Krzysztof Sarzała

"A prophet in danger" : the story of the oracle of Judas the Essene (BJ 1.78-80; Ant. 13.311-313)

Studia Warmińskie 38, 7-46

2001

KS. KRZYSZTOF SARZAŁA
Rzym

Studia Warmińskie
XXXVIII (2001)

A PROPHET IN DANGER
THE STORY OF THE ORACLE OF JUDAS THE ESSENE (BJ 1.78–80; Ant. 13.311–313)

INTRODUCTION

W. Whiston in his translation of Josephus of 1737[1], to which the ancient author owes much of his enormous popularity in modern times, renders the last part of Ant. 13.312 as follows: „he (Judas) was in danger of proving a false prophet". The interpretation is somewhat forced — Judas is explicitly called a seer — but it renders aptly the drama of the account: for a short while the Essene sees his life collapse since, as he believes, his predictive powers have failed. Judas is one of the four Essenes known by name to us, although the αἵρεσις must once have been spread throughout all the towns of Judaea (BJ 2.124). His extraordinary gift of future prediction, shared with two other individual Essenes (Simon, BJ 2.113, and Menahem, Ant. 15.373) and the sect as a whole (BJ 2.159), deserves attention inasmuch as it provides instances of prophetic phenomena in an age in which the prophets had long since ceased to appear (1 Macc 9,27). Given that Judas is depicted as an expert predictor of the future, whose experience could be transmitted to others (Ant. 13.311), the question arises about the method of procedure used to obtain foreknowledge; what role the prophecies recorded in Scripture played in it, as it was the case in pesher exegesis at Qumran, is of special interest. The relationship between the „Essaean" (ἐσσαῖος) seer and the Essene sect (ἐσσηνοί), given their different literary origin, is to be explained. Finally, from the historical point of view, the presence of an Essene teacher at the Jerusalem Temple should be

[1] W. Whiston, *The Works of Flavius Josephus, the Learned and Authentic Jewish Historian*, I, London 1862, 48.

taken into consideration since it sheds light on the Essenes' attitude to the central cult[2], and, in consequence, on the issue of the connection between the Essenes and the Qumran community.

1. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

1.1. Textual questions

Major variants of BJ 1.78–80 will be considered. The point of reference is the text established by B. Niese[3] who relies mainly on the codices P and A, both from X–XI cent. The group of manuscripts represented by P, A along with M, L, which are inconstant members, is judged also by H. Thackeray decidedly superior to the other text type found in the group VR(C)[4].

In BJ 1.78 instead of θαυμασαι L, V, N and *Excerpta* read θαυμασοι (future optative) that could have been a grammatical improvement intended to avoid the ambiguity of form of the original aorist optative. In 1.79 L, V, N, C and *Excerpta* have οτι for οτε in other witnesses that seems to be an attempt to smooth the style. In the same verse, Niese conjectures μου in the place of μοι attested by all the manuscripts quoted in his edition, *Excerpta* and the Latin Hegesippus; the old Latin version reads *ante me* which favours the conjecture. μοι, though supported by the textual evidence, can hardly be accepted because of the lacking agreement with προτέθνηκεν which demands nothing but a genitive. The marginal note in L, γρ(=γράφεται) οτε με προτερον ανηκεν η αληθεια, seems to witness to the perplexity of the copyist at μοι. It may be a scribal error due to confusion between υ and ι. In 1.80 L, V, N, C and *Excerpta* have the adverb ομωνυμως instead of participle ομωνυμουν. The difference concerns the termination of the word and does not affect the meaning of the text in any way. It may be due to the fact that the codices P and A appear to have been copied from an exemplar in which words were abbreviated[5]. The text established by Niese and confirmed through an independent investigation of A. Naber and Thackeray can be accepted[6].

In the parallel passage Ant. 13.311–313, the discrepancy in textual transmission at 13.311 between εσσαιον (P-group, accepted by Niese and R. Marcus in LCL[7]) and εσσηνον (A-group, supported by the Epitome and the Latin) should be taken

[2] J. Sievers, «Josephus und die Zeit „zwischen den Testamenten"», *BiKi* 55(1998) 65.

[3] B. Niese, *Flavii Josephi opera*. VI. *De bello judaico*, Berlin 1894.

[4] H.S.J. Thackeray, *The Jewish War. Books I–III*, in *Josephus in nine volumes*, II, LCL 203, London 1989 (1927[1]), xxix.

[5] Thackeray, xxx.

[6] Thackeray's only improvement in relation to Niese's text is the abbreviated ταυτ'at BJ 1.80, the elision being supported by C and Exc. Niese's reading is surely the *lectio difficilior*. That the unit BJ 1.78–80, small as it is, is inconsistent in using elision may be seen in section 79 where απο is unabbreviated before εξακοσιων in most manuscripts (accepted by Thackeray). C, reading αφ' confirms its tendency to apply elision. A. Naber, *Flavii Iosephi Opera omnia*, V, Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum teubneriana, Leipzig 1895, prefers to read in 1.78 θαυμασειε a different form of the same optative, and accepts the two elisions, following C.

[7] R. Marcus, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Books XII–XIII*, LCL 365, London 1998 (1943[1]).

into consideration. The decision is difficult since the readings reflect the division of the manuscript tradition of Ant. 10–20 into two main types[8]. The reasons that would explain the variants cannot be easily seen. While εσσαιον may be an assimilation to BJ 1.78, εσσηνον could have been influenced by the form of the Essenes' name in the preceding Ant. 13.298 (171), as, indeed, the marginal notes in A and M suggest. Since, however, the manuscripts do not show such hesitation at εσσαιος further on at Ant. 17.346 it seems more probable that it was Josephus himself who switched to the form εσσηνον in Ant. 13.311.

1.2. Literary questions

The unit BJ 1.78–80 is clearly delimited in its context. The main narrative, Aristobulus' reign (BJ 1.70–84), is interrupted in 1.77 and resumed in 1.81. A moral reflection on Antigonus' death marks the end of the preceding unit. The redactional ἐν τούτῳ (1.78) integrates the following story which forms a sort of retrospective digression. Supposedly, our text was originally independent[9].

The plot can be summarized as follows. Judas, an Essene seer, predicted that Antigonus[10] would be murdered on a certain day at a place called Strato's Tower, by which he meant the coastal town, renamed later Caesarea[11], 600 stades away from Jerusalem. But on the appointed day Judas saw Antigonus passing through the Temple, at a time that made it impossible for him to reach the place predestined for his murder. The seer, thus far having never failed in his predictions, thought he had spoken falsely and despaired before his disciples, wishing to be dead. Soon, however, it turned out that his oracle had been fulfilled in an underground passage in Jerusalem, also called Strato's Tower.

The parallel narrative in Ant. 13.311–313 follows closely that of BJ 1.78–80. It is a reworking with some variation in grammatical forms and vocabulary. The major difference is the addition in 13.311 which specifies that the disciples of Judas received instruction in foretelling the future. The comparison between BJ 1–2 and Ant. 13–14, which have parallel content, proves that the later work is a revision of the former. The story of Judas in the *Antiquities* is another example of the Josephan technique of selfparaphrase[12].

It has been suggested[13] that the narrative was modelled on the story of death of Cambyses[14] found in Herodotus' *History of the Persian Wars* 3.64[15]. The plots are

[8] R. Marcus, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Books IX–XI*, LCL 326, London 1995 (1937[1]), viii.

[9] R. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus. Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen*, Kampen 1993, 14.

[10] A son of John Hyrcanus I (135–104), the brother of Aristobulus I (104–103); cf. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, I, ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, Edinburgh 1993 (1973[1]), 200–218.

[11] By Herod the Great; BJ 1.408, 414; Ant. 15.331, 340.

[12] S.J.D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome. His Vita and Development as a Historian*, CSCT 8, Leiden 1979, 65.

[13] I. Lévy, *Recherches esséniennes et pythagoriciennes*, Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain 1, Genève – Paris 1965, 60.

[14] A son and successor of Cyrus the Great on the Persian throne (550–530).

[15] Text and translation by A.D. Godley, *Herodotus. II. Books III and IV*, LCL 118, Cambridge 1971–1982.

strikingly similar. Herodotus tells how the king received news of the revolt of Pseudo-Smerdis[16], while stationed with his army in Syria, at a place with the same name as the capital of the empire, Agbatana. Vexed by the news, he wounded himself accidentaly with his own sword. When he realized the wound was deadly, he inquired the name of the place, having been told earlier by the oracle at Buto[17] that his end would be in „Agbatana"; at home in Media, as he supposed. The oracle proved equivocal and its true meaning became now tragically plain to him[18].

The theme exploited here by Herodotus is very frequent in Greek oracular literature. This kind of equivocal prediction of death, concerning a notorious person, fulfilled in an unexpected way, often by a homonymy, despite his avoiding the place, the man or the action advised against is called „avertissement incompris"[19]. More precisely, the oracle is misleading: equivocation brings about deception[20].

Undoubtedly, the story of Antigonus' murder makes use of this common GrecoRoman pattern. Here too is a prediction of death that is at first misunderstood because of its double meaning. The confusion likewise is due to the homonymy of places. This feature is strongly accentuated in Josephus by the word ὁμωνυμοῦν (ον) which seems to be somewhat redundant just after καὶ αὐτὸ...ἐκαλεῖτο (BJ 1.80; Ant. 13.313). As in Herodotus, the fatal place is not mentioned elsewhere, nor known by other sources — a mark of literary fiction[21]. We have therefore to do with an anecdote which exhibits the typical features of Hellenistic pseudohistory; its authenticity must be questionable[22]. The literary form of the anecdote, it has been pointed out, follows the scheme of paradoxography[23].

This leads us to the problem of sources. Since G. Hölscher's exposition[24] the dominat opinion has been that Josephus follows in BJ 1.31–2.116 the work of a non-Jew, Nicolaus of Damascus, Herod's orator and biographer, entitled *Universal History*, now lost and known only through some citations by ancient authors, Josephus among them[25]. S. Schwartz hesitates to include here BJ 1.39–49 but admits Nicolaus as a major source from Ant. 13.225 to 17.320 (338)[26]. Bergmeier

[16] Smerdis is a name Herodotus gives Cambyses' brother called elsewhere Bardiya; *Hdt.* 3.30.

[17] An Egyptian city in the northwest delta where there was an oracle of Latona of the highest repute; *Hdt.* 2.83, 152.

[18] Josephus cannot directly depend on Herodotus since he gives a different place for the death of Cambyses, namely Damascus (Ant. 11.31).

[19] R. Crahay, *La littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote*, Paris 1956, 50. He gives several other examples of the motif.

[20] J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses*, Berkeley 1978, 59–69. He prefers for the theme the name „Jerusalem chamber motif" after a well-known example of it from Shakespeare's *Henry IV*. Among other examples BJ 1.78–80 is reported.

[21] Crahay, 217.

[22] Lévy, 60; J.D.E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Grand Rapids 1983, 144–145. The former calls the story „une fable", it would not be earlier than the reign of Herod the Great; the latter ascribes to it a category of „oracle story".

[23] Bergmeier, 17.

[24] G. Hölscher, «Josephus», PRE IX, 1944–1949.

[25] Ant. 12.126; 14.9, 68; 16.183–186; cf. Thackeray, xxii–xxiii; Schürer, I, 28–30; O. Michel, O. Bauernfeind, *Flavius Josephus. De bello judaico. Der jüdische Krieg*. I. Buch I–III, München 1962², XXV.

[26] S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaean Politics*, CSCT 18, Leiden 1990, 48.

moves the end of this source to BJ 2.117[27]. It seems very probable that Judas' anecdote was already contained in the work by Nicolaus. The supposition is in conformity with the fact that among Nicolaus' writings one is of a paradoxographic nature[28].

The addition about instruction in foretelling the future (Ant. 13.311) is a later development and might have been a redactional move of Josephus. Since in the *Antiquities* the description of the Essenes occurs in two separate sections (13.171–173; 18.11–22) and lacks any mention of their prophetic practice, this detail, corresponding to BJ 2.159, appears to have been intentionally transferred from the original context (Jewish „philosophical schools") into a new one. The *three-schools* section (BJ 2.119–166) depends on a source different from Nicolaus[29], as does the mention of prediction teaching by Judas. Moreover, the infallibility of Judas in his predictions (BJ 1.78; Ant. 13.311) is a typical qualification of true prophets like Moses (Ant. 2.293; 3.16), Samuel (Ant. 5.351), Isaiah (Ant. 10.35) and, on the other hand, of the Essenes (BJ 2.159). One may assume that the concern here, perhaps the language too to some degree, is Josephan.

This conclusion allows us to appreciate the compositional work of Josephus and discover other structures of the anecdote. As noticed above, there is an emphasis on the infallibility of the seer. He is introduced as one of the Essenes but without explaining who they are. That is unusual for the author when the subject is being mentioned for the first time[30]. This and the form of the word ἐσσαῖος (BJ 1.78) being different from ἐσσηνοί in BJ 2 shows dependence on a source. On the other hand, the notice that Judas never failed in his predictions follows immediately, although the reader was not told before that the Essene was a seer. Syntactically, it is a digression and its asyndetic construction is even awkward. Therefore it might be ascribed to Josephus, especially as he himself seeks to improve the problem of style — due to his own insertion — by changing the relative ὅς (BJ 1.78) into demonstrative οὗτος (Ant. 13.311). The decisive argument, however, is provided by the frequency of the infallibility-statements in Josephus' works. The first one in chronological order concerns Judas the Essene in BJ 1.78 (οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε πταίσας ἢ ψευσθεὶς ἐν τοῖς προαπαγγέλμασιν), to which corresponds Ant. 13.311 (οὐδέποτε δ' ἐν οἷς προεῖπεν διαψευσάμενον τἀληθές). In the *War* it is not merely affirmed that he never failed but also that he did not prove false. If the passive participle ψευσθείς does not simply repeat the notion of πταίσας, *to be mistaken* and we think it does not — the idea of Judas' truthfulness must be present. This is explicit in the *Antiquities* where the middle deponent διαψευσάμενον has an active force (τἀληθές is a direct object) and more intensive meaning (δια-): „he never belied (or falsified) the truth". The formula in the *War* is very similar to what the author says about the predictive powers of the Essenes in BJ 2.159 (σπάνιον δ' εἴ ποτε ἐν ταῖς προαγορεύσεσιν ἀστοχοῦσιν)[31]. Its counterpart in the

[27] Bergmeier, 18.

[28] Bergmeier, 18; Schürer, I, 31–32.

[29] Michel, Bauernfeind, I, XXVII; Bergmeier, 22.

[30] Bergmeier, 13.

[31] For L.H. Feldman, «Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus», *JTS* 41(1990) 401, the possibility of error distinguishes the Essenes from the true prophets. The meaning of the formula is, nevertheless, univocal: Josephus suggests that the Essenes never erred.

Antiquities recalls two statements on the prophetic charisma of Moses: μηδὲν ὧν προεῖπεν αὐτοῖς ψευσάμενον (Ant. 2.293); μηδὲν αὐτοὺς διαψευσάμενον περὶ ὧν εἶποι (Ant. 3.16). In the latter, διαψευσάμενον — as in Ant. 13.311 — has an active force (αὐτοὺς is a direct object) and the meaning *to deceive (utterly)* is probable[32]. Another similar statement is found in Ant. 10.35 about Isaiah: ὁμολογουμένως καὶ θαυμάσιος τὴν ἀλήθειαν, πεποιθὼς τῷ μηδὲν ὅλως ψευδὲς εἰπεῖν. The prophet is here acknowledged to have both a marvellous possession of truth and never to have uttered any falsehood. Finally, the notice about Samuel's prophecies may be added: πάντων ὧν προεφήτευσεν ἀληθινῶν βλεπομένων (Ant. 5.351). A rather vague Hebrew expression וְלֹא־הִפִּיל מִכָּל־דְּבָרָיו אַרְצָה וַיהוָה הָיָה עִמּוֹ (1 Sam 3,19; LXX renders it quite literally) was interpreted by Josephus in a way that demonstrates his special interest in accrediting the Jewish prophets with infallibility.

Two observations of importance are possible at this point. First, Judas (and all Essenes) shares with the biblical prophets the attribute of an unfailing future prediction. Secondly, just like them he is truthful, that is, he never pronounces falsehood. The opposition to the biblical false prophets may be suggested here, as we will see following the path of ψευδ-lexemes in the anecdote. These results enable us to glimpse the main features of the anecdote's structure. Found in a non-Jewish source and based on a typical Hellenistic scheme, it nevertheless was provided by Josephus with OT traditions. Furthermore, the parallelism between the biblical prophets on the one hand and Judas and the Essenes on the other reveals a literary purpose of the author, to which the story may be subordinated. Therefore its setting in the larger context of Josephan work with his rhetoric must be taken into consideration.

1.3. Some semantic remarks

1.3.1. The opening formula — a key to Josephus' rhetoric

The story starts with a fixed expression θαυμάσαι δ' ἄν τις ἐν τούτῳ, quite frequent in Josephus. The next instance in BJ is 3.70: κἀν τούτῳ μὲν οὖν θαυμάσαι τις ἄν. As in 1.78 the expression interrupts the narrative to supply some extraordinary details. There is a particular literary purpose behind the description of the Roman military procedures stated explicitly at the end and conforming to a major intent of the work: to demonstrate the futility of revolt against Rome (BJ 3.108–109; cf. the pivotal speech of the king Agrippa, 2.357–387). The object of the suggested admiration here is the circumspection (τὸ προμηθές) of the Roman army. The προμηθ-lexemes with the meaning *to be cautious, to act with foresight* (BJ 1.500, 539, Ant. 14.364; 17.33; 19.91) or *to take heed, hold in consideration* (Ant. 17.316; 18.172, 236, 284, 360) occur in the context of warfare also in BJ 1.374, Ant. 14.475; 19.153. Elsewhere, ἡ προμήθεια is an attribute of God (Ant. 4.186) with reference to the Jewish people (18.286). A cognate word is used to describe predictive abilities of the Pharisees (προμηθεῖς, Ant. 17.41, cf.

[32] Cf. the entry in LSJ. Thackeray (LCL) assumes the medial meaning, „he had never proved false to them" but Whiston's „he never deceived them" is to be preferred.

17.43). In Ant. 18.218 (gen. sing.) it refers to the emperor Tiberius' addiction to augury. Foreknowledge of the future is next set in relationship to God's providence (προμηθεία) in Ant. 17.354 f. In this passage, added by Josephus at the end of the original account (BJ 2.113–116), he justifies the concern for future-revealing dreams (Archelaus and Glaphyra) and the skill of their interpretation (Simon the Essene) in his history writing. Such incredible stories[33], he affirms, provide instances of God's providence. Josephus' admiration for τὸ προμηθές of the Roman military may have therefore something to do with his fascination[34] with the possibility of foreseeing the future. That is what he admires — θαυμάσειεν ἄν τις, a similar introductory formula — in the military brilliance of Judah Maccabaeus: he foresaw (συνῆκεν[35]) that two of his commanders, Joseph and Azariah, would be defeated if they disobeyed his instructions (Ant. 12.352). Josephus' own rhetoric is to be seen here for he departs at this point from the account of his source which gives a different explanation to the incident (1 Macc 5,55–64). The same concern turns up further in the *War*. What should excite the astonishment of the reader (θαυμάσαι δ'ἄν τις ἐν αὐτῇ) is Destiny or Fate (εἱμαρμένη) with its accuracy in determining the events (6.268). Behind the language meant for the Greek audience it is easy to recognize the action of God intended by Josephus. In BJ 6.250, which is referred to in 6.268, the day of destruction of the Jerusalem Temple decreed by fate (ἡ εἱμαρμένη...ἡμέρα), follows God's verdict of condemnation. Similarly, God's condemnation of the besieged Jews precedes their destiny (εἱμαρμένη, BJ 6.108). It is God himself who blots out the city through the agency of the Romans (6.110)[36]. This comes in a speech of Josephus to the tyrant John that reveals his actual view. It is important to notice that the fate of Jerusalem is accomplished in accordance with the writings of the ancient prophets and with a certain oracle (6.109). Fortune, related to the idea of fate, is also found as an object of wonder: ἐν οὐδενὶ θαυμάσαι τὴν τύχην οὕτως ὡς (BJ 4.238). The astonishing thing is here that fortune cooperates with the wicked and this in an incredible manner (τὰ παράδοξα). Unexpected twists of fortune are frequently reported by Josephus. ἡ τύχη hinders a Roman soldier, Sabinus, from his extraordinary (παράδοξα) achievement (BJ 6.63). The other, Julianus, does not escape fate (εἱμαρμένη) after a marvellous (θαυμασιώτερον) fight (BJ 6.85). Josephus recounts with delight incredible and marvellous events and phenomena. His admiration is attracted (θαύματος ἄξιον) by a self-reproducing glassy sand (BJ 2.190–191), a huge rue (BJ 7.178–179) and an odd dangerous plant of the same name (BJ 7.180–185). He marvels still more

[33] On the ground of the statements ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀλλότρια νομίσας αὐτὰ τῷδε τῷ λόγῳ εἶναι and ὅτῳ δὲ ἀπιστεῖται τὰ τοιάδε (Ant. 17.354) Bergmeier, 17 rates the account among „Reminiszenzen an paradoxographische Zusammenhänge" in Josephus.

[34] H. Burgmann, «Wer war der „Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit"?», *RdQ* 10/40(1981) 555.

[35] Feldman, «Josephus' Portrayal of the Hasmoneans Compared with 1 Maccabees», in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period. Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*, ed. F. Parente, J. Sievers, StPB 41, Leiden 1994, 59 n. 19, argues that „this is not an instance of prophecy but rather of insight based upon knowledge". The word θαυμάσειεν, however, suggests that Judah's foresight was something extraordinary.

[36] In Josephus' numerous discourses on fate God's providence stands often in apposition to εἱμαρμένη (BJ 2.163, 4.622). The latter makes up sometimes for the Greek equivalent of the former (Ant. 13.172; 18.13); cf. the respective notes of Marcus and Feldman on the passages in LCL).

(μᾶλλόν τις θαυμάσειε) at two curious springs near Machaerus (BJ 7.187–189). Describing the peculiar characteristic (θαυμαστὴν ἰδιότητα) of the „Sabbath river" which flows just one day a week he justifies again the presence of such accounts in his work (BJ 7.96–99). All this shows Josephus' familiarity with the literary genre of paradoxography and constitutes an important device in his rhetoric.

The parallel passage on Judas the Essene in the *Antiquities* has essentially the same opening formula: μάλιστα δ'ἄν τις θαυμάσειεν (13.311). The Eolic optative — prevalent in Ant. — replaced that in -σαι which is more common in BJ[37]. μάλιστα amplifies the rhetorical effect. An almost identical fixed expression introduces the passage on the fulfilment of Daniel's visions: μάλιστ'ἄν θαυμάσαι τις (Ant. 10.266). The extraordinary character of the reported matters is then underlined by the word παραδόξως. In the concluding polemic against the Epicureans, Daniel's prophetic gift serves as a proof of God's providence (πρόνοια, 10.278). Notice that Daniel is put by Josephus on a par with other OT prophets (καθάπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι προφῆται, 10.267; cf. 10.268), the title προφήτης being reserved in his works almost exclusively for them[38], and that he predicted future events on the basis of revelations received from God („God revealed them to him", 10.277), by speaking with God (10.267) or by visions (10.270). The discourse on Daniel's prophecies is closed by a „non-commitment formula"[39] that pretends a neutral attitude to the miraculous (10.281). The same statement sums up the passage through the Red Sea (Ant. 2.347 f). The usual elements of a wonder narrative are found: reaction of astonishment (θαυμάσῃ δὲ μηδεὶς) and the extraordinary nature (τὸ παράδοξον) of an occurrence. Remarkable is that it was the innocence of crime of the ancients (2.347) that favoured the miracle which was due to God's providence (πρόνοια, 2.349). Different aspects of life of the Jewish community are objects of astonishment or admiration introduced by the formula in question: hatred for Jews (θαυμάσειε δ'ἄν τις, Ant. 3.179), wealth of their temple (θαυμάσῃ δὲ μηδείς, Ant. 14.110), faithfulness to the laws (πάντας ἂν οἶμαι θαυμάσαι, CAp 2.221)[40]. Throughout Josephus' history of his nation events and personalities recur which are classified as miraculous or incredible (παραδοξ-lexemes[41]), often in the context of foretelling the future. Thus,

---

[37] The alternation of optatives in -σαι: BJ 1.78; 3.70; 6.268, Ant. 10.266 and in -σειε(ν): BJ 7. 187; Ant. 3.179; 12.352; 13.311; 14.367; 17.82 may indicate different secretaries; on the hypothesis of Greek assistants, cf. Thackeray, *Josephus. The Man and Historian*, New York 1929, 101–124.

[38] The problem will be discussed further.

[39] Cf. Thackeray's note to Ant. 1.108 in LCL.

[40] The other instances of the formula concern: Phasael's courage (δ'ἄν τις θαυμάσειε, Ant. 14.367); no particularly marvellous objects (θαυμάσειε δ'ἄν τις, Ant. 17.82; μὴ θαυμάσῃ τις, Vita 339).

[41] For example, Ant. 2.291 (Joseph of Egypt); 2.216, 223, 267, 285 (Moses); 2.295 (the plagues); 3.31, 38 (the miracles in the desert); 6.291 (David); 8.130 (Solomon's palace); 9.14 (Jehoshaphat's victory over the Ammonites); 9.60 (the actions of Elisha against Syrians); 10.14 (the cure of Hezekiah). As shown above, these words occur often together with those of θαυμ-group; cf. also Ant. 6. 290 (ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῆς σωτερίας θαυμάσας), 8.130 (θαυμαστῆς ἐργασίας καὶ παραδόξου), 9.60 (θαυμάσας ὁ Ἄδερ τὸ παράδοξον), 9.182 (θαυμαστὰ γὰρ καὶ παράδοξα); the last two instances refer to the prophetic power of Elisha. With this respect, Feldman, «Prophets», 395 n. 45 observes that the description of Jesus in the *Testimonium Flavianum* is modelled on Elisha (παραδόξων, Ant. 18.63; θαυμάσια, 18.64).

an extraordinary (παράδοξον) story is told about John Hyrcanus communicating with God in the Temple about the battle success of his sons (Ant. 13.282 f), Aristobulus and Antigonus whose subsequent conflict became the background of our anecdote. The fulfilled prophecy of an Essene, Menahem, to Herod may seem incredible (παράδοξα, Ant. 15.379) to the readers — Josephus states in a typical way for the paradoxographic genre — nevertheless, he found such report „not out of place in a work of history" (Ant. 15.372). A relevant point in this passage is that foreknowledge of the future both of Menahem and the Essenes in general is connected with their virtue (καλοκαγαθία, Ant. 15.372, 379). This connection may be seen at the example of the biblical prophet who, according to Josephus, had to be most virtuous (ἄριστον, Ant. 8.243) both in his speech and in his very person (8.244)[42]. Finally, we find a slightly varied form of the discussed formula, ἄξιον ...θαυμάσαι (Ant. 18.20) refering to unequalled virtues (ἀρετή) of the Essenes in the main text dedicated to them in the *Antiquities*. In the *War* it is the common ownership of property among the Essenes that deserves the qualification „admirable" (θαυμάσιον, BJ 1.122).

To sum up, the phrase that opens our text defines its primarily rhetorical function. The formula belongs to the repertory of the paradoxography. It interrupts the course of a narrative in order to provide extraordinary information. Indeed the story of Antigonus' death is completed in BJ 1.77. A moral reflection on the disruptive power of calumny and envy marks its definite end. Before the seer enters the stage nothing is concealed from the reader, even the ambiguous name of the crime spot. The main character in the drama is no longer Antigonus but Judas with his marvellous ability. Once the incident of the prediction is culminated, the Essene disappears from the account and the main story resumes (1.81). The formula, with variations, labels numerous spheres of miraculous or unusual nature which Josephus reports on enthusiastically. Occupying a prominent place among them are factors that determine the future (destiny, fortune, God's providence) and possibilities of predicting it, OT prophecy and contemporary Jewish practices alike. As for the latter, the Essenes appear to possess the skill par excellence, which results from their high moral standards. The way of presenting Judas in the *Antiquities* resembles that of Daniel, one of the ancient prophets. The same literary genre connects our text with two other accounts of the Essene seers (Simon, Menahem).

1.3.2. Ἐσσαῖος ἦν γένος: the problem of the Essenes' name

The opening moves the focus of attention to Judas. He himself, his conduct, is the object of suggested astonishment. Josephus introduces him with the words ἐσσαῖος ἦν γένος (BJ 1.78; Ant. 13.311: ἐσσηνὸν μὲν τὸ γένος). Such a syntagmatic unit usually indicates the origin of a person by nation, tribe, family or place[43].

[42] Feldman, 395.

[43] γένος δ'ἦν Ἰδουμαῖος (BJ 1.123, cf. 1.513, 577; 2.101); Γερασηνὸς τὸ γένος (BJ 4.503), γένος ἦν ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων (BJ 1.432); γένος ἐκ τῶν ἱερέων (BJ 4.225–226). Cf. Cohen, 'ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΣ ΤΟ ΓΕΝΟΣ and Related Expressions in Josephus», in Parente–Sievers, 29–30.

The other Essene seer, Simon, is introduced in that way: τις ἐσσαῖος τὸ γένος (BJ 2.113; Ant. 17.346: ἀνὴρ γένος ἐσσαῖος). In the preliminaries to Menahem's prophecy the term γένος is applied to the Essenes in general (Ant. 15.371). Again, the Essenes are called γένος in Ant. 13.172. Yet, they were not a clan or population, and neither the Zealots or the Sadducees were, despite being classified as γένος (BJ 7.268; Ant. 13.297). Outside the domain of kinship Josephus employs the term relatively often for diviners in their various sorts[44]. It seems therefore that also in our text it designates the membership of a class or group rather than descent[45]. In the case of Judas the name of his group is attested in two different forms: in the *War* it is ἐσσαῖος („Essaean"), in the *Antiquities* — ἐσσηνόν („Essene"), not without serious textual hesitations. Both forms occur throughout BJ and Ant.; Vita 10 has the latter just once, CAp does not mention the Essenes. This inconsistency remains unexplained till Ant. 15.371 f. when Josephus makes clear that ἐσσαῖοι is what the Essenes are called by Jews. It is the only instance of the form in plural[46]. Otherwise, this name refers to individual Essenes: Judas (BJ 1.78) and Simon (BJ 2.113 par. Ant. 17.346) the seers, John a general during the war against Romans (BJ 2.567, 3.11), with the exception of Menahem who is introduced only with the other name form as τις τῶν ἐσσηνῶν (Ant. 15.373). In the latter case, however, the choice of form was clearly imposed by Josephus' intent to resolve the problem of diversity of names. For that purpose he had to give up the syntagm (μὲν τὸ) γένος, a constant element at the presentation of all other individual Essenes, since the name ἐσσηνοί seemed to be unsuitable — probably due to its „Greek" form as opposed to the „Jewish" one (Ant. 15.371) — in such connection. In fact, this second form is found in all the descriptions of the Essenes as a whole and always in the plural (BJ 2.119, 158, 160, Ant. 13.171, 172, 298, 15.372, 378, 18.11, 18, Vita 10); likewise in the name of a gate of the Essenes in Jerusalem (BJ 5.145)[47]. The only singular is Ant. 13.311 that substituted ἐσσαῖος from BJ 1.78, apparently with the intent of

[44] „ventriloquists" (Ant. 6.630), „diviners" (Ant. 6.331), „Magi and Chaldaeans", interpreters of signs and dreams (Ant. 10.234).

[45] Bergmeier, 14 n. 12, however, points out that „die Essäer dann so etwas wie ein Sehergeschlecht darstellten". Judas and Simon, the „Essaeans", would have been introduced by Josephus as wandering seers.

[46] The form ἐσσαῖοι (always in plural) is that preferred by Philo: *Quod Omn.* 75; 91, *Vita Cont.* 1 (*Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, VI, ed. L. Cohn, J. Reiter, Berlin 1915), *Apol.* 11.1, 3, 14 as quoted by Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* VIII 11 (*Eusebius Werke*, VIII. *Die Praeparatio evangelica*, ed. K. Mras, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 43.1–2, Berlin 1954–1956) and by Hegesippus, *Hypomnemata*, as quoted in Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* IV 22 (*Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, I–III, ed. G. Bardy, Sources chretiennes 31. 41. 55, Paris 1952, 1955, 1958). The form was adopted also by Porphyry, *De abstinentia* 4.11–13 (*Porphyrii philosophi Platonici opuscula selecta*, ed. A. Nauck, Hildesheim 1963²), although he simply cites BJ 2.119–159 (with few omissions), where Josephus writes ἐσσηνοί.

[47] The form ἐσσηνοί occurs in Dio of Prusa as preserved by Synesius of Cyrene, *Dio* 3.2 (N. Terzaghi, *Synesii Cyrenensis opuscula*, Roma 1944); in Hippolytus' *Philosophumena*, *Ref.* 9.18.2–28.2 (M. Marcovich, *Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium*, Patristische Texte und Studien 3, Berlin 1986) and in Epiphanius, *Anc.* 12.9, *Haer.* 1.157, 159, 196, 203–205, 227, *Anac.* 1.166 (K. Holl, *Epiphanius. Ancoratus und Panarion*, I–III, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 25; 31; 37, Leipzig 1915–33). Epiphanius confuses ἐσσηνοί with a Samaritan sect; for groups residing near the Dead Sea he gives several names as: ὀσιαιοί (*Haer.* 1.157, 159, 217–219, 223, 226, 227, 333, 357, 2.315) and ὀσσηνοί (*Haer.* 1.222, 336). A Latin equivalent of the form ἐσσηνοί has Pliny the Elder (*esseni*), *nat. hist.* 5.73 (K. Mayhoff, *G. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae*, I, Leipzig 1906).

standardizing the names[48]. That Josephus himself felt the form ἐσσηνός to be unusual in connection with an individual is proved by Ant. 17.346 where he kept ἐσσαῖος unchanged, after having formerly abandoned the Jewish form in favour of the Greek one. Thus, the use of both names in Josephus can be explained, first, by his dependence on sources. For the episodes with the „Essaean" seers he took the information from the work of Nicolaus of Damascus while for the general description of the Essene sect he drew from another source. Second, he retained the native form for the individuals because it was more appropriate as a part of the personal name, which is a fixed appellative (cf. „John the Essaean", BJ 2.567, 3.11). Given the fact that most of the informations of Philo in his passages regarding ἐσσαῖοι are confirmed by Josephus, who nonetheless reads ἐσσηνοί, the difference between the „Essaean" seers and the Essenes in the *War* should not be stressed. The discrepancy between the name forms of the sect in Greek was probably caused by its Semitic origin which is assumed by most scholars. Josephus and Philo could have attempted to render in Greek the same text[49] as they elucidated the name in a similar manner. After the term „Essenes" both have a phrase with an abstract noun, respectively σεμνότης (BJ 1.119) and ὁσιότης (*Quod Omn.* 75). There is a similar vocabulary: δοκεῖ (BJ) — δόξαν (*Quod Omn.*). The nouns can function in the same semantic domain of moral and ethical qualities[50] and express aspects of personal piety, „holiness" or „sanctity"[51]. Hence, the same underlying Semitic term is possible. Since in Hellenistic Greek the endings -ηνοι/-αιοι were used indiscriminately[52] the difference of form between BJ and *Quod Omn.* does not exclude a unique Semitic form. If this had been the Aramaic חסין/חסיא (emphatic/absolute state), „the pious", the equivalent of the Hebrew חסידים[53], Philo's ὁσιότης would not have been a mere pun: LXX translates חסידים usually as ὅσιοι[54]. Josephus' preference for the form ἐσσηνοί, which he considered to be Greek in contrast to the Jewish ἐσσαῖοι, can be explained by his concern to make his people's culture comprehensible and acceptable for the Greco-Roman audience he addressed in the „idealizing portrayals"[55] of the Jewish „philosophical schools".

---

[48] According to Bergmeier, 13, in the *Antiquities* Josephus inserted a general *three-schools* text, Ant. 13.171–173 (298), before the account of Judas to create a link between the Essenes — ἐσσηνοί and the seer, an „Essaean" — ἐσσαῖος.

[49] A common source behind the texts of Philo and Josephus was suggested by W.R. Farmer, «Essenes», IDB II, 144. Michel–Bauernfeind, XXVII n. 32, allow for a possibility that the source was Semitic.

[50] J.P. Louw, E.A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* I, New York 1988², § 88.24 and 46: ὁσιότης — „holiness, divine quality"; σεμνότης — „propriety, befitting behaviour".

[51] BAGD: ὁσιότης — *piety, holiness* of life; σεμνότης — *dignity, holiness*. The adjectives σεμνός and ὅσιος „are only secondary designations of the conception of holiness"; «grave (Adjective)», in W.E. Vine, *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, I–IV, London 1948.

[52] Schürer, II, 559 n. 6.

[53] J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, London 1959, 80 n. 1; É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la résurrection des morts: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle*, Eb N.S. 22, Paris 1993, I, 21.

[54] Mi 7,2; Ps 30,5; 50,5; 79,2; 116,15; 132,9.16; 145,10; 148,14, etc. In *Quod Omn.* 91 Philo actually takes ὅσιοι for a synonym of ἐσσαῖοι. A serious objection to this hypothesis, however, is the lack of evidence for the use of חסי in the sense of חסיד in Jewish Aramaic (cf. Schürer, I, 559).

[55] S. Mason, *Josephus and te New Testament*, Peabody 1993², 132.

2. JUDAS AND ANTIGONUS, THE ESSENES AND THE HASMONAEANS

As noticed above, the main character of the story is Judas. The account begins with an introductory note on the seer and concludes with a final remark about him. Antigonus plays a secondary role. No mention is made of the oracle being delivered to him[56], nor of his reaction to the fulfilment of his fate. On the latter point Josephus; anecdote differs from the „Jerusalem chamber motif", where the disclosure of the true meaning of a misleading oracle involves its addressee. In BJ/Ant. it is the seer who experiences the drama because he has misunderstood his own prediction. He desires to be dead as he thinks his prediction has proved false (BJ 1.79; Ant. 13.312). His attitude to Antigonus is quite indifferent. Judas shows neither sympathy nor hostility. Betz misinterprets the text when he comments on it as a sign of a conflict between the Essenes and the Hasmonaeans. In his opinion, Antigonus has desecrated the temple by entering it on his return from a campaign, in the garments of war defiled with blood, contrary to the rules of the *War Scroll* (1QM 7,10–12; 9,7f). As an associate of his reigning brother Aristobulus, he shared responsibility for his offences and would have been condemned together with him by the pious Essenes who opposed uniting high priesthood with kingship for reasons of purity (CD 4,13–5,15; 6,12–7,6)[57]. Even though the opposition between the Qumran community and the Hasmonaean priest-rulers may be taken for granted, resulting from the Dead Sea Scrolls evidence[58], Josephus' text does not support the above deductions. According to BJ 1.71–72 the death of Antigonus was a retribution (ἡ ποινή[59]) that came indirectly on Aristobulus for his cruelty towards his relatives: he imprisoned his other brothers as well as his mother and caused her to die of starvation. The parallel Ant. 13.303 enumerates the same crimes but leaves out the mention of retribution. In both versions Antigonus is depicted as a victim of the calumnies of the plotting courtiers (BJ 1.74, 76; Ant. 13.305 f, 308 f.) and not as a culprit. Josephus, otherwise very concerned with the purity of the Temple[60], does not object in any way to the appearance of Antigonus at the festival of Tabernacles. In τὸ πλέον, *earnestly* (LCL; lit. *to a greater degree*, LSJ), his approval for Antigonus' piety can be heard (BJ 1.73). The Hasmonaean is „adorned" (κεκοσμημένον, BJ 1.73; Ant. 13.304), not armed. He does not hold the priestly office but simply prays (εὔχεσθαι, Ant. 13.305; BJ 1.73: προσκυνῆσαι) for his sick brother. This vocabulary refers to the actions of common worshippers who came up to the Temple (προσκυνέω, Sir 50,17.21; προσευχή, Sir 50,19)[61]. There are heavy-armed soldiers around Antigonus but it is not said that he entered the Temple in this manner. The text reads that he just went up; εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν is not found in BJ 1, it was added later in Ant. 13.304. Besides, τὸ ἱερόν is in Josephus a general

[56] R. Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine. The Evidence from Josephus*, Oxford 1993, 94.

[57] O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, WUNT 3.6, Tübingen 1960, 101–102. Similarly, according to Aune, 144, the prediction reflects antipathy between both parties.

[58] Schürer, II, 597.

[59] Thackeray's reading (LCL). AM, accepted by Niese, read τίσις, *vengeance*.

[60] E.g. BJ 4.150–151, 163, 183, 262; 5.402, 414.

[61] Cf. S. Safrai, «The Temple», in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Cultural and Religious Life and Institution* II, ed. S. Safrai, M. Stern, Assen 1976, 877.

term used with reference to the whole complex of the pre-Herodian Temple (BJ 1.118, 143 f., 251, 253). In the Hasmonaean period Josephus distinguishes between τὸ ἱερόν and the temple proper, ὁ ναός (BJ 1.39, 149, 354). Within the Temple at that time there was an area for public meetings that could contain crowds of people (BJ 1.122). This corresponds to the basic division of the Herodian Temple into outer and inner (priestly) courts[62]. Such division is attested in the Maccabaean era, as will be shown below. Antigonus, then, is to be seen in the non-priestly area of the Temple that was of a lower degree of purity (cf. BJ 1.26). What his adversaries at the palace used as a pretext for accusations was the pomp of his arrival that along with the presence of troops would have menaced the authority of the king. The text is silent on the relationship between Judas and Antigonus or between the Essenes and the Hasmonaeans in general, and this is intentional: the figure of the seer and his extraordinary skill alone come to the fore.

Actually, Josephus does report religious conflicts between the Jews and their Hasmonaean leaders. John Hyrcanus was exhorted by a Pharisee, Eleazar, to give up his high priesthood and to confine himself to political rule (Ant. 13.292 f, no parallel in BJ). The opposition to Alexander Jannaeus as high priest brought about an open rebellion of the people when he attempted to perform sacrifices during the feast of Tabernacles (Ant. 13.372 f, the circumstances of the protest are lacking in the parallel BJ 1.88)[63]. The matter under dispute was the legitimacy of the high priesthood of both Hasmonaeans. On the basis of levitical regulations (Lev 21,14) their genealogical qualification for the office[64] was contested as their mothers have been allegedly kept captives for a time (Hyrcanus: Ant. 13.292; Jannaeus: Ant. 13. 372). Moreover, Hyrcanus' discriminatory attitude toward Jannaeus (Ant. 13.321 f) arouses suspicion that he was not his legitimate son[65]. The recurrent source of difficulties between the Hasmonaean dynasty and its critics was then its questionable priestly descent (non-Zadokite)[66], perhaps already reflected in the break between Judas Maccabaeus and the Hasideans (1 Macc 7,13).

Betz' contentions should be rejected for still other reasons. Since there is no proof that Josephus knew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, filling in his meaning by the use of documents external to his writings is not justified. Besides, the simple equation of Essenes, especially of those appearing in Jerusalem, with Qumran sectarians has become more and more doubtful in modern scholarship[67].

Returning to the position of Judas in the narrative, the lack of connection with other public figures gives the impression that his predictive activity was limited to

---

[62] Cf. G. Schrenk, «ἱερός», TDNT III, 234.

[63] It has been suggested that in both instances the problem historically concerned Alexander Jannaeus, not John Hyrcanus; cf. Marcus' note *a* to Ant. 13.288 in LCL and É. Nodet, *Flavius Josèphe. Baptême et résurrection*, Paris 1999, 171). Indeed, the monarchy was not reestablished until Aristobulus, the successor of Hyrcanus (BJ 1.70; Ant. 13.301) or only during the rule of Jannaeus, according to Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.40 (A. Meineke, *Strabonis geographica*, I–III, Graz 1969²). But Strabo could have overlooked the short one year reign of Aristobulus; Schürer, I, 217 n. 5. In any case the functions of king and high priest are not yet clearly distinct at that time; cf. Nodet, 169.

[64] Cf. Marcus' note to Ant. 13.292 (LCL).

[65] Nodet, 178.

[66] Nodet, 177–178.

[67] Mason, review of Gray's book cited above, *JBL* 114 (1995) 311.

the circle of his associates. It does not mean, however, that he was „an outsider politically"[68]. His oracle did concern the political sphere at the highest level. The king's partner in power and the king himself in the person of his brother (cf. BJ 1.72) were affected. The political pertinence of the oracle was just one reason for Josephus to include this story in his history. One can infer it from the editorial comment to a similar story, in which another Essene seer, Simon, displays the skill of disclosing the future. The author explains that it is primarily the involvement of „the royal persons" in the event that makes him deal with such „incredible" stories (Ant. 17.354)[69]. If, then, Judas appears surrounded by the pupils (τῶν μανθανόντων, BJ 1.78) rather than by prominent people, it does not determine his political connections but, rather, places the phenomenon of prediction in the foreground. The Essene intervenes with his oracle at a crisis in Jewish history. In the preceding context Josephus praises the long and successful reign of John Hyrcanus (BJ 1.68 f; Ant. 13.299 f). A particular sign of his prosperity is the gift of prophecy that enabled him to foresee and predict the downfall of his two sons; it is at this point that the theme of foreknowledge of the future is first introduced. Josephus stresses how far Hyrcanus' sons fell short of their father's happiness. Now, with his death, the Hasmonaean dynasty, after having reached the summit of splendour, began to decline gradually until it lost the royal power that passed to Herod, a half-Jew „from a house of common people" (Ant. 14.491).

3. JUDAS AS TEACHER

Judas is said to have exclaimed his distress πρὸς τοὺς γνωρίμους (BJ 1.78). Since the Greek term is in the context juxtaposed with μανθανόντων, a more specialized meaning than Thackeray's „acquaintances" in the LCL translation is to be supposed. Josephus employs the substantive γνώριμος in its wide range of meaning[70] and in BJ 4.460 it means obviously *disciple* as referred to Elisha in relationship to Elijah. γνωρίμους in BJ 1.649 refers apparently to the disciples of two doctors (σοφισταί), Judas and Matthias, whose lectures on the laws attracted a large audience. It may be the case also in BJ 2.433 for the rebels leader, Menahem, is called σοφιστής[71]. The use of the term in this specific sense derives

[68] Gray, 94.

[69] In that regard it is not quite without reason to speak about *the political „prophecy"* as Betz, 99, does. In the same line, J. Becker, *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth*, BS 63, Neukirchen – Vluyn 1972, 45–6, making a detailed classification, numbers Judas among the examples of *the political ad-hoc prophecy without party program*, within a larger category of *the political-national prophecy without eschatological self-image*. But Aune, 144, improving on Becker, includes Judas in the category of *the sapiential prophecy*, that is „noneschatological, not connected with the gifts inherent in the priesthood, but with the faculty of wisdom, which is the peculiar speciality of the holy man, sage or 'philosopher'". Inasmuch as a single prophetic figure is concerned, the observations can be apt. Yet such categorizations are of little use to interpret the text.

[70] *acquaintance*: BJ 2.617; *friend*: BJ 3.347, 5.290; *companion*: 2.327; *person of note*: BJ 2.178, 193, 233 etc.

[71] A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus. Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit*, Stuttgart 1929, 129–130, adds BJ 2.411 to this evidence for γνώριμος as Rabbinic disciple but it is less sure.

from the later Greek scholastic tradition. It describes the relationship between a master and his disciples (not merely pupils). Related to μαθητής as one closely bound with his master, γνώριμος expresses the disciple's independence and emphasizes fellowship with the master as well as a degree of intimacy. Both in Strabo and Philo, whose writings Josephus was acquainted with, the terms are associated with each other[72]. Thus, γνώριμοι in BJ 1.78 signifies *disciples* or *followers*. The evidence in the *War* is sufficient to say that Judas is depicted in Greek fashion as a master of a school. The image is reinforced by the remark that the students were numerous (οὐκ ὀλίγοι) and, still more, by the word παρεδρεύοντες which implies continuity and regularity of their presence beside the teacher[73]. The fact that the verb παρεδρεύω is unique to this passage within Josephus' corpus supports the specified meaning. It may point to the underlying source. These features of the account are confirmed or further developed in the parallel passage in the *Antiquities*. Along with γνώριμοι[74] Josephus mentions there additionally ἑταῖροι, *companions* of Judas (Ant. 13.311). This word, again, belonged to the ancient scholastic terminology for „a 'pupil' in the sense of the adherent of specific teachings or of a particular philosopher"[75]. While the term γνώριμοι applies to the disciples of Greek and Hellenistic philosophers „in so far as they are united with their masters in the fellowship of pursuit after knowledge, ἑταῖροι groups them as *pares* under a *primus inter pares*"[76]. This meaning is very probable in Ant. 13.311 for the ἑταῖροι are there to receive teaching (διδασκαλία)[77]. As in the *War*, there is a word that denotes a continuation in a place: παρέμενον (Ant. 13.312), a common verb in the author[78]. Instead of the generic μανθανόντων the precise object of teaching is given in the *Antiquities*, instruction in foretelling the future (13.311 f), constituting a major expansion in comparison to the *War*. As a result, a consistent picture of Judas and his companions emerges, being attested both by BJ 1, which is primarily based on a source, and by Ant. 13 which is a Josephan revision. Judas acts as head of a school; the relationship between him and the persons gathered around is described in terms of the Socratic ideal of fellowship between the teacher and his pupils. Such a situation presupposes a degree of organization in Judas' group and a community of life of its members[79]. That it was „eine ganze Prophetenschule"[80] or really „what might be called a seminar in prophecy"[81] is rather dubious. The statement in the *Antiquities* about the sort of instruction is explicit but the original μανθανόντων in the *War* has no object specified. Further, the phrase

[72] K.H. Rengstorf, «μανθάνω κτλ.», TDNT IV, 418–419.441.

[73] LSJ: *to sit constantly beside, attend constantly, be always near.*

[74] „disciples"; Marcus rightly in LCL.

[75] Rengstorf, «ἑταῖρος», TDNT II, 699–700.

[76] Rengstorf, TDNT IV, 449.

[77] On that ground Gray, 95, is decisively for the rendering „pupils" or „disciples".

[78] As absolute, παραμένω means *to remain (in place), stay (on)*; cf. BAGD, TDNT. Such usage in Josephus, e.g. BJ 5.369.

[79] Cf. Betz, 52.

[80] R. Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa. Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelien*, Darmstadt 1970, 42; Id., «προφήτης κτλ. (Prophecy and Prophets in the Judaism of the Hellenistic-Roman Period)», TDNT VI, 823.

[81] J. Blenkinsopp, «Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus», *JJS* 25 (1974), 258.

διδασκαλία...μέλλοντα (Ant. 13.311 f.) is an insertion with a clear intent to fill in the vague meaning of the previous text. As noticed at the analysis of the sources, it may be understood as a conclusion from BJ 2.159 where the Essenes' gift of prediction is connected with their being trained in holy books, purifications and apophthegms of prophets. Already there prediction of the future is implicitly presented as a skill to be learned and taught. Since this passage seems to be a redactional note by Josephus[82], the idea that the prognostic abilities of the Essenes are controllable in educational proceedings should be considered within Josephus' tendency to rationalize the miraculous[83]. Judas' teaching had probably a more general character. An interpretation of BJ 2.159, to be examined below, permits the extension of the subject of instruction from Torah[84] to prophetic writings.

The results obtained are as follows. On the literary level, the description of the seer's group in Greek scholastic terms proves to be in conformity to the introduction of the Essenes as a philosophical school (φιλοσοφία, BJ 2.119; Ant. 18.11). It follows that a link may be seen in the *War* between the accounts of the „Essaean" seer and of the Essene sect. The texts are not quite unrelated[85]. At the historical level, an organized[86] group of Essenes is apparently present in Jerusalem and their presence there does not appear to be casual.

4. JUDAS AND THE PROPHETS: LITERARY TRADITIONS BEHIND THE STORY

The first conclusion leads on to a resumption of the issue of traditions behind the passage. There are two extreme views in this respect. Betz conjectures with the help of the Qumran writings that Judas judged himself according to the rule for the false prophets from Deut 18,22 and considered his mistaken oracle an insinuation of the devil. The seer's radical engagement for truth — the truth is dead (BJ 1.79) and he is proved to be a liar (Ant. 13.312), having erred in just one prediction — should reflect the Qumran dualism of truth and lie (1QS 3,13–4,26)[87]. The prophet Elijah could be the OT model for the Essene since in BJ 1.82, like in the prophecy in 1 Kgs 21,19, the blood of the culprit is shed on the same spot where the crime was committed[88]. On the contrary, Bergmeier denies any reference either to Qumran or to the Old Testament. The viewpoint from which the story is narrated is not Jewish

[82] Bergmeier, 54–55.

[83] This tendency to explain the supernatural in logical fashion can be seen especially in Josephus' paraphrase of biblical accounts; cf. R.K. Gnuse, *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus. A Traditio-historical Analysis*, AGJU 36, Leiden 1996, 10.

[84] Cf. Betz, 52.

[85] Against Bergmeier, according to whom „Es stehen also Essäer- und Essenertexte *beziehungslos* nebeneinander" (13).

[86] Michel–Bauernfeind, 406 n. 38 regard the Essenes' organization at this stage as still loose since the authors fail to recognize the specific meaning of γνώριμοι.

[87] Betz, 100.

[88] Betz, 102. Likewise, Aune, 144.

at all. The parallelism of motives between 1 Kgs 21,19 and BJ 1.82 does not apply to Judas because it is outside the anecdote[89].

To be sure, nothing in the text recalls explicitly a doctrine of the Dead Sea Scrolls or of the Bible. This is not surprising, given the Hellenistic pattern of the text and its origin from a non-Jewish writer. As Bergmeier rightly points out, the opposition ἀληθῆ λέγειν — ψεύδεσθαι is typical for the oracular literature (Artemidorus) and has nothing to do with the Qumran dualism[90]. But Judas' exclamation that the truth has died before him since one of his predictions has been falsified (BJ 1.78) displays his particular commitment to truth, a motive that can be traced in the descriptions of the Essenes both by Josephus and Philo as well as in the writings of the Community. The question to be asked is therefore how Josephus understood the material he took over and, moreover, how he meant it in his work. As was said above, there are reasons to assume that he placed the figure of Judas against the background of biblical prophecy and, on the other hand, that there are literary links between the anecdote and the main text on the Essenes in the *War*.

As already argued, Judas shares with the canonical prophets the gift of accurate prediction. That it is not a mere similarity may be seen from the fact that for Josephus prophecy consisted primarily in prediction. In his retelling of the biblical story he took particular note of the predictions by the prophets and their fulfillment[91]. The image of the prophet that emerges from his editorial comments and additions is that of the predictor of future events. In numerous instances he applies the word προφητεία where the Bible speaks only of the prediction[92]. In the same manner the verb προφητεύω refers to the action of foretelling and is interchangeable with προ(υ)λέγω or other synonymic verbs[93]. This is relevant both to the prophets and other personages since for Josephus „a prediction is *ipso facto* a prophecy"[94]. As he states explicitly in Ant. 8.418, foreknowledge of the future (πρόγνωσις) is equivalent to prophecy (προφητεία)[95]. It is this understanding of prophecy as prediction that underlies the much-discussed passage on the prophetic gift of John Hyrcanus. „Prophecy" is there equated with „foreknowledge" (BJ 1.68–69; Ant. 13.300); „prophesied" in BJ 1.69 is paralleled by „foretold" in Ant. 13.300.

What makes Judas' prediction and those of the biblical prophets alike is first of all their exactness (cf. the respective infallibility-statements, analyzed earlier). In

[89] Bergmeier, 15.

[90] Bergmeier, 15 n. 14.

[91] Blenkinsopp, 242.

[92] Feldman, 396.

[93] E.g., προφητεύειν...περὶ τῶν μελλόντων (Ant. 6.115), of a high priest, an unscriptural addition to 1 Sam 14,19; μέλλοντα...προφητεύσαντος (Ant. 6.254), of a high priest, where the Bible, 1 Sam 22,10, has „he inquired of the Lord"; προεφήτευσε...τὰς μελλούσας (Ant. 10.106), editorial, of Ezekiel; τὰ μέλλοντα προφητεύων (Ant. 10.267), Josephus' reflection on Daniel; προφητεύσαντα καὶ προειπόντα (Ant. 8.403), of the prophet Micaiah, the latter verb is absent in the corresponding biblical passage, 1 Kgs 22,8; προλέγω and προφητεύω are used in a parallel manner in editorial comments: Ant. 8.420 (Micaiah), Ant. 9.242 (Nahum), Ant. 13.68 (Isaiah); in Ant. 10.79 the predictive activity of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel is referred to by the verbs προκηρύσσω and προθεσπίζω, in 10.141 — by προφητεύω.

[94] Feldman, 396.

[95] Cf. Feldman, 396 n. 48.

Josephus' view the essential characteristics of the biblical prophecy is that it comes true. His extra-biblical editorials concerning the canonical prophets stress strongly the accuracy and truthfulness of their predictions[96]. In this respect Hebrew and pagan prophecy prove to be for Josephus related phenomena. He makes no systematic distinction between the two points of view[97]. His concern is rather how to distinguish the genuine prophecy from pseudoprophecy and the criterion he applies is as simple as the rule in Deut 18,22: a prophet is true if what he says comes true. Josephus' emphasis on the predictive aspect of prophecy is due, at least in part, to the Deuteronomist writings[98].

Daniel, considered by Josephus a προφήτης (Ant. 10.266, 267, 268), in contrast to the biblical tradition, is the one most praised for the accuracy and faithfulness of his prophecies (Ant. 10.269) as well as for his truthfulness (ἀλήθεια, Ant. 10.268). He was even superior to the other prophets, suggests Josephus, for he did not only foretell future events, „but he also fixed the time at which these would come to pass" (Ant. 10.266). The descriptions of Daniel and Judas in the *Antiquities* contain a strikingly similar wording noticed above (cf. 10.266 with 13.311). Another feature that assimilates the Essene to Daniel is that he, too, fixed the time of his oracle's fulfilment. Judas is convinced that his prediction has failed since it cannot come true within the appointed day (σήμερον, BJ 1.79 par. Ant. 13.312[99]). It is the time, precisely foretold, that the veracity of the oracle relies on (BJ 1.80). „The time" seemed to „frustrate the oracle" because it was „already the fourth hour of the day" (BJ 1.79). Apparently, Josephus uses here the system of reckoning the hours from the beginning of daylight that was common from the middle of the 2nd century B.C. This presupposed the division of the day into twelve equal hours. Given the variation in day length, the length of an hour was different, depending on season[100]. The incident in question took place during the festival of Tabernacles (BJ 1.73; Ant. 13.304) which started on the fifteenth day of the Jewish seventh month Tishri (September–October), and lasted seven days followed by a closing eighth one (Ant. 3.244; 8.100)[101]. The date of the feast was synchronized with the autumnal equinox

[96] Feldman, 409.

[97] Feldman, 413–414.

[98] Blenkinsopp, 248.

[99] In BJ the word refers unequivocally to the time („today") foretold for the murder of Antigonus. In Ant., theoretically, the adverb may be linked with the clause περιόντα ὁρᾷ, as — it seems — Marcus in the LCL edition does, resulting in translation „and *now* he saw him alive" (it may be due, however, to the omission of σήμερον by the translator). But this translation cannot be accepted for, first, it would mean that Josephus changed the sense of BJ without any recognizable reason; second, it disturbs the logic of the text since the following remarks on the remoteness of the foreseen crime spot and the time passed as indications that the oracle would prove false (Ant. 13.312) make sense only with the presupposition that Antigonus should die on the same day. Hence, in our opinion, σήμερον should be taken as a modifier of τεθνήξεσθαι, the proper translation being: „...he saw him still alive, although he had foretold that he would die *today*...". The obsolete Whiston was here quite correct.

[100] G. Delling, «ὥρα», TDNT IX, 680. This system is used consistently in Josephus' work for the day as well as for the night; e.g., BJ 6.79, 147.

[101] In agreement with the Torah (Lev 23,36; Num 39,34) Josephus gives seven days plus one for the feast (Ant. 3.246 f), the eighth day being kept as a „closing festival" (in the Bible: , ἐξόδιον; cf. n. *h* to Ant. 3.247 and n. *a* to 8.123 in LCL). It is probable that ἐπὶ τέλει τῆς ἑορτῆς (BJ 1.73, no par.), when Antigonus appeared at the Temple, refers to this last day of the festival. Thackeray's „at the close of the ceremony" in LCL seems to miss the point; ἑορτή can hardly have two different meanings in

(Exod 34,22; Ant. 3.244); the length of an hour in this period was, then, approximately sixty minutes. Consequently, the time indicated by Judas in BJ 1.79 — the fourth hour — means the period from 10 to 11 A.M. It is, however, hardly equivalent to „the greater part of the day already passed" in Ant. 13.312. Josephus made this change to leave no doubt that it was impossible for Antigonus to reach the place of his destiny — the seaside town, as the seer understood it — the same day. It seems probable that Josephus' calculation and the given distance itself reflect a state of being somewhat later than 104/103 B.C. 600 stades (BJ 1.79; Ant. 13.312), equal to aprox. 67 miles[102], corresponds exactly to the shortest route possible from Jerusalem to Strato's Tower (Caesarea), namely by Capharsaba (Antipatris[103]). But the main Jerusalem — Antipatris — Caesarea road has been attested only since the Roman times[104]. Before the construction of the Roman road network the shortest route from the capital to Strato's Tower led most likely through Shechem, then by Samaria, a distance of about 75 miles, which is over 70 stades longer than that found in BJ/Ant. Just for the Jerusalem — Samaria section of this road, it took „a day's journey" in Herod's time, according to Josephus' own calculation (Ant. 15.293). This gives a daily average of almost 50 miles, relatively fast for the antiquity, achievable only by the fastest means of transport like the imperial post, while private travellers covered 25–30 miles in a day[105]. To get to Strato's Tower via Shechem within a day, leaving shortly before noon, was plainly impossible in the early Hasmonaean age. Certainly this was so even when taking the shorter route since no major road was then in existence. If, however, Josephus had in mind the travel conditions in his own days, the change he made in the *Antiquities* was reasonable enough. Concerning the way from Jerusalem to Caesarea via Antipatris Josephus probably thought of[106] we find a helpful witness in the New Testament. Acts 23,23–32 reports that Paul, with an escort of soldiers, was hurriedly brought to Caesarea by this route. Although they set out as late as at „the third hour of the night" (9 P.M.), they reached Antipatris that very night and thus covered over half the distance. Josephus must have been aware of the possibility, if only hypothetical, of covering the whole distance in one day.

The claim that at the stage of writing the *Antiquities*, at least, after having reiterated the biblical story with an emphasis on prognostic phenomena, the author viewed the Essene predictor, one of his representative fellow countrymen[107], as

---

the same sentence. Then, the murder of Antigonus and the episode with the Essene seer (if it may be taken as historical) could be dated more precisely just after the 22nd of Tishri, that is, sometime in October 103 B.C, provided that Aristobulus died soon after the assassination of his brother; Josephus reports Aristobulus' illness got worse immediately afterwards (εὐθύς, BJ 1.81; Ant. 13.314). Cf. the chronology of the Hasmonaeans in Schürer, I, 201–202.

[102] 1 *stadion* ≈ 180 m (≈ 1/9 mile); M.A. Powell, «Weights and Measures», ABD VI, 901.

[103] Antipatris was erected by Herod the Great (BJ 4.17) in the place of Capharsaba (Ant. 13.390; 16.142 f.), or rather nearby; cf. n. *c* to Ant. 13.390 in LCL.

[104] D.F. Graf, B. Isaac, I. Roll, «Roads and Highways (Roman Roads)», ABD V, 783; F.F. Bruce, «Travel and Communication (The New Testament World)», ABD VI, 650.

[105] Bruce, 650.

[106] The same applies to his source, Nicolaus of Damascus, inasmuch as he was a contemporary of Herod the Great.

[107] Needless to say, the Essenes are presented by Josephus as a quintessence of the Jewish society. Cf. Mason, 61–62.

a follower of Daniel, the predictor *par excellence*, thus appears justified. Further, the text of the anecdote offers a more convincing parallel between the Essene and the classical prophets. As argued above, ψευσθείς (BJ 1.78) is complementary to πταίσας and includes the notion of lie. In effect, the clause may be translated „he had never failed or *proved a liar* in his pronouncements"[108]. Two different ideas (ἤ is disjunctive) are expressed: the predictor was always successful and never deliberately false. The paraphrase in Ant. 13.311 reduced all to the latter. Consequently, διέψευσται (BJ 1.79) means that the foretelling (Judas speaking) „has proved a lie" (Vermes–Goodman, 35) or „deception" (Michel–Bauernfeind), not just „untrue". Josephus makes it explicit in the parallel account (Ant. 13.312) where the verb has Judas as subject and means *to speak falsely*[109] with the connotation *to deceive*, judging from its other occurrences (Ant. 2.135; 13.322). The change from „So the time frustrates the oracle" (BJ 1.80) into „so that his oracle was in danger of proving *a lie*" (ψεῦδος, Ant. 13.312 f.; my own transl.) goes in the same direction. Judas himself (αὐτῷ, 13.312) ran the risk of proving a liar.

In a similar manner, the biblical prophets have an accurate foreknowledge of the future and cannot be convicted of lying. Moses was not mistaken in any of his predictions of future events (Ant. 2.293), „having in no whit strayed from the truth" (Ant. 4.303). At the same time, he has never deceived (διαψευσάμενον) his people in what he said at God's command (Ant. 3.16). Isaiah possessed a marvellous insight into the future and „was confident of never having spoken what was false (ψευδές, Ant. 10.35), maintains Josephus. In an addition to Scripture he makes Micaiah (son of Imlah), his favourite prophetic figure, declare that it is impossible for a true prophet „to tell falsehoods (καταψεύσασθαι) in God's name" (Ant. 8.403).

Furthermore, the veracity of prophetic predictions in the biblical period is often referred to as ἀλήθεια: Samuel (Ant. 6.92), Elijah (9.26), Elisha (9.72), Isaiah (10.35), Daniel (10.268). It is in this sense that the word occurs in the Judas' story. The depressed seer cries out that „truth has died before him" (BJ 1.79). This statement, puzzling at first sight, may be compared with another expression of disappointment found in the book. Josephus tells about one of Herod's old soldiers, Tiro, who, shocked at the cruelties of the king, went about shouting that „truth had perished" (BJ 1.544; Ant. 16.376). Obviously, ἀλήθεια has here a moral sense. Tiro's exclamation is a sign of his excessive distress as of one who „lost his reason"

[108] Thackeray in LCL renders ψευσθείς by „(his predictions) *had* (never) *proved false*", but he changed the subject, which in Greek is „Judas". Similarly, R. Harmand, in (Œuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe. V. *Guerre des Juifs. Livres I–III*, ed. T. Reinach, Paris 1911, who, however, brings out the notion of falsehood/lie better: „(jamais ses prédictions n') *avaient été convaincues de mensonge*". The translation in G. Vermes, M.D. Goodman, *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources*, Oxford Centre Textbooks, Sheffield 1989, 35 is clear-cut: „who *had* never... *lied* in his prophecies"; besides, these translators take πταίω for transitive, *to mislead*, which could strengthen the thesis of polemic against false prophets, but it seems forced since no transitive use of this verb is found in Josephus.

As for other translations of ψευσθείς, in Michel–Bauernfeind: „*er hatte* (noch in keinem Fall) *sich getäuscht gesehen*" and in A. Pelletier, *Josèphe. Guerre des Juifs. Livre I*, Paris 1975: „(Judas pas une foi n') *avait été démenti*", they have a basis in Josephus' use of the passive aorist (BJ 7.341; Ant. 18.227; 19.133; Vita 248), but then the two participles become synonymic.

[109] Marcus in LCL. Since at Ant. 13.311 διαψεύδομαι is in the middle voice and has active force, so does it at 13.312.

and „was careless of his life" (BJ 1.544 f). Judas is equally downcast so as to desire death. Yet „the truth" he speaks of is juxtaposed with „prediction" through an explicative καί, and so it means *truthfulness*[110]. This is why Judas thought it would be better for him to die. He would not have any reason for such despair, if it were merely a mistake in the art of divination conceived in Greek fashion. But his gift was like that of the prophets. It must have come from the God of Israel and was exercised in his name at the Temple[111]. Now it has ended, Judas has spoken falsely (Ant. 13.312); he sees himself judged a false seer.

That it was Belial who entrapped the seer (Betz), cannot be proved. Even had Josephus found something like that in his source, he would have surely skipped it, as he did with „a lying spirit" (that induced the false prophets to lie, cf. 1 Kgs 11,19–25 with Ant. 8.406) in his „faithful translation" (cf. Ant. 1.5, 17) of the Bible. Rather than with the Qumran writings, the anecdote shows at this point affinities with the Greek texts on the Essenes. In BJ 2.141 Josephus reports that one of the „tremendous oaths" a candidate to join the sect must swear is to „be for ever a lover of truth (ἀλήθεια) and to expose liars (ψευδομένους)"[112]. A similar motif appears in Philo, *Quod Omn.* 84: an example of the Essenes' love of God is their „rejection of falsehood (τὸ ἀψευδές)"[113]. Josephus' description of the sect in the *War* supplies a suitable context for understanding the seer's anxiety not to prove a liar. The oath that Judas would have taken offers a perfect explanation of his desire for death, unjustified unless coming from this particular concern for truth. Thus, at the compositional level of the book, another link between the anecdote and the excursus on the Essenes may be established. On the other hand, BJ 2.137–142 has striking parallels with the Qumran texts[114]. Interpreted with the key of BJ 2.141, Judas' story shows features that fit well with the dialectics of truth and falsehood from the Scrolls. Without claiming any direct dependence, it may be said that behind the characteristically Hellenistic composition of Nicolaus of Damascus there was a certain Jewish tradition about the Essenes.

To complete the list of motif parallels between our text and BJ 2.119–161, the qualification of the seer as ὁ γέρων, „the old man" (BJ 1.80, no par. in Ant.), must be considered. Judas' old age, seemingly irrelevant to the plot, is very important from the artistic point of view. The remark appears at the turning point of the story. The seer calms down and sinks in resignation. The action comes to a standstill; διεκαρτέρει renders it perfectly. The man's old age, insofar as it denotes a debilitation[115], harmonizes with this static image. At the same time it heightens the drama of the account, insofar as the defeat of the seer may bring into question his whole life. The final effect brought about by the sudden change of situation — Antigonus slain, the oracle fulfilled — increases in force. In the excursus on the Essenes Josephus remarks that „they live to a great age" (μακρόβιοι, BJ 2.151).

[110] Cf. Betz, 52: „die Richtigkeit der dort erzählten Weissagung"; Harmand (BJ 1.79): „l'ésprit de vérité".

[111] Aune considers Judas' uncertainty as to the real meaning of the oracle „an element emphasizing the divine origin of the prophecy" (144).

[112] Following the reading of Porphyry, *De abstinentia* 4.13.

[113] Translation of Vermes–Goodman, 23.

[114] Cf. the discussion in Bergmeier, 97–102, especially p. 101 for BJ 2.141.

[115] Cf. the remark to the meaning of γέρων in G. B o r n k a m m, πρέσβυς κτλ), TDNT VI, 652.

The information is inserted between two different themes, that of hierarchy (2.150) and that of endurance of persecution (2.151–153). It has, too, a rhetorical function. Although the Essenes may enjoy a long life, they make light of death and torture. This way their virtue takes on extraordinary proportions. The motif of longevity among the Essenes comes up also in Philo, *Quod Omn.* 13: „They usually quit life in extremely happy and splendid old age (γήρᾳ)[116]. There is surely a relationship between Philo and Josephus whose nature is out of our concern here. That the old age of Judas points to the longevity of the Essenes is less sure.

As concerns the parallel Judas — Elijah, claimed by Betz and Aune, the objection that the motif (the blood of the murderer and of the victim shed in the same place, BJ 1.82, cf. 1 Kgs 21,19) is outside the story which closes with 1.80 is not sufficient to confute it. In fact, the unity of the section BJ 1.70–84 (Aristobulus' reign) cannot be easily questioned. BJ 1.78–80 (the Essene's prediction) is a major digression but it has significant links with the context. With the preceding 1.73 (Antigonus attending the festival) our passage is connected through the same place of action, the Temple (1.78: Antigonus passing through the Temple). The more so in case of the name „Strato's Tower" that was most probably invented for the purpose of the anecdote and yet occurs as early as at 1.77 to anticipate 1.79 (80). δαιμονίῳ προνοίᾳ (1.82) in the following context, no doubt a mark of Josephan redaction[117], connects the ominous blood spillage with the oracle since every fulfilled prediction is for Josephus a proof *par excellence* of Divine providence (Ant. 10.77 ff); God's involvement in the affairs of man, called also προμήθεια is a reason for writing on foreknowledge of the future (Ant. 17.354). In turn, the fulfilment of Elijah's prophecy concerning the death of Ahab as punishment for killing Naboth (Ant. 8.360 ff), along with the prophecy of Micaiah against that king (Ant. 8.401 ff), gave Josephus an opportunity to make some key points of his own concepts. The editorial comments made to that biblical story bear upon his understanding of the Jewish revolt (Ant. 8.409: Josephus against the Zealots as false prophets) and of the prophecy in general (Ant. 8.418 ff: prophecy and fate)[118]. The above observations induce to reexamine the possible relation between the BJ 1.70–84 and 1 Kgs 21.

As Marcus noticed in his comment to Ant. 13.117 (LCL, note *a*), the words of Aristobulus seized by remorse for fratricide are Hellenistic in spirit and point to Josephus' source, Nicolaus. In reality, the text of Ant. is already adjusted in respect of BJ so as to fit better with the Jewish view. The noun χοαῖς (BJ 1.84, hapax legomenon in Josephus), denoting libations, a *terminus technicus* for the drink offerings to the dead[119] as practised in the pagan funeral rites and so unacceptable for the Jews, was omitted. There remained ἐπισπένδω, *to pour out as a libation*

[116] Translation of Vermes–Goodman, 29.

[117] θεοῦ (δαιμονίου) πρόνοια is a typical Josephan theme, cf. BJ 2.547; 3.28, 4.219, 366, 622; 7.82, 318, 453 and especially the autobiographical passages, 3.144, 391. In the material attributed to Nicolaus of Damascus the motif occurs only twice, BJ 1.82 and 1.593, in the latter clearly by way of insertion. Josephus often adds the reference to Providence to his sources, e.g. in Ant. 14.391; 14.463, the respective passages in BJ 1.287, 341 having no mention of it; the same applies to his paraphrase of 1 Macc, cf. Ant. 13.80, 163 with, respectively, 1 Macc 10,52; 12,1.

[118] Blenkinsopp, 243.

[119] O. Michel, «σπένδομαι», TDNT VII, 528 n. 3.

(Ant. 13.317; BJ 1.84, cf. 1.82), that belongs to the usual sacrificial vocabulary of drink offerings in the LXX[120]. The account of Aristobulus' reign in BJ 1 has a lot in common with Josephus' version of the biblical Ahab's story and this, surprisingly, much more than its parallel in Ant. 13. Ahab's remorse for crime is described in similar terms to that of Aristobulus: μετάμελος, λύπη (cf. Ant. 8.362 with BJ 1.81). None of them occurs in the corresponding 1 Kgs 20,27 (LXX) nor in Ant. 13. It is the wives of the rulers who plot the murders (Jezebel; Aristobulus' wife). Both in BJ 1.76 (par. Ant. 13.308) and in Ant. 8.359 the women are called ἡ βασίλισσα. The LXX never uses the title for Jezebel nor for any other Hebrew queen, save Esther. Josephus follows this usage in his paraphrase of the Bible, Jezebel being a striking exception[121]. The motif shared by BJ/Ant. and 1 Kgs that attracted attention of the commentators is, of course, the same place of bloodshed. In his version of Elijah's prophecy Josephus deliberately changed the source. The clear parallelism in 1 Kgs 21,19 (20,19 LXX): *where dogs licked the blood...dogs will lick the blood* was not to be overlooked. Further at Ant. 8.417, recalling the prophecy, Josephus was more faithful to the Bible and wrote: „the dogs licked up his (Ahab's) blood". In Ant. 8.361, however, the second clause is different: *the blood will be shed* (χέω). In Aristobulus' story the blood of the murderer is, too, *shed* (ἐπεγχέω) on the spot of Antigonus' assassination (BJ 1.82; Ant. 13.314). Again, it seems that Josephus was writing Ahab's story with an eye to BJ 1.70–84. In its turn, a major difference between Ahab and Aristobulus is that the latter did not receive any oracle. Though an excellent predictor is acting in the context, he is not said to have delivered his message — like Elijah did — either to the murderer or to the victim. The word προαπάγγελμα (BJ 1.78), lit. *forewarning* (LSJ) might mean that at a hypothetical stage of the redaction of the text Judas forewarned Antigonus but Josephus made no use of it in his double report. Thus Aristobulus stands in no relationship to the seer in the narrative. The points of contact between BJ 1 and Ant. 8, especially where the author departs from the Bible, suggest that the story of the Hasmonaean brothers was for Josephus reminiscent of the biblical narrative. Yet it was rather the material from BJ 1 that affected Ant. 8 and not the opposite.

5. THE OTHER ESSENE SEERS

Judas is not the only individual Essene manifesting extraordinary prognosticative powers. Josephus lets two other personages of the same Essene origin appear in his work, and this with a visible regularity as we will see.

[120] Michel, 533.

[121] In the LXX the term is applied first of all to the queen of Sheba (8x) and to Esther (13x). The wives of the Persian kings, Ahasuerus and Belshazzar are called „queens" (9x). Once the Greek term renders a Hebrew word which probably means „the queen mother" (Jer 36,2). Other uses are generic (Psa 44,10; Sol 6,8.9). For the biblical period, Josephus departs from the principles of the LXX only in case of the Egyptian princess who found Moses (Ant. 2.226) and of Jezebel (Ant. 8.330, 359).

5.1. Simon (BJ 2.113; Ant. 17.346–347)

In the *War* the teacher of the art of foretelling the future is followed by an expert interpreter of dreams, Simon. An „Essaean" by birth — just as Judas is — he was able to disclose the meaning of Archelaus' portentous dream, the other seers having been unsuccessful. The story is a typical court-tale widespread in the ancient literature. Among the biblical examples of this genre the episodes of Daniel's dream interpretation are the closest parallels. The material may be ascribed to Nicolaus of Damascus whose work as source for the *War* extends this far[122]. Despite „curious" (Blenkinsopp) similarities between Archelaus' dream and the dreams of Pharaoh in the Bible as well as between their interpretations, the literary dependence of the narrative BJ 2.111–113 on Genesis 41[123] is not convincingly proven[124]. It may be argued that a different process took place. The interpretation of Pharaoh's dream by Joseph as retold in the *Antiquities* contains a significant addition to Scripture. While explaining the meaning of the oxen Joseph remarks that they are „creatures born to labour (πονεῖν) at the plough (ἀρότρῳ)"; Ant. 2.84. There is nothing corresponding to it in Gen 41,25–36 and the insertion is not further developed as meaningful in Josephus' version of the story. Now, the motif of ploughing oxen appears in Simons' interpretation of Archelaus' dream (ἀροτριῶντας, BJ 2.113) but the labour does not. Finally, the parallel account in Ant. 17.347 makes use of both motives. „The painful labour" of the oxen (τὸ ἔργοις ἐπιταλαιπωρεῖν) signifies suffering, the displacing of the ground while „ploughed (ἀρουμένην) by their labour (πόνῳ)" — a change in situation. Simon's interpretation of the dream in BJ 1 influenced first that of Joseph in Ant. 2, the latter in turn reshaped the former as told anew in Ant. 17.

The description of Archelaus' fall in *Antiquities* shows other interesting improvements. Josephus placed emphasis on the disagreement between the interpreters of the dream (cf. BJ 2.113 with Ant. 17.346). This recalls his concern with criteria for distinguishing true prophecy from pseudoprophecy. Zedekiah, a false prophet, trying to discredit Micaiah as true prophet before Ahab, points to the seeming disagreement between the predictions of Elijah and Micaiah concerning the place of that king's death (Ant. 8.406 f, an amplification of Scripture). King Zedekiah disbelieved the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel because they seemed to differ from one another (Ant. 10.106 f, an extrabiblical motivation)[125]. Moreover, Simon asks for a guarantee of safety before explaining the dream and says that the change in Archelaus' situation will be for the worse (Ant. 17.346), details not found

[122] Bergmeier, 16, who indicates lexical links between Judas' and Simon's anecdotes (ἐσσαῖος, μάντις) and gives references to Hölscher, Michel–Bauernfeind, Schürer, M. Stern. On the contrary, Thackeray, the note to BJ 2.111 in LCL, followed by Vermes, 37, suggests on the ground of scarcity of Josephus' information for the period that the source ended earlier. Anyhow, the character of expansions in the parallel account in Ant. we discuss below prove that Josephus dealt previously with a source.

[123] Betz, 104; Vermes, 37; T.S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*, MSSNTS 58, Cambridge, MA 1988, 109.

[124] Bergmeier, 16, quoting M. Hengel, and Gray, 101–104.199 n. 112, argue for the Hellenistic method of dream interpretation in BJ 1.113 (Ant. 17.347) like that attested later in Artemidorus (2nd century A.D.).

[125] Both Blenkinsopp, 243, and Feldman, 409–410, find this theme relevant for Josephus' analysis of the national catastrophe in the *War* insofar as caused by false prophets.

in the original account. The danger for a seer who announces bad news is a frequent motif in Josephus' additions to Scripture. Pharaoh asks Joseph not to conceal anything from him through fear, „however grim (σκυθρωπότερον) the truth may be" (Ant. 2.80). Another example is the story of Daniel. The grandmother of king Belshazzar begged him to inquire of Daniel the significance of the writing that appeared on the wall, „even though a dark (σκυθρωπόν) outlook might be indicated by God" (Ant. 10.238). Belshazzar did not withhold his favour from Daniel, although he proved „a prophet of evil to him". Josephus dwells at some length on the reasoning of the king who declines to attribute the dark (σκυθρωπά) turn of his future to the prophet (Ant. 10.246 f). In accordance with the Bible Josephus reports how Zedekiah gave Jeremiah the oath not to put him to death to encourage the prophet to deliver God's message to him (Ant. 10.124; Jer 38,15–16). It may be claimed that Simon's request for a guarantee of safety is a reminder of the biblical stories as retold by Josephus. That it was precisely Daniel's story that Josephus relied on may be argued on the ground of another detail that was added to the narrative of Archelaus' deposition in its version in the *Antiquities*. The ethnarch is said to have related the dream to his friends (Ant. 17.345). The mention of friends — completely absent from BJ — is found even earlier. It is during a feast with friends (φίλων) that the summons to trial in Rome finds Archelaus (Ant. 17.344, no parallel in BJ). The bad news announcing the imminent exile of the ruler and the portentous writing on the wall to Belshazzar both arrive while the addressees are feasting with their friends (cf. Ant. 10.232 f; Dan 5,1 ff). Notice, the word φίλοι (Ant. 10.232) does not occur in the corresponding biblical passage. In the context of the *Antiquities* the *prophet* Daniel is a model for Simon[126]. It should be remembered that dream interpretation was for Josephus one of the prophetic functions. In his opinion the prophets received messages from God in sleep, as may be seen in several extrabiblical additions, e.g. Samuel (Ant. 6.38), Nathan (Ant. 7.147)[127]. Divine revelation may come either through prophets or through dreams (Ant. 6.334). Daniel's skill in dream interpretation is a sign of the Deity working in him (Ant. 10.250)[128]. Josephus' terming Daniel a prophet may be due to his oneiric experiences (Ant. 10.194)[129].

One more point concerning Simon should be made. By interpreting Archelaus' dream he predicts an important event in the Jewish political sphere, the fall of the ruler. In this, he plays a similar role to Judas. Again, a seer (μάντις, BJ 2.112) intervenes in the matters of secular power providing an instance of divine guidance of history, as the author himself states at Ant. 17.354. With the ethnarch's dismissal from office by the emperor Augustus in 6 A.D., Judaea was placed under direct Roman rule (BJ 2.117; Ant. 17.355; 18.1–3), undergoing a radical change, especially in its religious situation[130]. It is at this point of the history that Josephus inserted his description of the three „philosophies", beginning with the Essenes. The presence of Simon in the preceding context sets him in some relationship with them, despite the different form of the sect name.

[126] Meyer, 45.
[127] Gnuse, 11.
[128] Blenkinsopp, 245.
[129] Feldman, 408.
[130] Schürer, I, 356.

5.2. Menahem (Ant. 15. 373–379)

The last Essene prophet-like figure Josephus exploited in his *opus* to show God's directive role in the Jewish history is Menahem. Introduced as an ἐσσηνός, the question of the Essenes' name having been just settled (Ant. 15.371), he predicts Herod's rise to power as well as his dire end. The narrative has no parallel in the *War* and therefore should rather be ascribed to a source different from Nicolaus. No reason can be seen as to why Josephus should have left it out from the history of Herod in the *War*[131]. The plot is based on a Hellenistic motif of „recognition oracle", the examples of which are the predictions of Josephus and Johanan ben Zakkai to Vespasian, and Akiba's acclamation of Bar Kochba as Messiah[132]. Biblical parallels are often pointed to. The promise of kingship to a schoolboy Herod recalls Samuel's anointing of the young David as king (1 Sam 16)[133]. The slaps given Herod by Menahem as a sign of his changing fortune makes one think of Nathan's warning to David that God may punish his iniquities by blows of men (2 Sam 7,14)[134]. The Essene's „excellence" (or „virtue" — καλοκαγαθία, Ant. 15.373) „seems to refer...to asceticism as precondition for receiving a revelation" as it was the case of Daniel (Dan 9)[135]. These are not quite exact reminiscences; Josephus' text stands in close relationship to none of the referred passages[136]. It may be demonstrated, however, that significant literary links exist between the characters of this anecdote and those of another biblical story as retold by Josephus, namely the prophet Samuel and king Saul. It should be noted first that Josephus gives great attention to Saul's career. He dedicated to him two longer editorial comments, one critical (Ant. 6.263–268) and one of eulogy (Ant. 6.343–350); few other biblical personages deserved that. Needless to say, Herod's biography as preserved in Josephus is one of the largest surviving from the antiquity[137]. The essential features of Saul's and Herod's careers are similar enough: a brilliant rise from common people to the height of power and then a gradual degeneration marked by insane suspiciousness and envy resulting in violence and cruelty even to their closest associates. The proposal is that Josephus made the correspondences emerge and that Menahem's prophecy played a crucial role in this. The Essene's

[131] Against Bergmeier, 54–55, who argues that the story was left out since it seemed to have had no fitting place after BJ 2.117 and then the redactional note BJ 2.159 took its place. But it is only in the *Antiquities* that Josephus speaks about the Essenes as a group during Herod's reign and this quite briefly. The main text on the Jewish sects both in BJ and Ant. is placed after Archelaus' exile. Bergmeier admits, however, that Menahem's story is more Jewish than two other anecdotes (18).

[132] Aune, 146.

[133] Aune, 146; Betz, 104.

[134] Betz, 104.

[135] Meyer, 44–45. Otherwise, Gray, 99–100, who assumes that „virtue is here equated...with the practice of justice and piety, which in turn is understood as obedience to the law of Moses". On her part, she establishes links between the use of the word pair εὐσέβεια — δίκαιον in Ant. 15.376 and in Josephus' version of some biblical stories. The passage that stands especially close to the report of Menahem's encounter with Herod would be the mission of the prophet Jehu to the Israelite king Baasha (Ant. 8.299 f; 1 Kgs 16,1–4).

[136] Bergmeier, 17, rejects the OT parallels altogether and points to the Alexandrian-Jewish vocabulary here (18).

[137] Feldman, «Josephus», ABD III, 989.

prediction added, if not invented, by Josephus[138] makes Herod's kingship providentially foreseen like those of Saul, David, Jeroboam and other Jewish kings. Saul and Herod alike, while pursuing their own affairs, are surprised by a predictor who addresses them as kings. Another common feature is their reaction of disbelief to the announcement of the splendid future. Saul, a youth, in response to Samuel considers his origins too humble „to create kings" (Ant. 6.51). Herod, a boy of school age, reminds Menahem that he is a private citizen (or „commoner", ἰδιώτης, Ant. 15.374). In his criticism of Saul's character inasmuch as it has changed after accession to power, Josephus recalls his previous station as private citizen (ἰδιῶται, Ant. 6.263). Likewise, in the summary of Herod's reign, it is stressed — as it is through the *Antiquities*[139] — that he was made king from being a commoner (Ant. 17.192). What links Saul's and Herod's answers in particular is the suspicion expressed therein of being mocked by the predictor. That for Saul is an addition to Scripture (cf. 1 Sam 9,21). Josephus departs from Scripture in another detail that corresponds to Menahem's prediction to Herod. At 1 Sam 9,11 (MT and LXX), the people seeing Saul prophesy ask: „What has come over the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?" (NRSV). In Ant. 6.56 the question is changed into: „How hath the son of Kis come to this pitch of felicity (εὐδαιμονίας)?". To rule happily (εὐδαιμόνως, Ant. 15.374) is the Essene's promise to Herod. It may be objected that the people admire Saul's prophetic gift, not his kingship, but the fact that in Josephus' version, in contrast to the Bible, the question is a part of Samuel's prediction counts towards this as a parallel. Finally, both Samuel and Menahem give additional signs that preannounce the fulfilment of their predictions. For Saul some imminent events will be a sign (σημεῖον) of his election by God to kingship (Ant. 6. 54–57; 1 Sam 10,1–7). For Herod, who was found worthy of reigning by God, the blows on the backside are a token (σύμβολον) of his varying lot (Ant. 15.374).

Other minor analogies between the two kingly characters can be enumerated:

— elevation to eternal glory: Ant. 6.343, 346 — Ant. 15.376; and then rejection by God: Ant. 6.142 ff–15.376; both incur God's wrath for their impiety: Ant. 6.150–16.188;

— immoderate desire for rule followed by suspiciousness; both demand absolute loyalty from their subjects: Ant. 6.250 ff–15.365 ff;

— envy: Ant. 6.193 ff–15.50 ff;

— hate and cruelty not sparing own kin: Ant. 6.237 ff–16.395 ff;

— incurable illness, a sign of God's punishment, causing mental disturbances; its effects for breathing (for Saul, following the LXX and additionally amplified); helplessness of the physicians (for Saul, unscriptural): Ant. 6.166 ff–15.240 ff; 17.168 ff; etc.

[138] The character of the account, whose purpose was to justify the exemption of the Essenes from the oath of loyalty to Herod (Ant. 15.371), is clearly anecdotal (Gray, 97).

[139] The anti-Herodian revisions and supplements in the *Antiquities*, reflecting a change in Josephus' positive attitude to Herod taken over uncritically from the sources in the *War*, greatly stress Herod's low origin (ἰδιωτ-lexemes, Ant. 14.403, 489, 491) and thus his usurping the throne against the lawful claims of the Hasmonaeans.

Josephus' judgement on the two kings oscillates similarly between eulogy and condemnation (for Saul, cf. Ant. 6.262 ff with 6.343 ff; for Herod — 15.374, 376; 17.191 f).

Above all, it may be pointed out that Josephus alludes to Herod in his critical reflection on Saul (Ant. 6.262–267). Its starting point is the most appalling of Saul's crimes, the annihilation of the highpriestly clan at Nob (1 Sam 22; Ant. 6.259–261). The observations that illustrate the theme of warped human character after one's accession to power apply equally to Herod (cf. Josephus' reflections on Herod, Ant. 16.395 ff; 17.191 f). Some are especially accurate, like „fear of rumours", „wilful hates" and „irrational loves" (Ant. 6.266). The latter fits Herod even better than Saul, for there is nothing really corresponding to it in Saul's history while Herod's love to Mariamme, „a divine madness" (Ant. 15.240), meets the condition. Furthermore, „piety and justice" (εὐσέβεια καὶ δικαιοσύνη), a pair of attributes Saul lacked (Ant. 6.265), are exactly what, according to Menahem's prediction, Herod should have pursued (15.375) and what he would forget (15.376). Finally, Herod becomes explicitly an example of a negative change in character, once elevated from a low position to the throne, when the theme turns up again in the *Antiquities*. The Jews in Parthia seek to dissuade the high priest Hyrcanus from returning to Judaea arguing „that favours received by commoners are not returned by them in like manner when they become kings, since Fortune changes them in no small measure" (Ant. 15.17). This reflection concerning Herod was added by Josephus to the previous concise report of Hyrcanus' execution (BJ 1.433 f). And so the last parallel between Saul and Herod bearing on the interpretation of Menahem's anecdote emerges by itself. Both kings committed the same sort of crime: they put to death a high priest. Saul destroyed Abimelech's whole family (Ant. 6.262) with its city to prevent the future restoration (Ant. 6.268). With the killing of Hyrcanus, Herod extinguished in practice the Hasmonaean lineage (Ant. 15.164). The motives of the murders were identical: suspicion of conspiracy (for Abimelech, Ant. 6.255 ff, 268; for Hyrcanus, Ant. 15.165 ff). In the considerably amplified version of Hyrcanus' end in the *Antiquities* Josephus proves with „other sources" that the charges were unfounded (Ant. 15.174 ff). The dynamic of the Herod — Hyrcanus confrontation that led to the death sentence (Ant. 15.175 f) is very similar to the case of Saul and Abimelech (Ant. 6.255–259). Moreover, Josephus seems to present Hyrcanus' character as ruler in direct opposition to the warping exemplified in Saul and — as was argued — in Herod in the digression to the slaughter at Nob. Hyrcanus remained mild and moderate (ἐπιεικὴς καὶ μέτριος, Ant. 15.182), while the others lose this pair of attributes with the accession to throne (Ant. 6.263). Even as king he did not give any sign of boldness or recklessness (Ant. 15.177) which are defects of the others after they have attained to power (Ant. 6.260). It was due to Hyrcanus' mildness (ἐπιείκεια) that Herod had advanced so far, therefore, the execution of the high priest was an act of particular injustice and impiety (οὔτε δίκαιον οὔτ' εὐσεβές); Ant. 15.182. With this single act, corresponding to the crime of Saul, Menahem's prediction (Ant. 15.375 f.) that Herod would reject the attitude of mildness (ἐπιείκεια), justice (δικαιοσύνη) and piety (εὐσέβεια) was fulfilled.

Given the parallelism Herod–Saul and Menahem–Samuel, one may proceed without further hesitation to interpret the Essene's figure in terms of a classical prophet. Menahem appears unsolicited, in the name of God (ἐκ θεοῦ, Ant. 15.374). When urged later by Herod, he refuses to predict the length of his reign (cf. Samuel's refusal, Ant. 6.151 f), although he knows somewhat more of the king's future. Like the prophets, he does nothing without being commissioned[140]. The pat he gives Herod, trivial as it may seem, is not just a friendly gesture but it contains an announcement of the future and is accordingly expounded. Thereby Menahem performs a symbolic action „like a true prophet"[141]. His prediction is combined with moral exhortation[142] which is a feature of the biblical prophecy[143]. It does not mean that Josephus considered Menahem a prophet in the classical sense but it proves that an OT cliché is present in the text.

As compared with the other two anecdotes, that of Menahem displays some specific features. The Essene's foreknowledge of the future is explicitly said to come from God (ἐκ θεοῦ, Ant. 15.373). It is related to Menahem's conduct characterized by virtue (καλοκαγαθία, 15.373). The relationship between virtue and „knowledge of divine things" is further extended to „many" other Essenes (15.379)[144]. Menahem's connection with the Essenes as a group, in contrast to two other seers, is strongly accentuated. The preceding general passage (15.371 f) and the name form (15.373) contribute to this. There is also an evident link with the excursus on the Essenes in the *War*, namely through the syntagm προγνωσιν...τῶν μελλόντων (15.373, cf. BJ 2.159)[145]. The framework of the prediction — the exemption of the Essenes from the oath of loyalty to Herod — harmonizes with the sectaries' negative attitude to swearing oaths attested both by Josephus (BJ 2.135) and Philo (*Quod Omn.* 84). As is the case with Simon (Ant.), an editorial comment follows the account in which the author defends his duty „to reveal what has taken place among us (παρ' ἡμῖν)", despite the incredible or miraculous (παράδοξα) quality of the event (15.379).

Herod's forcible seizure of power in Judaea put an end to the last native dynasty, the Hasmonaeans (Ant. 14.490 f). A prediction of an Essene marks again a pregnant shift in Jewish post-biblical history. Thus Menahem joins the series of individual Essenes in Josephus' work to whom fell the exclusive task of announcing tremors in Judaean politics. Except for John the Essene, a general in the revolt, all other Essene characters appear only in connection with foretelling the future. Judas and Simon are introduced in such a way that it seems there may actually be a clan (γένος) of seers. It is true that some others were vouchsafed foresight into the future too: the high priests Jaddus (Ant. 11.327) and John Hyrcanus, some Pharisees (Ant. 15.4; 17.43), Josephus himself (BJ 3.351 ff), the ecstatic Jesus, son of Ananias (BJ 6.300 ff). Except for the latter (Josephus must be considered separately), they

[140] Betz, 103.

[141] Meyer, TDNT VI, 823; cf. Betz, 104. On the contrary, Gray, 195 n. 81.

[142] Gray, 99.

[143] Feldman, 389.

[144] Apart from the two occurrences, καλοκαγαθία appears only once again in Josephus' own digression on the motives in citing Roman decrees (Ant. 16.178). There it is connected with justice as a special concern of the Jewish law (16.177); cf. Gray, 197 n. 99.

[145] Bergmeier, 18.

do not, however, become such a focus of attention as the Essene predictors. While the prophetic gift of the two high priests is inherent in their office, belonging to the bygone era when the *essên* still shone (Ant. 3.218)[146], and Jesus is himself a portent rather than a conscious predictor (BJ 6.300), the ability of the Essenes is described as something extraordinary that deserves astonishment (Judas, BJ 1.78). Josephus dedicates to it separate narratives provided with his own comments which emphasize the „incredible" (Simon, Ant. 17.354) and „miraculous" (Menahem, Ant. 15.379) character of the phenomenon. The Essenes' mastery of foretelling the future is further expressed by the passage on giving relevant instruction and their renown for infallibility. This way they become particularly apt for the task of revealing the future course of national history.

In this task they succeeded the canonical prophets. Such a conclusion is confirmed, even more than through biblical reminiscences, by the relationship between foreknowledge of the future and God's providence which for Josephus is essentially the same both in the canonical and in the subsequent age. Very instructive in this respect is the editorial comment to Ahab's death. The fulfilled predictions of the prophets manifest the greatness of God. The supreme benefit of prophecy consists in foreknowledge of the future which God grants to enable man to guard against coming dangers (Ant. 8.418). That is to say He is actively present in the history. Indeed, the course of events determined by Him is inevitable even with that foreknowledge (Ant. 8.419). The concept of determining power which cooperates here with divine predestination is expressed by Josephus in Greek fashion as fate (τὸ χρεών, Ant. 8.419, cf. 8.409). The unconditional belief in fate (εἱμαρμένη), in turn, is for Josephus an identification mark of the Essenes (Ant. 13.172; 18.18) and, moreover, he makes a personal commitment to such belief (Ant. 16.397).

As the so called anti-Epicurean passage shows, the fulfilment of prophecies is in the author's view a proof of Providence, that is, of God's direction of the affairs of human life and the whole universe (Ant. 10.277 ff). The predictive activity of the biblical prophets made it apply especially to the history of the Jewish nation since „whatever happens to us (παρ' ἡμῖν, cf. Ant. 15.379) whether for good or for ill comes about in accordance with their prophecies" (Ant. 10.35). Moses, who had none to equal him as prophet (Ant. 4.329), already wrote down in a book „a prediction of future events, in accordance with which *all* has come and is coming to pass (Ant. 4.303). All is predetermined by God who controls history. The prophets and the Scripture are two means of making this manifest.

In the same manner Josephus' deterministic world view finds expression in his concern with foreknowledge of the future in the post-biblical period. The divine decree, which corresponds to the Greek εἱμαρμένη[147], leads the history of the nation (Ant. 16.397). God in his care of men continues to send „all kinds of premonitory signs" to show „his people the way of salvation" (BJ 6.310) and this is to the same effect as previously, that is, the destructive fate (τὸ χρεών), even though foreseen, turns out to be inevitable (BJ 6.314). In the absence of the prophets

[146] It is thought that according to Josephus the oracle ceased at the death of John Hyrcanus, around 105 B.C. Cf. Thackeray's note to the passage in LCL; Blenkinsopp, 242; Feldman, 420 n. 7.

[147] Blenkinsopp, 249.

— those who claim to be such are stamped out as ψευδοπροφῆται[148] — the recorded prophetic oracles took on importance (BJ 2.159; 6.109 f, 310 ff). Nevertheless, God did not cease to use certain individuals as instruments for revealing the course of the future to enlighten coming generations of their fate[149]. Josephus believed the primary function of the prophets — prediction of the future — continued to his own day[150] and was exercised first of all by the Essenes, a showcase for the Jewish society.

To be sure, neither Judas nor the other Essenes, nor Josephus himself, were prophets in the classical sense. In a recent attempt R. Gray failed to demonstrate that Josephus' definition of prophecy was considerably broader than that of modern scholarship and that, accordingly, these postbiblical seers, included himself, were prophets[151]. Josephus, often inconsistent in his use of terms, is extremely careful not to refer as προφήτης to anyone else save the biblical prophets[152]. Judas is described as μάντις (BJ 1.80 par. Ant. 13.313) and his prediction as μάντευμα (BJ 1.79; Ant. 13.312). The word μάντις and its cognates are used by Josephus in most cases with reference to pagan divination[153]. But the contrast between Jewish and heathen prophecy is not as great as in the Septuagint (or in Christian literature) where the word group has always unfavourable connotations[154]. Some pagan diviners receive Josephus' recognition or even admiration. Balaam, „the best diviner (μάντις) of his day" (Ant. 4.104) was granted the honour of recording his divinations (μαντείας) by Moses, the greatest among prophets, thereby the memory of his unusual skilfulness was deservedly perpetuated (4.157 f). The witch of Endor, one of a class of diviners (μάντεων) who foretell the future through the spirits of the dead, otherwise called „ventriloquists", deserved an extra eulogy for her generosity toward Saul crushed by the encounter with the ghost of Samuel (Ant. 6.329–342). Nevertheless, there is a clear opposition between prophets and diviners. Saul has his desperate recourse to the latter only when the first have become silent in token of his rejection by God (6.328 f, 334)[155]. What distinguishes the μάντεις from inspired

[148] BJ 2.261; 6.285; or γόητες, *impostors* (BJ 2.261, 264; Ant. 20.97, 167).

[149] Blenkinsopp, 256; Gnuse, 21.

[150] Feldman, 396.

[151] Gray, 165. Cf. critiques by Feldman, 405–406, and Mason, *JBL* 114 (1995) 308–312.

[152] Feldman, 394. One of the few exceptions is a historian Cleodemus-Malchus (Ant. 1.240).

[153] Feldman, 417; Gnuse, 32.

[154] Cf. the entries μάντις and μαντεύομαι in *BAGD*.

[155] Therefore, Gray's suggestion that „Josephus considered the kind of skills possessed by the witch to be prophetic" (109–110) is completely mistaken. The witch's fear of carrying out Saul's demand (Ant. 6.331) leaves no doubt that she considered herself one of those banished from the country by the king and not one of the prophets who were left. Gray's theory about Josephus' use of μάντις-terminology (the word-group designates a type of genuine prophecy, „of more technical sort", 107–110) must be objected in some more points. The terminology does not apply to Daniel. He may be numbered among the court μάντεις (Ant. 10.195) but only from the point of view of his masters. He himself is at pains to convince Nebuchadnezzar that his marvellous knowledge is not due to any human skill or effort but comes directly from God (10.203; Dan 2,30 greatly amplified). Josephus stresses that Daniel's skill is distinct: „he was...skilful in discovering things beyond man's power and known only to God" (10.237). The contrast with other diviners is sharp: Daniel's superiority brings about condemnation of the others' ignorance (10.238). The use of the word μαντεία for Jotham's prediction (Ant. 5.253) — next point in the theory — needs no other explanation than that Jotham's fable is a kind of a riddle which requires *divination* in the sense *to surmise, guess*. This meaning of μαντεία is attested e.g. in Sophocles, *OT* 394 (cf. LSJ).

prophets then is their quality of technical expertise[156]. They appear together with other professional practitioners of the art (τέχνη, Ant. 6.327) of soothsaying (Ant. 10.195; BJ 2.112). It would explain Josephus' use of the terminology with reference to his own predictive abilities (προμαντεύσαιτο, BJ 3.405; μαντείας, BJ 4.625) for he justifies them with his training in interpretation of dreams and scriptural prophecies (BJ 3.352). In terming Judas a μάντις, Josephus notes the Essene's expertise in foretelling the future which makes him similar to the great prophets. At the same time, it restricts the use of the term προφήτης to the figures of the canonical period in the Jewish history. The rabbis believed prophecy had ceased with the last prophets of the canon, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. Josephus, who prefers to speak of the failure in the exact succession of the prophets during the reign of Artaxerxes I (465–424), represents a similar view (CAp 1.41). After the biblical normative age no one's claim to be a prophet can be asserted[157].

6. THE MEANS OF PREDICTING THE FUTURE

The prediction of Judas was strikingly precise. It is perhaps the most detailed oracle Josephus reports in his corpus. The Essene fixed not only the place but even the time of the incident. He knew also that Antigonus would die slain (BJ 1.79). As we know, the feature that for Josephus distinguished Daniel from other prophets was his ability to fix the time at which the future things he prophesied would come to pass (Ant. 10.267). In the reflection on the accuracy of Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's prophecies the author affirms that what God „foretells must come to pass, duly take place *at the appointed hour* (Ant. 10.142). It seems Judas' precision points to divine origin of his oracle, as well as his confusion about the real meaning of the name „Strato's Tower" since — as Josephus believed — „the utterances of the Deity" were ambiguous (ἀμφιβόλως); BJ 3.352. It should be noted that both in Ant. 10.142 and in BJ 3.351, where Josephus claims his own predictive skills, he ascribes the action of foretelling directly to God. His use of the same μάντις--terminology with reference to Judas and to himself has been already remarked. It is clear from Menahem's anecdote that Essenes' foreknowledge of the future is for Josephus first of all a gift of God (ἐκ θεοῦ, Ant. 15.373). Second, it is related to their καλοκαγαθία (Ant. 15.373, 379) which is to be understood as an „excellent" observance of the Law. The precise relationship between foreknowledge of the future and human virtue may be inferred from an unscriptural detail where Josephus states that Daniel was granted with the insight into Nebuchadnezzar's dream and its meaning because God admired his wisdom (Ant. 10.200). Indeed, it is on the ground of the Essenes' virtue (καλοκαγαθία) that they were deemed worthy (ἀξιοῦται, sc.: by God) of a knowledge of divine things (Ant. 15.379). In this way Josephus sums up his account of Menahem's prediction.

After these preliminary remarks the question how Judas (and the Essenes in general) proceeded to obtain the knowledge about future events may be faced.

[156] Cf. H.J. Rose as cited in Feldman, 416; Gray, 109–110.

[157] Blenkinsopp, 240; Feldman, 400–407.

Bergmeier and Gray are right when they maintain that nothing in the episodes involving Judas and the two other individual Essenes attests the interpretation of scripture as a base for prediction[158]. In fact, these texts contain no hint at all as to how the predictions were made. Hence, it cannot be argued independently on the ground of the anecdotes concerning the Essene seers that the Essene prognostication was related to the pesher exegesis at Qumran. The problem should be put rather as follows: in his description of the sect Josephus connects the Essenes' predictive abilities with their being versed in holy books, purifications and apophthegms of prophets (BJ 2.159); through some editorial procedures — as was shown above — the author created links between the material on the individual seers and the presentation of the Essenes in BJ 2. What can be said for certain is that it was Josephus' purpose to associate the instances of successful prediction with the general statement on Essene prophecy at BJ 2.159. In other words, the only safe path to follow in answering the question of what method of prediction Judas and others employed is in trying to understand Josephus on his own terms.

Though only indirectly, the passage BJ 2.159 does reveal Josephus' view on how the seer could gain insight into Antigonus' fate. The three elements which the Essene training in foretelling the future relies upon are not an incongruent combination[159]. „Purifications" and „apophthegms of prophets" should be subordinated to „sacred books" as the contents of the latter[160]. Such an understanding of BJ 2.159 proves valid when compared with Josephus' justification of his own experience in foretelling the future. The prophecies he „was not ignorant of", corresponding to the element of prophetic sayings in BJ 2.159, are found in the sacred books (BJ 3.352). It may be added that the mention of his priestly status there corresponds to purity rites (the Essene ritual baths being referred to, cf. BJ 2.129) that are an essential practice for priesthood[161]. In both BJ 2.159 and 3.352 Josephus indicates scriptural study as a basis for prediction. In several other instances in the *War* the future events are determined by specific, though unidentified, biblical texts. Thus Josephus mentions an ancient saying that announced the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple as a result of

[158] Bergmeier, 15f, 54; Gray, 105–106. On the contrary, Betz, 104; Michel–Bauernfeind, 430 n. 30; Beall, 109, who opt for the content of Simon's prediction as modelled on Scripture. Blenkinsopp, 258, inclines to see an example of Essene midrash in Simon's interpretation of the dream of Archelaus. His assumption that the references to Judas and Menahem confirm Essene prophecy as based on scriptural study (247) is, however, unfounded.

[159] This is the suspicion of A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte*, Paris 1960², 45, who emends διαφόροις ἁγνείαις (BJ 2.159) to διαφόροις ἁγίαις, translating „holy writings" instead of „various forms of purification" (Thackeray, LCL). He takes then these writings for works of the Community and concludes that the prediction at Qumran was based primarily on them. Blenkinsopp, 247, follows the emendation. In his opinion, „The writings in question would then be the three parts of the canon in the order of LXX" (247 n. 30). Cf. the critique of the reading proposal by Beall, 109–110.

[160] Bergmeier, 55. He then points to the parallel between the Essene emphasis on scriptural purity precepts and prophetic sayings on the one side and two basic trends of biblical exegesis in the Qumran community, that is, the search for God's will in the Torah and the pesher exegesis of Prophets and Psalms, on the other. In conclusion, however, he denies a real connection between Josephus and the Scrolls (77–78).

[161] Blenkinsopp, 259. On the relationship between prophecy and the priestly character of Essenes, cf. also Feldman, 421.

sedition along with defilement of the sacred precincts (BJ 4.388). It is clear from the context that the saying was a prophecy (προφητείαν, 4.387) and the „inspired men" (4.388) who delivered it were prophets (προφητῶν, 4.386). Again, in his call to surrender addressed to the defenders of the besieged city Josephus refers to an oracle „coming now true" found in the records of the ancient prophets in which they foretold the capture of Jerusalem as a result of civil war (BJ 6.109)[162]. We know from elsewhere that Josephus believed the books of the prophets contained the prediction of the fall of Jerusalem under the blows of the Romans (Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Ant. 10.79; Daniel, Ant. 10.276). Finally, Josephus reports two more oracles, one concerning the capture of the city with the Temple made four-square (BJ 6.311), the other, especially ambiguous (ἀμφίβολος) — the ruler of the world is to come from the country of the Jews (BJ 3.312), which signified Vespasian's proclamation as emperor taking place in Judaea (3.313). He does not specify the origin of the oracles but states that both were found in the Jewish sacred scriptures (3.312).

Another element of Josephus' self-awareness as a predictor that coincides with the Essene practice is dream interpretation. It already plays an important role in his concept of prophecy in his history of the biblical period. In contrast to the negative view of dreams in some traditions of the Old Testament (Jer 23,23–40; Sir 34,1–5), Josephus, through extrabiblical reports of God's apparitions in dreams, makes appeal to his Graeco-Roman audience who generally believed that divine revelation came to people through dreams[163]. As to the prophets of the canonical age, God appeared in sleep to reveal the future to Josephus' characters of the postbiblical period. God spoke, for instance, to the high priest Jaddus in his sleep after the sacrifice, giving him instructions for the meeting with Alexander the Great at Jerusalem (Ant. 11.327). John Hyrcanus, who is said to have possessed the gift of prophecy, conversed with God in sleep to know which of his sons would be his successor and received precise indications (Ant. 13.322). Hyrcanus received revelations from God even while awake. He learned thus beforehand of his sons' victory in a battle through a voice he heard while exercising his office in the sanctuary (Ant. 13.282). The Pharisees obtained their foreknowledge of the future (πρόγνωσις, as in the cases of Hyrcanus, Menahem and the Essenes) through God's appearances (lit. „visitation", ἐπιφοίτησις, Ant. 17.43), the reference being most probably to revelatory dreams[164]; visions in the waking state like that of Hyrcanus in the Temple may be included. The foresight of the Pharisees is related, in the context, to their particular observance of the divine laws (Ant.17.41). In connection with the Pharisee predictors some draw attention to their exegetical activity[165]. The concern with oneiric interpretation among the Essenes is attested in the double account of the dreams of the kingly pair, Archelaus and Glaphyra (BJ 2.112–116). The material, Hellenistic in spirit, was interpreted in the *Antiquities* in the way that the prophetic dreams witness the immortality of the soul and God's

[162] The same oracle as in BJ 4.388 is probably meant. Thackeray points in both cases to an oracle from *Orac. Sibyll.* 4.115 ff. (cf. the notes to the passages in LCL).

[163] Feldman, 407–409.

[164] ἐπιφοιτάω is used in the sense *to haunt* of dreams, e.g. ἐπιφοιτῶν ὄνειρον, *Hdt.* 7.15.

[165] Blenkinsopp, 257–258; Feldman, 411.

providence (Ant. 17.354). Josephus' conviction of the relationship between sleep, immortality of the soul and foreknowledge of the future finds expression in Eleazar's appeal to the defenders of Masada for suicide. The Sicarii commander of the last Jewish fortress in the war regards sleep as „a most convincing proof" of the immortality of the soul. In sleep the soul enjoys a perfect independence from the body, its prison, which enables it to converse with God and, in consequence, to foretell the things to come (BJ 7.349). Josephus' reports of his own prophetic dreams (BJ 3.351 ff; Vita 208 ff) provide one more element of his view concerning the way in which one could gain insight into the future. Experience in dream interpretation and acquaintance with scriptural prophecies (BJ 3.352) seem to be only prerequisites for prediction. The factor that sets in motion the process of foretelling the future is inspiration. It was his state of being inspired (ἔνθους γενόμενος) that enabled Josephus to read the meaning of the prophecies with reference to present and future fulfilment (BJ 3.353)[166]. The inspired interpretation of Scripture confirmed the validity of the foreknowledge Josephus acquired previously through revelatory dreams (BJ 3.351).

It may be concluded that according to Josephus the ability to predict the future was based on the skill in dream interpretation combined with the inspired exegesis of biblical prophecy. The gift was inherent in the priestly self-understanding of the predictor implying a high standard of cultic (legal purity) and ethical (virtue) observance that in turn gave access to God's providential plans, the source of foreknowledge. This applies equally to the Essenes and to Josephus himself; his claim to have been thoroughly acquainted with the sect lifestyle (Vita 10 f) — whatever its veracity — should be recalled. The prophetic typology used by Josephus in his descriptions of the individual Essene seers counts for the dependence of their predictions on Scripture. Without drawing ultimate conclusions, it may be assumed that the Qumran pesher represents a similar type of predictive prophecy inasmuch as it „implies exegetical study vitalized by divine inspiration"[167].

7. JUDAS AND THE ESSENES' ATTITUDE TO THE TEMPLE

With regard to the historical relevance of Judas' anecdote a high value should be placed on the mention of the Essene presence in the vicinity of the Temple.

The seer is said to have seen Antigonus when he was passing through the Temple (παριόντα διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, BJ 1.78)[168]. The parallel Ant. 13.311 omits the

[166] In this respect, W.C. van Unnik, *Die Propetie bei Josephus*, in Id., *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*, Heidelberg 1978, 43–44, draws attention to parallel expressions in the *Antiquities*. With γενόμενος ἔνθεος, „divinely inspired", Josephus translates the biblical phrase „the spirit of God came upon" that describes Saul's prophetic inspiration (Ant. 6.56, 76; 1 Sam 10,10; 11,6). It may be objected, however, that Josephus' own inspiration cannot be equated with that of Saul for it is not immediate but concerns the interpretation of prophetic texts.

[167] Blenkinsopp, 247.

[168] Antigonus was heading towards a place called „Strato's Tower" (πύργος) where he was slain. Neither the spot nor its name is attested elsewhere during the Hasmonaean period. It is described as dark underground quarter (ὑπόγαιον, BJ 1.75, 80; Ant. 13.307, 313) or passage (πάροδος, BJ 1.77; Ant.

preposition giving the phrase a probable sense of „passing by the Temple" (Marcus, LCL). This understanding does not preclude the possibility that Antigonus was actually within the Temple area, as is explicit in BJ 1.78, unless Josephus intended to stress that the Hasmonaean did not cross the Temple precincts. This time Antigonus was in full armour (BJ 1.77; Ant. 13.309) which might impair the holiness of the site as Betz suggests. Josephus, however, does not object to Antigonus' appearance in the Temple, as was argued above. He speaks without condemnation about the use of force in the Temple area by Alexander Jannaeus which took place in the outer part attended by the common worshippers as distinct from the inner one reserved for the priests (Ant. 13.373). Josephus has even the much praised high priest Ananus, „a man of profound sanity" (BJ 4.152, cf. his encomium at 4.319 ff) fighting against the Zealots in the outer court of the Temple (BJ 4.196 ff). What cannot be accepted for Josephus is a defilement of the inner court with the sanctuary, the principal transgression of the Zealots. That is why Ananus, after he had recaptured the outer court, refrained from assailing the most sacred precincts considering it unlawful because of the ritual uncleanness of his combatants (BJ 4.205). Josephus is careful to stress that „no blood but theirs (sc. the Zealots') defiled the sanctuary" (BJ 4.201). Therefore, to return to the phrase under discussion, παριόντα τὸ ἱερόν (Ant. 13.311) does not have a meaning opposed to BJ 1.78. Considering Josephus' usage of the forms of πάρειμι (εἶμι *ibo*, LSJ), it may be noticed that the verb in reference to a place and without preposition means *to pass into, enter* (BJ 1.152; Ant. 9.155; cf. the entry in LSJ, sense III). According to the *Antiquities*, then, Antigonus was just entering the Temple when Judas saw him. Since the underground passage where the murder took place was most probably something similar to that in the Herodian Temple (Ant. 15.424), the Hasmonaean must have entered the Temple area to reach it. The location of Judas must also be put somewhere inside the Temple complex[169]. Although our knowledge of the physical disposition of the pre-Herodian Temple is very incomplete, it may be reasonably assumed that the seer and his disciples used the public part of the general Temple area, that is, the equivalent of the court of the gentiles in the Herodian structure[170]. The basic plan of the postexilic Temple as divided into two parts, the inner and the outer court, is attested in the sources. Neh 8,1 mentions a broad area (τὸ πλάτος) before the Water Gate, where Ezra read the Law to the assembly of men and women, which may have been an outer court of the Temple[171]. „The courts" (αἱ αὐλαί) are mentioned in 1 Macc 4,38.48. 1 Macc 9,54 witnesses to

13.309) that led from the Temple area — in BJ 1.78 Antigonus is crossing the Temple to get to it — to the fortress Baris rebuilt later by Herod and renamed Antonia (BJ 1.75, cf. Ant. 18.92). At the end of the report of reconstruction of the Temple Josephus says that Herod made a secret underground passage (διώρυξ, ὑπόγειον) with a tower (πύργος) above it that led from the Antonia to the eastern gate of the inner sacred court (Ant. 15.424). The two structures resemble each other in every detail. Josephus and his / source, Nicolaus, could have had in mind the state of being after the Herodian reconstructions, nonetheless, it is quite probable that Herod rebuilt an existing structure.

[169] Gray, 93; 194 n. 67; A.I. Baumgarten, «Josephus on Essene Sacrifice», *JJS* 45,2 (1994), 175 n. 27.

[170] J. Murphy, O'Connor, «Judah the Essene and the Teacher of Righteousness», *RdQ* 40(1981), s. 581.

[171] C. Meyers, «Temple, Jerusalem», ABD VI, 364.

the existence of a wall separating the inner court (τῆς αὐλῆς...τῆς ἐσωτέρας) of the sanctuary from the outer area of the Temple. Josephus confirms this division of the pre-Herodian Temple. His report of the capture of Jerusalem by Sossius and Herod distinguishes between the outer precincts of the Temple (τοῦ ἔξωθεν ἱεροῦ) and the inner ones (τὸ ἔσωθεν ἱερὸν); Ant. 14.477[172]. The report, based probably on Herod's Memoirs[173], also has porticoes around the Temple area (στοῶν; Ant. 14.476). It may have been there that the Essene teacher would gather his disciples as was customary for the sages in the later period[174].

Judas is not the only Essene who appears inside the Temple precincts. During the war John the Essene was appointed general of the province of Thamna (BJ 2.567) at an assembly held in the Temple (BJ 2.562). Besides, one of the city gates was called „Gate of the Essenes" (BJ 5.145) which supposes that the Essenes were not alien to the populace of Jerusalem, being perhaps themselves residents[175]. The regular presence of the Essenes in the Temple vicinity — Judas is the head of a school established in the Temple courtyards — reinforces the interpretation of Josephus' texts on the Essenes that admits their acknowledgement, at least partial, of the legitimacy of the Temple. The primary argument for this recognition is the notice that the Essenes sent offerings (ἀναθήματα), either the Temple tax or voluntary gifts, to the Temple (Ant. 18.19)[176]. On the other hand, the undisturbed longterm activity of the Essenes, that is the teaching, within the Temple enclosures implies a degree of acceptance of the sect on the part of the Temple authorities. This supports the interpretation of the bar imposed on the Essenes concerning their access to the Temple (Ant. 18.19) as not all-inclusive[177]. The above conclusions as to a limited mutual recognition between the sect and the Temple institution poses a serious problem to the theory that equates the Essenes with the Qumran community. The more or less favourable attitude of the Essenes towards the cult in Jerusalem contradicts the absolute rejection of the present Temple by the Qumran sectaries[178]. Finally, the presence of an Essene prophesying and teaching in the Temple around 103 B.C., some decades after the retreat of the Teacher of

Righteousness into exile[179], seems to favour the „Groningen Hypothesis" according to which Josephus' Essenes and the people of Qumran are two distinct groups that arose through a rift occurred within an original Essene movement[180].

SUMMARY

The story of Judas' oracle, along with the preceding mention of John Hyrcanus' gift of prophecy, takes up right at the beginning of *The Jewish War* one of Josephus' leading themes, foreknowledge of the future. In fact, the biblical prophets, whose primary function in Josephus was to predict the future on behalf of God, appear already in the preface (BJ 1.18). There their role as historians, the authors of Scripture, is referred to; due to divine inspiration the canonical prophets also had an accurate knowledge of ancient history (CAp 1.37).

Judas, predicting in a detailed manner the circumstances of Antigonus' death, intervenes at a crisis in Jewish history. So do the other Essene seers. After the cessation of the canonical prophecy, they continue a major task of the ancient prophets, that is, to be instruments of revealing the course of the future, just as God continues to direct the history of the nation by his providence. Here applies what Josephus states — not without reason in the present tense — concerning the biblical prophets: „whatever happens to us whether for good or ill comes about in accordance with their prophecies" (Ant. 10.35).

It is not then surprising that for Josephus prediction relies mainly on scriptural exegesis. This, however, can be argued for Judas' oracle only indirectly since the original story in the *War* contains no pertinent evidence, nor do the other Essene anecdotes. The literary pattern

[172] This basic structure of the Temple mount is reflected also in the Mishna (*m. Mid.* 1–5) which, according to some, relates to a pre-Herodian stage during the Hasmonaean era. Cf. L.I. Levine, «Josephus' description of the Jerusalem Temple: *War*, *Antiquities*, and Other Sources», in Parente-Sievers, 236. 241 (his reservation about the hypothesis).

[173] Cf. the note to Ant. 14.476 in LCL; Schürer, I, 26–27.

[174] Safrai, 865.

[175] T. Rajak, «Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe vide: Josephus and the Essenes», in Parente–Sievers, 146; Schürer, II, 563 n. 5.

[176] Baumgarten, 175.

[177] According to Baumgarten, 173, κοινοῦ τεμενίσματος, the area from which the Essenes were barred (Ant. 18.19), designates the courtyard „to which all ritually pure Jews, both male and female, were entitled to enter". H. Stegemann, «The Qumran Essenes — Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times», in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, I, ed. J. Trebolle Barrera, L. Vegas Montaner, Leiden 1992, 122–126, opts for the priestly enclosure.

[178] Baumgarten, 176. The Dead Sea Scrolls witness to the extreme opposition of the community to the Temple Establishment that legitimates the breach with it and the withdrawal of the group to the desert; Schürer, II, 582; F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English*, Leiden 1994, lii–lvi.

[179] The interpretation of archeological discoveries at Qumran along with the Scrolls makes it possible to date this event before 130 B.C; Schürer, II, 586–587; Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Ein Sachbuch*, Herder-Spektrum 4128, Freiburg i.Br. 1994, 207. 211; García Martínez, liii.

[180] García Martínez, «Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis», *FO* 25 (1988) 113–136. The distinction between the Essenes and the Qumran group precludes the possibility of identifying Judas the Essene with the Teacher of Righteousness. The proposal advanced again by J. Carmignac, «Qui était le Docteur de Justice?», *RdQ* 38 (1980) 235–246, was refuted by Murphy–O'Connor in the article cited above as „obtained by a process of exclusion" (580).

and origin of Judas' narrative are not Jewish. Nevertheless, the story is clearly subordinated to Josephus' own purposes. The prophetic typology is present especially in the parallel passage in the *Antiquities*, even more so in the case of two other Essene seers. Numerous literary links connect both versions of the story with the excursus on the Essenes in BJ 2. The mysterious *Essaean* seer displays reliable predictive abilities, comparable with those of the true prophets, which turn out to be a general characteristic of the *Essene* sect which, on its part, represents the quintessence of Jewish society. Josephus' own claim to the power of foreseeing the future, crucial for the understanding of *The Jewish War* as well as for his career as depicted there, finds a convincing context.

Levy rejected the proposal of E. Zeller that the presence of an Essene teacher in the Jerusalem Temple around 103 B.C. meant that the Essenes' break with the Temple occurred after this date. For him, the narrative BJ 1.78–80 is a tale invented under Herod the Great. Therefore, it has nothing to say about the Essenes' attitude to the Temple[181]. For Carmignac, who believed to have found the Teacher of Righteousness in Judas, the Essene's appearance within the Temple precincts constituted an argument for a peaceful phase of contacts between the Jerusalem authorities and the sect — a similar conclusion to that of Zeller. Murphy–O'Connor, who refuted Carmignac's hypothesis, has no doubts as to the historicity of the information on Judas teaching in the Temple, he maintains, however, as Lévy does, but on different grounds, that the presence of the Essene in a public area of the Temple proves nothing as regards the Essene attitude towards the cult there[182]. The common feature of these contradictory opinions is the assumption of the simple identity between the Essenes and the Qumran community. Yet, Judas' presence in the Temple expresses a more favourable attitude to the central cult than that of the Qumran people. The story of Judas' oracle along with other evidence of the Essenes appearing in Jerusalem („The Gate of the Essenes"), in the vicinity of the Temple (John the Essene), demands a careful distinction between the „third philosophy" and the people of the Community. This conclusion, in turn, induces a restatement of the issue of the relationship between primitive Christianity and the Essene movement. Martin Buber, whose intuition concerning the Essenes in his *Legend of Baalshem* sums up in part the results of this paper and stimulate further reflection, may be given the floor:

„The Essaeans intended to achieve the prophets' objectives through simplification of life patterns: and from those was born in secret the circle of men that carries the Nazarene and creates his legend: the greatest of all myth's triumphs"[183].

PROROK ZAGROŻONY
HISTORIA WYROCZNI JUDY ESSEŃCZYKA
(BJ 1.78–80; Ant. 13.311–313)

STRESZCZENIE

Opowiadanie o esseńskim mistrzu sztuki przewidywania przyszłości, który przez chwilę znalazł się zagrożony w swej sławie nieomylności z powodu błędnej interpretacji swojej dwuznacznej przepowiedni, zaczerpnął Józef Flawiusz z nie istniejącego dziś dzieła Mikołaja z Damaszku, które stanowiło jedno z głównych źródeł wstępnej części *Wojny*

[181] Lévy, 60–61.
[182] Murphy–O'Connor, 579.582.
[183] M. Buber, *Die Legende des Baalschem*, Zürich 1993[7], 10 (transl. by F. Schulz-Robson).

żydowskiej. Opowiadanie oparte jest na hellenistycznym motywie niejednoznacznej, wprowadzającej w błąd wyroczni, sięgającym Herodota, a rozwiniętym w starożytnej literaturze paradoksu. Niezależne wprost od tradycji starotestamentowych czy qumrańskich, zostało przejęte przez Józefa Flawiusza w sposób interpretujący i podporządkowane konsekwentnie założeniom literackim jego dzieła. Biblijna typologia prorocka widoczna jest zwłaszcza w „samoparafrazie" tekstu, jakiej dokonał autor w *Starożytnościach żydowskich*. Opowiadanie wprowadza zaraz na początku BJ jeden z wiodących tematów w dziełach Józefa Flawiusza, mianowicie przewidywanie przyszłości. Juda, przepowiadając zabójstwo hasmonejczyka Antygona, wkracza na scenę w przełomowym momencie historii narodu żydowskiego. Zasada potwierdza się na przykładzie dwu pozostałych „widzących" esseńczyków, Manaema i Szymona, którzy zapowiadają kolejno wstrząsy polityczne w Judei. Po ustaniu klasycznego profetyzmu biblijnego essеńscy „widzący" kontynuują obwieszczanie przyszłych wydarzeń jako narzędzia opatrzności Bożej, która nie zaprzestaje kierować historią narodu. Tekst milczy na temat metody uzyskiwania wiedzy o przyszłości i nie może być argumentem w dyskusji nad zależnością (typu qumrański *peszer*) między interpretacją ksiąg świętych a przepowiadaniem przyszłości u esseńczyków. Nie ulega wątpliwości natomiast, że taka zależność jest kluczowa dla koncepcji Józefa Flawiusza. Zauważyć należy związki literackie między opowiadaniem a ogólnymi opisami esseńczyków. Obraz Judy jako głowy szkoły według ideału sokratejskiego odpowiada przedstawieniu „sekty" jako szkoły filozoficznej. Esseński (ἐσσαῖος) wróżbita demonstruje uzdolnienia prorocze, porównywalne przez swą precyzję i niezawodność z biblijną inspiracją prorocką, które z kolei charakteryzują ogół ugrupowania esseńczyków (ἐσσηνοί); ci zaś ucieleśniają ideał społeczeństwa żydowskiego według wizji Józefa Flawiusza. Osobiste roszczenie autora do posiadania proroczych umiejętności, kluczowe dla zrozumienia *Wojny żydowskiej*, otrzymuje w ten sposób uwiarygodniający kontekst. Z historycznego punktu widzenia niezakłócona działalność grupy esseńczyków na zewnątrznym dziedzińcu świątyni jerozolimskiej sugeruje pewien stopień wzajemnego uznania pomiędzy „sektą" a centralną instytucją kultową, co wydaje się być w sprzeczności z radykalnym odrzuceniem aktualnej świątyni przez wspónotę z Qumran. Obecność esseńskiego proroka-nauczyciela w bliskości świątyni ok. 103 przed Chr., a zatem w kilka dziesięcioleci po wycofaniu się Nauczyciela Sprawiedliwości na pustynię, domaga się starannego rozróżnienia pomiędzy esseńczykami hellenistycznych źródeł a stróżami zwojów znad Morza Martwego.