohen's work in this case is not entirely consistent.

Daube (1980) analyses the "type" phenomenon ('typos') in Josephus and demonstrates, just as in his brief article from 1976, that Josephus draws his own fate into his narratives of Joseph, Jeremiah, Daniel, Esther and Mordecai, whereas, conversely, these "types" play a role in Josephus' description of his own life in Bell. and Vita (cf. esp. pp. 32–33).

In his article from 1980 (a), Downing investigates a great number (40) of Josephus' speeches by way of comparing them with speeches of Dionysius from Halicarnassus and Luke (pp. 548 ff.). The speeches investigated are asserted to follow a definite outline which partly reflects the moral of Ant. in 1, 14–15 (p. 549) and partly corresponds to and is dependent on Dionysius (pp. 552 and 561), while at the same time they can be recognized in Luke (pp. 554–555 and 561).

Ladouceur (1983) makes a thorough study of a single problem, namely, the thesis of Shutt (1961) (and others) that especially in Ant., Josephus is dependent upon Dionysius from Halicarnassus (cf. Balch, Downing, Feldman (1982) and Rajak (1982)). The thesis is tested linguistically and statistically with regard to the vocabulary (pp. 21 ff.), and it is unconditionally rejected as being completely unsound (pp. 34–35).

Schwartz (1981) clarifies a single problem in Ant. 10, 80, but in his articles from 1982 and 1983 he embarks on an ambitious and impor-



tant project, namely, the criticism of sources in Josephus which has been neglected. In the first and largest article, Schwartz attempts to launch this project by circumscribing and establishing a new criterion in the criticism of sources, the expression "at this time" ('kata touton ton kairon' (pp. 246-248)). His point of departure is that in some places, Josephus speaks of King Agrippa II in favourable terms, whereas, in other places, he is spoken of in a deprecatory way (pp. 241-242). This observation gives reason to presume that Josephus has used different sources which have not been coordinated accurately (pp. 243-244). First, Schwartz demonstrates that the criterion mentioned actually appears to occur in instances where Josephus for other reasons may be presumed to have drawn on supplementary sources (pp. 248-253). Then, the six places in Ant. 20 where Agrippa II is referred to in negative terms are reviewed (pp. 256-257). Four of these places contain the criterion mentioned as well as others of the same kind. Therefore, it is maintained that they belong to a particular priestly source which is critical of King Agrippa as well as the high priests and the levites (pp. 257-262). In the article from 1983, Schwartz argues in favour of the theory that the places where Josephus speaks unfavourably about the Pharisees, must be derived from Nicolas of Damascus. Although in this article, Josephus is granted a higher degree of independence and creativity (pp. 163 and 169), here too, the classical conception of Josephus as the careless and automatic copyist of his sources dominates.

Schwartz' articles are significant attempts to make progress on the difficult question of the criticism of sources, which in more recent years only scholars as Lindner (1972) and S.J.D. Cohen (1979 and 1982) have given serious attention, whereas Nikiprowetzky, Broshi et al. have touched upon it. However, the vestiges of the classical criticism of sources are scaring, and as demonstrated by Lindner and Cohen it is essential that if it shall be rescued from the dangers of coincidence and arbitrariness, source criticism must be combined with an analysis of tendencies. It is Schwartz' greatest weakness that he neglects this aspect in his long

article from 1982. A thorough understanding of the "positive" and "negative" statements of King Agrippa II cannot be obtained without an analysis of Josephus' complete interpretation of this monarch.

#### *g. Theology*

Many of the works we have already reviewed also belong in this section. This applies, e.g., to Michel (1984) with regard to Josephus' general theological position, Amaru to this eschatology, Schäublin and Vermes (1982) with regard to Ap., and not least, Attridge (1984) on the theology of Bell. and Ant. As mentioned, Aune's article demonstrates that Josephus appears to have believed that prophecy did not end with the Biblical prophets during the Exile, but that it lived on as a reality after the Exile and down to Josephus' own time.

The three works by Downing are also of importance to the enlightenment on Josephus' own theology. Here, thorough arguments are presented that the theology which influences Ant. 1, 14-15 and the speeches and prayers in the works of Josephus are not expressions of Palestinian Judaism (1980a, pp. 553-554). In line with Dionysius from Halicarnassus and Luke, the intention of Josephus' works is to divert and entertain an educated heathen audience (1980a, pp. 546-548, and 1982, pp. 552 and 557-558). And the religious aspects of their works is described as Hellenistic (1980a, pp. 552-553), namely, as a "general humanistic theism" (1980a, pp. 554 and 1982, p. 558), that is to say an enlightened and educated Hellenistic moral kind of religion.

Martin, in continuation of earlier works, especially Wächter, concerning Josephus' rendering of the three most important Jewish religious groups, discusses the places in Ant. where Josephus uses the word "necessity by fate" ('heimarmenē'). According to Martin, Josephus does not use this idea in a limited philosophical Stoic meaning, but rather in a wider sense as the word is used in *Corpus Hermeticum* (especially in *Poimandres*), astrology and

gnosticism (pp. 132–133). In these contexts, the word is used about the universe or life perceived of as being an evil compulsion or necessity (pp. 132–133). Against this, according to Martin, Josephus places Judaism, which Martin without directly saying so identifies with the Pharisaic belief that man is able to live in free responsibility in obedience to the Torah (pp. 134–135). Thus, Martin presents Josephus as a kind of missionary.

Momigliano in a brief article, along with Vidal-Naquet, proposes that in his works, Josephus has nothing to relate with regard to the institution of the synagogue and contemporary Jewish apocalypics (pp 325, 327–328 and 330). According to Momigliano, the reason for this was, first, that Josephus failed to grasp the importance of the apocalyptic idea (p. 330). His position as a Jew was flat, common and rhetorical (p. 334), and the similarities between him and Yoḥanan ben Zakkai, which have often been pointed out, are merely superficial (p. 335). Therefore, it is also wrong to say that Josephus anticipated the Rabbinical rejection of the apocalyptic idea (p. 330). Secondly, the reason was that Josephus wrote in Greek with a view to the higher circles in the Greco-Roman world, and apocalyptic thoughts cannot at all be expressed in a fluent Hellenistic Greek (p. 331). Nevertheless, according to Momigliano, Josephus was convinced that Roman domination had been foreseen by the prophets of the Old Testament and that, as predicted by them, it would come to an end, but cautiously he makes only vague utterances to this effect (cf. Ant. 10, 79, 210 and 276, thus p. 332, cf. also Stemberger, pp. 36–37).

The fact that Josephus does not deal much with the institution of the synagogue is correct. But the reason for this may also be that, at the time of Josephus, this institution was not yet so important as assumed by Momigliano, or that, as a priest, Josephus did not view it as a central institution. But it is not true that Josephus writes nothing about Jewish apocalyptic thoughts. Josephus himself is under influence of the apocalyptic ideas of Daniel, as admitted by Momigliano (pp. 332–333). So, Momigliano's work is marked by internal contradictions like the works by Attridge (1984),

S.J.D. Cohen, Freyne and Migliario.

Shutt (1981) debates on the question of Josephus' conception of God. Is it Hellenistic or Jewish? (pp. 171–172, cf. Rajak, 1982). Shutt reviews Josephus' Hellenistically toned expressions, "the divine" ('to theion'), "necessity" ('to chreōn'), "destiny" ('he tychē'), etc., and, in line with earlier scholars, comes to the conclusion that although Josephus uses a Greek form, the meaning of the ideas are definitely influenced by Biblical and Jewish outlook (pp. 173–184, cf. e.g., Lewinsky, p. 27; Poznanski, pp. 10–12, and Schlatter, 1932, pp. 3 and 32 f.). According to Shutt, Josephus remained a Jew and a Pharisee all of his life (pp. 185–186), and the Hellenistic use of language is to be understood primarily as a didactic means (p. 186, cf. also Attridge, 1976 and 1984; Vermes, 1982; Goldenberg, 1980, and several others).

Trisoglio's work is not merely an analysis of Josephus, but an investigation of the entire classical Greek and early Christian (Eusebius) writing of history with particular reference to divine interference in history. The work is comprehensive, wordy and immensely learned, if learnedness can be measured by virtue of the 324 long footnotes with which it is interspersed, the longest of which occupies four tightly printed pages. However, it has nothing to do with research and scholarship and it remains a mystery that it was accepted by the distinguished international work *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (ANRW). For the work is a piece of pure Christian theological apologetics. It is entirely uncritical towards Eusebius (pp. 1066ff.), whereas, on the other hand, quite unhistorically it reproaches the classical Greek historians for their incomplete and, that is to say, their non-Christian conception of the divine (cf. esp. pp. 994–995, 1015, 1039, 1041 and 1065–1066). In this context, he places and deals also with Josephus (pp. 983–1000, 1014–1016, 1029–1041 and 1060–1065). Trisoglio's lengthy "classical" list of Josephus' personal and professional deficiencies may be briefly recounted here. The decisive factor is that Josephus, so it is postulated, has betrayed his Biblical and Jewish faith in God (pp. 997, 1015, 1029, 1039 and 1064), and instead is said to have surrendered completely to Hellenistic

historiographic mentality (pp. 984, 997–998, 1039 and 1064–1065) and syncretism (pp. 997, 1014–1015, 1035, 1040 and 1064–1065). With self-assurance Josephus is decried as an apostate (pp. 1062 and 1064) and as one who has abused Jewish religion and theology so as to justify partly Rome and the Flavian supremacy (pp. 992, 1015 and 1064), and partly his own treachery (pp. 999, 1031–1032, 1061–1062 and 1064). It is quite incomprehensible that Josephus is reproached for not having given up his Judaism and for not having acknowledged and accepted the truth of the Christian faith (p. 1041). The rest may be left alone. Thus, Josephus has been unambiguously catalogued by Trisoglio. It cannot come as a surprise that in the vast number of notes there is a conspicuous lack of references to that modern literature on Josephus which I have reviewed under the heading "The modern conception of Josephus". Ideological apologetics thus, are still a flourishing genre (cf. also Moehring's (1984) criticism of Schalit (1975) which oddly enough was also published in the "distinguished" series ANRW).

#### *h. Historiography*

Important aspects of this problem have already been discussed. The archaeological and topographical works have shown with S.J.D. Cohen (1982), as a single, but not entirely resolute, exception that by and large Josephus' account is reliable insofar as it may be subjected to verification. In his article, Broshi deals with this subject specifically, in general confirming Josephus' historical reliability (pp. 379–381) and then deliberates whether the material which is particularly precise and meticulous may perhaps not be derived from Roman military reports (pp. 381–383). This possibility which cannot be refuted has been considered on previous occasions, particularly by Weber, Lindner (1972) and most recently by S.J.D. Cohen (1982, p. 398). But it must still be accepted and maintained that Josephus has chosen to incorporate this kind of material in his works, no matter from where he derived it.

Gauger's article is of a different variety.

Here, it is discussed whether the Hecataeus fragments handed down by Josephus, primarily in Ap., are genuine. We are faced with the theses, well-known by now, concerning Josephus' treatment of his sources: He rarely falsifies (pp. 9, 11, and 15), but readily manipulates apologetically with the material he uses (pp. 10, 11–12 and 15). According to Gauger, the Hecataeus fragments which have been examined are authentic (pp. 25–35), apart from Ap. 2,43 and Ant. 12,37 (pp. 36–40).

Finally, Saulnier may be brought into the picture. Strictly speaking this is a purely historical investigation of the legal status of the Jews in the Roman period, but it is based on the assumption that the official decrees used by Josephus, broadly speaking, are all genuine (p. 162, cf. also Rajak, 1984, p. 109).

The literary aspect concerning Josephus' historiography has already been discussed. It is true that Josephus makes use of the forms and patterns found in Greco-Roman writing of history (cf. Attridge (1984), Balch, S.J.D. Cohen (1982), Downing (1980a and 1982), Feldman (1982), Ladouceur (1980 and 1983), Martin, Michel (1984), Rajak (1982 and 1983), Schäublin, Shutt (1981) and Vermes (1982)), but most of these scholars have argued convincingly in favour of the assumption that the contents and line of thought in his works are primarily of a Biblical and Palestinian-Jewish nature (cf. Attridge, Goldenberg, Martin, Michel, Rajak, Runnalls, Schäublin, Shutt and Vermes).

#### *i. Josephus' person and political position*

This topic has also been touched upon above, particularly in the section concerning Vita. The main positions are marked by Attridge, Freyne and Migliario on the one side and Daube, Rajak (1983) and Moehring (1984) on the other. It is not so strange that it is with regard to this question about Josephus as an historical person that opinions differ. For reasons of principle, this is where the amount of uncertainty is greatest. It is in fact extremely difficult to penetrate Josephus' literary style and to trace the history of his life. Moreover, here, Josephus is most vulnerable because of the fre-

quently frank and self-contradictory accounts which he has left concerning important events in his own life. Here, therefore, emotions run freely (cf. Feldman, 1984b, p. 779), and the traditional animosity for the "turncoat", "traitor", "apostate" and "bootlicker" makes itself particularly strong. Therefore, it is here that the classical conception of Josephus has its best hand and its firm starting point. It is not difficult, therefore, to criticize Josephus for vanity, opportunism and cowardice (Freyne, 1980, pp. 89 and 242-243), for tyranny and cruelty in Galilee (Migliario, pp. 113 and 132) and for opportunism and greed for power (Attridge, 1984, p. 191). However, this position in its entirety rests and falls on the overall evaluation of the relation between Bell. and Vita. If Rajak's evaluation (1983) is taken as a starting point, the result turns out to be the opposite. Her interpretation is supported by the socio-cultural evaluation of Josephus' political career as seen in the light of his economical, social and cultural background (pp. 6, 21 and 130). It is also supported by Rajak's arguments in favour of Josephus' works as being modified by a unity and consistency of attitude (pp. 224-229). According to her, throughout his life, Josephus remained decisively influenced by his status as a Palestinian-Jewish priest, aristocrat and Pharisee.

With Moehring (1984), this position has acquired another prominent advocate. In a penetrating analysis of Josephus' political position, Moehring adopts an uncompromising stand against earlier and particularly modern scholars when they have applied criticism of a moralizing nature and apologetic abuse of Josephus (pp. 866-868 and 917 ff.). Against this attitude, Moehring asserts that Josephus should be understood on his own premises (pp. 868, 925 and 940). In order to clarify Josephus' political stand, Moehring works through his accounts in Bell. and Ant. of the history of the Hellenistic and the Roman period (pp. 871-907). Thereby, it appears that the main point of view as seen by Josephus is that the Jewish people can exist in safety when they stand united in loyalty towards the ruling power (pp. 874, 879, 881 etc.); that the Jews owe their political and religious rights and privileges to

Rome (cf. the official documents, pp. 896-897); that Roman supremacy is in accordance with God's plan (p. 890) and that according to Josephus, the Jewish Revolt was caused by irresponsible conduct on the part of the Jews as well as on the part of the Romans, whereas the Jewish people as a whole were without responsibility (pp. 898-901). The primary aim in both of Josephus' principal works was to prevent a recurrence of the War in 66-70 (74) (p. 934). Therefore, Josephus works towards a reconciliation between Jerusalem and Rome (p. 868). In his person, Josephus combined a Jewish and a Roman existence (p. 869), and his wish is for the same to happen to all of his people. In this way, according to Moehring, Josephus is close to the Septuagint, Philo and the Hellenistic outwardly orientated Judaism (pp. 875-876, 913 and 940). This point of view permeates Bell. as well as Ant. Therefore, Josephus may be viewed as consistent politically as well as theologically (pp. 927 and 939). Based upon this, Moehring submits Schalit (1975) to a devastating criticism (917-940). Schalit's work, it is claimed, is an example of moralizing and apologetic abuse of Josephus. According to Moehring, Schalit does not allow Josephus himself to be heard, because the scholar has already taken his stand, knows which is good and which is bad and is aware of the entire historical truth.

Yet, Moehring does in fact pursue ideas which are found already in Schalit (cf. my review above in paragraph 5). Besides, it must be said to be an illusion that Moehring's treatment is objective. It is not (cf. pp. 869, 876 and 934). Nevertheless, it is historical and therefore closer to the truth from a scholarly point of view than that of Schalit.

#### *j. Status*

This concludes our summary of the Josephus research during the period 1980-1984. Perhaps the summary may seem to give a flickering picture, and the works which have been reviewed may appear to point in many directions. On a closer study, however, the reader will be amazed to see that the situation in the

research today actually is astonishingly clear and is also most explosive. The impression which the review in the preceding paragraphs has left us, that the modern conception of Josephus definitively has broken through, on the face of it may perhaps appear to have been erased. The situation today seems to be completely open. In reality, the classical conception of Josephus has been revived. The works by Attridge, S.J.D. Cohen, Downing, Freyne, Migliario, Momigliano, (U. Rappaport), Schwartz and Trisoglio can with certain reservations and exceptions be asserted to continue the classical positions of Hölscher, Weber and Laqueur. In these works, emphasis is placed on the inconsistency in Josephus' life and works, the lack of originality and the unreliability of his writings as well as the Hellenistic influence which is in contrast to the opposite positions taken by the other authors who may be said to represent the modern conception of Josephus.

However, this impression is false and rests on optical illusion. First and foremost, as we have observed, Cohen himself makes considerable reservations against the classical positions. And if we revert to Migliario and Attridge, it becomes even more obvious since, in addition to this, they take considerable reservations against Cohen. In reality, like Momigliano, these two scholars represent an impossible compromise between the two main conceptions, wherefore their standpoints, like those of Schalit and Cohen, must be regarded as untenable.

Therefore, the summary of the most recent Josephus research should not lead us to be deceived. A critical and correct evaluation of this research must be said to confirm the interpretation of the history of Josephus research which has been set forth in this article. The classical Josephus conception, like the earlier uncritical research, has culminated, since its modern adherents, influenced by the modern conception, have on their own accord revised it drastically, and since in its modern versions the classical conception of Josephus would seem to indicate an incoherent attitude which in the long run will prove to be untenable.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altschuler, D., The Treatise ΠΕΡΙ ΕΘΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΤΙΩΝ "On Customs and Causes" by Flavius Josephus, JQR, 69, 1978-1979, 226-232.
- Amaru, B.H., Land Theology in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* JQR, 71, 1980-1981, 201-229.
- Armenti, J.R., On the Use of the Term "Galileans" in the Writings of Josephus: A Brief Note, JQR, 72, 1981, 45-49.
- Attridge, H.W., The Interpretation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus, Miskoulas 1976.
- Attridge, H.W., Josephus and his Works, Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period, CRINT, Section Two, ed. M. Stone, Assen-Philadelphia 1984, 185-232.
- Aune, D.E., The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus, JBL, 101, 1982, 419-421.
- Baer, Y., Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt (Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Destruction) (Hebr.), Zion, 36, 1971, 127-190.
- Baerwald, A., Josephus in Galiläa. Sein Verhältnis zu den Parteien, insbesondere zu Justus von Tiberias und Agrippa II, Breslau 1877.
- Balch, D.L., Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius on Rome and Josephus on the Jews, JSJ, 13, 1982, 102-122.
- Bardy, G., Le souvenir de Josèphe chez les Pères, RHE, 43, 1948, 179-191.
- Bell, A.A., jr., Joseph the Satirist? A Clue to the original Form of the Testimonium Flavianum, JQR, 67, 1976-1977, 16-22.
- Bentwich, N., Josephus, Philadelphia 1914, rp. 1926 and 1976.
- Berggren, J., Judiske Häfdatecknaren Flavii Josephi vittnesbörd om Christus, Christi Broder, Johannes Döparen och Essenerne eller de första Christna, till dess autenticitet granskadt och framställt av J. Berggren, Stockholm 1948.
- Bernstein, L., Flavius Josephus, his Time and his Critics, New York 1938.
- Bilde, P., Josefus' beretning om Jesus, DTT, 44, 1981, 99-135.
- Bilde, P., Josefus som historieskriver. En undersøgelse af Josefus' framstilling af Gaius Caligulas konflikt med jøderne i Palaestina (Bell 2, 184-203 og Ant 18, 261-309) med særligt henblik på forfatterens tendens og historiske pålidelighed, København 1983.
- Bloch, H., Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seiner Archäologie, Leipzig 1879, rp. Wiesbaden 1968.
- Blosser, The Sabbath Year Cycle in Josephus, HUCA, 52, 1981, 129-139.

- Braun, M., *Griechischer Roman und hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung*, Frankfurt/M 1934.
- Braun, M., *History and Romance in Greco-Oriental Literature*, Oxford 1938.
- Braun, M., *The Prophet Who Became a Historian*, *The Listener*, 56, 1956, 53-57.
- Broshi, M., *The Credibility of Josephus*, *AV Y. Yadin*, ed. G. Vermes and J. Neusner, (=JJS, 33, 1982, 379-384).
- Bruce, F.F., *Josephus and Daniel*, *ASTI*, 4, 1965, 148-162.
- Brüne, B., *Flavius Josephus und seine Schriften in ihrem Verhältnis zum Judenthume, zur griechisch-römischen Welt und zum Christenthume*, Wiesbaden 1913, rp. 1969.
- Case, S.J., *Josephus' Anticipation of a Domitianic Persecution*, *JBL*, 44, 1925, 10-20.
- Cohen, N.G., *Josephus and Scripture: Is Josephus' Treatment of the Scriptural Narrative Similar Throughout the Antiquities I-XI*, *JQR*, 54, 1963-1964, 311-332.
- Cohen, N.G., *Asinaeus and Anilaus. Additional Comments to Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews*, *ASTI*, 10, 1975-1976, 30-37.
- Cohen, S.J.D., *Josephus in Galilee and Rome. His Vita and Development as a Historian*, Leiden 1979.
- Cohen, S.J.D., *Masada: Literary Tradition, Archaeological Remains, and the Credibility of Josephus*, *AV Y. Yadin*, ed. G. Vermes and J. Neusner (=JJS, 33, 1982, 385-405).
- Daube, D., "I believe" in *Jewish Antiquities XI*. 237, *JJS*, 27, 1976, 142-146.
- Daube, D., *Typologie im Werke des Flavius Josephus*, *Freiburger Rundbriefe*, 31, 1979, 59-69 (= *Typology in Josephus*, *JJS*, 31, 1980, 18-36, as used here).
- Destinon, J. von, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII-XVII=Jüd. Krieg Buch I*, Kiel 1882.
- Downing, F.G., *Ethical Pagan Theism and the Speeches in Acts*, *NTS*, 27, 1980, 544-563. (Quoted as 1980a).
- Downing, F.G., *Redaction Criticism: Josephus' Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels, I & II*, *JSNT*, 8, 1980, 46-65, og 9, 1980, 29-48. (Quoted as 1980b).
- Downing, F.G., *Common Ground with Paganism in Luke and in Josephus*, *NTS*, 28, 1982, 546-559.
- Drexler, H., *Untersuchungen zu Josephus und zur Geschichte des jüdischen Aufstandes 66-70*, *Klio*, 19, 1923-1925, 277-312.
- Drüner, H., *Untersuchungen über Josephus*, Marburg 1896.
- Eisler, R., *ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*, I-II, Heidelberg 1929-1930.
- Farmer, W.R., *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus. An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*, New York 1956, rp. Westport 1973.
- Feldman, L.H., *Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus*, *TAPAPA*, 99, 1968, 143-156. (Quoted as 1968a).
- Feldman, L.H., *Hellenizations in Josephus' Portrayal of Man's Decline, Religions in Antiquity*, *MV E.R. Goode-nough*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1968, 336-353. (Quoted as 1968b).
- Feldman, L.H., *Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther (Ant. Jud. 11,185-295)*, *TAPAPA*, 101, 1970, 143-170.
- Feldman, L.H., *Masada: A Critique of Recent Scholarship, Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco-Roman Cults*, *AV M. Smith*, ed. J. Neusner, I-IV, Leiden 1975, III, 218-248.
- Feldman, L.H., *Josephus as an Apologist to the Greco-Roman World: His Portrait of Solomon, Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. E.S. Fiorenza, Notre Dame 1976, 69-98.
- Feldman, L.H., *The Term "Galileans" in Josephus*, *JQR*, 72, 1981, 50-52.
- Feldman, L.H., *Josephus' Portrait of Saul*, *HUCA*, 53, 1982, 45-99.
- Feldman, L.H., *Flavius Josephus Revisited: The Man, His Writings, and his Significance*, *ANRW*, II, 21, 2, 1984, 763-862. (Quoted as 1984b).
- Feldman, L.H., *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)*, Berlin-New York 1984. (Quoted as 1984a).
- Feldman, L.H., *A Supplement to Heinz Schreckenberg's Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus*. (cf. Feldman, 1984a, p. 17: "in progress").
- Foakes-Jackson, F.J., *Josephus and the Jews. The Religion and History of the Jews as Explained by Flavius Josephus*, London 1930, rp. Grand Rapids 1977.
- Franxman, Th.W., *Genesis and the "Jewish Antiquities" of Flavius Josephus*, Roma 1979.
- Freyne, S., *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E. A Study of Second Temple Judaism*, Notre Dame 1980 (= Leiden 1981).
- Gauger, J.-D., *Zitate in der jüdischen Apologetik und die Authentizität der Hekataios-Passagen bei Flavius Josephus und im Ps.Aristeas-Brief*, *JSJ*, 13, 1982, 6-46.
- Gelzer, M., *Die Vita des Josephos*, *Hermes*, 80, 1952, 67-90.
- Geva, H., *The "Tower of David"—Phasaël or Hippicus?* *IEJ*, 31, 1981, 57-65.
- Gichon, M., *Cestius Gallus's Campaign in Judaea*, *PEQ*, 113, 1981, 39-62.
- Goldenberg, D., *The Halakha in Josephus and in Tannaitic Literature: A Comparative Study*, *JQR*, 67, 1976-1977, 30-43.
- Goldenberg, D., *Flavius Josephus or Josef ben Matithiah*, *JQR*, 70, 1980, 178-182.

- Goldstein, J.A., *The Tales of the Tobiads, Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco-Roman Cults*, AV M. Smith, ed. J. Neusner, I-IV, Leiden 1975, III, 85-123.
- Goodman, M., *The First Jewish Revolt: Social Conflict and the Problem of Debt*, AV Y. Yadin, ed. G. Vermes and J. Neusner, (= JJS, 33, 1982, 417-427).
- Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, I-XI, Leipzig 1853-1875, III, 1 and III, 2, Leipzig <sup>5</sup>1905 and <sup>5</sup>1906.
- Grant, M., *The Ancient Historians*, London 1970.
- Grant, R.M., *Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews*, Society of Biblical Literature, 1979, Seminar Papers, ed. P.J. Achtemeyer, Missoula 1979, II, 69-86.
- Gutmann, J., *Josephus Flavius*, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, IX, 1932, 394-420.
- Hata, G., *Is the Greek Version of Josephus' "Jewish War" a Translation or a Rewriting of the First Version?* JQR, 66, 1975-1976, 89-108.
- Hayward, R., *The Jewish Temple of Leontopolis: A Reconsideration*, AV Y. Yadin, ed. G. Vermes and J. Neusner (= JJS, 33, 1982, 429-443).
- Hengel, M., *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.*, Leiden-Köln 1961, <sup>2</sup>1976.
- Hölscher, G., *Josephus*, P-WRE. IX, 1916, 1934-2000.
- Hohlfelder, R.L. et al., *Sebastos, Herod's Harbor at Caesarea Maritima*, BA, 46, 1983, 133-143.
- Horowitz, S., *Untersuchungen über die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seinen Antiquitäten B. XII, 241-XVIII, 54*, Wien (unpublished dissertation) 1919.
- Horsley, R.A., *Ancient Jewish Banditry and the Revolt against Rome*, A.D. 66-70, CBQ, 43, 1981, 409-432.
- Horsley, R.A., *Popular Messianic Movements around the Time of Jesus*, CBQ, 46, 1984, 471-495.
- Jacobs, I., *Eleazar ben Yairs's Sanction for Martyrdom*, JSJ, 13, 1982, 183-186.
- Jonge, M. de, *Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes*, J-S, 205-219.
- Jost, J.M., *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, I-III, Leipzig 1857-1859.
- Justus, B., *Zur Erzählkunst des Flavius Josephus*, *Theokratia*, II, 1973, 107-136.
- Klausner, J., *The History of the Second Temple*, (Hebr), I-V, Jerusalem <sup>2</sup>1950, rp. 1968.
- Ladouceur, D.J., *Masada: A Consideration of the Literary Evidence*, GRBS, 21, 1980, 245-260.
- Ladouceur, D.J., *The Language of Josephus*, JSJ, 14, 1983, 18-38.
- Laqueur, R., *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biografischer Versuch auf neuer Quellenkritischer Grundlage*, Giessen 1920, rp. Darmstadt 1970.
- Lewinsky, A., *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der religionsphilosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus*, Breslau 1887.
- Lindner, H., *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage*, Leiden 1972.
- Lindner, H., *Eine Offene Frage zur Auslegung des Bellum-Proömiums*, J-S, 254-259.
- Luther, H., *Josephus und Justus von Tiberias. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des jüdischen Aufstandes*, Halle 1910.
- Malinowski, F.X., *Galilean Judaism in the Writings of Flavius Josephus*, Duke University (unpublished dissertation) 1973.
- Malinowski, F.X., *Torah Tendencies in Galilean Judaism According to Flavius Josephus with Gospel Comparison*, *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 10, 1980, 30-36.
- Martin, L.H., *Josephus' Use of Heimarmene in the Jewish Antiquities XIII*, 171-3, Numen, 28, 1981, 127-137.
- Michel, O., *Spätjüdisches Prophetentum, Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, Berlin 1954, 60-66.
- Michel, O. und O. Bauernfeind, ed. et trans., *Flavius Josephus, De bello Judaico*, Zweisprachige Ausgabe der sieben Bücher, Herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung sowie mit Anmerkungen versehen von Otto Michel und Otto Bauernfeind, I-IV, Darmstadt 1959-1969.
- Michel, O., *Die Rettung Israels und die Rolle Roms nach den Reden im "Bellum Judaicum". Analysen und Perspektiven*, ANRW, II, 21, 2, 1984, 945-976.
- Migliario, E., *Per l'interpretazione dell' Autobiografia di Flavio Giuseppe*, *Athenaeum*, 59, 1981, 92-137.
- Moehring, H.R., *Novelistic Elements in the Writings of Josephus*, Chicago (unpublished dissertation) 1957.
- Moehring, H.R., *The Persecution of the Jews and the Adherents of the Isis Cult at Rome A.D. 19*, NovT, 3, 1959, 293-304.
- Moehring, H.R., *Rationalization of Miracles in the Writings of Flavius Josephus, Texte und Untersuchungen*, 112, 1973, 376-383.
- Moehring, H.R., *Joseph ben Matthia and Flavius Josephus: the Jewish Prophet and Roman Historian*, ANRW, II, 21, 2, 1984, 864-944.
- Momigliano, A., *Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe non vide*, *La storiografia greca*, Torino 1982, 322-335.
- Morel, W., *Eine Rede bei Josephus*. (Bell. Jud. VII, 341 sqq.), RM, 75, 1926, 106-115.
- Motzo, B., *Due edizioni della Vita di Giuseppe*, *Saggi di storia e letteratura guideo-ellenistica*, Firenze 1924, 214-226.
- Motzo, B., *Gli avvenimenti di Galilea in Bellum e in Vita*, *Saggi di storia e letteratura guideo-ellenistica*, Firenze 1924, 226-240.
- Netzer, E., *Greater Herodium*, Jerusalem 1981.

- Niese, B., Der jüdische Historiker Josephus, HZ, NF, 40, 1896, 193–237.
- Niese, B., Josephus, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J. Hastings, Edinburgh 1908–1926, 7, 1914, 569–579.
- Nikiprowetzky, V., La mort d'Éléazar fils de Jaïre et les courants apologétiques dans le *De Bello Judaico* de Flavius Josèphe, AV A. Dupont-Sommer, Paris 1971, 461–490.
- Norden, E., Josephus und Tacitus über Jesus Christus und eine messianische Prophetie, Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur, 16, 1913, 637–666 (= Zur Josephus-Forschung, ed. A. Schalit, Darmstadt 1973, 27–69).
- Paul, A., Le concept de prophétie biblique. Flavius Josèphe et Daniel, (Ant X, 266–281), RSR, 63, 1975, 367–384.
- Pelletier, A., Flavius Josèphe adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée. Une réaction atticisante contre la Koine, Paris 1962.
- Petersen, H., Real and Alleged Literary Projects of Josephus, AJPh, 79, 1958, 259–274.
- Pixner, B., Putting Bethsaida-Julias on the Map, Christian News from Israel, 27, 1982, 165–170.
- Poznanski, A., Über die religionsphilosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus, Halle 1887.
- Prager, J., Ueber das Verhältniss des Flavius Josephus zur Zelotenpartei beim Ausbruch des jüdischen Krieges, Breslau 1873.
- Rajak, T., Justus of Tiberias, CQ, 23, 1973, 245–268.
- Rajak, T., Josephus and the "Archaeology" of the Jews, AV Y. Yadin, ed. G. Vermes and J. Neusner (= JJS, 33, 1982, 465–477).
- Rajak, T., Josephus. The Historian and His Society. London-Philadelphia 1983.
- Rajak, T., Was there a Roman Charter for the Jews? JRS, 74, 1984, 107–123.
- Rappaport, S., Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus, Wien 1930.
- Rappaport, U., John of Gischala: From Galilee to Jerusalem, AV Y. Yadin, ed. G. Vermes and J. Neusner (= JJS, 33, 1982, 479–493).
- Richards, G.S., The Composition of Josephus' "Antiquities", CQ, 33, 1939, 36–40.
- Rosenzweig, A., Der politische und religiöse Charakter des Flavius Josephus, Populär-wissenschaftliche Monatsblatt zur Belehrung über das Judentum, 9, 1889, 78–83 und 101–108.
- Rühl, F., Justus von Tiberias, RM, 71, 1916, 289–308.
- Runnalls, D., Moses' Ethiopian Campaign, JSJ, 14, 1983, 135–156.
- Saulnier, C., Lois romaines sur les Juifs selon Flavius Josèphe, RB, 88, 1981, 161–198.
- Schäublin, Ch., Josephus und die Griechen, Hermes, 110, 1982, 316–341.
- Schalit, A., Die Vita des Flavius Josephus. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung, Wien 1925.
- Schalit, A., Wann schrieb Josephus die Vita? (Hebr.) Zion, 5, 1933, 174–187. (Quoted as 1933a).
- Schalit, A., Josephus und Justus. Studien zur Vita des Josephus, Klio, 36, 1933, 67–95. (Quoted as 1933b).
- Schalit, A., The Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis Regarding the Establishment of Jewish Military Colonies in Phrygia and Lydia, JQR, 50, 1959–1960, 289–319.
- Schalit, A., Flavius Josephus, Antiquitates Judaearum, transl. from Greek to Hebrew, I–III, Jerusalem (1944–1963) 1967–1973, Introduction (Hebr.), I, Jerusalem 1967, XI–LXXXII.
- Schalit, A., König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk, Berlin 1969.
- Schalit, A., Die Denkschrift der Samaritaner an König Antiochos Epiphanes zu Beginn der grossen Verfolgung der jüdischen Religion im Jahre 167 v. Chr. (Josephus, AJ, XII §§258–264), ASTI, 8, 1970–1971, 131–183.
- Schalit, A., Josephus Flavius, Encyclopaedia Judaica, X, Jerusalem 1971, 251–265.
- Schalit, A., ed., Zur Josephus Forschung, Darmstadt 1973.
- Schalit, A., Die Erhebung Vespasians nach Flavius Josephus, Talmud und Midrasch. Zur Geschichte einer Prophetie, ANRW, II, 2, 1975, 208–327.
- Schlatter, A., Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas, Stuttgart 1893.
- Schlatter, A., Der Bericht über das Ende Jerusalems. Ein Dialog mit Wilhelm Weber, Gütersloh 1923, rp. Kleinere Schriften zu Flavius Josephus, ed. K.H. Rengstorf, Darmstadt 1970, 1–64.
- Schlatter, A., Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus, Gütersloh 1932.
- Schmitt, G., Die dritte Mauer Jerusalems, ZDPV, 97, 1981, 153–170.
- Schrekenberg, H., Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus, Leiden 1968.
- Schrekenberg, H., Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter, Leiden 1972.
- Schrekenberg, H., Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus, Leiden 1977.
- Schrekenberg, H., Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus. Supplementsband mit Gesamtregister, Leiden 1979.
- Schrekenberg, H., Flavius Josephus und die lukanischen Schriften, Wort in der Zeit, AV K.H. Rengstorf, ed. W. Haubeck und M. Bachmann, Leiden 1980, 179–209.
- Schrekenberg, H., Josephus und die christliche Wirkungsgeschichte seines "Bellum Judaicum", ANRW, II, 21, 2, 1984, 1106–1217.



- Schwartz, D.R., Priesthood and Priestly Descent: Josephus, *Antiquities* 10, 80, *JTS*, 32, 1981, 129–135.
- Schwartz, D.R., KATA TOYTON TON KAIPON: Josephus' Source on Agrippa II, *JQR*, 72, 1982, 241–268.
- Schwartz, D.R., Josephus and Nicolaus on the Pharisees, *JSJ*, 14, 1983, 157–171.
- Serenius, J., *Christendomens Styrka Af Hedningarnas, Och Särdeles Af Flavii Josephi, Omdömen Om Christo*, Stockholm 1752.
- Shutt, R.J.H., *Studies in Josephus*, London 1961.
- Shutt, R.J.H., The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus, *JJS*, 31, 1981, 171–189.
- Sprödowsky, H., *Die Hellenisierung der Geschichte von Josef in Ägypten bei Flavius Josephus*, Greifswald 1937.
- Stein, Ed., *De Flavii Josephi arte narrandi*, *Eos*, 33, 1930–1931, 641–650.
- Stein, Elchanan, *De Wordenkeuze in het Bellum Judaicum van Flavius Josephus*, Amsterdam 1937.
- Stemberger, G., *Die römische Herrschaft im Urteil der Juden*, Darmstadt 1983, esp. pp. 33–37.
- Täubler, E., Die nicht bestimmbareren Hinweise bei Josephus und die Anonymushypothese, *Hermes*, 51, 1916, 211–232.
- Temporini, H. und W. Haase, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms in Spiegel der neueren Forschung (ANRW)*, Berlin-New York 1972 ff.
- Thackeray, H.St.J., *Josephus the Man and the Historian*, New York 1929, rp. 1967.
- Trisoglio, F., L'intervento divino nelle vicende umane dalla storiografia classica greca a Flavio Giuseppe e ad Eusebio di Cesarea, *ANRW*, II, 21, 2, 1984, 977–1104.
- Ulrich, E.C. Jr., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, Missoula 1978.
- Unnik, W.C. van, Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's Sin with Alien Women in the Country of Midian (Num. 25,1 ff.), *Travels in the World of the Old Testament*, AV M.A. Beek, ed. M.S.H.G. Heesma et al., Assen 1974, 241–261.
- Unnik, W.C. van, *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*, Heidelberg 1978.
- Vermes, G., A Summary of the Law by Flavius Josephus, *NovT*, 24, 1982, 289–303.
- Vidal-Naquet, P., *Du bon Usage de la trahison, Flavius Josephus, La guerre des juifs traduit du grec par Pierre Savinel*, Paris 1977, 9–115.
- Wächter, L., Die Unterschiedliche Haltung der Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener zum Heilmarmene nach dem Bericht des Josephus, *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, 21, 1969, 97–114.
- Weber, W., *Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem Jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus*, Berlin-Stuttgart-Leipzig 1921, rp. Hildesheim 1973.
- Williamson, G.A., *The World of Josephus*, Boston-Toronto 1964.
- Willrich, H., *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur*, Göttingen 1924.

\*Reprinted by courtesy of JSOT Press, Sheffield, England. The article appears with minor alterations as chapter IV of *Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome*, JSOT, 1987.