

Flavius Josephus' Account of the Anti-Roman Riots Preceding the 66–70 War, and its Relevance for the Reconstruction of Jewish Eschatology during the First Century A.D.

FAUSTO PARENTE
University of Rome

1. As Flavius Josephus himself states in the first paragraph of the conclusion of the *Antiquitates* (XX, 259–68), παύσεται δ' ἐνταῦθά μοι τὰ τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας μεθ' ἣν καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἠρξάμην γράφειν (XX, 259). As the *Bellum judaicum* precedes the *Antiquitates*, this can only mean that *Antiquitates* ends where *Bellum* begins. There is, however, a long section common to both, beginning with Antiochus VII Sidetes' dispatching his general Cendebaeus to Judaea ὅπως πολεμῆ τὸν λαόν (1 *Macc.*, 15.35; cf. *Bell.*, I, 51; *Ant.*, XIII, 225); Antiochus had arrived in Syria to combat the usurper Tryphon and, going back on his previous acknowledgement of Simon's traditional rights (1 *Macc.*, 15.1–9; cf. *Ant.*, XIII, 223), refused his proffered assistance in the siege of Dora (1 *Macc.*, 15.27); Athenobius had been sent to Jerusalem to request the evacuation of Joppa and Gazara, and the ἄκρα of Jerusalem (1 *Macc.*, 15.28), which Simon promptly refused (1 *Macc.*, 15.33–35). This is thus to be located in 178 seleuc. = 139/8 or 138/7.

The parallel narration ends with the account of the events of the *Antiquitates* (XX, 258: 259–68 contain the concluding reflections of the author), namely, the misgovernment of Gessius Florus (64–66), the last of the procurators (*Bell.*, II, 277–83; *Ant.*, XX, 252–58), during which period, on 16 Artemisius (March–April) 66 (*Bell.*, II, 284; cf. 315; *Ant.*, XX, 257), revolt broke out: as Tacitus says (*Hist.*, V, 10), *duravit tamen patientia Iudaeis usque ad Gessium Florum procuratorem*.

The parallelism between the two accounts appears never to have been examined systematically.¹ R. Marcus, in his comment on *Ant.*, XIII, 225, quotes an unpublished

¹ See, however, J. von Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus. I Die Quellen der Archäologie Buch XII–XVII = Jüd. Krieg B. I* (Kiel, 1882); Sh. J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome. His Vita and*

note of H. St. John Thackeray: "*Ant.* besides reverting to and making fuller use of the original sources, has had *B.J.* before him (*sic*) and aimed at avoiding repetition. The greater freedom with which *B.J.* had treated the source left *Ant.* at liberty to adhere more closely to its language."² This is undoubtedly true: there are cases, however, in which discrepancies in the narration of the same event point to Josephus' deliberately giving different versions, albeit in seemingly secondary details. Since Josephus' works, far from being an objective account of history, are undoubtedly distorted at points by an element of apologetics,³ an examination of the parallelism seems particularly necessary, both for a historical reconstruction of the events recorded, and to determine the narrator's intentions. The problem of the intentions behind his account, and of its intended addressee, is still far from resolved, though of clear importance.

I propose to leave aside this problem and concentrate on the passages in which Josephus examines the different incidents of anti-Roman riots leading up to the outbreak of the 66-70 war, of particular significance for a "reconstruction of events."⁴

2. A good point at which to begin is the account (*Bell.*, II, 56-65 = *Ant.*, XVII, 271-84) of the riots led by Judas, the son of Ezechias (*Bell.*, II, 56 = *Ant.*, XVII, 271-72), Simon (*Bell.*, II, 57-59 = *Ant.*, XVII, 273-77), and Athronges (*Bell.*, II, 60-65 = *Ant.*, XVII, 278-84).⁵

These take place in the period immediately following Herod's death (5 or 4 B.C.),⁶ with the problem of the succession still unsolved.⁷ Nicolas of Damascus (*de uita sua*, in

Development as a Historian (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, 8, Leiden, 1979), 48-66; T. Rajak, *Josephus. The Historian and his Society* (London, 1983), 65-77 (*Josephus' Account of the Breakdown of Consensus*).

2 *Josephus* with an English translation by R. Marcus. VII *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XII-XIV (London-Cambridge, Mass., 1943), 341.

3 C. Thoma, "Die Weltanschauung des Josephus Flavius, dargestellt anhand seiner Schilderung des jüdischen Aufstandes gegen Rom (66-73 n.Chr.)," *Kairos* 11 (1969), 39-52; R. G. Garson, "An Introduction to Josephus' Jewish War," *Prudentia*, 4 (1972), 103-13; Rajak, *Josephus*, 78-103 (*Josephus' Interpretation of the Jewish Revolt*).

4 For the history of the whole period see: J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après le Talmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques*. Première partie. *Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu'à Adrien* (Paris, 1867), 193 ff.; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi I* (Leipzig, 1901³⁻⁴) 418 ff.; Id., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. A new English Version revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar I (Edinburgh, 1973), 330 ff.; F.-M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe*. I *De la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à la guerre juive* (Paris, 1952), 407 ff.; E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 20, Leiden, 1976).

5 Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 418-25; Id. *History* I, 330-35.

6 See W. E. Filmer, "The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great," *JThS* 17 (1966), 283-98; T. D. Barnes, "The Date of Herod's Death," *JThS* 19 (1968), 204-9.

7 On this problem see especially: Smallwood, *Jews*, 105-19 (*The transition from client Kingdom to Province*) and, for Herod's position as *rex socius et amicus populi Romani*, O. Bohn, *Qua condicione juris reges socii populi Romani fuerint* (Berolini, 1877); E. Bammel, "Die Rechtsstellung des Herodes," *ZDPV* 84 (1968), 73-79; Smallwood, *Jews*, 60-104 (*The Idumaean client King*) and Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 401-4; *History* I, 316-20 with further bibliography. On Herod's testaments see H. W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas* (Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series 17, Cambridge, 1972), 269-76 (Appendix I: *The Wills of Herod*).

Constant. Porphyr., *excerpta de insidiis* I [2, 33–35 de Boor = Fr. Gr. Hist. II, A 90, F 136])—without doubt Josephus' source here⁸—comments that, after the king's death, τὸ ἔθνος ἐπανίσταται τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν; his attributing the reason for anti-Roman riots to a decline in centralised power seems likely given his support for Archelaus. Josephus himself writes that “in the meantime, in divers part of the land disorder reigned, while the (exceptional nature of the) moment led many to aspire to the throne, καὶ συχνοὺς βασιλειᾶν ὁ καιρὸς ἀνέπειθεν” (*Bell.*, II, 55).

This sentence, opening the account of the three episodes, is not to be found in the parallel passage in the *Antiquitates* (XVII, 269–70); here he mentions disturbances caused not by Jews but by veterans of Herod's army in conflict with soldiers who had continued loyal to the Herodian dynasty. This was led by the king's cousin Achiab, who only just managed to escape with his life. In the *Bellum* (II, 55), the episode is given considerably less emphasis and is set not in Judaea but in Idumaea.

According to W. R. Farmer, this “aspiration to the throne” is logical if we assume Judas, Simon and Athronges to belong to the family of the Hasmonaeans, and, as such, to be advancing claims to the dynasty: “there probably were many Jews in this period who had Maccabaeian blood in their veins, the most important of whom . . . were most likely the sons of Matthatias Antigonus.” Judas and Simon are typically Maccabaeian names; Athronges (Ἀθρόγγης: *Ant.*, XVII, 278; Ἀθρογγαῖος: *Bell.*, II, 60) “has been derived from the Hebrew for ethrog (citrus fruit). Ethrogs were used by the Jews in this period in their celebration of the Feast of the Tabernacles. This feast was of particular importance for the Maccabees . . .”⁹

Judas and Simon are, however, among the most common Jewish names, and no plausible explanation of Athronges has been advanced.¹⁰ Moreover, according to Josephus, Judas is the son of the “head bandit,” ἀρχιληστής, Ezechias (*Bell.*, I, 204 = *Ant.*, XIV, 195) whom Herod had executed on his father's nominating him (47

8 See E. Täubler, “Zur Beurteilung der constantinischen Excerpte,” *ByZ* 25 (1925), 33–40; M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Volume One. *From Herodotus to Plutarch* (Jerusalem, 1976), 250–60 (n^o 97). On Nicolas as Josephus' source: H. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seiner Archäologie* (Leipzig, 1879), 106–16; Von Destinon, *Quellen*, 91–120; G. Hölscher, *Die Quellen des Josephus für die Zeit vom Exil bis zum jüdischen Kriege* (Leipzig, 1904), 17–19; R. Laqueur, *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Eine Versuch auf neueren quellenkritischer Grundlage* (Giessen, 1920), 96 ff.; M. Stern, “Nicolaus of Damascus as a Source for Jewish History in the Herodian and Hasmonean Periods” [Hebrew], in *Bible and Jewish History. Studies in the Bible and Jewish History dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver*, ed. by B. Uffenheimer (Tel Aviv, 1972), 375–94; Id., “The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century* (Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, I), II (Assen-Amsterdam, 1976), 1137–39; Id., *Greek and Latin Authors* I, 227–60; Smallwood, *Jews*, 558–60; A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom. The Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge, 1975), 106, 108–9; B. Bar Kochva, “Manpower, Economics, and Internal Strife in the Hasmonaeian State,” in *Colloques Nationaux du C. N. R. S. n^o 936: Armée et fiscalité dans le monde antique*, ed. par H. Van Effenterre (Paris, 1977), 167–96; L. H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)* (Berlin-New York, 1984), 402–6 with the most recent literature. On Nicolas see B. Zion Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (University of California Publications in History, 75, Berkeley, 1962).

9 W. R. Farmer, “Judas, Simon and Athronges,” *NTS* 4 (1957–58), 147–55, at 151–52.

10 The explanation of the name suggested by Farmer was proposed by S. J. L. Rapoport, *erek millin* (Praha, 1852), 257, s.v. ²etrog (³atrōngā² being a loan-word from Persian *turundš*, Arab *utrudš*) and accepted by A. Schlatter, *Die hebräischen Namen bei Josephus* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 17/3, Gütersloh, 1913), 115, and by Hengel, *Zeloten* (see, *infra*, note 22), 298, note 3.

b.c.) στρατηγός of Galilee¹¹ (*Bell.*, I, 203 = *Ant.*, XIV, 158); Simon was τις τῶν βασιλικῶν δούλων (*Bell.*, II, 57), a “slave of Herod’s” (*Ant.*, XVII, 273), and Athronges a shepherd, ποιμὴν τις (*Bell.*, II, 60) ἀνεπιφανῆς τοῖς πᾶσιν εἰς τὰ πάντα ὧν (*Ant.*, XVII, 278). Farmer’s explication is thus relatively unlikely: the καιρός in *Bell.*, II, 55 does not indicate that the throne was formally vacant, but that a central authority was lacking.

I shall return to Judas at a later stage. He appears to repeat the achievements of his father, who carried out raids along the borders of Syria σὺν μεγάλῳ στίφει (*Ant.*, XIV, 159); Josephus does not state that he is killed by Romans, as he does of the other two, which would give support to Schürer’s hypothesis, later seconded by J. S. Kennard, that he is to be identified as Judas “the Galilaeen” (*Bell.*, II, 118; *Ant.*, XVIII, 4-10 and 23-25, where he is called “of Gamala in Gaulanitis”) who opposed the census promoted by the legate of Syria, Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, when Judaea became a Roman province in A.D. 6, and instituted the so-called “fourth philosophy.”¹²

Simon was active in the mountainous region to the east of Jordan, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (*Mark*, 3.8; *Matth.*, 4.15 [= *Isa.*, 9.1 LXX] which Josephus terms Περαιά (*Bell.*, III, 44-47), which had been conquered and Judaized in the Maccabean period.¹³ Simon was proud of his physical preeminence, and “assumed the diadem, περιτίθησιν μὲν ἑαυτῷ διάδημα” (*Bell.*, II, 57), which undoubtedly stands for “proclaimed himself king,” as Josephus, in *Bell.*, I, 70 = *Ant.*, XIII, 301, states that Aristobulus τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς βασιλείαν μετατιθεῖς περιτίθεται μὲν διάδημα πρῶτος; and διάδημα is, precisely (Lucianus, *Pisc.*, 35), the βασιλείας γνῶρισμα. He is known to Tacitus, who writes that *post mortem Herodis nihil expectato Caesare Simo quidam regium nomen invaserat* (*Hist.*, V, 9.2). This can only mean “Simon proclaimed himself king without awaiting Augustus’ decision.” Herod had indeed left the decision of the succession to Augustus (*Bell.*, I, 669; *Ant.*, XVII, 244-47), but could a *Simo quidam* reasonably expect Augustus to decide in his favor? The expression must however have an explanation. According to M. Stern, “Tacitus’ puzzling statement is probably due to his compression of the narrative,”¹⁴ which is acceptable only if taken to mean that Tacitus had discovered, in his (unidentified) sources, that Simon’s revolt had taken place before Augustus had taken his final decision as to Herod’s successor.

Simon fell in battle against the army still loyal to the Romans (the three cohorts of Sebastenians, Σεβαστηνοὶ τρισχίλιοι, *Bell.*, II, 52) led by the Roman officers Rufus and

11 Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 348; Id., *History* I, 275; A. Schalit, *König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk* (Studia Judaica. Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums, 4, Berlin, 1969), 41; S. Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.* (University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity, 5, Wilmington-Notre Dame, 1980), 63 ff.

12 Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 486-87; see also 420-21; 526-27; Id., *History* I, 381-82; 332; 414. J. S. Kennard, Jr., “Judas of Galilee and his Clan,” *JQR* 36 (1945-46), 281-86. See D. M. Rhoads, *Israel in Revolution 6-74 C.E. A Political History Based on Writings of Josephus* (Philadelphia, 1976), 47-60. The identification has been accepted by R. Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa. Studie zum Bild der drei ersten Evangelien* (Leipzig, 1940), 74, and by Hengel, *Zeloten* (see, *infra*, note 22), 298-99.

13 G. Boettger, *Topographisch-historisches Lexikon zu den Schriften des Flavius Josephus* (Leipzig, 1879), 201-2; L. Haefeli, *Samaria und Peräa bei Flavius Josephus* (Biblische Studien 18/5, Freiburg i.B., 1913), 66-120; F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine. II Géographie politique. Les villes* (Paris, 1938), 154. See Schürer, *Geschichte* II (Leipzig, 1907⁴), 12-16; Id., *History* II (Edinburgh, 1979), 10-13.

14 Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Volume Two. *From Tacitus to Simplicius* (Jerusalem, 1980), 50.

Gratus, first setting fire to the royal palace (βασιλείον; cf. Xenophon, *Cyr.*, II, 4.3; *Prov.*, 18.19 LXX; Philo, *Sobr.*, 66; *Ant.*, VI, 251; *Luke*, 7.25) of Jericho¹⁵ (*Bell.*, II, 57 = *Ant.*, XVII, 274).

After the description of the revolt and Simon's death there follows (*Bell.*, II, 59) a brief account of another group of Peraean insurrectionists who set fire to the royal palace of Betharamatha (Bet-Haram in the O.T.: *Josh.*, 13.17; Ammatha in the *Antiquitates*).¹⁶ In the parallel passage in the *Antiquitates* (XVII, 277) this gives rise to a comment on the πολλή ἀφροσύνη which had unsettled the population διὰ τὸ βασιλέα μὲν οἰκεῖον οὐκ εἶναι τὸν καθέξοντα τὸ πλῆθος ἀρετῆ, "the nation possessing no king through whose authority to control the mob."

Athronges appears equally active and impervious to danger. He operated with his four brothers, each of which led an "armed band" and whom he used "as generals and satraps," αὐτὸς δὲ καθάπερ βασιλεὺς τῶν σεμνοτέρων ἤπτετο πραγμάτων (*Bell.*, II, 61). Their exploits continued for a good length of time: at that point he was "assuming the diadem," but his raids around the country went on for some time after until (*Bell.*, II, 61) he was finally captured by Gratus.

The parallel passage in the *Antiquitates* implies that it was precisely on account of his becoming king that he was able to continue his exploits for so long: διέμενέ τε ἐπὶ πολὺ τῷδε τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἢ ἰσχύς βασιλεῖ τε κεκλημένῳ (*Ant.*, XVII, 281). Athronges and his brothers aimed particularly at eliminating Romans and βασιλικοί, those who had remained faithful to the dynasty of Herod (*Bell.*, II, 62), possibly to be identified with the Ἡρώδαιοι in *Bell.*, I, 319 and the Ἡρωδιανοί in the Gospels.¹⁷ The parallel passage (*Ant.*, XVII, 281), adds reasons: the "king's men" were hated for their arrogance (ὑβρις) during Herod's reign, the Romans for present injustices.

An examination of the parallel narratives would seem to corroborate, at least in this case, Thackeray's thesis: both derive from the same source, although it is drawn on more amply in the *Antiquitates*. This is without doubt Nicolas' *Historiae* and Josephus limits himself to this, eschewing personal judgments. Facts and opinions are therefore attributable to Nicolas, including the definition of the protagonists as "regal": an obvious proof of this is the fact that it is documented in Tacitus.

The prevailing climate after Herod's death is characterized by a violent reaction against the dynasty, as is confirmed by the deputation sent to Rome by the Jews (*Bell.*, II, 80 = *Ant.*, XVII, 299–300) ὑπὲρ αἰτήσεως αὐτονομίας and to inform Augustus of Herod's malpractices and misgovernment (*Bell.*, II, 84–91 = *Ant.*, XVII, 304–14).¹⁸ It was on this occasion that Nicolas defended Archelaus (*Bell.*, II, 92 = *Ant.*, XVII, 315–16), also acquitting him of the massacre of 3,000 people in the Temple (*Bell.*, II, 89 = *Ant.*, XVII, 313), of which the deputation accused him. The responsibility for this,

15 L. Mowry, "Settlements in the Jericho Valley during the Roman Period (63 B.C.–A.D. 134), *BA* 15 (1952), 26–42; 34–36; J. L. Kelso–D. C. Baramki, *Excavations at New Testament Jerico and Khirbet En-Nitla (AASOR XXIX–XXX for 1949–1951, New Haven, 1955)*, 18, n° 55. See also Schalit, *Herodes*, 402–3 and Schürer, *Geschichte*, II, 213–16; Id., *History* II, 176–78.

16 F.-M. Abel, "Exploration du sud-est de la vallée du Jourdan," *RB* 40 (1931), 214–26, at 219–23.

17 E. Bickerman, "Les Hérodiens," *RB* 47 (1938), 184–97; H. H. Rowley, "The Herodians in the Gospels," *JThS* 41 (1940), 14–27; Hoehner, *Antipas*, 331–42.

18 Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 449–54; Id., *History* I, 354–57; W. Otto in *RE Suppl.* II (1913), 191–200, s.v. "Herodes Archelaos"; W. Rees, "Archelaos, son of Herod," *Scripture* 4 (1951), 348–55; Hoehner, *Antipas*, 18–39.

Nicolas rejoined in his speech, lay with the Jews themselves, “restive under any authority and insubordinate towards their sovereigns” (*Bell.*, II, 92); ἐνεκάλει—repeated in the *Antiquitates* (XVII, 316)—δὲ νεωτεροποιίας αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῦ στασιάζειν ἡδονήν. Νεωτεροποιία is (Thucyd., I, 120) the “revolt” or “uprising,” obviously meaning, in this context, the very recent episodes involving Simon and Athronges, which Nicolas represents as attempts to usurp the throne from Herod’s son, designated by his father to succeed him, and thus legitimate heir.

This seems the most plausible explanation of Simon’s and Athronges’ assuming “royal” prerogatives, a fact which caused no little reverberation among the Romans, but which is documented by Tacitus in a somewhat incongruous context. What should be underlined, however, is that the narration and characterization are both Nicolas’, the intention clearly being to affirm the legitimacy of Archelaus.¹⁹

This superimposing of characterization on the facts of the narration is particularly evident in the account of Athronges’ exploits. A simple shepherd, he “dared,” ἐτόλμησεν, aspire to the throne (*Bell.*, II, 60); in the analogous passage in the *Antiquitates* (XVII, 278) it is stressed that his intentions, once king, were to continue with even greater arrogance, ἐτόλμησεν ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ φρονῆσαι τῷ κτώμενόν τε αὐτὴν ἡδονῆς πλέον ὑβρίσαι, since he had no fear of death. This is clearly the description not of the would-be usurper of Archelaus but of the head of an armed band involved in guerilla tactics. The *Bellum* states this quite clearly: Athronges uses his four brothers as generals and satraps in his raids and incursions, αὐτὸς δὲ καθάπερ βασιλεὺς τῶν σεμνοτέρων ἦπτετο πραγμάτων, “while he, like a king, did concentrate on questions of greater moment” (*Bell.*, II, 61).

Further considerations only point to the same conclusion. Anyone aspiring to usurp Archelaus would have needed to be in or around Jerusalem, or to consider it his inevitable destination. Simon’s sphere of action, however, even though he crossed the Jordan to set fire to the royal palace of Jericho, is limited to the Peraea area; he surrounds himself with his fellow-countrymen, and in the final battle against Gratus, τῶν μὲν οὖν Περαίων συχνοὶ διεφθάρησαν ἐν τῇ μάχῃ. Destinon’s restitution Περαίων (mss. παίων, παίδων, πεζῶν) in *Bell.*, II, 59²⁰ is beyond doubt: in the parallel passage in the *Antiquitates* (XVII, 276), we read that “a long and hard battle was fought between them and the greater part of the Peraeans, who, fighting with more courage than (military) skill, were annihilated” (τῶν Περαίων ἀσύντακτοι ὄντες). In the *Bellum* the episode closes with a mention of the burning of the palace of Bet-Haram (and therefore in Peraea) by a group of Peraean insurrectionists (συστάντων ἐτέρων τινῶν ἐκ τῆς Περαίας, *Bell.*, II, 59) who, in the *Antiquitates* become “a number of rebels similar to Simon,” ὑπὸ τινῶν συστάντων ἀνδρῶν Σίμωνι παραπλησίω (Ant., XVII, 277).

3. The figure of Judas, the son of Ezechias,²¹ and the first of the three people Josephus (or, more precisely, Nicolas) presents as heading revolts after Herod’s death,

19 As emphasized by Stern, *Jews in Greek and Latin Literature* (supra, note 8), 1138, “Josephus took from Nicolas both the factual material and, to a great extent, his point of view.”

20 *Flavii Iosephi Opera*. Edidit et apparatus critico instruxit Benedictus Niese. VI *De Bello Iudaico* libros VII ediderunt Iustus a Destinon et Benedictus Niese (Berolini, 1894), 165.18.

21 Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 486–87; see also 420–21; 526–27; Id., *History*, 381–82, 332, 414; Kennard, “Judas of Galilee” (supra, note 12); Farmer, “Judas, Simon” (supra, note 9); Rhoads, *Israel in Revolution* (supra,

has so far been left aside for a very good reason. If we identify him with Judas "the Galilaeen" who rebelled against the government of the first procurator, Coponius, (and therefore 6–9 A.D. circa) after Archelaus' deposition (*Bell.*, II, 117 = *Ant.*, XVII, 342–44; cf. Strabo, XVI, 2.46) and the incorporation of Judaea (with Samaria and Idumaea) as a Roman province (*Bell.*, II, 117 = *Ant.*, XVII, 355), εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνήγε τοῦς ἐπιχωρίους (*Bell.*, II, 118), we shall have further information from which to reconstruct his character, while Simon and Athronges are mentioned only in the passages in the *Bellum* and *Antiquitates* already examined above. Since, however, Josephus (and his source) present all three in much the same manner, it follows that a different evaluation of Judas also permits a different evaluation of Simon and Athronges. Hengel's conclusion regarding the two is as follows, "wir haben wohl in beiden Fällen messianische Prätendenten vor uns." "Beide," he had previously observed, "zeichneten sich auch durch überragende Körperstärke aus, ein Zug, der in Anlehnung an alttestamentliche Vorstellungen vom 'Gibbor' als Führer im 'Heiligen Krieg' hier wohl messianische Bedeutung erhielt."²² While nothing precludes this interpretation of the two, a careful analysis of the text induces caution. Above all, the "aspiration to the throne" cannot be considered a determining factor; adequate explanations exist beyond that of a Messianic self-proclamation. In this case "holy war" might well have been merely attacks by armed bands on the centres of Herod's power in the different provinces: Nicolas subsequently presents it as such, and this would certainly tally with the historical context.²³

On the other hand, the identification of the Judas "son of Ezechias" of *Bell.*, II, 56 = *Ant.*, XVII, 271–72 as "Judas the Galilaeen" is a possibility, not a certainty.²⁴ It should be said that, while in *Bell.*, II, 56, he is unequivocally identified: Ἰούδας υἱὸς Ἐζεκία; in II, 118, we find: ἐπὶ τούτου τις ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαῖος Ἰούδας ὄνομα εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνήγε τοῦς ἐπιχωρίους. No connection is made with the Judas mentioned in II, 56, nor is he mentioned as anyone of whom anything seems to be known other than his being a Galilaeen: τις ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαῖος.²⁵ This may simply mean that Josephus was here using a different source, particularly as *Bell.*, II, 117 finishes the account whose

note 12), 47–60; Hengel, *Zeloten* (*infra*, note 22), 57–61; 79–150 and *passim* (see index, 474 of the second edition); M. Black, "Judas of Galilee and Josephus' 'Fourth Philosophy'" in *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament. Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Herausg. von O. Betz, K. Haacker und M. Hengel (Göttingen, 1974), 45–54.

22 M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 N.Chr.* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und des Urchristentums, I, Leiden-Köln 1961; 1976² with *Literaturnachtrag* and index, 432–89), 298–99, 334.

23 M. De Jonge, "Josephus und die Zukunfterwartungen seines Volkes," in *Josephus-Studien*, 205–19, doubts the messianic character of Judas son of Ezechias. See also the observations of Freyne, *Galilee*, 214–16 on this hypothesis.

24 See Feldman's comment on Kennard's paper (*supra*, note 12) in his *Scholarship*, 671, n° 2701. Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums. II Die Entwicklung des Judentums und Jesus von Nazareth* (Stuttgart-Berlin, 1921), 403, note 1: "Die Annahme, dass er identisch sei mit Judas, dem Sohn des von Herodes im J.46 hingerichteten Räuberhauptmann Ezechias . . . schwebt in der Luft." De Jonge, "Zukunfterwartungen," 217 and note 33: "Die Identification der zwei Judasse ist aber ganz hypothetisch und selbst nicht wahrscheinlich." See also Freyne, *Galilee*, 217–18 and Rhoads, *Israel in Revolution: the identity of the two Judases* is possible, but, in any case, "Josephus does not identify these two men as the same person."

25 Some scholars take Γαλιλαῖος not as a strict geographic definition but as a political or religious name; see S. Zeitlin, "Who were Galileans? New Light on Josephus' Activities in Galilee," *JQR* 64 (1973–74), 189–203; F. Loftus, "A note on συντάγματα τῶν Γαλιλαίων B.J. IV, 558," *JQR* 65 (1974–75), 182–83; E. M.

parallel is in the XVII book of the *Antiquitates*, and II, 118 begins the account which has its parallel in Book XVIII. In the *Antiquitates* passage, however (XVIII, 4), he is given yet another characterization: Ἰούδας δὲ Γαυλανίτης ἀνὴρ ἐκ πόλεως ὄνομα Γάμαλα (according to Niese's text which follows A, although the MWE reading may be preferable: Γαυλανίτης δὲ τις ἀνὴρ Ἰούδας . . .). Gamala is a village some ten kilometres east of Lake Tiberias in Lower Gaulanitis, near the Decapolis border.²⁶ The text is precise and detailed in its identification of the person involved, and thus preferable to the much briefer parallel passage in the *Bellum*. He is identified, however, by the village he comes from, and not by his patronymic, as in *Bell.*, II, 56 = *Ant.*, XVII, 271, and can therefore by no means be identified "sicherlich" (as Schürer has it) with the homonymous person who in *Ant.*, XVII, 271 is identified by the name of his rather well-known and previously mentioned (*Bell.*, I, 204 = *Ant.*, XIV, 159) father.

Furthermore, Josephus usually makes precise inter-connections with people he has already named. Some examples one could give from among the offspring and descendants of Judas the Galilaeen are Menahem, of whom, in *Bell.*, II, 433, Josephus expressly states "son of Judas named the Galilaeen, the dangerous sophist who, under Quirinius *etc.*" (cf., however, *Vita*, 46, where he is not identified, presumably on account of his fame); Eleazar, son of Jairus, and relative of Menahem's (*Bell.*, II, 447), who is to play an important role at Masada (*Bell.*, VII, 275 ff.), is called (*Bell.*, VII, 253) ἀπόγονος "descendent" (grandson?) of Judas, who, ὡς πρότερον δεδηλώκαμεν, incited the Jews to revolt on account of Quirinius' census; and lastly, when mentioning James and Simon, the two sons of Judas the Galilaeen whom Tiberius Julius Alexander (ca. A.D. 66) ordered to be crucified, Josephus is careful to state that Judas is the one, ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων δεδηλώκαμεν, "who did incite the people to revolt against the Romans when Quirinius *etc.*" (*Ant.*, XX, 102).

Kennard, in what is virtually a reconstruction of the family tree, assigns great importance to two expressions Josephus uses when speaking of Menahem, "he returned to Jerusalem οἷα δὴ βασιλεύς" (*Bell.*, II, 434) and "went up to the Temple to make his devotions ἐσθῆτί τε βασιλικῇ κεκοσμημένος" (*Bell.*, II, 444).²⁷ These would seem to be no more than figures of speech, however; the first surely does not mean he entered Jerusalem "as king," but "like a king"; the second means that he "was dressed like a king," not that he was dressed in the kingly robes of office, having been proclaimed king. In any case the expressions hardly serve to explain the statement (*Ant.*, XVII, 272) that Judas, son of Ezechias, "become a figure of terror, robbing all whom he encountered ἐπιθυμία μειζόνων πραγμάτων καὶ ζηλώσει βασιλείου τιμῆς which has no parallel in the *Bellum*. The "aspiration to royal honors" is obviously Nicolas' slant on Judas' part

Meyers, "Galilean Regionalism as a Factor of historical Reconstruction," *BASOR* 221 (1976), 93-101; F. Loftus, "The Anti-Roman Revolts of the Jews and the Galileans," *JQR* 68 (1977-78), 78-98; S. Freyne, "The Galileans in the Light of Josephus' Vita," *NTS* 26 (1980), 397-413; Id., *Galilee*, 208-55; Feldman, *Scholarship*, 667-70. Freyne calls to "critical caution."

26 On Gamala (Arab: Ġamleh) see G. Schumacher, *Across the Jordan* (London, 1886), 74-76; Boettger, *Lexikon*, 124-25; Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 615, note 46; Id., *History* I, 495, note 46; G. Dalman in *Palästina-jahrbuch* 8 (1912), 52-57; Abel, *Géographie* II, 326; B. Bar-Kochva, "Gamla in Gaulanitis," *ZDPV* 92 (1976), 54-71.

27 Kennard, "Judas of Galilee" (*supra*, note 12), 282.

in the revolt, and is said of someone who is never reported to have assumed the diadem (unlike Simon and Athronges), but who (*Bell.*, II, 56), having sacked Sepphoris' arsenal in Galilee and armed his companions, "attacked the (other) aspirants to power, τοῖς τὴν δυναστείαν ζηλοῦσιν ἐπεχείρει."

It thus follows that if Judas "son of Ezechias" (*Bell.*, II, 56 = *Ant.*, XVII, 271), cannot "sicherlich" be identified with Judas "the Galilaeen" (*Bell.*, II, 118) or "of Gamala" (*Ant.*, XVIII, 3), this latter should be considered a separate person. Nor should a tentative reconstruction of his character and actions on evidence given by Josephus, the significance of which is clearly as religious as political, if not more so, be used to attest a religious significance in the figures of Simon and Athronges; their activities can be feasibly explained in the context of the violent anti-Herod reactions after the king's death. And although the religious implications seem possible—indeed probable—, a careful analysis of Josephus shows how rarely his implications leave such room for doubt as is left here.

4. Josephus mentions Judas "the Galilaeen" or "of Gamala in Gaulanitis" (here without doubt one and the same person) in *Bell.*, II, 118, and at greater length in *Ant.*, XVIII, 4–10 and 23–25.

In *Bell.*, II, 117, he states that the territories over which Archelaus was ethnarch had been made a Roman province and that Coponius had been declared procurator with full powers, including that of resorting to capital punishment. He then goes on: "Under his administration, a Galilaeen, Judas by name, did incite his fellow-countrymen to revolt, ἀπόστασιν, pronouncing them cowards, κακίζων (cf. Euripides, *Iph. in Aul.*, 1435), if they consented to pay the tribute to the Romans, εἰ φόρον τε Ῥωμαίοις τελεῖν ὑπομενοῦσιν (cf. *Ant.*, V, 181; XII, 182; Καίσαρι: *Bell.*, II, 403), and to have earthly masters as well as God, καὶ μετὰ τὸν θεὸν οἴσουσι θνητοὺς δεσπότης. This man was a sophist of a particular sect having nothing in common with all others, ἦν δ' οὗτος σοφιστῆς ἰδίας αἵρέσεως οὐδὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις προσεικώς (*Bell.*, II, 118)." Josephus then inserts a long digression (II, 119–66) on the three "sects," which he calls αἵρεσις, in the sense of "school of philosophy" (cf. Dion. Hal., *Comp. uerb.*, 2; Diog. Laert., I, 19; Iambl., *Uita Pyth.*, 34, 241; Eusebius, *Praep. eu.*, XIII, 12.10 = Aristobulus) and which begins τρία γὰρ παρὰ Ἰουδαίους εἶδη φιλοσοφεῖται, but is concerned for the most part (II, 119–61) with Essenism.

The parallel passage (*Ant.*, XVIII, 1–25) is very differently structured. It opens with the arrival of Publius Sulpicius Quirinius in Syria as δικαιοδότης ([*legatus*] *iuridicus* = *legatus Augusti pro praetore*) τοῦ ἔθνους and τιμητῆς τῶν οὐσιῶν, literally "estimator of wealth,"²⁸ and that of Coponius in Judaea as first procurator of the new province, which was under Syria's jurisdiction. He goes on to explain exactly what Syria's new legate's τίμησις entailed, and which he had already mentioned at the end of the preceding book (*Ant.*, XVII, 355): to take a census of property in Syria and liquidate Archelaus' property (houses and goods) (οἶκον: XVII, 355; χρήματα: XVIII, 2).²⁹

28 Ed. Groag in *RE* zweite Reihe IV (1932), 822–43 s.v. "P. Sulpicius Quirinius (90)."

29 See the classical treatment in Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 508–43; Id., *History* I, 399–427 with full bibliography. The problem is discussed chiefly because of its mention in *Luke*, 2.1–5; see H. R. Moehring,

Josephus (XVIII, 3) adds that the Jews were initially indignant (ἐν δεινῷ φέροντες; cf. XVIII, 372) at the idea of the census, but gave in at the insistence of the High-Priest Joazar (deposed by Archelaus, *Ant.*, XVII, 399) and agreed to declare the value of their property (*Ant.*, XVIII, 3); only Judas of Gamala and a Pharisee called Saddok rebelled, insisting that the census would reduce them to slavery, and "appealed to the nation to claim their freedom," καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐπ' ἀντιλήψει παρακαλοῦντες τὸ ἔθνος (*Ant.*, XVIII, 4).

The passage which follows (*Ant.*, XVIII, 5-10) describes the Jews' growing dissatisfaction with Rome's administrative measures; this unrest culminated in the destruction of the Temple and the final catastrophe. In conclusion to this Josephus adds a personal reflection: the innovations in and transformation of ancestral traditions had had considerable weight in bringing about the community's disintegration, and in doing so Judas and Saddok introduced among the Jews a "fourth philosophy" which had previously been extraneous (ἐπίσακτος, literally, "brought from without"; the opposite of αὐτόχθων) to them: οὕτως ἄρα ἡ τῶν πατρίων καίνισις καὶ μεταβολὴ μεγάλας ἔχει ῥοπᾶς τοῦ ἀπολουμένου τοῖς συνελθοῦσιν, εἴ γε καὶ Ἰούδας καὶ Σάδδωκος τετάρτην φιλοσοφίαν ἐπίσακτον ἡμῖν ἐγείραντες. He then, having finished his personal reflection, traces the three traditional "philosophies," explicitly referring to the passage in *Bell.*, II, 119-66, but very briefly and concisely, particularly when speaking of the Essenes (*Ant.*, XVIII, 12-22).

In the passage quoted above (*Ant.*, XVIII, 9) the "fourth philosophy" is presented in substantially the same terms as in *Bell.*, II, 118: "brought from without" = "having nothing in common with the others." In the *Antiquitates*, however, after the description of the Essene sect (*Ant.*, XVIII, 23-25), he again speaks of the "fourth philosophy," but giving it a radically different evaluation. "As regards the fourth philosophy, Judas the Galilaean became its leader, ἡγεμῶν κατέστη. (This) in all else concurs with the ideas of the Pharisees, τὰ μὲν λοιπὰ πάντα γνώμη τῶν Φαρισαίων ὁμολογοῦσι, (except in that) they possess an invincible love of liberty, δυσνίκητος δὲ τοῦ ἐλευθέρου ἕρος ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς, (since their) only lord and master, they claim, is God, μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην τὸν θεὸν ὑπειληφόσιν." In *Bell.*, II, 118, the end result of this rejection of "earthly lords" was a refusal to pay their tribute to the Romans.

This further comment on the fourth philosophy would seem to indicate a "re-editing" of the text on Josephus' part. A precise indication of this is contained in the text itself: while in *Ant.*, XVIII, 23—i.e., in the second reference—Judas is termed "the Galilaean," as in *Bell.*, II, 118, in *Ant.*, XVIII, 4 he becomes "a Gaulanite, from the city named Gamala." In this case the two passages refer without doubt to the same person, but they should be carefully distinguished (for the additional reason that he is associated with the Pharisee Saddok only in the first) to the extent of hypothesizing a different source. Josephus' subsequent interpolation of the early text is certainly his first mention

"The Census in Luke as an Apologetic Device" in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature. Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, edited by D. E. Aune (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 23, Leiden, 1972), 144-60. See also P. Benoit in *Dict. de la Bible. Suppl. IX* (1979), 693-720 s.v. "Quirinius (Recensement de)."

of the matter; it is less than likely that he would speak of the "fourth philosophy" before the other three, and the two parts of the text are clearly disconnected.

The *Antiquitates* and the *Bellum* give diametrically opposed pictures, then, of the movement of which Judas of Galilee was the leading exponent, if not the initiator. A possible reason for this shift lies in the different audiences of each of these works. If the *Bellum* were chiefly aimed at the Romans, it would suit his public to hear that the anti-Roman movement had been started by a "sophist" who had given it a totally different stamp from previous Jewish movements. If, in the *Antiquitates*, however, he is aiming chiefly at the Jews, he might have been induced to admit, given his readers' knowledge, that the movement led by Judas was merely the "radical faction" of the Pharisees.

At some later point he must then have reviewed the text, possibly to correct the divergence from the *Bellum*, but more probably to explain what he meant by the "extraneous" quality of which he had spoken in *Bell.*, II, 118. Subsequently, after describing the disastrous consequences of the "fourth philosophy" in *Ant.*, XVIII, 9, he writes: "οὕτως ἄρα (from all this) there follows, in all certainty, ἡ τῶν πατρίων καίνισις καὶ μεταβολὴ μεγάλας ἔχει ῥοπᾶς τοῦ ἀπολουμένου τοῖς συνελθοῦσιν, (that) an innovation and change in ancestral tradition carries determining weight in the destruction of the congregation (of a people), εἴ γε καὶ, and most certainly (for this same reason), Ἰούδας καὶ Σάδδωκος τετάρτην φιλοσοφίαν ἐπέισακτον ἡμῖν ἐγείραντες, Judas and Saddok gave rise amongst us to a fourth philosophy brought from outside." The "fourth philosophy" is extraneous to the Jewish tradition, then, in that it had "changed traditional customs," thus determining Israel's ruin. In what, however, does this "change" and "innovation" consist?

It would seem logical to deduce that it was the struggle against the Romans, since it was this which brought Israel to ruin. Previously, however, the Jews had also rebelled against the Seleucids, which makes it difficult to associate this "innovation" simply with the anti-Roman revolt. Besides, Josephus had also said that those belonging to the "fourth philosophy" held the same opinions as the Pharisees, differing only in their "love of liberty," "since they truly held God to be their only lord and master, αὐτοῖς μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην τὸν θεὸν ὑπειληφόσιν" (*Ant.*, XVIII, 23). In Greek, ὑπολαμβάνω is generally used to imply a wrongly-held belief, and the Jews had indeed been under "earthly lords" for centuries without their having considered it an undue insult to their God. It was not, then, the struggle against the Romans, but the "love of liberty" which constituted the "innovation" leading to the destruction of their people. What exactly was this "invincible love of liberty"?

5. Speaking of Judas the Galilaean in *Bell.*, II, 118, Josephus states that he "did incite his fellow-countrymen to revolt, pronouncing them cowards if they consented to pay the tribute to the Romans." The stand seems primarily political; however, the mention of refusing "earthly lords" then gives a hint of an underlying religious motive, which, in the *Antiquitates* becomes explicit: the opposition is not to the tribute, but to the census. It is on receiving news of the census that the Jews "initially," κατ' ἀρχάς, become restive, ἐν δεινῷ φέροντες (*Ant.*, XVIII, 3). They are later persuaded by the High-Priest Joazar (*Ant.*, XVIII, 4) to accept it, until Judas and Saddok countermand his arguments.

The Jews' uneasiness at the idea of a census, ἀπογραφῆ³⁰ (*Ant.*, XVIII, 3; cf. *Luke*, 2.2), is not difficult to explain: counting the population meant going against the promise God had made to Abraham: "I will make your seed (countless) as the dust of the earth; if anyone could count the dust of the earth, then also your seed will be counted" (*Gen.*, 13.16; cf. 15.5; 16.10; 22.17; 26.4; 28.14; 32.13; 41.49). In 2 *Sam.*, 24.1, Yahweh, incensed with anger at the Israelites, makes David order a census of Israel and Judah; an appalled David then asks God's pardon for his "foolish" and "wicked" behavior (2 *Sam.*, 28.10).³¹ The Chronicler (1 *Chron.*, 21.1) wishing to exculpate Yahweh, imagines that David had been inspired by Satan.

That this concept was prevalent at the beginning of the first century A.D. is demonstrated by the fact that when, in 3 *Macc.*, a census, λαογραφία, is spoken of (2.29)—that of Egypt ordered by Augustus in 20 B.C.³²—we find that at a certain point "the scribes reported to the king that they were unable to continue the registration of the Jews on account of their incalculable number, διὰ τὴν ἀμέτρητον αὐτῶν πληθύν" (4.17), thus fulfilling God's promise to "multiply your seed, and it will not be counted for multitude" (*Gen.* 16.10; cf. 32.13).

Joazar had momentarily assuaged their fears that a census would provoke divine wrath; when, however, the Jews heard the arguments put forward by Judas and Saddok, they responded ἡδονῆ, "with joy," "with enthusiasm"; "and no evil is there that these men did not succeed in sowing; no words are there to convey the great harm done thereby to the people," Josephus comments (*Ant.*, XVIII, 6).

Judas and Saddok urged that the census would lead to slavery, and "appealed to the people, that they (might fight) for their liberty," καὶ τῆς ἐλευθέριας ἐπ' ἀντιλήψει παρακαλοῦτες τὸ ἔθνος (*Ant.*, XVIII, 4). Ἐλευθερία is the post-Biblical *herut*, a term found on the coins minted during the second and third years of the war (ḤRWT ṢYWN) and during the second and third years of Bar Kosiba's rebellion (LḤRWT YRWŠLM).³³ Here it is used simply as the opposite of δουλεία and it seems unwise to translate it as "independence" as Feldman does.³⁴ Furthermore, the speech Josephus puts into the mouth of the two initiators of the "fourth philosophy" to convince the

30 See [L. Mitteis]—U. Wilken, *Gründzüge und Chrestomatie der Papyrskunde* I, 1 (Leipzig-Berlin, 1912), 175-76, 178; 202-5; 225-28; see also P. W. Barret, "ἀπογραφῆ and ἀπογράφεσθαι in Luke 2.1-5," *ET* 85 (1973-74), 377-80.

31 See J.-R. Kupper, "Le recensement dans les textes de Mari" in *Studia mariana* publiées sous la direction de A. Parrot (Leiden, 1950), 99-110; E. A. Speiser, "Census and Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel," *BASOR* 149 (1959), 17-25.

32 V. Tcherikover, "The third Book of the Maccabees as a Source of the Augustan Period" [Hebrew], *Zion* 10 (1945), 1-20 = "The third Book of Maccabees as a historical Source of Augustus' Time," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 7 (Studies in History) (1961), 1-26; Id., "Syntaxis and Laographia," *Journ. of Jur. Papyrology* 4 (1950), 179-207.

33 Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 766-67; Id., *History* I, 605-6; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period*, translated from the Hebrew by I. H. Levine (Tel Aviv, 1967), nn. 153, 153A, 153B and 178-215. See G. Baumbach, "Das Freiheitsverständnis in der zelotischen Bewegung," in *Das Ferne und nahe Wort. Festschrift L. Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 30. November 1966 gewidmet* . . . herausg. von F. Maas (BZAW, 105, Berlin, 1967), 11-18.

34 Josephus with an English Translation by L. H. Feldman. IX *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII-XX (London-Cambridge, Mass., 1965), 7.

people not to act on Joazar's advice is far from political. If they won, they argued, the Jews would have "established the basis of their prosperity" (*Ant.*, XVIII, 5) "and God would assist them in zealously carrying out their plans with success, and particularly if, their hearts won to love of great enterprises, they did not shrink from those crimes which necessity might lay before them," καὶ τὸ θεῖον οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ ἐπὶ συμπράξει τῶν βουλευμάτων εἰς τὸ κατορθοῦν συμπροθυμεῖσθαι μᾶλλον, ἂν μεγάλων ἐρασταὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ καθιστάμενοι μὴ ἐξαφίωνται φόβου τοῦ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς (*Ant.*, XVIII, 5).³⁵ The emphasis is on the inevitable "collaboration," σύμπραξις, with God, establishing a close inter-relationship between human and divine action: man initiates, God accomplishes. It is this which constituted the difference between Pharisaism and the "fourth philosophy" or Zealotism, notwithstanding the doubts raised on the connection. However, Pharisaism similarly conceived of an interrelation between human and divine action.

After the disaster of the year 70, Josephus' comment that "no evil is there that these men did not succeed in sowing; no words are there to convey the great harm done to the people" has foundation (*Ant.*, XVIII, 6). Later, when the Bar Kosiba³ revolt had radically changed the Romans' attitude toward the Jews, and with it the latter's conditions of daily living, the Rabbis were to echo Josephus' remarks, albeit expressed differently. "Rabbi Helbo said: Four solemn injunctions are given in the passage. God made Israel vow never again to rebel against (foreign) governments; never to seek to hasten the end; never to reveal its mysteries to other nations, and never to attempt to return from the Diaspora through violence, since if such were their behavior, for what reason should the King Messiah come to gather together the exiles of Israel?" (*Cant. R.*, II, 7.1).

Dāḥaḳ ^{al ha-ḳeṣ} is not from Biblical Hebrew. The verb *dāḥaḳ* is found only in *Josh.*, 2.8 and *Judg.*, 2.18 in the sense of "to push," "to crowd," "to oppress"; in post-Biblical Hebrew, as in Aramaic (*dēḥaḳ*, *dēḥēḳ*), it means "to push," "to press," "to drive."³⁶ In Greek it could be translated βιάζω. *Ḳeṣ* is "end" in an eschatological sense: in *Dan.*, 8.17 the expression *ēṭ ḳeṣ*, the "time of the end," is translated as καιρὸς in both LXX and Theodotion.³⁷ The passage from the *midraš* quoted above goes on to affirm that the four divine injunctions refer to "the four generations which have sought to hasten the end and have been brought to ruin"; this had once occurred "in Ben Kozibah's day." Using arms then—and arms were undoubtedly used "in Ben Kozibah's day"—does not mean fighting a war of independence, but trying to hasten the end.

The end is not hastened, though, only through the use of arms. It can be helped along by observing precepts (*Šabbat*, 118b; *Midraš Tehillim*, 95.2; *Lev. R.*, III, 1; *Midraš Kohelet*, 4.6; *Exod. R.*, XXV, 12); studying the *Tōrāh* (*Sanhed.*, 99b); by acts of charity (*Babā³ Batrā³*, 10a); and above all by repentance or "conversion," *tēšuvah*, or "turning" (*šūb*) to God: "Rabbi Yose the Galilaeen has said: 'Great is conversion, since it brings redemption nearer'" (*Yōma³*, 86b); "Rabbi Levi has said: 'If the Israelites return to God

35 Hudson's correction (accepted by Niese) of πόνου instead of φόβου seems to me unsuitable.

36 J. Levy-L. Goldschmidt, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* I (Berlin Wien, 1924), 390b.

37 See *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* . . . by A. A. Bevan (Cambridge, 1892), 138; *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* . . . by R. H. Charles (Oxford, 1929), 394; G. Delling in *ThWNT* III (1938), 456-64 s.v. καιρὸς; H. Chr. Hahn in *ThBNT* II, 2 (1971), 1462-66 s.v. καιρὸς.

for one day only, they will be redeemed and the Son of David will come forthwith” (*Cant. R.*, V, 2.2).³⁸

Although this is typical Pharisaic doctrine, even here the concept of human and divine cooperation is very evident indeed. The Pharisaic *halakāh* rises from a purely eschatological necessity: to “separate” from those destined to destruction and to “determine” the advent of the Kingdom by strict observance of ritual laws. Jesus too preached “conversion”: μετανοείτε (*Mark* 1.15), not because the converted ever enter the Kingdom—everything had already been decided: “Already the axe is laid to the roots of the trees, and every tree that fails to produce good fruit is (already) cut down and thrown on the fire” (*Matt.* 3.10)—but because, the time being ripe and the Kingdom of God at hand, πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Mark* 1.15), the conversion of the people would make it a reality.

Jesus rejected the Pharisees’ position and its imposition of the “commandments of men,” ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων, (*Mark* 7.7) instead of laws laid down in the scriptures: “You neglect the commandment of God, and hold fast to the tradition of men,” ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (*Mark* 7.8).³⁹ At the same time he rejected the position of the “violent,” βιασταί, i.e., the Zealots, who sought to “hasten the end” by initiating the eschatological conflict which God would necessarily bring “to a felicitous conclusion,” εἰς τὸ κατορθοῦν, to use Josephus’ expression (*Ant.*, XVIII, 5). Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται· καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν (*Matt.* 11.12), an expression which was already incomprehensible to Luke (16.16).⁴⁰

6. Each group or “sect,” then, considered itself able to “hasten the end,” but each in its different way, this constituting the chief difference among them. Josephus, who never

38 See C. G. Montefiore, “Rabbinic Conception of Repentance,” *JQR* 16 (1904), 209–57; *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* von H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck. I *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (München, 1926), 162–72. See esp. 165–70: *Die Kraft der Busse*; G. Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of Tannaim I* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), 507–37; E. K. Dietrich, *Die Umkehr (Bekehrung und Busse) im A. T. und im Judentum bei besonderer Berücksichtigung der neutestamentlichen Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1936), 314–427; J. Behm in *ThWNT IV* (1942), 991–94 s.v. μετανοέω, D: *Die Umkehr in der rabbinischen Literatur*.

39 See J. D. M. Derret, *Law in the New Testament* (London, 1970) with the former literature; J. Bowker, *Jesus and the Pharisees* (Cambridge, 1973); R. Banks, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge, 1977); see also W. G. Kümmel, “Jesus und die jüdische Traditionsgeschichte,” *ZNW* 33 (1934), 105–30.

40 G. Braumann, “Dem Himmelreich wird Gewalt angetan’ (Mt. 11.12 par.),” *ZNW* 52 (1961), 104–9; D. R. Catchpole, “On doing violence to Kingdom,” *Journ. of Theology for Southern Africa* 25 (1978), 50–61; B. E. Thiering, “Are the ‘Violent Men’ false Teachers?” *NT* 21 (1979), 293–97; G. Schwarz, “καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν (Matthäus, 11, 12),” *Biblische Notizen* 11 (1980), 43–44. See also E. Bammel, “Is Luke 16, 16–18 of Baptist’s Provenience?” *HTThR* 51 (1958), 101–6; F. W. Danker, “Luke 16.16—An Opposition Logion,” *JBL* 77 (1978) 231–43. On the use of the term: G. Schrenk in *ThWNT I* (1933), 608–13 s.v. βιάζομαι, βιαστής and E. Moore, “ΒΙΑΖΩ, ΑΡΠΑΖΩ and cognates in Josephus,” *NTS* 21 (1974–75), 519–43. The discussion in S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots. A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (Manchester, 1967) usefully focused on the relations between Jesus and Zealotism. See esp. M. Hengel, *Was Jesus Revolutionär?* (Calwer Hefte zur Förderung biblischen Glaubens, 110, Stuttgart, 1970) and O. Cullmann, *Jesus und die Revolutionären seiner Zeit* (Tübingen, 1970).

uses concepts of a religious nature, defining the Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenes and Zealots as "philosophical schools," consistently calls the Zealots' particular position "an invincible love of liberty," δυσνίκητος δὲ τοῦ ἐλευθέρου ἔρωσ, at the same time observing that the followers of the "fourth philosophy," i.e., the Zealots, τὰ μὲν λοιπὰ πάντα γνώμη τῶν Φαρισαίων ὁμολογοῦσι (*Ant.*, XVIII, 23).⁴¹ This "invincible love of liberty" is thus Josephus' expression for their belief that they could initiate the Messianic war by an armed struggle "not shrinking from those crimes which necessity might lay before them, μὴ ἔξαφίωνται φόνου τοῦ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς" (*Ant.*, XVIII, 5).

This belief, however, was held only by a faction of the Zealots, those termed *sicarii*.⁴² Another faction thought the "end" could be "hastened" in a somewhat different way, as is clear from Josephus' description of the "revolts" of Theudas and the "Egyptian." Again, the N.T. gives important clues; and again Josephus and N.T. throw considerable light one on the other.

In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus' public life seems to divide into two distinct periods, each with its geographical setting: the preaching in Galilee, and the deeds in Jerusalem, culminating in his arrest, trial and death. Between the two there is the sending forth of the disciples (*Matt.* 10.5 ff. cf. *Mark* 6.6b-13) which marks the height of the eschatological tension in the wait for the coming of the Kingdom. The disciples are sent to announce that the Kingdom was at hand, but are told they had no time to travel throughout all the cities of Israel before it came about, ἔως ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (*Matth.*, 10.23).⁴³ It does not come about, however: the exhortation to convert fails to attain its end because the people remained indifferent.

Until that moment, Jesus had been simply the "announcer" of the Kingdom; when he moves down to Jerusalem, however, he behaves very differently.⁴⁴ He enters Jerusalem on a donkey, i.e., according to *Zech.*, 9.9, the Messiah's mount (*Mark* 11.1-10; *Matt.* 21.1-9; *Luke* 19.28-40). *Matthew* (21.4-5) expressly quotes the passage in *Zechariah* as the prophecy of the event: τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος κ.τ.λ.; a perfectly legitimate *interpretatio prophetica* from a Hebrew position since everything that happens in the present must be "legible" in the Scriptures: *pišrō 'al . . .*, "its interpretation (refers) to . . .," according to the formula used in the *Commentary of Habbakuk*. But if the early Christian tradition could a

41 Some scholars pointed out that in Josephus' account the "Zealots" do not appear before 67-68 (*Bell.*, IV, 130-61). Above all, M. Smith in his paper "Zealots and Sicarii: Their Origins and Relations," *HThR* 64 (1971), 1-19, reviewing the former literature (esp. Hengel's book), pointed out the inconsistency of the assumption that the "Fourth Philosophy" is the equivalent of "Zealotism." But, if "it seems unlikely . . . that the organization Judas founded—Josephus' "fourth philosophy"—called itself 'Zealots'" (Smith, "Zealots," 18), the term may be used not wholly improperly for terming the whole and multiform movement that led to the war against the Romans, as does Hengel (and the majority of scholars); see Hengel, "Zeloten und Sikarier. Zur Frage nach der Einheit und Vielfalt der jüdischen Befreiungsbewegung 6-74 nach Christus," in *Josephus-Studien* (*supra*, note 21), 175-96 = *Zeloten*², 386-412. Here the term "Zealots" is used in this (loose) usage. The problem of the history of Zealotism lies beyond the scope of this paper.

42 See, *infra*, note 57.

43 M. Goguel, *Jésus*. Seconde édition entièrement refondue (Paris, 1950), 279: "leur mission est comme un prolongement de celle de Jésus."

44 Goguel, *Jésus*, 312: "Jésus a été conduit à dépasser le sentiment d'une simple vocation prophétique et à se considérer, non plus seulement comme l'annonciateur, mais comme le réalisateur du Royaume de Dieu."

posteriori read Jesus' entry into Jerusalem as the fulfillment of a prophecy, it is legitimate to imagine that Jesus himself, considering himself to possess Messianic prerogatives, would have ordered his actions so as to fulfill Zechariah's prophecy. "In welchem Sinn und Umfang wollte Jesus diese Weissagung erfüllen?" Michel asked himself.⁴⁵ In other words, this memory of his entrance may be based on historical fact. *Mark*, unlike *Matthew*, makes no explicit mention of the prophetic passage, but states that Jesus sent two disciples to a particular place where they would find a donkey. This is clearly a particular donkey—according to Rabbinic tradition (*Pirkē dē Rabbi Eliezer*, 31), that was used by Abraham (*Gen.* 22.3) and by Moses (*Exod.* 4.20).⁴⁶

The episode of his driving out the money-changers from the Temple, which in the Synoptic Gospels immediately follows his entry into Jerusalem (*Mark* 11.15-17; *Matt.* 21.12-13; *Luke* 19.45-46), can be similarly interpreted. Jesus' intention was apparently to purify the Temple; but without the sale of animals, there could be no sacrifices, and without the money-changers, it would be impossible to pay the half-*šekel* which each Jew gave to the Temple treasury (*Exod.* 30.13 ff.; cf. *Matt.* 17.24). Jesus could consider the Temple illegal for a number of reasons, but not on account of the animal dealers or the money-changers who guaranteed its regular functions, and the incongruity has been frequently underlined.⁴⁷ This, however, is the interpretation of the episode which the evangelists put into Jesus' mouth, having him quote a mixture of two prophecies: καὶ ἐδίδασκειν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν [*Isa.* 56.7] ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον ληστῶν [*Jer.* 7.11] (*Mark* 11.17; *Matt.* 21.13; *Luke* 25.46) and which most modern commentaries repeat, underlining however the realistic aspect. "Neither the salesmen nor the money-changers

45 In *ThWNTV* (see following note), 287, note 24. A propos of the *pēsher* significance, O. Betz writes that: "Als Deutung wird ein Tatbestand der Gegenwart oder Zukunft angeführt, in dem das davon zitierte Schriftwort seine Erfüllung gefunden hat." See his *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 6, Tübingen, 1960), 78-79. I. Rabinowitz, "Pēsher/Pittārōn. Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature," *RQ* 8 (1972-75), 219-32, says that "the term *pēsher* . . . never denotes just an explanation or exposition, but always a presaged reality, either envisaged as emergent or else observed as already actualized" (225-26).

46 A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Zweite Auflage (Tübingen, 1913), 440; G. Friedländer, *The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount* (London, 1911), 143: "The story of the entry into Jerusalem shows that Jesus consciously assumed the outward or public office of the Messianic King based on the prophecy of Zecharia IX.9"; O. Michel in *ThWNTV* (1954), 285-87 s.v. ὄνος, C (*Der Esel im NT*). On the problem of the animal used by Jesus for his entry into Jerusalem, see W. Bauer, "The 'colt' of Palm Sunday (Der Palmesel)," *JBL* 72 (1953), 220-29; H. W. Kuhn, "Das Reittier Jesu in der Einzugs geschichte des Markusevangeliums," *ZNW* 50 (1959), 82-91; O. Michel, "Eine philologische Frage zur Einzugs geschichte," *NTS* 6 (1959-60), 81-82. See also J. Blenkinsopp, "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry," *JBL* 80 (1961), 55-64.

47 See V. Eppstein, "The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple," *ZNW* 55 (1964), 42-58, esp. 48, "Such interpretation can but increase the difficulty of analyzing the narrative as found in the Gospels. The money-changers had not set up shops in the Temple for the pursuit of private business. They were performing the necessary exchange of the annual Temple tax into coin 'after the shekel of the Sanctuary' as commanded in the Law [*Exod.* 30.13-16]." See too N. Q. Hamilton, "Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank," *JBL* 83 (1964), 365-72, esp. 372, "If Jesus had wished to oppose the sacred function of the Temple, he would have passed through the Court of the Gentiles to make his protest where the sacrifices were actually offered."

were better than λησταί," Swete writes.⁴⁸ This may well be true, but the real significance of the episode lies elsewhere, and has only recently been recognized by C. Roth.⁴⁹

If Jesus, entering Jerusalem, was shaping his acts to conform with the Messianic passage in *Zech.* 9.9, it is legitimate to suppose he had in mind the collection of oracles and prophecies critics term *Deuterozechariah* (*Zech.* 9–14).⁵⁰ The second part of this collection (called *Tritozechariah*: *Zech.* 12–14) is a late eschatological piece concerned specifically with the "day of Yahweh" and connected events.⁵¹ The last chapter, in particular (a minor apocalypse, probably unrelated to the rest of the piece), describes the eschatological collision in which—according to the traditional scheme—initial distress (14.2) is followed by God's direct intervention (14.3) with an inevitable cosmic upheaval (14.4–8) at the conclusion of which "Yahweh shall become king over all the earth" (14.9); God will confound the enemy (14.10–14) who will then come to Jerusalem and lay themselves at Yahweh's feet (14.15–19). The last two verses (14.20–21) give the final situation: "On that day, shall there be inscribed upon the bells of the horses 'Holy to Yahweh [*qodeš layhwh*, as on the gold leaf of the high-priest's tiara: *Exod.* 28.36]' and the pots in the house of Yahweh shall be like the bowls before the altar. Every pot [of profane use] in Jerusalem and Judah shall be holy to Yahweh *šēbā'ōt* and all who sacrifice shall come and take some of them and boil (the flesh) in them, *wē lo²-yihyēh kēna^cany^c ōd bēbēyt-Yhwh šēbā'ōt bāyyōm hahū²*, and there shall be no more a trader [*kēna^cany* = "trader": see *Prov.* 31.24 and Targum's translation *tāgarā²*] in the house of Yahweh *šēbā'ōt* on that day."

The meaning of the two verses is very clear: the final situation after God's intervention will be one in which the distinction *bēyn hakkōdeš ūbēyn haḥōl*, "between sacred and profane" (*Lev.* 10.10; cf. *Ezek.* 22.26; 42.20; 44.23; 48.15; 1 *Sam.* 21.5–6),⁵²

48 *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices by H. B. Swete (London, 1898, 1902²), 257. I. Abrahams, although he judges "impossible to agree that 'the whole of this traffic . . . was in itself . . . a terrible desecration' (as A. Edersheim wrote in his *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [London, 1883, 1894⁸, I, 370–71]," thinks, however, that "there might well have been occasions on which indignation such as that of Jesus would be justified"; see his *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*. First Series (Cambridge, 1917), 87. E. Trocmé, "L'expulsion des marchands du Temple," *NTS* 15 (1968–69), 1–22, at 18, asks himself if "Jésus aurait-il voulu accomplir un acte *zélote*."

49 C. Roth, "The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah XIV 21," *NT* 4 (1960), 174–81; see also Hamilton, "Temple Cleansing" (*supra*, note 47); R. H. Hiers, "Purification of the Temple: Preparation for the Kingdom of God," *JBL* 90 (1971), 82–90.

50 On *Deuterozechariah*, see B. Otzen, *Studien über Deuterosecharja* (Acta Theologica Danica, 6, Copenhagen, 1964); P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, 1975), 281–401 (*Zechariah 9–14 and the Development of the Apocalyptic Eschatology of Visions*).

51 On the "Day of Yahweh," see L. Černý, *The Day of Yahweh and some relevant Problems* (Filosofická Fakulta University Karlovy. Práce z Vědeckých Ústavů, 53, Praha, 1948); S. Mowinckel, "'Jahves Dag'," *NTT* 59 (1958), 1–56; 209–29; G. von Rad, "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," *JSS* 4 (1959), 97–108; K.-D. Schunck, "Strukturlinien in der Entwicklung der Vorstellung vom 'Tag Jahwes'," *VT* 14 (1964), 320–30; M. Weiss, "On the Origin of the 'Day of the Lord'—Reconsidered," *HUCA* 37 (1966), 29–60; K.-D. Schunck, "Der 'Tag Jahves' in der Verkündigung der Propheten," *Kairos* 11 (1969), 14–21; J. Gray, "The Day of Yahweh in Cultic Experience and Eschatological Prospect," *SEA* 39 (1974), 5–37; A. J. Everson, "The Day of Yahweh," *JBL* 93 (1974), 329–37; M. Saebø in *ThWAT* III (1977–1982), 561 (bibliography) and 584–86 s.v. *yom*, IV.3b–d.

52 See W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. The Fundamental Institutions* (London, 1889, 1927³), 446–54; B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testament*. I, *Die Religion Israels und*

becomes meaningless since all will be "sacred." The concept is expressed in the paradoxical image of the holy name inscribed on the bells of the horses, and the equally paradoxical affirmation that "there shall no more a trader in the house of Yahweh *šēbāʾōt* on that day," the paradox underlining the total lack of realism in this picture of eschatological reality. Thus in *Zech.* 14.21, there is no condemnation of the traders in the Temple; nor is Jesus' action—certainly a historical fact, and which probably determined his end (cf. *Mark* 11.18; *Luke* 19.47)—to be interpreted in this way. Jesus entered into the Temple court to drive out the traders immediately after his entry into the city: καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ἔρξατο ἐμβάλλειν κ.τ.λ. (*Mark* 11.15; *Matt.* 21.10-12; *Luke* 19.41-45 where the tradition's development is very obvious). It is the evangelist himself who gives this a clumsy interpretation interrupting the account of the action: καὶ ἐδίδασκεν, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ. (*Mark* 11.17).

Jesus saw his action as fulfilling one of the prophecies—the only one he considered attainable—which, according to the prophetic books, were to come about "in that day."

In the same way, a Portuguese marrano, Diogo Pires, who had reconverted to Judaism under the name of Solomon Molko and was convinced that the Messiah would appear in 1533 or in 1540 (i.e., 5,300 years after the creation), saw a clear omen in the imperial forces' sack of Rome in 1527. Convinced of being the Messiah, during a stay in Rome in 1530, he spent a month among the poor occupying Ponte S. Angelo in order to fulfill the prophecy (*Sanh.*, 98a) according to which the Messiah, before appearing, was to sit at the entrance to the town (Rome) "among the poor lepers."⁵³

This "hastening" the Kingdom by creating an "eschatological situation" to force God's hand is, however, illustrated very clearly in Josephus' description of the revolts of Theudas and the "Egyptian," where a particular aspect of first century Jewish eschatology emerges very clearly.

7. The accounts of the two episodes are in *Ant.*, XX, 97-98 and in *Bell.*, II, 261-63 = *Ant.*, XX, 171-72 respectively and are echoed in *Acts* 5.36 and 21.38. The first (*Ant.*, XX, 97) takes place during Cuspius Fadus' procuratorship of Judaea (44?-46: *Bell.*, II, 220; *Ant.*, XIX, 363);⁵⁴ the second (*Bell.*, II, 260; *Ant.*, XX, 168) when Antonius Felix was procurator (52-60?: *Bell.*, II, 247; *Ant.*, XX, 137; Suet., *Claudius*, 28; Tacitus, *Hist.*, V, 9).⁵⁵ In *Acts* the Theudas episode takes place immediately before the rebellion of Judas the Galileean, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς (*Acts* 5.37), while that of the "Egyptian" seemingly in the summer of 55.

die Entstehung des Judentums (Tübingen, 1905), 134-38; W. Dommershausen in *ThWAT* II (1974-1977), 980-81 s.v. *hol-hāil*, II, 4.

⁵³ See L. Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften* III (Berlin, 1876), 229; H. Vogelstein-P. Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom* II (Berlin, 1895), 53-58; D. Kaufmann, "Un poème messianique de Salomon Molkho," *REJ* 34 (1897), 121-27; J. H. Greenstone, *The Messiah Idea in Jewish History* (Philadelphia, 1906), 194-99; A. H. Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel. From the First through the seventeenth Centuries* (New York, 1927), 133-35; 147-50.

⁵⁴ Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 565-66; Id., *History* I, 455-48.

⁵⁵ Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 571-78; Id., *History* I, 459-66; M. Aberbach, "The Conflicting Accounts of Josephus and Tacitus concerning Cumanus' and Felix' Terms of Office," *JQR* 40 (1949-50), 1-14; Fr. F. Bruce, "The full name of Procurator Felix," *JSNT* 1 (1978), 33-36.

I shall begin with the second episode, of which a parallel narration exists in *Bellum* and *Antiquitates*. In *Bell.*, II, 247, Josephus begins an account of the events during the Judean procuratorship of Antonius Felix whom Tacitus (*Ann.*, XII, 54.2), almost certainly wrongly, gives as a previous governor of Samaria.⁵⁶ Tacitus (*Hist.*, V, 9.3) states that Felix, a freedman of Claudius' mother *per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili animo exercuit*. Felix, Josephus recounts, captured Eleazar, a "head bandit," ἀρχιληστής (*Bell.*, II, 253), the son of Deinaeus, who with a certain Alexander "slaughtered the inhabitants [of Samaria] of all ages, and burnt down their villages" (*Bell.*, II, 235). He then sent him to Rome for trial, crucifying an incalculable number of his followers.

In the meantime, in Jerusalem, ξτερον εἶδος ληστῶν began to appear, soon to be called *sicarii*, οἱ καλούμενοι σικάριοι, who would take advantage of moments of disturbance to kill their enemies with daggers hidden under their tunics (*Bell.*, II, 254).⁵⁷ Their first victim was Jonathan the son of Hananyah (the Ἰωνᾶς of the New Testament), nominated high-priest by Vitellius in 36 (*Ant.*, XVIII, 95) and deposed shortly afterwards (*Ant.*, XVIII, 123).

Besides these, Josephus goes on, there emerged a further group of people of "lowly extraction," στίφος πονηρῶν, with "purer hands" (i.e., who stopped at killing), but whose intentions were even worse (*Bell.*, II, 258). These were "impostors," "seducers," πλάνοι γὰρ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἀπατεῶνες (a hendiadys; cf. πνεύματα πλάνα, 1 *ad Tim.*, 4.1) who, claiming divine inspiration, urged change and novelty, νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ μεταβολάς (so apparently of a political nature) and incited the mob, τὸ πλῆτος, to senseless actions, leading groups into the desert and promising God would there reveal the signs of liberation.

His drift is quite clear: Josephus is here carefully distinguishing between *sicarii*, operating for explicitly political ends (assassination of the high-priest), and those with "purer hands" who incite revolt by claiming divine inspiration and are thus essentially "impostors." The religious aspect is here clear. In Jesus' words: εἰάν οὖν εἴποσιν ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστί, μὴ ἐξέλθητε (*Matth.*, 24.26) since they are obviously ψευδόχριστοι and ψευδοπροφήται (*Matth.*, 24.24), "impostors" *par excellence*. In the words attributed to Jesus, those who "lead in the wilderness" are "false Messiahs," people convinced they were acting out a Messianic role.⁵⁸ Once again, the Synoptic Gospels, polemically, reveal forms and ways of Jewish eschatology of the time.

We are thus in a position to gauge to what extent Josephus' description of the "Egyptian" episode is tendentious.⁵⁹ Citing him as an example of the new στίφος

56 Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors II* (*supra*, note 14), 78–80.

57 A Critical survey of the scholarly discussion on the *sicarii*, the "fourth philosophy" and the "Zealots" is in Feldman, *Scholarship* (*supra*, note 8), 655–67. See esp. M. Stern, "Sicarii and Zealots," in *The World History of Jewish People. First Series. VIII. Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem, 1977), 263–301 and 374–77 (bibliography).

58 See E. Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. *Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Giessen, 1927), 162–64; R. Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa* (*supra*, note 12), 82–88; Id. in *ThWNT VI* (1959), 826–27 s.v. προφήτης 5. (*Die messianische Propheten*); Hengel, *Zeloten*, 235–51; J. Reiling, "The Use of ΨΕΥΔΟ-ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus," *NT 13* (1971), 147–56.

59 See *Die Apostelgeschichte* neu übersetzt und erklärt von E. Haenchen, 7. . . verbesserte Auflage (Krit. exeg. Kommentar . . . begründet von H. A. W. Meyer) (Göttingen, 1977), 592–95; F. Parente, "L'episodio

πονηρῶν, Josephus states that he is a γόης, a “magician” (Herod., II, 33; Plato, *Resp.*, 380d), in the sense, however, of “charlatan” (Plato, *Symp.*, 203d; Dio Chrys., 15[32].11; Ael. Arist., 28.11; Philo, *Leg. sp.*, I, 315 etc.)⁶⁰ whose fame as prophet inspired 30,000 people to follow him into the wilderness and on the Mount of Olives. “From there he (claimed he was able) to force entrance into Jerusalem, defeat the Roman garrison, and set himself up as a tyrant over the people, using those who had followed him as his personal body-guard,” ἐκεῖθεν οἶός τε ἦν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παρελθεῖν βιάζεσθαι καὶ κρατήσας τῆς τε Ῥωμαϊκῆς φρουρᾶς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τυραννεῖν χρώμενος τοῖς συνεισπεσοῦσιν δορυφόροις (*Bell.*, II, 262).

His actions are thus presented in unequivocal politico-military terms: when Felix launches a pre-emptive attack with the heavy infantry, “everyone rallied round him in the defense” (*Bell.*, II, 263). This presentation is at odds, however, with everything that goes before; the parallel passage in the *Antiquitates* also gives a substantially different version, evidencing its religious and specifically eschatological aspects.

This passage (*Ant.*, XX, 168-72) still speaks of γόητες καὶ ἀπατεῶνες ἄνθρωποι who convince groups of followers to follow them into the desert where τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα would be manifest—although no longer σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας, as in *Bell.*, II, 259—but the intentions of the “Egyptian” are very different: leading his followers to the Mount of Olives, θέλειν γὰρ ἔφασεν αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖθεν ἐπιδείξει, ὡς κελεύσαντος αὐτοῦ πίπτοι τὰ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν τείχη, δι’ ὧν καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον αὐτοῖς παρέξειν ἐπηγγέλλετο, “declaring that he wished from there to demonstrate to them how, at his command, the walls of Jerusalem, through which he had promised entry into the city, would then fall” (*Ant.*, XX, 170). Feldman’s comment on the passage is as follows: “B.J.ii.262 adds that the impostor intended to establish himself as a tyrant, with those who had joined him acting as his bodyguard”;⁶¹ he apparently does not realize that the intention Josephus attributes to the “Egyptian” in the *Bellum* is the logical consequence of that εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παρελθεῖν βιάζεσθαι which Josephus also attributes to him while in the *Antiquitates* the “Egyptian’s” action is no longer an act of force. He has no intention of using arms: the reference to *Josh.*, 6.20 is very clear. Here the “battle-cry,” as *tērū‘āh* is generally translated, is not an incitement to arms, but, as P. Humbert has pointed out,⁶² part of the ritual of magic, the culmination of a whole process including circling the city on seven consecutive days to the sound of the *šofar* (*Josh.*, 6.8, 19).

The “Egyptian” intends to do the same thing: to instigate an action which would then be carried εἰς τὸ κατορθοῦν by God himself; or, like Jesus driving out the money-changers from the Temple, to create a situation which would necessarily “force God’s hand.” Nothing was further from his intentions, then, than to instigate military action, far less to set himself up as “tyrant” over the people.

dell’ ‘Egiziano’ in Acta 21.38: qualche osservazione sulla possibile dipendenza degli Atti degli Apostoli da Flavio Giuseppe,” *Rendiconti dell’Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* 112 (1978), 360-76.

60 See Fr. Pfister in *RE* Suppl. IV (1924), 323-25 s.v. *Epode*; Th. Hopfner in *RE* XIV (1928), 381-82 s.v. *Mageia* (γοητεία); G. Delling in *ThWNT* I (1933), 737-38 s.v. γόης; A. D. Nock, “Paul and the Magus,” in *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part I. *The Acts of Apostles*, ed. by G. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, V (London, 1933), 164-88 (Note XIV).

61 *Josephus* with an English Translation (*supra*, note 34), 481.

62 P. Humbert, *La “Terou‘a”*. *Analyse d’un rite biblique* (Université de Neuchâtel. Recueil de Travaux publié par la Faculté des Lettres, 23, Neuchâtel 1946).

A comparison of this episode with its Theudas counterpart, moreover, reveals other aspects of Jewish eschatology in the first century A.D. The Theudas episode appears only in the *Antiquitates* (XX, 97–99), and thus lacks a “political” interpretation.⁶³ Theudas too is a γόης; γόης τις ἀνὴρ θευδᾶς (*Ant.*, XX, 97), who persuades τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλος to gather together wealth and worldly goods and follow him into Jordan. “He claimed to be a prophet before (whose) command the river would divide, permitting easy passage καὶ προστάγματι τὸν ποταμὸν σχίσας δίοδον ἔχειν ἔφη παρέξειν αὐτοῖς ῥαδίαν” (*Ant.*, XX, 97). Fadus intervened with a detachment of cavalry, thus denying Theudas’ followers “the fruits of their folly, τῆς ἀφροσύνης, killed a good many people, including Theudas himself, and took many others prisoner.” The reference is of course to *Josh.*, 3.15–16, where, at the banks of the Jordan, the miracle of the Red Sea (*Exod.*, 14.8) is repeated, and “the water coming down from upstream was brought to standstill; it piled up like a bank . . .” (*Josh.*, 3.16).

Theudas has long been recognized as a Messiah.⁶⁴ What should be underlined, however, is that the two clearly interconnected episodes bear witness to an eschatological perspective in which the ἔσχατον is seen as a re-entry into the Promised Land, a second conquest of Palestine which was not however a “military” conquest. The “desert” seems to be the departure-point for a new march towards the Promised Land, the “signs” and “miracles” received by the followers of the two leaders being a repetition of those accompanying the Israelites on their 40-year march from Egypt into Canaan. The concept of “desert” thus seems very different here from that of the Dead Sea Scrolls, where “desert” is also a central eschatological element.⁶⁵

The Biblical passage referred to in the Scrolls is *Ezech.*, 20.35: “I will bring you into the wilderness of the peoples, and there will I plead with you face to face.” The “wilderness of the peoples,” *midbar ha-‘ammyim* is the Syrian-Arabic desert surrounded by different peoples, as opposed to the “wilderness of the land of Egypt,” *midbar ‘eres Misyrayim* of the following verse, the desert of the exodus. 1Q S, 8.13–14 states in fact that “on the basis of these norms, they [the members of the sect] are to be separated from the [place of] abode of the men of unrighteousness to go into the wilderness and prepare his way, as it is written: ‘Prepare a road for Yahweh through the wilderness, clear a highway across the desert for our God’” (*Isa.*, 40.3; cf. *Mark*, 1.3; *Matth.*, 3.3;

63 Schürer, *Geschichte* I, 566; Id., *History* I, 456; P. W. Schmiedel in *Encycl. Biblica* IV (1903) s.v. *Theudas*; L. Campeau, “Theudas le faux prophète et Judas le Galiléen,” *Sciences Eccles.* (Montreal) 5 (1953), 235–45; P. Winter, “Miscellen zu Apostelgeschichte I. Acta 5.36: Theudas,” *Ev. Th.* 17 (1957), 398–99; Hengel, *Zeloten*, 235–36.

64 *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* herausg. von H. Lietzmann IV, 1. *Die Apostelgeschichte* erklärt von E. Preuschen (Tübingen, 1912), 33; J. Jeremias in *ThWNT* IV (1942), 863 s.v. Μωυσης, 3a; Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte* (*supra*, note 59), 246.

65 See G. Kittel in *ThWNT* II (1935), 654–57 s.v. ἔρημος; I. Guillet, “Le thème de la marche au desert dans l’Ancien et le Nouveau Testament,” *RSR* 26 (1949), 161–81; U. W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness. The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* (Studies in Biblical Theology, 39, London, 1963); Sh. Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif’ in the Bible and Qumran Literature,” in *Biblical Motifs. Origins and Transformations*, ed. A. Altman (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies Brandeis University—Studies and Texts, 3, Cambridge, Mass., 1966), 31–63; Id. in *ThWAT* IV (1982–1984), 660–95 s.v. *midbar*.

Luke, 3.4-6). According to 1Q M, 1.2-3, "The sons of Levi, the sons of Judas and the sons of Benjamin [i.e., the tribes who had remained faithful at the time of Jeroboam's schism], the exiled of the wilderness, will take arms against them . . . and against all their armies, when the exiled of the sons of light return from the wilderness of the peoples [*Ezech.*, 20.35] to make their camp in the wilderness of Jerusalem . . ." ⁶⁶ Lastly, in 4Q pPs. 37, 3.1, *Psalm* 37, 19, "When times are bad, he shall not be distressed" is interpreted as a reference to "those who returned [*Allegro*: "penitents"] from the wilderness who will live a thousand generations in rectitude."

In other words, while in Essenism the "wilderness" is considered an element intrinsically eschatological since the "wilderness of the peoples" is contrasted with the non-Biblical "wilderness of Jerusalem," the "desert" which Theudas and the "Egyptian" aim for is merely considered an ante-room to the Promised Land. ⁶⁷ The unparalleled mention in *Matth.*, 24.26 of "false Messiahs" of whom it is said ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστὶν seems to refer precisely to this kind of eschatological perspective, both on account of the presence of a messianic figure and because the alternative given in his presence in the "inner room" (ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις).

8. From the above considerations two conclusions may be drawn about the nature of first century A.D. Jewish eschatology.

1) Wellhausen has already emphasized that the part each single sect believed itself to have in bringing about the Kingdom represented an essential and distinctive element amongst them. Wellhausen further stated à propos of the Pharisees that "ihre Handlungen keineswegs in direkte Beziehung zur Realisierung der Hoffnung setzen," since "die Pharisäer kennen nur Eine Aufgabe, die, das Gesetz zu erfüllen . . . Praktische Ziele verfolgen sie nicht . . ." ⁶⁸ M. Hengel, in his book on the Zealots which stresses the intrinsically eschatological nature of the movement, thus placing it within the context of the religious history of early Judaism, seems in agreement. He has rightly called attention to the passage in *Ant.*, XVIII, 5 in which Josephus, speaking of Judas the Galilaeen, mentions the unflinching "collaboration" expected from God: καὶ τὸ θεῖον οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ ἐπὶ συμπράξει τῶν βουλευμάτων εἰς τὸ κατορθοῦν συμπροθυμῆσθαι. Hengel comments as follows, "hier wird im Stil eines philosophischen Traktats gesagt, dass Judas und Zadduk sich nicht mit einer passiven Hoffnung auf die kommende Erlösung Israels zufrieden gaben, wie sie wohl in gewissen spätjüdischen Kreisen zu finden war, sondern ein tatkräftigen Mitwirken zur Herbeiführung des kommenden Heilszeit forderten; denn Gott konnte nach ihrer Ansicht nur dann helfend eingreifen, wenn die Frommen vom blossen Warten zur Tat übergegangen waren." ⁶⁹

Various statements in Rabbinic literature, however, indicate clearly that in early Pharisaic lore, rigid observance of the law aimed generally at "hastening" the coming of

⁶⁶ See *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of the Light against the Sons of Darkness*, edited with a commentary by Y. Yadin (Oxford, 1962), 257.

⁶⁷ See, however, Talmon, "Desert Motif," 60-63, for whom the "desert" is here only "the locale of a period of purification and preparation for the achievement of a new goal. This goal is the conquest of the Holy Land, culminating in the seizure of Jerusalem, and the re-establishment in it of the supreme sanctuary of Israel" (63).

⁶⁸ J. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* (Greifswald, 1874), 21.

⁶⁹ Hengel, *Zeloten*, 128.

the Kingdom. In other words, the Pharisees too had a "practical purpose" (to use Wellhausen's expression), which coincided exactly with that of the Zealots. Only bearing this in mind is it possible to give a correct interpretation to Josephus' affirmation that the Zealots had the same principles, the same *Weltanschauung*, as the Pharisees, differing only in their "invincible love of liberty" as Josephus rather vaguely phrases it. From this it is to be deduced that Jewish eschatology in the first century A.D. consisted essentially in finding a way to "force God's hand," to assure God's intervention; and that the different currents within Judaism differed in their views of how to bring this about.

2) Evaluating Zealotism within this perspective, Hengel underlines the difference between the "false" prophets who gave rise to nothing more than ephemeral movements, and the real Zealots who set up a serious and highly-organized guerilla offensive against the Romans. In evaluating figures like Theudas and the "Egyptian," however, he states that "dennoch muss auch bei den Zeloten das prophetisch-enthusiastische Element wirksam gewesen sein," pointing out that for the pre-war period Josephus (*Bell.*, II, 264 ff.) speaks of a drawing together "zwischen Zeloten und Goeten."⁷⁰

In actual fact, it is very clear from Josephus' evidence that the eschatological perspective of Theudas and the "Egyptian" differed from that of the mainstream of Zealotism, which Josephus terms the "fourth philosophy," in the ways they considered "forcing God's hand." While the Zealots were prepared for a fight which was to extend to heaven, Theudas and the "Egyptian" wished to create an "eschatological situation" which had been preannounced in the Scriptures: precisely what Jesus had wanted to do in driving out the money-changers from the Temple.

70 Hengel, *Zeloten*, 239.