

ZEALOT EARLY CHRISTIANITY AND THE EMERGENCE OF  
ANTI-HELLENISM

GEORGE SIDIROUNTIOS

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
at the University of London (Royal Holloway and Bedford New College)

March 2016

Candidate's declaration:

I confirm that this PhD thesis is entirely my own work.

All sources and quotations have been acknowledged.

The main works consulted are listed in the bibliography.

Candidate's signature:

*To the little Serene, Amaltheia and Attalos*

## CONTENTS

<i>Absract</i>	p. 5
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	p. 6
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	p. 7
<i>Conventions and Limitations</i>	p. 25
INTRODUCTION	p. 26
1. THE MAIN SOURCES	
1.1: <i>Lost sources</i>	p. 70
1.2: <i>A Selection of Christian Sources</i>	p. 70
1.3: <i>Who wrote which work and when?</i>	p. 71
1.4: <i>The Septuagint that contains the Maccabees</i>	p. 75
1.5: <i>I and II Maccabees</i>	p. 79
1.6: <i>III and IV Maccabees</i>	p. 84
1.7: <i>Josephus</i>	p. 86
1.8: <i>The first three Gospels (Holy Synopsi)</i>	p. 98
1.9: <i>John</i>	p. 115
1.10: <i>Acts</i>	p. 120
1.11: <i>"Pauline" Epistles</i>	p. 123
1.12: <i>Remarks on Paul's historical identity</i>	p. 126
2. ISRAELITE NAZOREAN OR ESSENE CHRISTIANS?	
2.1: <i>Israelites - Moses</i>	p. 136
2.2: <i>Israelite Nazoreans or Christians?</i>	p. 140
2.3: <i>Essenes or Christians?</i>	p. 148
2.4: <i>Holy Warriors?</i>	p. 168
3. "BCE CHRISTIANITY" AND THE EMERGENCE OF ANTI-HELLENISM	p. 173
3.1: <i>A first approach of the Septuagint and "Josephus" to the Greeks</i>	p. 175
3.2: <i>Anti-Hellenism in the Septuagint</i>	p. 183
3.3: <i>The Maccabees and "Josephus" from Mattathias to Simon</i>	p. 193
3.4: <i>"Josephus," from John Hyrkanos to the arrival of the Romans</i>	p. 214
4. ZEALOTS, SIKARIOI, GALILEANS AND THE FOLLOWERS OF THE MESSIAH	
4.1: <i>Do any sources name the first Christians as revolutionaries?</i>	p. 222
4.2: <i>Galileans and the massacre of the innocent infants.</i>	p. 226
4.3: <i>Galilee and the signa</i>	p. 237
4.4: <i>Buy a sica, get a whip and fight for the Lord?</i>	p. 242
4.5: <i>Christian participation in the Great Revolt?</i>	p. 252
CONCLUSIONS	p. 267
<i>Epilogue</i>	p. 271
APPENDICES	
1: <i>Greeks or Hellēnes?</i>	p. 276
2: <i>Lost and censored works</i>	p. 277
3: <i>Jewish (?) Pseudepigrapha</i>	p. 279
4: <i>Greeks in the works of Philo of Alexandria</i>	p. 281
5: <i>Eviōnaioi/Engratites, some of the first Christians?</i>	p. 286
6: <i>Parting of the ways during the first century?</i>	p. 289
7: <i>Greeks in the Early Church?</i>	p. 295
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
<i>Lexica</i>	p. 321
<i>Primary Sources</i>	p. 323
<i>Secondary Studies</i>	p. 337

## ABSTRACT

The present thesis explores and tests the validity of the hypothesis raised by Reimarus (1694-1768) that the first Christians aimed at establishing an earthly and not a heavenly kingdom.

The INTRODUCTION presents the problem and how this has been approached by previous scholars. It also outlines the aim and scope of the thesis and the methodology employed. CHAPTER 1 is a critical presentation of the main sources upon which the findings of the thesis are based, namely *Maccabees I-IV*, Josephus (*fl.* 1st c.) and the *New Testament*. It examines the issues of authenticity, dating, reliability, alterations and interpolations of the texts. CHAPTER 2, examines the case that the Early Christians were continuators of certain pre-existing Messianic traditions and perceived themselves as original Israelites. It also explores the validity of the hypothesis that the first Christians were Essenes. CHAPTER 3 covers the historical period from the reign of the Greek Antiochos IV Epiphanēs (175-164 BCE), when according to a certain Church tradition the first "Christians" do appear in history as martyrs. It ends with the last years of the Hasmonean dynasty (*c.*37 BCE). This chapter also investigates the rise of religious anti-Hellenism. CHAPTER 4 starts with the war Herod the Great (*c.*73-4 BCE) raised against certain Galileans and ends with the last events of the Great Revolt. Also, it questions what did the first Christians do during this period of repeated conflicts? How did the Gentiles perceive the Christians and who were the Greeks in the Early Church? The CONCLUSIONS summarise the findings on the validity of the "earthly kingdom" hypothesis, and the thesis ends with APPENDICES.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am most grateful to my supervisor Dr David Gwynn, and to all other scholars and friends whose names will always be with me.

My sincere gratitude to the staff of all Libraries where my research was carried out, to the staff of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Digital Library of Greek Literature* and to the administrative staff of Royal Holloway.

Omiroupolis

February 2016

## ABBREVIATIONS

<i>A.H.</i>	Irenaeus, <i>Contra haereses</i> , ed. W.W. Harvey, <i>Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libros quinque adversus haereses</i> , 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1857)
<i>Agouridēs, O χριστιανισμός</i>	S. Agouridēs, <i>O χριστιανισμός έναντι Ιουδαϊσμού και Ελληνισμού κατά το Β' αι. μ.Χ.</i> (Athens, 1997)
<i>Alexander, Apocalyptic</i>	Paul J. Alexander, <i>The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition</i> , ed. D. de F. Abrahamse (Berkeley, 1985), (henceforth Alexander, <i>Apocalyptic</i> )
<i>Alon, Jews</i>	G. Alon, <i>The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age</i> , translated and edited by G. Levi, 2 vols., (Jerusalem, 1980-1984)
<i>Αληθής</i>	Celsus, <i>Αληθής λόγος</i> , ed. R. Bader, <i>Der Αληθής λόγος des Kelsos</i> (Stuttgart, 1940)
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i> , 4 vols. (Berlin, 1887-1890) in ed. B. Niese, <i>Flavii Iosephi opera</i> , 6 vols (Berlin, 1887-1894)
<i>Apostolic Fathers</i>	ed. Kirsopp Lake, <i>The Apostolic Fathers</i> 2 vols (Loeb: London, 1912-1913)
<i>Applebaum, 'Zealots'</i>	Shimon Applebaum 'The Zealots: The case for revaluation,' in <i>JRS</i> , vol. 61 (1971), pp. 155-170
<i>Aristidēs, Apologia</i>	ed. C. Vona, <i>L'apologia di Aristide</i> (Rome, 1950)
<i>Aristobulus, Fragmenta</i>	Aristobulus Judaeus, <i>Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca</i> , ed. A. Denis (Leiden, 1970)
<i>Arnal</i>	William Arnal, 'The Q Document' in <i>Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts</i> , ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe (Minneapolis, 2007), pp. 119-154
<i>Aslan, Zealot</i>	Reza Aslan, <i>Zealot: the life and times of Jesus of Nazareth</i> (London, 2013)
<i>Assumption</i>	<i>Assumption of Moses</i> , ed. R. H. Charles (London, 1897)
<i>Atwill, Caesar's</i>	J. Atwill, <i>Caesar's Messiah, the Roman Conspiracy to invent Jesus</i> (Charleston, 2011)
<i>Aune, Blackwell</i>	David E. Aune, <i>The Blackwell Companion to The New Testament</i> (Oxford, 2010)

<i>Autolycum</i>	Theophilus, <i>Ad Autolycum</i> ed. R.M. Grant in <i>Theophilus of Antioch</i> (Oxford, 1970)
Bammel, 'Revolutionary'	E. Bammel, 'The revolutionary theory from Reimarus to Brandon', in <i>Jesus and the Politics of His Day</i> , ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 11-68
Barnard, 'The origins'	L. W. Barnard, 'The origins and emergence of the Church in Edessa during the first two centuries A.D.', in <i>Vig. Chr.</i> 22 (1968) pp. 161-175
Barnett, <i>Jesus</i>	Paul W. Barnett, <i>Jesus and the Logic of History</i> (Leicester, 1997)
Bartlet, <i>1 Macc.</i>	John R. Bartlet, <i>1 Maccabees</i> (Sheffield, 1998)
Bassler, 'Paul'	Jouette M. Bassler, 'Paul and his <i>Letters</i> ', in Aune, <i>Blackwell</i> , pp. 373-397
BDT	A. Blasi, J. Duhaime, P. Turcotte, eds., <i>Handbook of Early Christianity, Social Science Approaches</i> (Walnut Creek, 2002)
Becker-Reed	Adam H. Becker and Annette Y. Reed, eds., <i>The Ways that Never Parted : Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages</i> (Tübingen 2003)
<i>Bel.</i>	Josephus, <i>De Bello Judaico</i> , in ed. B. Niese, <i>Flavii Iosephi opera</i> , 6 vols (Berlin, 1887-1894), vol. 6 (1894)
Bellinzoni	Arthur J. Bellinzoni, <i>The Two-Source Hypothesis: a Critical Appraisal</i> (Mercer, 1985)
Benko-O' Rourke	S. Benko and J. O' Rourke, eds. <i>The Catacombs and the Colosseum, the Roman empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity</i> (Valley Forge, 1971)
Berger, <i>Qumran</i>	Klaus Berger, <i>Qumran und Jesus: Wahrheit unter Verschluss?</i> (Stuttgart, 1993), trans. James S. Currie, <i>The Truth under Lock and Key</i> (Louisville, 1995)
Betz-Riesner	O. Betz and R. Riesner, <i>Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan. Klarstellungen</i> (Giessen, 1993), trans J. Bowden, <i>Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican: Clarifications</i> (London, 1994)
Bickerman, 'The name'	Elias Bickerman, 'The name of Christians,' in <i>Studies in Jewish and Christian history</i> 3 (Leiden, 1986), pp. 139-151
Bird, <i>Crossing</i>	Michael Bird, <i>Crossing over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period</i> (Peabody, Mass., 2010)
Black, <i>Scrolls</i>	Matthew Black, <i>The Scrolls and Christian Origins</i> (London, 1961)



Bock, <i>Studying</i>	Darrell L. Bock, <i>Studying the Historical Jesus: A Guide to Sources and Methods</i> (Grand Rapids, 2002)
Bond, 'Quest'	Helen K. Bond, 'The Quest for the Historical Jesus: An Appraisal,' in <i>The Blackwell Companion to Jesus</i> , ed. Delbert Burkett (Oxford, 2011), pp. 337-353
Bormann	Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici, Angela Standhardttinger, eds, <i>Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi</i> (Leiden, 1994)
Brandon, <i>Fall</i>	Samuel G. F. Brandon, <i>The fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: a study of the effects of the Jewish overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity</i> (London, 1978 <sup>2</sup> )
Brandon, <i>Jesus</i>	S. G. F. Brandon, <i>Jesus and the Zealots, a study of the Political factor in primitive Christianity</i> (Manchester, 1967)
Brandon, <i>Trial</i>	S. G. F. Brandon, <i>The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth</i> (London, 1968)
Burkill, 'Syrophoenician'	T. A. Burkill, 'The Syrophoenician woman: The congruence of Mark 7:24-31,' in <i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i> 57, ed. Walther Eltester (Berlin, 1966), pp. 23-37
Cadbury, <i>Making</i>	Henry J. Cadbury, <i>The Making of Luke-Acts</i> (New York, 1958 <sup>2</sup> )
Carson, 'Pseudonymity'	D. A. Carson, 'Pseudonymity and Pseudepigraphy,' in <i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i> , eds Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove, 2000), pp. 857-864
CCB	H. C. Kee, Meyers, Rogerson and Saldarini, eds., <i>The Cambridge Companion to the Bible</i> (Cambridge, 1997)
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca
CCOC	<i>The Cambridge history of Christianity, Origins to Constantine</i> , eds. M. M. Mitchell and F. M. Young, 9 vols (Cambridge, 2006)
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
Charlesworth, 'Old'	James H. Charlesworth, 'From Old to New,' pp. 56-72, in J. H. Charlesworth and Peter Pokorny, eds., <i>Jesus Research: An International Perspective (The first Princeton-Prague Symposium on Jesus Research)</i> (Michigan, 2009)
Charlesworth-Pokorny	J. H. Charlesworth and Peter Pokorny, eds., <i>Jesus Research: An International Perspective (The first Princeton-Prague Symposium on Jesus Research)</i> (Michigan, 2009)

Chilton-Evans	<i>Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the state of current research</i> , eds. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden, 1994)
CHJ	<i>The Cambridge History of Judaism</i> , ed. S. T. Katz et al., 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1984-2006)
Chronicon	Georgius Monachus, ed. C. de Boor, <i>Georgii Monachi Chronicon</i> , 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1904)
Chr. Paschale	<i>Chronicon Paschale</i> , ed. L. Dindorf, <i>Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae</i> (Bonn, 1832), vol. 1
Clark, 'Early'	Howard Clark Kee, 'Early Christianity in the Galilee,' in <i>The Galilee in Late Antiquity</i> , ed. Lee I. Levine (New York, 1992), pp. 3-22
Coakley-Stang	Sarah Coakley, Charles M. Stang, eds., <i>Re-thinking Dionysius the Areopagite</i> (Oxford, 2009)
Cohen, Josephus	Shaye J. D. Cohen, <i>Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian</i> (Leiden, 1979)
Cohn	ed. L. Cohn and S. Reiter, <i>Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt</i> , 6 vols (Berlin, 1896-1915)
Collins, 'Artapanus'	John J. Collins, 'Artapanus revisited,' pp. 59-68 in P Walters, ed. <i>From Judaism to Christianity: Tradition and Transition, A Festschrift for Thomas H. Tobin, S.J., on the Occasion of His Sixty - fifth Birthday</i> (Leiden, 2010)
Collins, Jewish	J. J. Collins, <i>Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule</i> (Leiden, 2005)
Collins, 'Potter'	J. J. Collins, 'The Sibyl and the Potter: political propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt,' in Bormann, pp. 57-69
Comfort-Barrett	Philip W. Comfort and David P. Barrett, <i>The text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: A Corrected Enlarged Edition of the Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts</i> (Wheaton, Illinois, 2001)
Commentarius in Isaiam	Eusebius, <i>Commentarius in Isaiam</i> , ed. J. Ziegler, <i>Eusebius Werke, Der Jesajakommentar</i> , in DGCS (Berlin, 1975)
Concilium Quinisextum	<i>Concilium Quinisextum</i> , ed. H. Ohme, <i>Das Konzil Quinisextum</i> (Turnhout, 2006)
Contra Apionem	Josephus, <i>Contra Apionem</i> , ed. B. Niese, <i>De Iudaeorum vetustate in Flavii Iosephi opera</i> , 6 vols (Berlin, 1889), vol. 5

<i>Contra Celsum</i>	Origen, <i>Contra Celsum</i> , ed. M. Borret, <i>Origène Contre Celse</i> , 5 vols (Paris, 1967-1976)
CPJ	<i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i> , ed. V. A. Tcherikover and A. Funks, 3 vols (Harvard, 1957-64)
Crossan, <i>Historical</i>	John Dominic Crossan, <i>The historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant</i> (Edinburgh, 1991)
Davila, <i>Provenance</i>	James R. Davila, <i>The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian or other?</i> (Leiden, 2005)
<i>De Bello</i>	Josephus, <i>De Bello Judaico</i> , ed. B. Niese, <i>Flavii Iosephi opera</i> , 6 vols (Berlin, 1887-1894), vol. 6
<i>Dem. Evang.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Demonstratio Evangelica</i> , ed. I.A. Heikel in <i>Eusebius, DGCS</i> , 8 vols (Leipzig 1902 - Berlin 1956), vol. 6 (Leipzig, 1913)
<i>De Providentia</i>	<i>Philo of Alexandria, De Providentia</i> , vol. 9 (1941), eds. F.H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, 12 vols (Loeb: London, 1921-1962) (based on ed. Cohn)
Deschner, <i>Kriminalgeschichte</i>	Karlheinz Deschner, <i>Kriminalgeschichte des Christentums</i> , 10 vols (Reinbek, 1986-cont), trans. Ξενοφών Αρμύρος, <i>Η εγκληματική ιστορία του χριστιανισμού</i> , vol. 1 (Athens, 2004)
DGCS	<i>Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften</i>
<i>Dialogus</i>	Justin the Martyr, <i>Dialogus</i> , ed. E.J. Goodspeed in <i>Die ältesten Apologeten</i> (Göttingen, 1915)
Diodorus, <i>Bibliotheca</i>	Diodorus Siculus, <i>Bibliotheca historica</i> , eds. F. Vogel and C.T. Fischer, <i>Diodori bibliotheca historica</i> , 6 vols (Leipzig, 1888, repr. 1964-1970)
<i>Doctrina</i>	Epiphanius, <i>Doctrina Patrum</i> , ed. F. Diekamp (Münster: Aschendorff, 1907)
Dodd, <i>History</i>	Dodd, C. H., <i>History and the Gospel</i> (London, 1964 <sup>2</sup> )
Droge, <i>Homer</i>	Arthur J. Droge, <i>Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture</i> (Tübingen, 1989)
ed. Funk	<i>Opera Patrum Apostolicorum</i> , ed. F. X. Funk, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1881)
Edwards, <i>Gospel</i>	James R. Edwards, <i>The Gospel according to Mark</i> (Leicester, 2002)
Eisenman, <i>James</i>	Robert Eisenman, <i>James the Brother of Jesus</i> (London, 2002)

Eisler, <i>Ἰησοῦς</i>	Robert Eisler, <i>Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας</i> , 2 vols (Heidelberg, 1:1928-29, 2:1930)
Eisler, <i>Messiah</i>	R. Eisler, <i>The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' recently rediscovered 'Capture of Jerusalem' and the other Jewish and Christian sources</i> (London, 1931)
Eisler, <i>Enigma</i>	R. Eisler, <i>The enigma of the fourth Gospel, its author and its writer</i> (London, 1938)
Eissfeldt, <i>OT</i>	Otto Eissfeldt, <i>Einleitung in das Alte Testament</i> , trans. P. R. Ackroyd <i>The Old Testament, an Introduction</i> , from the 3rd German edition (Oxford, 1965)
Ellegård, <i>Jesus</i>	Alvar Ellegård, <i>Jesus – One Hundred Years Before Christ: A Study In Creative Mythology</i> (London, 1999)
Elliott, <i>Apocryphal</i>	J. K. Elliott, <i>The Apocryphal New Testament: a collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation</i> (Oxford, 1993)
Esler, <i>Early</i>	<i>The Early Christian World</i> , ed. P. F. Esler, 2 vols (London, 2000)
<i>Ethnika</i>	Stephanos Byzantios, <i>Ethnika</i> , ed. A. Meineke, <i>Stephan von Byzanz. Ethnika</i> (Berlin, 1849)
Eus.	Eusebius of Caesarea
Eus. <i>CP</i>	<i>Commentaria in Psalmos</i> , ΑΛΛΗΛΟΥΙΑ ΑΓΓΑΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΖΑΧΑΡΙΟΥ 112, PG 23
Fairweather	W. Fairweather, <i>Jesus and the Greeks</i> (Edinburgh, 1924)
Falk, <i>Jesus</i>	Harvey Falk, <i>Jesus the Pharisee</i> (New York, 1985)
Farmer, <i>Macc.</i>	William R. Farmer, <i>Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period</i> (1956, r. Westport, Conn., 1973)
Feldman, <i>Josephus</i>	L. Feldman, <i>Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)</i> (Berlin, 1984)
Feldman, <i>Judaism and Hellenism</i>	L. Feldman, <i>Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered</i> (Leiden, 2006)
Fiensy, <i>Jesus</i>	David A. Fiensy, <i>Jesus the Galilean: Soundings in a First Century Life</i> (New Jersey, 2007)
Finegan, <i>Handbook</i>	Jack Finegan, <i>Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the Ancient World and Problems of Chronology in the Bible</i> (Peabody Mass., 1998 <sup>2</sup> )

Fitzmyer, <i>Essays</i>	Joseph A. Fitzmyer, <i>Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament</i> (London, 1971)
Flint, 'Jesus'	Peter Flint, 'Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Amy-Jill Levine, D. C. Allison Jr., J. D. Crossan, eds, <i>The Historical Jesus in Context</i> (Princeton, 2006), pp. 110-131
Fox, <i>Pagans</i>	Robin Lane Fox, <i>Pagans and Christians</i> (Harmondsworth, 1986)
Fredriksen, 'Historical'	Paula Fredriksen, 'The Historical Jesus, the scene in the Temple and the Gospel of John' pp. 249-276 in <i>John, Jesus, and History</i> , vol. 1, eds. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta, 2007)
Frend, <i>Martyrdom</i>	W. H. Frend, <i>Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church, a Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus</i> (Oxford, 1965)
Freyne, 'The Galilean'	S. Freyne, 'The Galilean World of Jesus' in P. F. Esler, ed., <i>The Early Christian World</i> , 2 vols (London, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 113-135
Fujita, <i>Crack</i>	N. Fujita, <i>A Crack in the Jar. What Ancient Jewish Documents tell us about the New Testament</i> (New York, 1986)
Funk, <i>Seminar</i>	Robert W. Funk (and the Jesus Seminar), ed., <i>The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus</i> (San Francisco, 1998)
Gager, <i>Origins</i>	J. G. Gager, <i>The origins of anti-semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in pagan and Christian antiquity</i> (Oxford, 1985)
Gamble, <i>Books</i>	Harry Y. Gamble, <i>Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts</i> (Yale, 1995)
Garber, 'Jewish'	Zev Garber, 'The Jewish Jesus: a Partisan's Imagination,' in <i>The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation</i> , ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011), pp. 13-19
García Martínez, <i>Textos</i>	F. García Martínez, <i>Textos de Qumrán</i> (Madrid, 1992), trans. W. G. E. Watson, <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English translation</i> (Leiden, 1994)
<i>Geographica</i>	Strabo, <i>Geographica</i> , ed. A. Meineke, <i>Strabonis geographica</i> , 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1852-53)
Glykas	Michael Glykas, <i>Annales</i> , ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1836)
Gmirkin, 'The War'	Russelll Gmirkin, 'The War Scroll, the Hasidim, and the Maccabean Conflict,' in Schiffman, <i>Dead</i> , pp. 491-492
Goldstein, 'Jewish'	J. A., Goldstein, 'Jewish acceptance and rejection of Hellenism,' pp. 64-87 in E. P. Sanders et. al., eds., <i>Jewish and Christian Self-Definition</i> (London, 1981)

Golb, <i>Who wrote</i>	Norman Golb, <i>Who wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran</i> (New York, 1995)
Goodblatt, <i>Historical</i>	David Goodblatt et al., eds. <i>Historical perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kochba in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> (Leiden, 2001)
Goodman, <i>The ruling</i>	M. Goodman, <i>The ruling class of Judea: The Origins of the Jewish revolt against Rome A.D. 66-70</i> (Cambridge, 1987)
Grabbe, <i>Moses</i>	Lester L. Grabbe, ed., <i>Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i> 317 (Sheffield, 2001)
Griggs, <i>Early</i>	C. W. Griggs, <i>Early Egyptian Christianity from its origins to 451 CE</i> (Leiden, 1990)
Gruen, <i>Heritage</i>	E. S. Gruen, <i>Heritage and Hellenism</i> (California, 1998)
Guthrie, <i>NT</i>	Donald Guthrie, <i>New Testament Introduction</i> (Illinois, 1990)
Hadas, <i>Macc.</i>	Moses Hadas, <i>The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees</i> (N.Y., 1953)
Haenchen, <i>Acts</i>	Ernst Haenchen, <i>The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary</i> (Oxford, 1971)
<i>Haeresibus</i>	Joannēs Damascēnos (John of Damascus), <i>De Haeresibus</i> , vol. 4 (1981) ed. B. Kotter, <i>Die Schriften des Johannes Von Damaskos, Herausgegeben vom Byzantinischen Institut der Abtei Scheyern</i> , 5 vols. (Berlin, 1969-1988)
Hardwick, <i>Josephus</i>	Michael E. Hardwick, <i>Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius</i> (Atlanta, 1989)
<i>Harugei</i>	<i>The Ten Harugei Malkhut</i> , trans. David G. Roskies, <i>The Literature of Destruction: Jewish Responses to Catastrophe</i> (Philadelphia, 1989), pp. 60-69
Harvey	ed. W.W. Harvey, <i>Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libros quinque adversus haereses</i> , 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1857)
Harvey, <i>True Israel</i>	Graham Harvey, <i>The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature</i> (Leiden, 1996)
<i>H.E.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i> , ed. G. Bardy, <i>Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire Ecclésiastique</i> , SC, 3 vols (Paris, 1:1952; 2:1955; 3:1958)
Hengel, 'Paul,'	Martin Hengel, 'The pre-Christian Paul,' in Lieu, <i>The Jews</i> , pp. 29-52

Hengel, <i>Jews, Greeks</i>	M. Hengel, <i>Juden, Griechen und Barbaren, Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlicher Zeit</i> (Stuttgart, 1976), trans. by John Bowden, <i>Jews, Greeks and Barbarians</i> (London, 1980)
Hengel, <i>Judentum</i>	M. Hengel, <i>Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begengung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2 Jh.s v. Chr.</i> (Tübingen, 1973), trans. J. Bowden, <i>Judaism and Hellenism</i> (London, 1981 <sup>2</sup> )
Hengel, 'Septuagint'	M. Hengel, 'The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians', in James D.G. Dunn, ed., <i>Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135</i> (Tübingen 1992), pp. 39-83
Hengel, <i>Was Jesus</i>	M. Hengel, <i>Was Jesus a Revolutionist?</i> , Biblical Series 28 (Philadelphia, 1971)
Hengel, <i>Zeloten</i>	M. Hengel, <i>Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur Jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.</i> (Leiden, 1961), trans. David Smith, <i>The Zealots. Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 AD</i> (Edinburgh, 1989)
Herodotus, <i>Historiae</i>	Herodotus, <i>Historiae</i> , ed. Haiim B. Rosén, <i>Herodoti Historiae</i> , 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1 :1987, 2 :1997)
<i>Hist. Rom.</i>	Dio, Cassius, <i>Historiae Romanae</i> , ed. U.P. Boissevain <i>Cassii Dionis Cocceiani</i> , 5 vols. (Berlin, 1895-1931) used in trans. E. Cary, <i>Dio's Roman History</i> , 9 vols (Loeb: London, 1914-27)
Hoehner, <i>Herod</i>	Harold W. Hoehner, <i>Herod Antipas</i> (Cambridge, 1972)
<i>Holy Bible</i>	<i>The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, New revised standard Version</i> (Oxford, 1989)
<i>Holy Scriptures</i>	eds. M. Lonzano and Y. Norzi, <i>The Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic text, a new translation</i> , The Jewish Publication Society of America (Philadelphia, 1917)
Honigman, <i>Tales</i>	Sylvie Honigman, <i>Tales of High Priests and Taxes</i> (Oakland, Cal. 2014)
<i>Hōrologion</i>	Ωρολόγιον τὸ Μέγα (Ἐκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος: Athens, 1998)
Hoskyns-Davey	Edwyn Hoskyns and Noel Davey, <i>The Riddle of the New Testament</i> (London, 1958)
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>

Humphries, <i>Early</i>	M. Humphries, <i>Early Christianity</i> (London, 2006)
<i>In Flaccum</i>	Philo, <i>In Flaccum</i> , ed. L. Cohn and S. Reiter in <i>Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt</i> , vol. 6 (Berlin: Reimer, 1915)
Jack, <i>Christ</i>	J. W. Jack, <i>The historic Christ, an examination of Dr. Robert Eisler's theory according to the Slavonic version of Josephus and the other sources</i> (London, 1933).
Jastrow	Marcus Jastrow, <i>A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic literature</i> (Berlin, 1926)
J ECS	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JJH	<i>John, Jesus, and History</i> , Symposium Series 1, Society of Biblical Literature, eds. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta, 2007)
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>Josephi Vita</i>	Josephus, <i>Josephi Vita</i> , ed. B. Niese, in <i>Flavii Iosephi opera</i> , 6 vols (Berlin, 1887-1894), vol. 5.
Jossa, <i>Gesù</i>	Giorgio Jossa, <i>Gesù e i movimenti di liberazione della Palestina</i> (Brescia, 1980)
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JSHJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Historical Jesus</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSP	<i>Journal for the study of pseudepigrapha</i>
Julius Afr., <i>Epistula</i>	Sextus Julius Africanus, <i>Epistula ad Aristidem</i> , ed. W. Reichardt (Leipzig, 1909)
Justin, <i>Apologia</i>	<i>Iustinus Martyr Apol., Apologia</i> , ed. E.J. Goodspeed in " <i>Die ältesten Apologeten</i> " (Göttingen, 1915)
Keener, <i>Historical</i>	Craig S. Keener, <i>The Historical Jesus of the Gospels</i> (Michigan, 2012)
Kessler, <i>Introduction</i>	Edward Kessler, <i>An introduction to Jewish-Christian relations</i> (Cambridge, 2010)
Kissinger, <i>The Lives</i>	Warren S. Kissinger, <i>The Lives of Jesus: A History and Bibliography</i> (New York, 1985)



Kleist, <i>Ancient</i>	J. A. Kleist, <i>Ancient Christian Writings, The Works of the Fathers in Translation</i> (London, 1957) 61- vols.
Kordatos	Yianis Kordatos, <i>Ιησούς Χριστός και Χριστιανισμός</i> , 2 vols (Athens, 1975)
Kordatos, <i>Αρχαίες</i>	Y. Kordatos, <i>Αρχαίες Θρησκείες και Χριστιανισμός</i> (Athens, 1973 <sup>5</sup> )
Kümmel, <i>Das neue</i>	Werner G. Kümmel, <i>Das neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme</i> (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970), trans. S. McLean Gilmour and H. C. Kee, <i>The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems</i> (London, 1973)
Lenzman, <i>L' origine</i>	I. Lenzman, <i>L' origine du christianisme</i> , Editions en langues étrangères (Moscou, 1961), trans. in Greek by Φ. Φωτίου, <i>Οι ρίζες του Χριστιανισμού</i> (Athens, 2001)
<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>	Philo of Alexandria, <i>Legatio ad Gaium</i> , ed. S. Reiter (Berlin, 1915), vol. 6 in ed. Cohn
<i>Les manuscripts</i>	J. Daniélou, <i>Les manuscripts de la mer Morte et les origines du Christianisme</i> (Paris 1956)
Levine, <i>Judaism</i>	L. I. Levine, <i>Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity, Conflict or Confluence ?</i> (Seattle, 1998)
Levine, <i>Synagogue</i>	L. I. Levine, <i>The Ancient Synagogue, The First Thousand Years</i> (Yale, 2005 <sup>2</sup> )
Lieberman, <i>Greek</i>	S. Lieberman, <i>Greek in Jewish Palestine, Studies in the literary transmission beliefs and manners of Palestine in the 1st century BCE-IV century AD</i> (New York, 1942)
Lieberman, <i>Hellenism</i>	S. Lieberman, <i>Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, Studies in the literary transmission, beliefs and manners of Palestine in the 1st cent. BCE - 4th cent. CE</i> (New York, 1950)
Lieu, <i>The Jews</i>	J. Lieu, J. North, T. Rajak, eds., <i>The Jews among Pagans and Christians</i> (London, 1992)
LIL	<i>The Galilee in Late Antiquity</i> , ed. Lee I. Levine (New York, 1992)
LSJ	<i>Greek – English Lexicon</i> , Liddell & Scott
<i>Macc.</i>	<i>Maccabees Septuaginta Books</i> , see <i>Sept.</i>
Maccoby, <i>Revolution</i>	Hyam Maccoby, <i>Revolution in Judea: Jesus and the Jewish Resistance</i> (NY, 1980)

Mack, <i>Myth</i>	Burton L. Mack, <i>A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins</i> (Philadelphia, 1988)
Mason, <i>Josephus</i>	Steve Mason, <i>Josephus and the New Testament</i> (Peabody, Mass., 2003 <sup>2</sup> )
Meier, <i>Marginal</i>	John P. Meier, <i>A marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus</i> , 3 vols (New York, 3:2001)
Metzger-Ehrman	B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman, <i>The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration</i> (Oxford, 2005 <sup>4</sup> )
Milik, <i>Ten Years</i>	J. T. Milik, <i>Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea</i> (London, 1959)
Minucius, <i>Octavius</i>	Marcus Minucius Felix, <i>Octavius</i> , ed. J. P. Waltzing, trans Gerald H. Rendall, <i>Minucius Felix</i> (London, 1931)
Modrzejewski, <i>Les Juifs</i>	Joseph M., Modrzejewski, <i>Les Juifs d' Egypte, de Ramses II à Hadrien</i> (Paris, 1992), trans. R. Cornman <i>The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian</i> (Edinburgh, 1995)
Moll, <i>Marcion</i>	Sebastian Moll, <i>The Arch-Heretic Marcion</i> (Tübingen, 2010)
Montserrat Torrents, <i>Jesús</i>	José Montserrat Torrents, <i>Jesús el Galileo armado: Historia laica de Jesús</i> (Madrid, 2007)
Moody Smith, 'John'	D. Moody Smith, 'John: A source for Jesus research?,' in <i>JJH</i> , pp. 165-178
Mor, <i>AAA</i>	Menahem Mor, ed., <i>Jewish Assimilation, Acculturation and Accommodation: Past Traditions, Current Issues and Future Prospects: Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization</i> (Lanham, 1992)
Nazir	B. D. Klein, ed., <i>Nazir</i> , translated into English with notes, glossary and indices, vol. 8 (London, 1936) in I. Epstein, <i>Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nashim</i> , 8 vols. (London, 1936)
Nestle–Aland	<i>Novum Testamentum Graecae</i> , eds. Nestle – Aland et. al. (Stuttgart, 1979 <sup>26</sup> and 1993 <sup>27</sup> )
Neusner, <i>Judaisms</i>	Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, Ernest S. Frerichs, eds., <i>Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era</i> (Cambridge, 1987)
Niese	<i>Flavii Iosephi opera</i> ed. B. Niese, 6 vols (Berlin, 1887-1894)
North, <i>Roman</i>	J. A. North, <i>Roman Religion, Greece and Rome</i> , New Surveys in the Classics 30 (Oxford, 2000)

NT	<i>New Testament</i>
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OCD	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i>
O'Neill, 'Origins'	John C. O'Neill, 'The origins of monasticism', in <i>The Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick</i> , ed. Rowan Williams (Cambridge, 1989)
Orat.	Oration
Origen, <i>Matthaei</i>	<i>Commentarium in Evangelium Matthaei</i> ed. R. Girod, <i>Origène, Commentaire sur L' Évangile Selon Matthieu, livres X et XI</i> , 1 vol. (Paris, 1970)
OT	<i>Old Testament</i>
OTP	James H. Charlesworth, ed. <i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , 2 vols (NY, 1983-1985)
<i>Panarion</i>	St. Epiphanius <i>Panarion (Adversus haereses)</i> , ed. K. Holl, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1:1915; 2:1922; 3:1933)
<i>Papias</i>	<i>Papiae Fragmenta</i> , fr. 11, ed. F. X. Funk, <i>Die Apostolischen Väter</i> (Tübingen-Leipzig, 1901)
Parente, 'Onias'	F. Parente, 'Onias III and the founding of the Temple of Leontopolis,' pp. 69-98, in Parente, F. and J. Sievers, eds., <i>Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith</i> (Leiden, 1994)
Parker, <i>Codex</i>	D. C. Parker, <i>Codex Sinaiticus. The Story of the World's Oldest Bible</i> (London, 2010)
PG	<i>Patrologia Graecae</i> Migne, J. P., <i>Patrologie Cursus Completus: Series Graeco Latina</i> , 166 vols (Paris, 1857-66)
<i>Philonica</i>	<i>The Studia Philonica Annual, Studies in Hellenistic Judaism</i>
Photios, <i>Bibliotheca</i>	Photios, <i>Bibliotheca</i> , ed. I. Bekker (Berlin, 1824)
Piñero-Peláez	A. Piñero & J. Peláez, <i>The Study of the New Testament</i> (Leiden, 2003)
Powell, <i>Jesus</i>	Mark Allan Powell, <i>Jesus As a Figure in History: How Modern Historians View the Man from Galilee</i> (Louisville, 1998)
Portier, <i>Apocalypse</i>	A. Portier-Young, <i>Apocalypse against Empire, Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism</i> (Michigan, 2011)

Pritz, <i>Nazarine</i>	R. A. Pritz, <i>Nazarine Jewish Christianity from the End of the New Testament Period Until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century</i> (Jerusalem, 1988)
Ps.	Pseudo
Ps.-Zonaras	Pseudo Zonaras, <i>Lexicon</i> , ed. J.A.H. Tittmann, <i>Iohannis Zonarae lexicon ex tribus codicibus manuscriptis</i> , 2 vols (Leipzig, 1808)
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
<i>Quod omnis</i>	Philo, <i>Quod omnis probus liber sit</i> , eds L. Cohn and S. Reiter, <i>Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt</i> , 6 vols. (1896-1915), vol. 6 (1915)
Rahlfs	<i>Septuaginta</i> , ed. A. Rahlfs, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1935)
<i>Räisänen</i>	<i>Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen</i> , eds. Ismo Dunderberg, Christopher Tuckett and Kari Syreeni (Leiden, 2002)
Rajak, <i>Josephus</i>	Tessa Rajak, <i>Josephus, The Historian and His Society</i> (Philadelphia, 1984 <sup>2</sup> )
Rajak, <i>Jewish</i>	T. Rajak, <i>The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome, Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction</i> (Leiden, 2001)
Rajak, <i>Translation</i>	T. Rajak, <i>Translation and Survival, The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora</i> (Oxford, 2009)
Rankin, <i>Origins</i>	Oliver S. Rankin, <i>The Origins of the Festival of Hanukkah</i> (Edinburgh 1930)
<i>Refutatio</i>	St. Hippolytus, <i>Refutatio Omnium Haeresium</i> , ed. M. Marcovich (Berlin, 1986)
<i>Reimarus, Fragments</i>	<i>Reimarus, Fragments</i> , ed. C. Talbert, trans. R. Fraser (London, 1971)
Reimarus, 'The Real'	Hermann S. Reimarus, 'The Real Intention of the Apostles,' in Craig A. Evans, ed., <i>The Historical Jesus: Critical Concepts in Religious Studies</i> (London, 2004), pp. 13-31
Rhoads, <i>Israel</i>	David Rhoads, <i>Israel in Revolution: 6-74 CE. A Political History Based on the Writings of Josephus</i> (Philadelphia, 1976)
Richards, <i>Paul</i>	Randolph E. Richards, <i>Paul and the first-century letter writing: secretaries, composition and collection</i> (Downers Grove, 2004)
Richardson-Edwards	P. Richardson and D. Edwards, 'Jesus and Palestinian Social Protest: Archaeological and Literary Perspectives', in BDT, pp. 247-266

Roetzel, 'Paul'	Calvin J. Roetzel, 'Paul in the second century,' in James D. G. Dunn, ed. <i>The Cambridge Companion to St Paul</i> (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 227-241
Routh	ed. M.J. Routh <i>Fragmenta Hegesippi, Reliquiae sacrae</i> , 5 vols (Oxford, 1846-1848), vol. 1 (1846)
Royse, <i>Spurious</i>	J. M. Royse, <i>The Spurious Texts of Philo of Alexandria: a Study of Textual Transmission and Corruption with Indexes to the Major Collections of Greek Fragments</i> (Leiden, 1991)
Runia, <i>Philo</i>	David T. Runia, <i>Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey</i> (Assen, 1993)
Sanders, 'Jesus'	E. P. Sanders, 'Jesus' Galilee' in <i>Räisänen</i> , pp. 3-41
Sanders, <i>Schismatics</i>	Jack T. Sanders, <i>Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants: The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations</i> (London 1993)
<i>Sept.</i>	<i>Septuaginta</i> , ed. A. Rahlfs, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1935)
SC	Sources chrétiennes
Schaff, <i>History</i>	Schaff, Philip, <i>History of the Christian Church, Ante-Nicene Christianity</i> , 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1884)
Schäfer, <i>Judeophobia</i>	P. Schäfer, <i>Judeophobia: Attitudes Towards the Jews in the Ancient World</i> (Princeton 1997)
Schiffman, <i>Dead</i>	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: fifty years after their discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997</i> , L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, J. VanderKam eds. (Jerusalem, 2000)
Schonfield	Hugh J. Schonfield, <i>According to the Hebrews</i> (London, 1937)
Schrötter, 'Jesus'	Jens Schrötter, 'Jesus in Galilee,' in Charlesworth-Pokorny, pp. 36-55
Schwartz, <i>2 Macc.</i>	Daniel R. Schwartz, <i>2 Maccabees</i> (Berlin, 2008)
Schweitzer, <i>Quest</i>	Albert Schweitzer, <i>Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung</i> (Tübingen, 1913), trans W. Montgomery et. al., <i>The Quest of the Historical Jesus</i> (London, 2000)
Shepkaru, <i>Jewish</i>	Shmuel Shepkaru, <i>Jewish Martyrs and Christian Worlds</i> (Cambridge, 2006)

Signiori, <i>Dying</i>	Gabriela Signiori, ed., <i>Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective</i> (Leiden, 2012)
<i>Slavonic Version</i>	Josephus, <i>De Bello Judaico</i> , ed. N.A. Meščerskij, <i>Istorija Iudejkoj Vojny Iosifa Flavija v drevnerusskom perevode</i> (Moscow, 1958), in H. Leeming et al, <i>Josephus's Jewish War and its Slavonic Version</i> (Leiden, 2003)
Sordi, <i>The Christians</i>	Marta Sordi, <i>The Christians and the Roman Empire</i> (London, 1986)
<i>Stromata</i>	Clemens of Alexandria, <i>Stromata</i> , ed. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel and U. Treu, <i>Clemens Alexandrinus, DGCS</i> , 3 vols (Berlin, 1960-1985)
Stern	M. Stern, <i>Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism</i> , 2 vols (Jerusalem, 1974-1980), Appendix (1984)
Strauss, <i>Life</i>	David Friedrich Strauss, <i>The Life of Jesus Critically Examined</i> , 3 vols (London, 1846)
<i>Suetonius</i>	<i>Suetonius, The Twelve Caesars</i> , ed. J. C. Rolfe, 2 vols (Harvard, 1997-1998)
<i>Suidae Lexicon</i>	<i>Suidae Lexicon</i> , ed. A. Adler, 5 vols (Leipzig, 1928-1938)
s.v.	sub voce
Sweet, 'Zealots'	J. P. M. Sweet, 'The Zealots and Jesus', in <i>Jesus and the Politics of His Day</i> , ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 1-9
Swete, <i>Introduction</i>	H. Barclay Swete, <i>An introduction to the Old Testament in Greek</i> (Cambridge, 1900)
<i>Syriaca</i>	Appian, <i>Syriaca</i> , ed. P. Viereck, A.G. Roos and E. Gabba, <i>Appiani historia Romana</i> (Leipzig, 1962)
Talbot, <i>Dynasty</i>	J. Talbot, <i>The Jesus Dynasty</i> (London, 2006)
Tal Ilan	Tal Ilan, <i>Lexicon of Jewish names in Late Antiquity</i> , Part I, Palestine 330 BCE-200 CE (Tübingen, 2002)
Tatian, <i>Oratio</i>	Tatian, <i>Oratio ad Graecos</i> , ed. E.J. Goodspeed, <i>Die ältesten Apologeten</i> (Göttingen, 1915)
TIEJ	<i>Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity</i> G. eds. N. Stanton, G. G. Stroumsa (Cambridge, 1998)
trans. Jeffreys	John Malalas, <i>Chronographia</i> , tr. E. and M. Jeffreys, R. Scott et al, <i>The Chronicle of John Malalas</i> (Sydney, 1986)

Tyson, <i>Marcion</i>	Joseph B. Tyson, <i>Marcion and Luke-Acts: a defining struggle</i> (Columbia, 2006), pp. 1-23.
VanderKam, 'Hanukkah'	James C. VanderKam, 'Hanukkah: its timing and significance according to 1 and 2 <i>Maccabees</i> ,' in <i>JSP</i> 1 (Sheffield, 1987), pp. 23-40
Vermes, <i>Christian</i>	Geza Vermes, <i>Christian Beginnings: From Nazareth to Nicea, AD 30-325</i> (London, 2012)
Vermes-Goodman, <i>Essenes</i>	G. Vermes and M. Goodman, <i>The Essenes according to the Classical sources</i> (Sheffield, 1989)
Vermes, <i>Scrolls</i>	G. Vermes, <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls</i> (London, 2000)
Vig. Chr.	<i>Vigiliae Christianae, a review of Early Christian life and language</i>
Vit. Cont.	Philo, <i>De vita contemplativa</i> , ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1915), vol. 6
Voorst, <i>Jesus</i>	Robert Voorst, <i>Jesus Outside the New Testament: An Introduction to the Ancient Evidence</i> (Grand Rapids, 2000)
Weitling	W. Weitling, <i>Das Evangelium eines armen Sünders</i> (Bern, 1845), trans. Dinah Livingston, <i>The poor sinner's gospel</i> (London, 1969)
Wendland	ed. P. Wendland in L. Cohn, <i>Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt</i> , 6 vols (Berlin, 1896-1915), vols. 2 and 3
BCP	<i>The Blackwell Companion to Paul</i> , ed. Stephen Westerholm (Malden, MA, 2011)
Williams, <i>Stylometric</i>	David S. Williams, <i>Stylometric Authorship Studies in Flavius Josephus and Related Literature</i> (N.Y., 1992)
Williamson, <i>Josephus</i>	G. A. Williamson, <i>Josephus the Jewish War</i> (Harmondsworth, 1970 <sup>2</sup> )
Wilson, <i>Jesus</i>	Ian Wilson, <i>Jesus: the evidence</i> (London, 1985 <sup>2</sup> )
Wilson-Kiraz	E. J. Wilson and G. A. Kiraz, eds, <i>The Old Syriac Gospels</i> , (Piscataway, NJ, 2003 <sup>2</sup> )
Witherington, <i>Jesus</i>	Ben Witherington III, <i>The Jesus Quest: The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth by</i> (Carlisle, 1995)
Yadin, <i>Masada</i>	O. Barag and M. Herschowitz, <i>Masasa I, The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Reports</i> (Jerusalem, 1989)
Yonah, <i>Jews</i>	M. A. Yonah, <i>The Jews under Roman and Byzantine Rule, a political History of Palestine from the Bar Kohba War to the Arab Conquest</i> (Jerusalem, 1984)

Zeitlin, 'Essenes'	Solomon Zeitlin, 'Essenes and Messianic expectations,' in <i>Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism</i> (NY, 1974), vol. 2, pp. 57-119
Zeitlin, <i>Rise</i>	S. Zeitlin, <i>The Rise and Fall of the Judaeae State: A Political, Social and religious History of the Second Commonwealth, Vol. 1, 332-37 BCE</i> (Philadelphia, 1968 <sup>2</sup> )
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
V.D.Hoek	A. Van Den Hoek, <i>Clement of Alexandria and his use of Philo in the Stromateis</i> (Leiden, 1988)



## CONVENTIONS

All *New Testament* Greek texts are cited from the Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> edition, unless stated otherwise. Punctuation and spelling in the Greek texts in the footnotes, follow the editions cited.

For the transliteration and rendering of ancient Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic names into English, I have tried to follow some of the widely accepted versions, but the usual problems may not have been avoided.

## LIMITATIONS

The secondary bibliography on Early Christianity and the *New Testament* in particular is vast and impossible to be covered in full.

## INTRODUCTION

### *The Problem and those who deny it*

German Philosopher Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768), a Professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages and a Protestant Deist, is the first known modern era scholar who raised the hypothesis that historical Jesus and his followers aimed at establishing an earthly and not a heavenly kingdom.<sup>1</sup> Fearing how the religious establishment would react to his views, Reimarus never presented this case in public. His work in question in the form of personal notes without significant references to sources was published for the first time posthumously in the end of the 18th century.<sup>2</sup> From then on up to the present, Reimarus's comments on the historical identity of the first Christians have received limited attention.<sup>3</sup> He argued that Jesus gave his Apostles the promise

---

<sup>1</sup> Reimarus, *Fragments*, pp. 132-157; Schweitzer, *Quest*, pp. 14-26: Herman Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768) was the first scholar who “had attempted to form a historical conception of the life of Jesus”; Brandon, *Jesus*, p. 22, based on Reimarus's *Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seine Jünger*, ed. H. Hohlwein, also concludes that Reimarus is the first who produced a critical study of historical Jesus; Powell, *Jesus*, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> Reimarus, *Fragments*, p. 1, fragments of his research on historical Jesus were first published in 1774-1778; Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter, *Die Kritirienfrage in der Jesusforschung : Vom Differenzkriterium zum Plausibilitätskriterium* (Göttingen, 1997), trans M. E. Boring, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria* (Louisville, 2002), pp. 35-37, 39-41 on the importance of the Deists for the development of Reimarus's critical approach of historical Early Christianity. For the latest publication of this essay see Hermann S. Reimarus, 'The Real Intention of the Apostles,' in Craig A. Evans, ed., *The Historical Jesus: Critical Concepts in Religious Studies* (London, 2004), pp. 13-31.

<sup>3</sup> Kissinger, *The Lives*, pp. 14-16, remarked that Reimarus's hypothesis did not have an impact in the works of scholars after him: he was far ahead of his time.

that they will reign over the twelve tribes of Israel.<sup>4</sup> As a result, the Apostles looked forward to Jesus establishing his earthly kingdom and appoint them leaders of their people. According to Reimarus, the Apostles were motivated by a strong desire to gain power and wealth, both when Jesus was alive and later.<sup>5</sup> After Jesus died, Reimarus claimed that the Apostles did not have any idea of presenting their leader as a heavenly Saviour. Guided by their own ambitions and interests, they introduced this fabricated doctrine of the heavenly Jesus at some later stage; they invented such theories in order to present themselves as the exclusive mediums between a supreme power, Jesus, and the people who believed that Jesus was divine. In this way, the Apostles gained the admiration and submission of their followers. Reimarus accused the Apostles as dishonest authors of bold and enormous lies which later were presented in various parts of the *New Testament* as divine facts.<sup>6</sup> Reimarus also claimed that the Apostles learned from the example of Jesus that it was possible to earn glory and a living just by preaching. They controlled, compelled and terrorised their disciples to sell their property and hand them the proceeds.<sup>7</sup> Among all the scholars I examined, Reimarus is the only one who, though indirectly, pointed out that Peter murdered two Christians for financial reasons.<sup>8</sup> Reimarus's source for this is the *Acts*,<sup>9</sup> which state that Peter was involved in an incident that terrorised the Church. The pretext to this incident was that certain disciples began selling

---

<sup>4</sup> Reimarus, 'The Real', p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Strauss, *Life*, vol. 2, p. 23, Strauss indicates that apart from the opponents of Christianity since the ancient times, the author of *Wolfenbüttel Fragments* (meaning Reimarus), argues extensively that Jesus aimed into establishing an earthly kingdom; vol. 2, p. 25, Strauss concludes: "Nowhere in our evangelical narratives is there a trace of Jesus having sought to form a political party"; vol 2, p. 27; *Luke* 22:38 and *Matthew* 26:52 that Jesus rejected the sword of his followers.

<sup>6</sup> Reimarus, 'The Real' p. 14-15

<sup>7</sup> Reimarus, 'The Real' p. 16-17. Evans quotes here *Acts* 2:43-47, where the followers of the Apostles were terrified by what the Apostles did, sold their property and distributed the proceeds according to the needs of the congregation. In the same chapter, few verses above (37-42), Peter preached and as a result 3000 people were baptized. Evans observed that there is one more instance in *Acts* 4:32-37, where the followers of the Apostles sold their property and delivered the money to the Apostles, who in turn distributed the proceeds.

<sup>8</sup> Reimarus, 'The Real', pp. 24-25.

<sup>9</sup> 4:32-37 and 5:1-11.

their property, giving the entire proceeds to their Church leaders. Ananias and Sapphira were a couple who decided not to give Peter the entire proceeds from the sale of their land. In response, Peter became angry and straight away Ananias and Sapphira dropped dead in front of Peter. The *Acts* are clear that certain children came to collect the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira in order to bury them. Although the *Acts* do not make direct reference that these children were the offspring of Ananias and Sapphira, it makes sense that they were, because they cared for the remains of this unfortunate couple. It is usually the close relatives who care for the funerals of their own. Reimarus fully accepted this event as historical and presented the case that Peter wanted the money to serve his own aims. Trying to analyse this event, Reimarus did not take into account that in *Luke* Jesus himself made it clear to one of his followers that he could not become his disciple without giving up everything he owned.<sup>10</sup> The same teaching of Jesus "sell what you have, give it to the poor and follow me" is repeated in *Matthew*<sup>11</sup>, *Mark*<sup>12</sup> and *Luke*<sup>13</sup>. Were these words said by Jesus, totally unrelated to Peter's style of fundraising? Who exactly were those poor Jesus wanted to support? Did Peter also want funds in order to support some poor people? Also, Reimarus does not appear to be aware that long before Jesus there was another Israelite leader, Judas Maccabee (d. 160 BCE) who also requested his followers to sell their possessions and follow him in his own military struggle for the establishment of his own earthly kingdom.<sup>14</sup> The new question here is whether the Christians too, just like the Maccabees before them, asked their supporters to sell their property and give everything they had in order to support a militant struggle? Is this why Peter was so anxious to find money?

---

<sup>10</sup> 14:33

<sup>11</sup> 19:21

<sup>12</sup> 10:21

<sup>13</sup> 18:22. In the same *Gospels* Jesus explains that this was a way to enter the heavenly kingdom of God. See *Matthew* 19:23-24; *Mark* 10:23-25 and *Luke* 18:22-25.

<sup>14</sup> *II Macc.*, 8:14.

To the best of my knowledge, after Reimarus the next author who emphasised the earthly character of Jesus's movement was the German-French Wilhelm Weitling (1808-1871), the founder of the German Communist movement and a member and protégé of the "League of the Proscribed," who commissioned him to write some of his books.<sup>15</sup> Weitling's efforts to publish *Das Evangelium eines armen Sünders*<sup>16</sup> in 1843 led the authorities to destroy the plates and the copies, and to his imprisonment and prosecution. In the court Weitling was very clear: "I am on trial for printing a new interpretation of the Bible.<sup>17</sup>... I saw how for eighteen hundred years the teaching of Christianity had served the interests of injustice, and I wanted to teach it to serve the interests of justice."<sup>18</sup> A second edition of his work by one of his followers led to the confiscation of several copies and to the persecutions of their owners.<sup>19</sup> Eventually, Weitling managed to publish his work in 1845, which was translated into a number of European languages.

Weitling was a Christian Communist preacher: "Christ is a prophet of freedom. His teaching is a teaching of freedom and love and he is therefore a picture for us of God and love".<sup>20</sup> But according to Weitling, historical Jesus did not love everybody: "Jesus had a revolutionary purpose ... He wanted to overthrow the Roman and the priestly authority."<sup>21</sup> Regardless of Weitling's increasing popularity and the rapid spread of the Christian Communist ideas he promoted, the League withdrew their support to him soon after the publication

---

<sup>15</sup> See David McClellan in the introduction of Weitling, pp. 6-14. The League (*Bund der Geachteten*) was a German Socialist organisation.

<sup>16</sup> W. Weitling, *Das Evangelium eines armen Sünders* (Bern, 1845), trans Dinah Livingston, *The poor sinner's gospel* (London, 1969). Weitling makes no mention of Reimarus.

<sup>17</sup> Weitling, p. 187.

<sup>18</sup> Weitling, p. 197.

<sup>19</sup> Weitling, preface, pp. 16-17.

<sup>20</sup> Weitling, pp. 10-11.

<sup>21</sup> Weitling, p. 55.

of his controversial book. Weitling was attacked by Marx and after a quarrel between the two men in 1846, Weitling lost the leadership of the Communist movement to the favour of Marx. Soon after he decided to emigrate to the US.<sup>22</sup> His Christian-Communist ideas were condemned by both the new leaders of the Communist movement and the Christian establishment. For the former, he failed to renounce religion and he was perceived as utopian. For the latter he was too much of a reformist, a heretic distorter of the divine image of Jesus. Weitling must have been disliked also by certain Jews, for he openly called Moses, their supreme spiritual leader, a "barbarian and nationalist".<sup>23</sup> In the years that followed his defeat by Marx his work received almost no attention. However, among all scholars I examined, Weitling is the only one who observed and analysed two specific *NT* incidents. The first is mentioned in each one of the *Synoptic Gospels*: Jesus and his followers were passing by certain fields; they felt hungry and started feeding themselves by picking crops.<sup>24</sup> The second is in *Mark*<sup>25</sup> where Jesus instructed his followers to enter a suburb in Jerusalem, take a donkey and bring it to him. Weitling questioned whether these two acts (picking the crops and taking the donkey) were acts of theft. He did so because there is no evidence in the relevant *NT* texts that the food and the donkey were taken with the consent of their owners.<sup>26</sup> Weitling also pointed to another incidence in the *NT* where Jesus made a whip and attacked with it the merchants and the money changers in the Temple.<sup>27</sup> Weitling questioned whether this attack against those who had the money is a good Christian example to be followed by the poor. After all, Weitling remarked, God in the *OT* instructed Moses and his people to rob the Egyptians in order to finance

---

<sup>22</sup> Bammel, 'The revolutionary,' pp. 14-16.

<sup>23</sup> Weitling, p. 130.

<sup>24</sup> Weitling, p. 126. Cf *Matthew* 12:1; *Mark* 2:23; *Luke* 6:1.

<sup>25</sup> 11:2 .

<sup>26</sup> Weitling, p. 127.

<sup>27</sup> Weitling, p. 128. Cf *John* 2:15; *Matthew* 21:12; *Mark* 11:15; *Luke* 19:45.

their flee from Egypt.<sup>28</sup> Why should this not be an example to follow by other people who also are in need? Weitling concluded that God and Jesus did not disapprove of the redistribution of wealth by violent means, provided that this wealth was the product of the exploitation of the poor.<sup>29</sup>

Weitling's questioning remains unanswered: did Jesus and the Apostles collect those crops and take the donkey without the permission of their owners? Were these acts of theft? Weitling did not examine these two incidents in parallel to a particular teaching of Jesus presented both in *Matthew*<sup>30</sup> and *Mark*<sup>31</sup>, where Jesus advised his followers not to make provisions for their travels. They were also instructed by Jesus not to carry any money with them.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, under the light of these passages, Weitling's questioning becomes even more powerful: how did a group of men who travelled without provisions and without money, survive? Is it possible that they did result into robbery?

Another question deriving from Weitling's observations is why Jesus and his followers left their homes and their families and had to result in feeding themselves with crops in the fields? Were there any food shortages in the area where their family homes were located? Were they a group of people who could not afford to feed themselves by making provisions or buy what they needed? Under which circumstances were they led into this position? Was it a custom for groups of people to feed themselves in such a way in that particular region at that particular period of history? Why did Jesus enter the Temple with his followers and attack those who had the money?

From Weitling onwards, for a long time there had been sporadic and limited

---

<sup>28</sup> Weitling, p. 129. Cf *Exodus* 3:20-22 (thus you will plunder the Egyptians).

<sup>29</sup> Weitling, pp. 128-131.

<sup>30</sup> 6:25-34.

<sup>31</sup> 6:8.

<sup>32</sup> *Matthew* 10:9.

discussion of the "earthly kingdom" hypothesis.<sup>33</sup> Czech-German Marxist philosopher Karl Kautsky (1854-1938), the spiritual father of the Social Democrat movement and an opponent to Lenin's Communism, is the most known early 20th century scholar who presented this case, but without conducting significant research on the primary sources.<sup>34</sup> The Greek writer Yiannis Kordatos (1891-1961) explored the earthly kingdom hypothesis further. A lawyer and a professional editor of ancient classical Greek works, he also served as the leader of the first Communist party in Greece.<sup>35</sup> In 1924, soon after he made it clear that he was against the party promoting the separation of Macedonia from the rest of Greece, there was an assassination attempt against him. Convinced that this was organised from inside the party, he left it.<sup>36</sup> Regardless of his clash with the party, in the 1930s he was imprisoned by the fascists who took over the administration of the Greek state. It is evident that, just like Weitling, Kordatos too, was a man who did not sacrifice his own ideas and principles in order to be liked either by the left or the right. He published his first work with reference to Early Christianity in 1927, where in a chapter he pointed to Jesus as a militant revolutionary.<sup>37</sup> In the decades that followed he worked extensively on this subject, but without managing to make his research known to the wider public. His two volume *Ιησούς Χριστός και Χριστιανισμός*<sup>38</sup> was rejected by all publishers he approached, even though he

---

<sup>33</sup> For example, Albert Kalthoff (1850-1906), in his *Die Entstehung des Christentums: Neue Beiträge zum Christusproblem* (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 17-23, suggested that Jesus was a leader of a social movement, without presenting any new analysis. John M. Robertson, *The historical Jesus* (London, 1916), p. 56, in a single phrase, repeated a similar argument that Jesus could have been a political leader who acted against the Roman yoke.

<sup>34</sup> Similarly to Kalthoff, Karl Kautsky, *Der Ursprung des Christentums* (Berlin, 1908) made a made a socio-political presentation of Early Christianity.

<sup>35</sup> ΣΕΚΕ.

<sup>36</sup> On the life of Kordatos see also Δήμος Μέξης, *Ο ιστορικός Γιάννης Κορδάτος και το έργο του: εισαγωγή, ανέκδοτη αυτοβιογραφία και αυτοκριτική* (Athens, 1975), pp. 163-167, (influenced by Dimitrios Glinos (1882-1943)).

<sup>37</sup> Kordatos, *Αρχαίες*, pp. 230-256. In p. 219, Kordatos states that 'recently' Henri Barbusse in two articles (both published in 1926, in *Humanité*, 28<sup>th</sup> July and 20<sup>th</sup> August), and in his book *Jesus*, also presented the case that Jesus was a revolutionary.

<sup>38</sup> trans. *Jesus Christ and Christianity*.



worked within this industry as an editor of ancient texts. Fourteen years after his death, this work was published thanks to the efforts of his son but it received little attention from the scholarly world. Just like Weitling, Kordatos wrote with the aim to enlighten the working classes and not the academics. This does not mean that Kordatos did not engage in an extensive analysis of the *NT* and Josephus the Jewish historian (*fl.* 1st c. CE).

Apart from Kordatos, no other scholar I examined emphasised that Jesus's attack in the Temple began soon after a certain preaching Jesus delivered to his followers, which ended with the phrase "but as for these enemies of mine who did not want me to be king over them-bring them here and slaughter them in my presence."<sup>39</sup> Kordatos understood that Jesus said this as an instruction to his disciples, just before the attack. Kordatos wrote that Jesus's militant movement did reach its peak during that same day when he attacked the Temple, and failed. According to Kordatos, this short duration of the revolt and its failure, explains why a number of historians who lived during those years ignored it, and wrote nothing about it.<sup>40</sup> For what he wrote, Kordatos faced the menace of the Greek conservative academic establishment. Savvas Agouridēs (1921-2009) in particular, an eminent professor of theology at the University of Athens, a vice president of the United Biblical Societies and of the Académie Internationale des Sciences Religieuses, attacked Kordatos for not approaching his sources in a critical way, appropriating certain material, his very limited bibliography and for hiding the fact that he based much of his material and interpretations on Karl Kautsky (1854-1938). This left a dark shadow upon Kordatos that he plagiarised Kautsky.<sup>41</sup> Kordatos was not alive to reply to Agouridēs that in both his *Αρχαίες Θρησκείες και Χριστιανισμός* and *Ιησούς*

---

<sup>39</sup> Trans. *Holy Bible*, p. 85; *Luke* 19:27-28: πλὴν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς μου τούτους τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεῦσαι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀγάγετε ὧδε καὶ κατασφάξατε αὐτοὺς ἔμπροσθέν μου. Καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

<sup>40</sup> Kordatos, vol. 1, pp. 36, 318-323.

<sup>41</sup> Agourides, *Οράματα και Πράγματα* (Athens, 1991), pp. 230-235.

Χριστός και Χριστιανισμός he repeatedly cited Kautsky.<sup>42</sup> Kordatos also highlighted his differences with Kautsky.<sup>43</sup> I have examined Kautsky<sup>44</sup> and I have seen that Kordatos's analysis of Jesus's revolutionary activities is entirely his own. The fact that Kordatos was attacked in such a malicious way by such an eminent figure as Agouridēs does not convince me that Kordatos's opponents are more scholarly, scientific, impartial or unbiased in their understanding of history than Kordatos himself. Certainly, Kordatos's bibliography is very limited and his work is speculative but is Kordatos's case that Jesus ordered a bloody attack, unworthy of any further investigation? What exactly do the ancient texts say about this incident?

Kordatos was convinced by Robert Eisler (1882-1949), an Austrian Jewish scholar who worked about the same time as him, that Medieval Christians censored and falsified the references Josephus made on Jesus's original historical activities.<sup>45</sup> It is not known whether Eisler came to know Kordatos or his circle when Eisler was studying at the University of Athens. While Kordatos remains unknown outside Greece, Eisler, just like Reimarus and Weitling, is a long forgotten scholar. An historian and a polymath, he too, in his *Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας* (1928-1930) came to the conclusion that Early Christianity participated in the first-century revolts as an active militant movement.<sup>46</sup> Outspoken, Eisler proclaimed that the official version of the Church about historical Jesus is nothing else than "a naive and touching legend"

---

<sup>42</sup> Kordatos, *Αρχαίες*, p. 52, p. 170, p. 270; Idem, *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός και Χριστιανισμός* (Athens, 1975<sup>2</sup>), vol.1, p. 129 (Kordatos makes it clear that he consulted Kautsky for his chapter), p. 206, p. 211, p. 230; vol. 2, p. 178

<sup>43</sup> Kordatos, *Αρχαίες*, pp. 218-219.

<sup>44</sup> Karl Kautsky, *Der Ursprung des Christentums* (Berlin, 1908), no name of translator, *Foundations of Christianity, A Study in Christian Origins* (London, 1925); idem, *Die materialistische Geschichtsauffassung* (Berlin, 1927), trans and ed. John Kautsky and R. Meyer, *The Materialist Conception of History* (Yale, 1988).

<sup>45</sup> Kordatos, vol. 1, pp. 39-40. Cf. idem, pp. 47-50 on Eisler.

<sup>46</sup> R. Eisler, *Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας*, 2 vols (Heidelberg, 1:1928-29, 2:1930); Idem, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* (London, 1931), pp. 74-92.

without historical value.<sup>47</sup> At about the same time Kordatos was arrested and imprisoned by the fascists, Eisler too was imprisoned by the Nazis in Dachau and Buchenwald. For some unknown reason to me, he was released before the start of WWII. Soon after, he emigrated to England.<sup>48</sup>

Eisler did not make any reference to Reimarus or Weitling, with the only exception being the short dedication "Von Reimarus - zu Reimarus,"<sup>49</sup> in the introduction of his German edition. This means that, according to Eisler, other scholarly research did not surpass the importance of Reimarus's conclusion that Early Christianity aimed to establish an earthly kingdom. Working on exactly this central argument, Eisler examined Professor Alexander Berendts's (1863-1912) analysis that a certain Slavonic text of Josephus's *De Bello*<sup>50</sup> contained parts of an original version of this work that did not exist within the different surviving Greek variants on which Jürgen A. B. Niese (1849-1910) based his own edition of *De Bello*.<sup>51</sup>

According to Eisler, the main reason that the Slavonic text of Josephus remained relatively unknown is because of certain reviews of its first German translation, which spread the propaganda that the text has no value as a historical source

---

<sup>47</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 92.

<sup>48</sup> [http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert\\_Eisler](http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Eisler) last accessed on the 29 June 2014.

<sup>49</sup> Eisler, *Ἡ σοφία*, vol. 1, p. vii.

<sup>50</sup> Also known as *Halōsis*. Berendts was the first who made this text known to the West.

<sup>51</sup> Alexander Berendts, *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen "De Bello Judaico" des Josephus in Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 1-80, at p. 1, the Slavonic text was first discovered by Andreas Popoff who published its overview in Moscow in 1866 and 1869; pp. 28-70 (the Slavonic text probably derives from an original text produced by Josephus); pp. 70-75, Berendts questioned whether the Slavonic derives from Josephus's mother tongue and concluded that the Slavonic derives from a very different recession than those Niese used. Eisler was able to write his own work only after Berendts's annotated translation of the Slavonic text was published posthumously in 1924-27. See *Flavius Josephus vom Jüdischen Kriege Buch I-IV. Nach der slavischen Übersetzung deutsch herausgegeben und mit dem griechischen text verglichen*, eds Alexander Berendts and Konrad Grass in *Eesti Vabariigi Tartu Ülikooli toimetused, Acta et commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis (Dorpatensis) B, Humaniora*, 4 vols (Tartu, 1924-27).

and is not worth studying.<sup>52</sup> Contrary to those reviews<sup>53</sup>, Eisler was convinced that the Slavonic texts contained original Josephus material that was censored by the Medieval Christian editors of the Greek manuscripts.

Eisler also argued that some of the ancient and original historical material of Josephus, which certain Christians aimed to destroy, did in fact survive due to the stupidity and the negligence of certain absent-minded copyists and censors. In some other cases, Eisler also concluded that some material survived due to the respect certain Christians had for some of their Gentile inheritance, meaning that some Christians did preserve some Gentile material regardless of the information it contained that historical Early Christianity was something very different to what the Church preached.<sup>54</sup> As a result, Eisler claimed that in spite of the efforts of the mainstream Church to eradicate the historical evidence it did not approve,<sup>55</sup> enough scattered material survived in certain manuscripts to reconstruct the image of historical Jesus.<sup>56</sup> Eisler made extensive efforts to discover, collect and analyse as much of that material as he could, and stressed the need to examine the differences not only between the Greek and the Slavonic but also the differences in between all extant variants of Josephus, available in different ancient languages.

Unfortunately, Eisler's textual criticism went too far. Regardless of his originality of thought and his extensive erudition, he did not hesitate to employ

---

<sup>52</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 113.

<sup>53</sup> For a bibliographical list of those reviews see Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 624.

<sup>54</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 13.

<sup>55</sup> Eisler claimed that a significant amount of historical evidence about Jesus was destroyed or falsified by Christians from Constantine onwards. He makes special note on Emperors Theodosius II (401-450) and Valentinian III (419-455). In *Messiah*, p. 12, he points to the extensive destruction and alteration of certain sources during Byzantium, e.g. Eunapius, Dio Chrysostom, *Historia Augusta* in the version extant in *Codex Palatinus* 899. Eisler also mentioned that *De Judaeis* of Antonius Julianus the procurator of Judea (c. 66-70) has disappeared. Cf. Idem, *Ἰησοῦς*, vol. 1, pp. 543 ff, for censored Hebrew manuscripts on Jesus.

<sup>56</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, preface, p. vii.

his own imagination to reconstruct parts of ancient texts which he thought were missing or were altered. In numerous instances he followed a process of restoring, correcting and composing passages according to his own preferences. In other words, he often created the evidence himself that he needed to make his arguments convincing. Apart from this point, Eisler's main work does not have a flow. Its topics are fragmented and scattered. In addition to these deficiencies, Eisler did not hesitate to praise himself for his objectiveness and for his high level of scholarly work, while attacking his contemporary Christian academic establishment for disregarding all NT evidence that goes contrary to their "preconceived picture of Jesus."<sup>57</sup> His language is often absolute and patronising, pushing his readers to accept his conclusions. Another point that makes Eisler's work appear as subjective and biased towards his Christian opponents is that, although he criticises them for accepting Christian forgeries and fabrications as history, he accepts wholeheartedly the Rabbinic tradition of his Jewish forefathers as "thoroughly trustworthy."<sup>58</sup> In other words, Eisler was convinced that ancient Rabbis presented history in a much more reliable and credible manner than the Christians did. More specifically, Eisler claimed that certain traces of the original *De Bello*, which were later erased from certain Byzantine Christian editions of Josephus, survived within the 15th-century *editio princeps* of the Hebrew *Josippon*<sup>59</sup>, and inside *Codex Hebraicus 1280* produced in 1472. Eisler observed that these two sources clearly state that Jesus was a leader of robbers.<sup>60</sup> Eisler also observed that one more Jewish source, a

---

<sup>57</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, preface, p. viii.

<sup>58</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 507.

<sup>59</sup> Ed. Rabbi Abraham Conat (Mantua, c.1476-1480). There is no consensus on the dating of the ancient material used in *Josippon*. Certain Jewish traditions accept it as a work originally written by Josephus, the Jewish historian.

<sup>60</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, pp. 94-98. Eisler also observed that the first source calls Jesus son of Josef, and the second son of Pandera. Apart from the above Hebrew evidence, Eisler *Messiah*, pp. 8-9 and p. 20 also accepts the historicity of *Adoba zara* (16b-17a), a rabbinical testimony that a certain Jacob of Kephars Sekhanjah reported to Rabbi Eliezer b. Hyrkanos (an eye witness to Great Revolt) a certain teaching passed to him by Jesu han-nosri (Jesus). In turn, Rabbi Eliezer passed this testimony to Rabbi Aquiba c. 110 CE. Cf. idem, pp. 593-594.

certain version of *Toldoth Jesu*,<sup>61</sup> reports that Jesus, son of Joseph, was in command of 2000 warriors.<sup>62</sup> Eisler also brought into light that another version of *Toldoth Jesu* states that certain "robbers" who were followers of Jesus, were also allied to the city of Edom.<sup>63</sup> The question here is whether these passages do have any historical value, as Eisler suggested, or should they be dismissed as un-historical? Do Eisler's conclusions deserve any further research?

Coming back to Reimarus on Peter's interaction with Ananias and Sapphira who dropped dead in front of his feet, although this incident is not analysed by Eisler, there is a striking observation brought forward by Eisler who had seen that in *Matthew*<sup>64</sup> Jesus calls Peter<sup>65</sup> with the name Βαριωνᾶ. This is often translated into English as "son of Jonah" or "son of John," but Eisler made an etymological analysis of this word and concluded that it derives from the Aramaic word *barjona* (*barjonîm* in plural).<sup>66</sup> This, Eisler claimed, has the same meaning with the Hebrew *barjon*, the Arabic *barjun* and the Syriac *baraja*. All these words in the different languages Eisler examined, have the meaning of "rebel," an "outcast" or "outlaw" who lives in remote, deserted areas.<sup>67</sup> If Peter was in fact a *barjona* outlaw, then the chances that Peter was responsible for the murder of Ananias and Sapphira increase significantly.

---

<sup>61</sup> There is no consensus as to when this might have been composed. Estimates vary between the fourth and eleventh century CE. It is a Jewish polemic work against Jesus that survives in various versions in over 100 manuscripts dating after the 11th century. There is no consensus on the dating of the composition of the earliest *Toldoth Jesu* text. In general, it has been classified as an untrustworthy source and is ignored by the vast majority of scholars. Most of the manuscripts they contain it remain unpublished: see Schonfield, pp. 29-34 (MSS); pp. 214-227 (*terminus ad quem* 9th c., *terminus a quo* 4th c.).

<sup>62</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 107. See also William Horbury, 'The depiction of Judaeo-Christians in the Toledot Yesu,' in Tomson, Peter J. and Doris Lambers-Petry, eds., *The Image of Judeo-Christians* (Tübingen, 2003), pp. 280-286 (*Toledoth Yeshu* calls Jesus's disciples violent and robbers who caused bloodshed).

<sup>63</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p.111.

<sup>64</sup> 16:17-18

<sup>65</sup> Simon in Hebrew

<sup>66</sup> Transliterated in the Greek *Matthew* as Βαριωνᾶ.

<sup>67</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 252-253. See also Joseph Nedava, 'Who Were the Biryoni?' in *JQR* 63, (1972-73), pp. 317-322, at p. 137 (Biryoni in Hebrew sources).

It is important to examine here that Martin Hengel (1926-2009), a German industrialist and a Professor of *New Testament* and Early Judaism, one of the most eminent and widely respected scholars both among Christians and Jews, rejected Eisler's conclusion on the meaning of *barjona*. Without making an etymological or linguistic analysis, Hengel preferred to examine how this term was used in certain *Midrashim*,<sup>68</sup> which Hengel examined through secondary sources. In one particular *Midrash* quoted by Hengel, certain *barjonîm* were men in arms, a kind of guards, who insulted their king. In two more of Hengel's *Midrashim* a certain *barjon* "guard" threw stones at a statue of a king. From these narratives Hengel concluded that the meaning of *barjon* is, most probably, that of a "praetorian" or "palace soldier" or "castle-guard" and this is why Hengel found it more probable that Eisler is wrong. Therefore, Hengel concluded, the Βασιωνᾶ in *Matthew* most probably means "son of John."<sup>69</sup> I am puzzled here on the relevance of the methodology and the analysis Hengel used to conclude that Eisler's explanation on the meaning of *barjona* should better be left aside. I am also puzzled why Hengel has not said a word about Eisler's other discovery that *Toldoth Jesu* names a certain John also as one of the *barjonîm* robbers?<sup>70</sup> Another scholar, Shulamis Frieman, who did not refer to either Eisler or Hengel on this topic, puts Hengel's analysis and understanding of *barjona* under further questioning. Frieman observed that the *biryonim*<sup>71</sup> in the *Talmud* were a group

---

<sup>68</sup> Short stories aiming at explaining and interpreting the meaning of certain passages of the *Hebrew Bible* (also known as *Tanakh*) which were difficult to be understood.

<sup>69</sup> *Zeloten*, pp. 53-56: (*ExRab* 30,18: "A parable of a king whom his barjonim insulted in the purple that he was wearing"; *ibid*, 30,11: "A parable about a barjon who was drunk, broke open the gaol, let the prisoners out, threw stones at the statue of the king, cursed the governor and said: 'Show me where the king is and I will teach him the law'; *YalShim(Esther)* 2,1056: "A parable about a barjon who threw stones at the statue of the king; then they all flocked together...". Cf. Jack, *Christ*, p. 188. Jack insists that the "bar" in Peter "barjona" stands for "son". Though Jack also accepts that *barjonim* has a negative connotation, in the case of Peter, Jack states that this is impossible; Fitzmyer, *Essays*, p. 112, just like most scholars, accepts Bar Jonah as patronymic.

<sup>70</sup> Eisler, *Enigma*, pp. 70-71.

<sup>71</sup> Another form of the *barjonîm* we have seen above.

of zealots who, during the siege by Vespasian disobeyed certain Israelite authorities in Jerusalem, and fought against the Romans.<sup>72</sup> Frieman concluded that the meaning of *barjona* was embarrassing to translate into Greek, and this explains why the author of *Matthew*<sup>73</sup> left it in the Aramaic form, transliterated into Greek as Βαριωνᾶ. This word has no meaning in the Greek language, and as a result the Greek reader of *Matthew* is not able to understand what it means. Frieman also concluded that the Greek *Gospel of John*, instead of calling Peter a Βαριωνᾶ, as the *Gospel of Matthew* did, chose not to mention this word at all. Instead, it provides the distorted translation "son of John."<sup>74</sup> Frieman also claimed that *John* opted not to mention Βαριωνᾶ at all, and chose to distort its meaning by calling Peter "son of John".<sup>75</sup> This explanation presented by Frieman implies that the author of *John* either tried to conceal or distort original information that revealed a different picture about the first Christians. After having examined the explanation provided by Eisler and Frieman on one hand, and Hengel on the other on the meaning of *barjona*, I am not in a position to make a final judgement in this introduction. The question here is, could Frieman and Eisler be right that Peter was one of the *barjonîm*, the outlaw rebels? Who exactly were the *barjonîm* and what was their historical relation with the Early Christians? For the academic establishment there is no such question. Eisler's entire work has been almost unanimously judged to be unworthy of any further investigation.<sup>76</sup> Before Hengel, James Jack (*fl.* 1930s)

---

<sup>72</sup> Shulamis Frieman, *Who's Who in the Talmud*, (Northvale, New Jersey, 1995), p. 393 (*Gittin* 56b)

<sup>73</sup> 16:17-18.

<sup>74</sup> *John* 1:42 .

<sup>75</sup> *John* 1:42 .

<sup>76</sup> Hengel, *Was Jesus*, p. 4 : "neither the new sources nor [Eisler's] historical method, which Dibelius characterises as 'combination magic', could convince critical research." Hengel's determination to ridicule Eisler is evident from the fact that he kept repeating Dibelius's phrase; *Zeloten*, p. 2, this could be the first time where Hengel quotes Dibelius, *ThBl* 6 (1927), p. 219, that "Eisler's method was called Kombinatorische Magie"; In pp. 9-10, fn 28, Hengel again attacks Eisler for his imaginative combinations. Cf. Idem, pp. 16-18, on the few scholars who accepted Eisler's thesis. The majority have accepted that the *Slavonic* Josephus is "a late hybrid form" while "certain Christian insertions... are purely literary and stylistic and have no



went as far as to compose an entire work against Eisler and in defence of "the Vision Beautiful of Jesus."<sup>77</sup> In his preface, Jack stated that "after nineteen centuries of assault and misrepresentation, we can still look on the Picture of Jesus, as it stands in the Gospel story, and adore it as Divine." Eisler, Jack says, altered and manipulated the sources in order to suit to his own theories; Eisler based his work on the inauthentic and interpolated Slavonic version of Josephus and contrary to most scholars, he also wrongly accepted the *Acta Pilati* as a reliable source.<sup>78</sup> Just like Jack and Hengel, the Cambridge scholar Ernst Bammel<sup>79</sup> too, condemned Eisler's entire work, and repeated earlier accusations against Eisler for lack of source criticism, selective use of sources and also that he ignored the *New Testament* and *Mark* 11:27-12:34 in particular, where Jesus preached submissions to Caesar<sup>80</sup> and to love your neighbour<sup>81</sup> as yourself.<sup>82</sup> For these reasons, Bammel observed that "neither Jewish nor Marxist historians felt challenged to give [Eisler] substantial and massive support."<sup>83</sup> But did Eisler ignore the *NT*? And what exactly did Eisler see in the Slavonic Josephus? Are all Eisler's findings and conclusions without scientific value? Unlike the vast majority of scholars, Hugh J. Schonfield (1901-1988), a Hebrew Christian and a Doctor of Sacred Literature, took a more careful approach to Eisler:

"Despite Eisler's perverse handling of his material, he is at least to be congratulated on forcing a recognition that there are traces in known Christian and Jewish tradition of other facts about Jesus of Nazareth, no less worthy of credence than those contained in the canonical

---

historical validity" and this is the main reason they rejected Eisler. Cf. J. Reumann in Hengel, *Was Jesus*, p. xi.

<sup>77</sup> Jack, *Christ*, pp. 5-6; Jack rejects any thought that the Christians censored Josephus (p. 219) on the basis that it was not possible to censor all available manuscripts (p. 217).

<sup>78</sup> Jack, *Christ*, pp. 99-100 (alterations and manipulations); pp. 50-67 (*Slavonic*); pp. 220-229 (*Acta Pilati*); Craig. A. Evans, 'Jesus in non-Christian sources', in Chilton-Evans, pp. 443-478 at 451 (Evans states that no scholar accepts the historical value of the *Slavonic* evidence on Jesus).

<sup>79</sup> (d. c. 1999).

<sup>80</sup> 12:17.

<sup>81</sup> 12:31-32.

<sup>82</sup> Bammel, 'Revolutionary,' pp. 11-68 at p. 32, Eisler was based mainly on non-*NT* material.

<sup>83</sup> Bammel, 'Revolutionary,' p. 35 "his thesis on the origin of the *Slavonic* Josephus had met with little or no approbation."

narratives."<sup>84</sup>

Professor Samuel G. F. Brandon (1907-1971), an Anglican priest and a comparative religion scholar, did have much respect for Eisler whom he met in person a number of times and proclaimed a charismatic scholar.<sup>85</sup> Brandon, with his studies<sup>86</sup> re-enforced Eisler's case that Early Christianity was a militant revolutionary movement. Brandon accepted *Mark* and the *Acts* as vital sources for the understanding of historical Early Christianity. Based also on Josephus, he examined the historical context of the period between the first and the seventh decades CE.<sup>87</sup> According to Brandon, a young Jesus living during years of turmoil and revolts, could not have taken the side of the Romans; he must have stood on the side of his compatriot Judas the Zealot, a certain Galilean leader of a revolution which started in Galilee.<sup>88</sup> In the years that followed, Brandon explained, Jesus formed his own revolutionary movement that was welcomed by a multitude in Jerusalem.<sup>89</sup> Brandon questioned what that multitude did when Jesus attacked the Temple?<sup>90</sup> Did they leave Jesus whom they proclaimed as their Messiah, without any help during his struggle?<sup>91</sup> Brandon understood historical Jesus as a rebel who also fought against Rome; this is why he was crucified.<sup>92</sup> However, Brandon also concluded that although

---

<sup>84</sup> Schonfield, p. 15.

<sup>85</sup> Brandon, *Fall*, preface, xi.

<sup>86</sup> *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church, a study of the effects of the Jewish overthrow of AD 70 on Christianity* (London, 1957<sup>2</sup>); *Jesus and the Zealots, a study of the Political factor in primitive Christianity* (Manchester, 1967); *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (London, 1968)

<sup>87</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 65-145, also makes a careful examination of the military struggles of the Israelites against Rome from 6-73 CE; Idem, *Trial*, pp. 25-59.

<sup>88</sup> Brandon, *Trial*, pp. 30-31.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. *Mark* 11:8-10.

<sup>90</sup> Brandon, *Trial*, pp. 83-84.

<sup>91</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, p. 331. Idem, pp. 332-333, Brandon questions the validity of the Gospels in presenting Jesus attacking the Temple alone, and indicates that this could not have been done by a single person.

<sup>92</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 22-25, cf pp. 1-21. Contrary to this conclusion, in p. 336, after the attack to the Temple, Brandon sees Jesus as leading a revolt not against the Romans, but solely against the Israelite authorities.

Jesus was punished for the political crime of sedition, he should not be regarded as the leader of a certain Zealot party which was active at the same time. According to Brandon, Jesus was sympathetic to those Zealots,<sup>93</sup> and just one of Jesus's followers was a member of that Zealot party.<sup>94</sup> Brandon argued that the rise of the Zealots against the Romans should not be examined as unconnected to the separate movement led by Jesus.<sup>95</sup> Brandon also raised the case that some parts of the *NT*, and *Mark* in particular, which present Jesus as cooperative towards Rome, should be regarded as suspicious in terms of originality.<sup>96</sup> Through his extensive analysis of *Mark*, Brandon concluded that this is an apologetic work written after the Great Revolt (c.60-73 CE),<sup>97</sup> not only to persuade the Roman world that Christianity had nothing to do with the wars against it, but also to persuade the Christians to become loyal to Rome.<sup>98</sup> Brandon also concluded that a number of passages in the *NT* were written by authors whose communities suffered great disasters from the revolts, and this is why they tried to discourage those who wanted to continue the militant struggle.<sup>99</sup> In other words, Brandon openly claimed that some *New Testament* material was produced by a certain group who altered the historical record, trying to conceal the Christian involvement in the first century wars against Rome.

---

<sup>93</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 322-358.

<sup>94</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, p. 324 and p. 327.

<sup>95</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, p. 351.

<sup>96</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 146-220.

<sup>97</sup> For this dating of the Great Revolt see my explanations below that the hostilities stopped three years after the fall of Jerusalem to the Romans in 70 CE, and began 7 years before the widely accepted dating.

<sup>98</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 221-282. Cf. idem, *Trial*, p. 59, where Brandon accepts that the Christians did participate in the Great Revolt; Garber, 'Jewish,' p. 13, Garber is in agreement with Brandon that the *NT* has altered the historical image of Jesus from a revolutionary to a pacifist, in order "to win Roman favor."

<sup>99</sup> Brandon, *Trial*, pp. 77-78, Brandon concludes that *Matthew* 26:52 "all who take the sword will perish by the sword."

Brandon's thesis was rejected by the academic establishment.<sup>100</sup> Hengel in particular composed a thirty six pages long essay entitled *Was Jesus a revolutionist?* that aimed to prove that Brandon was based on "fantasy and a selective treatment of sources."<sup>101</sup> Hengel summarised Brandon's entire work in three pages,<sup>102</sup> and pointed out that Brandon built his whole theory on a misunderstanding of a very small collection of NT passages.<sup>103</sup> The fact is that Hengel himself chose only a very small fraction of Brandon's work to criticise it, while Brandon presented ample evidence in his books that he had studied the entire *New Testament* with much scholarly care. Contrary to Brandon, Hengel

---

<sup>100</sup> E.g. see M. De Jonge who reviewed Brandon's *Jesus and the Zealots* in *Vig. Chr.* 23 (1969), pp. 228-231. Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 301, without any analysis or substantial counter-arguments, Hengel simply condemned Brandon's conclusion that the Christians participated in any revolts; Applebaum, 'Zealots,' p. 156, Applebaum praised Hengel's work for its objectiveness, but he named Brandon's work "a highly debatable special thesis" without any further analysis; G. Krodel, 'Persecution and Toleration of Christianity Until Hadrian', in *The Catacombs and the Colosseum, the Roman empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity*, eds S. Benko and J. O' Rourke (Valley Forge, 1971), pp. 255-267 at p. 257 (Krodel states that Jesus did not rise against Rome); Powell, *Jesus*, p. 175, on the rejection of Brandon by all scholars Powell examined; Fiensy, *Jesus*, pp. 210-214, on Brandon as a category of his own: imaginative and speculative; Marcus J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the teachings of Jesus*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, vol. 5 (New York, 1984), p. 279, for a list of articles and books which refute Brandon. Idem, pp. 8-12 on the well established theory that Jesus was not involved into politics, and the eschatological character of his mission; Hengel, *Was Jesus*, p. 25; H. Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society, from Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 6-7 (the Christians had nothing to do with the Zealots). More recently, S. Freyne also rejected that Jesus and his circle had anything to do with Zealot circles. See Freyne, 'The Galilean,' p. 131; Barnett, *Jesus*, pp. 84-89, does not see any connection between Jesus and revolts. In accordance to Brandon's theory, in the 1980s Hyam Maccoby also supported the case that Jesus must have been a rebel, without bringing forward any new evidence or new analysis. See idem, *The Mythmaker: Paul and the invention of Christianity* (London, 1986), pp. 46-49; idem, *Jesus the Pharisee* (London, 2003), pp. 139-152, on contradictory perceptions of Jesus within the *Talmud*; idem, *Revolution*. Maccoby does not refer to Eisler and does not include his work in the bibliography.

<sup>101</sup> Hengel, *Was Jesus*, p. 9.

<sup>102</sup> 7-10.

<sup>103</sup> Most notably *Mark* 15:7, interpreted by Brandon that it referred to a revolt that was taking place when Jesus attacked the Temple. Brandon claimed that Jesus acted as an assistant to that revolt; *Luke* 22:36 (whoever does not have a sword should buy one); *Luke* 23:2 (Jesus was accused of stirring the people against Caesar); *Matthew* 10:34 ("I did not come to bring peace, but a sword") Cf Fernando Bermejo-Rubio, 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance, A Reassessment of the Arguments,' in *Journal for the study of historical Jesus*, 12 (2014), pp. 1-105 at pp. 9-14: Bermejo-Rubio presents 35 points in the NT which support the earthly kingdom/revolutionary hypothesis. He is based on Brandon and Montserrat Torrents.

presented the case that the attack in the Temple was, in fact, verbal rather than physical.<sup>104</sup> Hengel was convinced that the entire *NT* refers only to a single act of Christian violence, that of Peter cutting a servant's ear in Gethsemane. According to Hengel, this was insignificant because the *NT* is clear that the authorities let Peter and his fellows free to go after that incident.<sup>105</sup> Hengel was also convinced that in the forty years after Jesus, the Roman authorities took no action against any Christians. Hengel concluded that the extermination of Peter and Paul by the Romans was primarily the fault of the Jews who lobbied the Romans to attack the Christians.<sup>106</sup> Therefore, according to Hengel, there is no evidence that the Romans had anything against Christianity because it challenged their dominion; Brandon was simply misguided; he failed to observe that the *NT* often presents Jesus as a physician who tried to heal people.<sup>107</sup> These are the *NT* stories Brandon should have examined because these, according to Hengel, do present the historical Jesus. As for Jesus advising the purchase of swords, Hengel concluded that it was a custom at that time for everybody to carry a sword.<sup>108</sup> Regarding the other saying of Jesus that "I came to bring sword, not peace," Hengel concluded that this was a prophecy with reference to the organisation of the Church, the internal strives and the divisions of the Church which followed in the years after Jesus.<sup>109</sup> According to Hengel, historical Jesus preached peace<sup>110</sup> and was nothing like Che Guevara.<sup>111</sup> He was more like Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> p.17.

<sup>105</sup> p. 18 (Gethsemane: *Mark* 14:47, *Matthew* 26:51-54, *Luke* 22:50, *John* 18:11).

<sup>106</sup> p. 19, see also note 58.

<sup>107</sup> p. 20.

<sup>108</sup> pp. 21-22.

<sup>109</sup> p. 23.

<sup>110</sup> *Luke* 6:27-36; *Matthew* 5:38-48.

<sup>111</sup> p. 20.

<sup>112</sup> p. 29.

Working on the same side as Hengel, Ernst Bammel emphasised that Brandon himself concluded that Jesus was not a Zealot<sup>113</sup> and attacked Brandon and anyone else, Jewish or Christian, who dared support that Jesus was a militant revolutionary.<sup>114</sup> The Catholic John Dominic Crossan, a *New Testament* Professor also attacked Brandon's argument that the first Christians did associate themselves with the so called "Fourth Philosophy" initiated by Judas the Galilean Zealot, without providing any convincing evidence that he examined either Brandon or Josephus in detail. Crossan, just like the vast majority of scholars, examines the Fourth Philosophy, the Sicarii and the Zealots as three different movements.<sup>115</sup> The question here is what exactly those movements were, and what did the primary sources, Christian, Jewish or Gentile say about them? Should the vast majority of scholars who see no relation between them and Christianity be trusted, or should I investigate this matter any further?

One more eminent scholar, Professor John P. Meier, a Catholic priest, also without providing evidence that he examined Brandon and Josephus in depth, came to the conclusion that Jesus had nothing to do with revolutionary Zealots, and that they did not even exist at the time of Jesus.<sup>116</sup> John P. M. Sweet (1927-2009), an Anglican priest and a Cambridge scholar accused Brandon of not

---

<sup>113</sup> Bammel, 'Revolutionary,' pp. 37-43. Cf. Sweet, 'The Zealots,' p. 1: Brandon did not name Jesus and the Christians as Zealots, but as sympathisers of Zealots.

<sup>114</sup> Bammel, 'Revolutionary,' p. 55: "The Jew who incorporates Jesus into his own heritage does so at the cost of moving him away from Christianity, of widening the gap between Jewry and Christendom and of denouncing Paul and Christianity. The non-Jew, who pictures Jesus as Zealot takes this as a sufficient reason for dispensing with a Christian heritage which is built on so strange a foundation. The Zealot interpretation serves as a means of and justification for dissociation from Christianity." Cf. Shaul Magid, 'The New Jewish Reclamation of Jesus in Late Twentieth-Century America: Realigning and Rethinking Jesus the Jew', pp. 358-382 in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011), the entire article on the process that began in the 1960s among the Jewish community in US, reclaiming Jesus as a proper Jewish leader.

<sup>115</sup> Crossan, *Historical*: "I emphatically do not presume any coordinated and continuous century-long insurrection against Rome led, say, on the ideological level by the fourth philosophy or the Sicarii and on the practical level by the Zealots."

<sup>116</sup> Meier, *Marginal*, vol. 3, pp. 565-569.

understanding that Jesus said certain things with a sense of irony.<sup>117</sup> For example, Sweet pointed to *Matthew*<sup>118</sup> (where Jesus said that he did not come to bring peace on earth, but sword) and *Luke*<sup>119</sup> (where Jesus advised whoever of his followers did not have a knife to sell their cloth and buy one), by explaining that such things were said by Jesus not in order to instigate violence or support a militant revolutionary cause. Without mentioning the explanations provided above by Hengel on the same passages, Sweet presented his own theory that Jesus said such things for rhetorical reasons and he did not mean to instigate any kind of violence.

Craig S. Keener, a Baptist pastor and a Professor is also convinced that Brandon was wrong because there is not enough evidence to support that Jesus was a Zealot.<sup>120</sup> Just like Sweet, Keener too pointed to the saying of Jesus in *Mark* "render to Caesar what is Caesar's,"<sup>121</sup> and to *Matthew*<sup>122</sup> and *Luke*,<sup>123</sup> where Jesus preached "love your enemies." According to Keener, this is strong and historical evidence that Jesus was very loyal to Rome and Caesar, and had absolutely nothing to do with the revolts.<sup>124</sup> Keener also pointed to *Matthew*<sup>125</sup> and *Luke*,<sup>126</sup> where Jesus clearly preached about a kingdom in the heavens, and not about an earthly one. This is how, in a couple of pages, Keener also discarded the validity of Brandon's entire work.

---

<sup>117</sup> Sweet, 'Zealots,' p. 8.

<sup>118</sup> 10:34.

<sup>119</sup> 22:35-38.

<sup>120</sup> Keener, *Historical*, p. 10-11.

<sup>121</sup> 12:17.

<sup>122</sup> 5:38-47: "Do not resist an evildoer. But if one strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other also; and if one wants to sue you and take your coat, give your cloak as well... Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you..."; 26:52: "all who take the sword will perish by the sword."

<sup>123</sup> 6:27-37.

<sup>124</sup> Keener, *Historical*, pp. 12-13.

<sup>125</sup> 5:10.

<sup>126</sup> 6:23.

Klaus Berger, a New Testament Theology Professor at Heidelberg is another noteworthy and eminent academic who rejects the hypothesis that the first Christians had anything to do with any Zealots and with the establishment of an "earthly kingdom." According to Berger, there is powerful historical evidence in *Matthew* 26:53 that Jesus did not command any army of the Zealots.<sup>127</sup> The passage is clear, Berger explained, that Jesus said he was able to command twelve legions of angels to protect him, and therefore he did not need Peter's use of any violence. Jesus said that right after Peter cut the servant's ear, in order to emphasise that he did not need any help from Peter and his knife. Just like Hengel, Bammel, Sweet and Keener examined above, Berger also concluded there is only a very small group of *NT* passages on which the "Zealot" theorists built their case.<sup>128</sup> Regarding the attack in the Temple, according to Berger this was not military but a spiritual, messianic and religious event that had nothing to do with physical violence. Also, answering why Jesus advised his followers to buy swords in *Luke*, Berger is clear: Jesus said so in order to help them protect themselves from wild dogs<sup>129</sup> and it is evident that this explanation is an invention made up by Berger, who did not question that for poor men like Jesus and his followers it would have been much cheaper and more affective to combat any wild dogs with long sticks or stones, rather than selling their clothes in order to buy swords. Let alone that there is no mention of any dogs in the relevant passages. According to Berger, Jesus in *Matthew* said that he came to bring sword in a metaphorical sense, and with reference to the divisions between members of the same family on the matter of following

---

<sup>127</sup> Berger, *Qumran*, p. 54.

<sup>128</sup> Berger prefers to point to *Mark* 11:15 (Attack on the Temple); *Luke* 22:38 (the two swords); *Matthew* 10:34 (to bring sword to the world).

<sup>129</sup> There are no wild dogs mentioned here in the *NT*, and this is clearly an invention made up by Berger, who did not question that for poor men like Jesus and his followers it would have been much cheaper and more affective to combat any wild dogs with long sticks of wood and stones, rather than using swords.



him.<sup>130</sup> Berger is convinced: "the *New Testament* contains no suggestion whatsoever that Jesus or any authoritative person of early Christianity (besides Simon the Zealot in *Luke* 6:15 and *Acts* 1:13, the origin of whose nickname we do not know) had been Zealots." Therefore, according to Berger, those who propagate such theories are doing so guided by a very strong "self-interest"; some of them are Socialists while others are Jews.<sup>131</sup> In other words, Berger meant that it is him and people like him who should be trusted on the matter of historical Early Christianity, and not some Socialists or Jews.

Giorgio Jossa, a Catholic Professor at the University of Napoli, based his refutation of the "earthly kingdom" hypothesis on extensive analysis of the *NT*. Just like Hengel, he too concluded that the Romans crucified Jesus because they were deceived by the Jews to believe that Jesus was leading a political movement against them.<sup>132</sup> The truth, according to Jossa, is that Jesus was a pacifist. Reimarus, Eisler and Brandon, were deceived. Reimarus in particular, presented his case under the misguiding influences of the Enlightenment.<sup>133</sup> Contrary to Eisler and Brandon, Jossa's study of Josephus convinced him that the revolutionary Zealots and Sicarii had nothing to do with the Christians.<sup>134</sup> Jossa also analysed the *NT* passages regarding Jesus's attack at the Temple, and concluded that Jesus had absolutely no intention of occupying the Temple.<sup>135</sup> In accordance with his Protestant and Catholic colleagues examined above, Jossa too concluded that the actions of Jesus inside the Temple were not those of a Sicarius or Zealot;<sup>136</sup> the material in the *Gospels* with reference to Christians

---

<sup>130</sup> Berger, *Qumran*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>131</sup> Berger, *Qumran*, p. 18. He does not give any names.

<sup>132</sup> Jossa, *Gesù*, p. 334.

<sup>133</sup> Jossa, *Gesù*, p. 96

<sup>134</sup> Jossa, *Gesù*, pp. 21-94

<sup>135</sup> Jossa, *Gesù*, p. 128: *Mark* 11:15-17; *Matthew* 21:12-13; *Luke* 19:45-46; *John* 2:13-17.

<sup>136</sup> Jossa, *Gesù*, pp. 134-139.

using violence is very scarce and insignificant; it is clear that Jesus proclaimed a heavenly kingdom and not an earthly one.<sup>137</sup>

Contrary to Jossa, another Catholic Professor, José Montserrat Torrents, a Catalan expert in Coptic sources, has seen very different evidence deriving from the same primary sources Jossa examined: the *NT* and Josephus. Firmly in support of Brandon, Montserrat Torrents highlighted that John the Baptist, Jesus and his brother Jacob<sup>138</sup> were all executed by the authorities: this is a powerful indication that they must have been involved in the rebellions.<sup>139</sup> In the most straight-forward, clear and laconic book that has been produced so far by any scholar on the "earthly kingdom" hypothesis, Montserrat Torrents emphasised that the Romans crucified only those who instigated aggravation against the authorities or were involved in very serious crimes. Jesus's crucifixion was the result of his violent revolutionary activities. Montserrat Torrents also emphasised that Jesus and his circle were Nazirites, a certain extremist religious order.<sup>140</sup> Through his own study of Josephus and the *NT*, Montserrat Torrents presented a thesis exactly opposite to Jossa: Jesus was a leader of revolutionaries who fought against Rome.<sup>141</sup> So far, I have not been able to examine any criticism against Montserrat Torrents. Regardless of the importance of his work, it has not been translated in English. Although it was written with the aim of reaching the wider public, I refuse to discard it as a populist approach to the earthly kingdom / Zealot hypothesis. Instead, I will

---

<sup>137</sup> Jossa, *Gesù*, p. 182 (insignificant), pp. 293-309 (heavenly kingdom).

<sup>138</sup> Also known as James.

<sup>139</sup> *Jesús*, pp. 15-16.

<sup>140</sup> *Jesús*, pp. 63-66

<sup>141</sup> In his chapter, 'La lucha armada' (The armed struggle) in *Jesús* pp. 89-124; (pp. 91-94: (crucifixion), and that this a serious indication the Jesus was a political revolutionary. Idem, pp. 101-124 he juxtaposed a selection of evidence, most notably from Josephus (*Bel.* 1.648; 2.56, 259, 264-265. *Ant.* 17.152-153, 158, 215; 18.12; 19.243; 20.97-98, 106, 164) and the *NT* (*Luke* 22:35-38; *Acts* 21:30-32; *Matthew* 26:51; *John* 18.10, *Mark* 11.15-17). In p. 111 instead of *Mark* 26:51 he probably wanted to cite *Matthew* 26:51). Indicative of its contents, his eighth chapter, pp. 137-143, is entitled 'Batalla, captura y muerte' (Battle, capture and death).

conduct a complete - as possible investigation of the sources in order to discover myself who these Nazirites were and what they had to do with Christianity. Why exactly were John the Baptist, Jesus and his brother Jacob put to death? Were there any other Early Christians who became known as Nazirites and were executed by the authorities?

Jewish-American Professor Robert Eisenman, a foremost expert on the *Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls*<sup>142</sup> who compared textual evidence from the *Scrolls*, Josephus, and the *NT*, came to the conclusion that Jacob the brother of Jesus was no other than a historical leader of the Essenes, a religious sect who called their leader 'Teacher of Righteousness.'<sup>143</sup> More specifically, Eisenman indicated that numerous symbolisms and certain terminology in the *Habakkuk Peshier* of the *Dead Sea Scrolls* were used with direct reference to Jacob the brother of Jesus and that the same work also referred to certain followers of James, called Evionites. Based on his analysis of the primary evidence he discovered, Eisenman presented the case that the Essenes and the Eviōnaioi were no others than the Zealot revolutionaries who destroyed Jerusalem.<sup>144</sup> Eisenman did not deal with the material and analysis presented by Eisler and Brandon.<sup>145</sup> Instead his work was based primarily on material deriving from the *Scrolls* that was unknown to both previous scholars because the scrolls were discovered in the 1950s and

---

<sup>142</sup> The *Qumran Scrolls* are dated between 200 BCE and 70 CE, while a small part of them may be dated to the third c. BCE. Most of the texts are dated to the first century CE: see Vermes, *Scrolls*, pp. 26, 54-60; For a later dating by R. Eisenman see below, p. 70; García Martínez, *Textos*, p. xx (both Hebrew and Aramaic texts were discovered in Qumran); p. xxiv. García Martínez translated all non-biblical manuscripts, with the exception of certain illegible fragments that are of no practical use to the common reader.

<sup>143</sup> R. Eisenman, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians* (Shaftesbury, 1996), pp. 111-217, 332-351.

<sup>144</sup> Eisenman, *James*, pp. 217-408; Betz-Riesner, pp. 48-49, reject Eisenman's theory that Early Christians participated in the Great Revolt without providing an analysis. They also refer to populist authors (Baigent, Leigh) who copied Eisenman's theory.

<sup>145</sup> Eisenman, *James*, p. 64 n. 25, p. 264 n. 10. I could find only these two references to Eisler, and no reference to Brandon in this work. P. Cresswell in his popularised *Jesus the Terrorist* (Ropley, 2010), also supports the case of Christian participation in the revolts against Rome, without referring to Eisler. Also see P. Cresswell, *Censored Messiah, the truth about Jesus Christ* (Alresford, 2004), pp. 215-238.

were published much later. Regardless that Eisenman spent most of his life on a systematic study of the *Qumran Scrolls*, his thesis that James was the leader of Zealot revolutionaries met little approval from the academic establishment.<sup>146</sup> The complication of his thought surpassed that of Eisler.

Without providing any analysis of Eisenman's theory, Berger attacked Eisenman's thesis as "wild and half-scholarly theories that no one in the nineteenth century believed and that have been justifiably forgotten, so that they can appear today as something new."<sup>147</sup> Without referring to Eisenman, and without providing any scholarly evidence, the American historian Paula Fredriksen follows the same line with Berger in rejecting the validity of the theory that Jesus or his brother were Essenes."<sup>148</sup> Fredriksen simply repeated the views of the vast majority of Early Christianity academics on this topic. On the same line with Berger and Fredriksen regarding the validity of the Zealot or Essene identity of the first Christians, the Oxford Professor of Jewish Studies Martin Goodman, without any direct reference to Eisenman, confronts Eisenman's conclusion by insisting on the irrelevance between a number of different extremist Jewish sects.<sup>149</sup> So far I am not convinced that those who attacked Eisenman did so only after they examined his work in detail. That is

---

<sup>146</sup> Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London, 1991), pp. 225-227, on their support to Eisenman's efforts for open access to the entire Qumran material; pp. 199-210, on their support to Eisenman's thesis that Early Christians did participate in revolts, and that they continued a Zealot tradition first initiated by Mattathias (the descendant of Hasmon).

<sup>147</sup> Berger, *Qumran*, p. 12.

<sup>148</sup> Paula Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews: A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity* (London, 2000), p. 5: "Some of the wildest arguments-that Jesus himself, or perhaps his brother James, was an Essene; ... routinely appear in the popular media without seriously affecting the direction most scholars take."

<sup>149</sup> M. Goodman, 'Josephus and Variety in First Century Judaism,' in *The Religious History of the Roman Empire, Pagans, Jews and Christians*, eds J. A. North and S. R. F. Price (Oxford, 2011), pp. 419-434 at 432, on the divisions among the Jews in the first century. See also Berger, *Qumran* p. 31, Berger presents six groups in the deserts which he considers different. He refers to John the Baptist (*Mark* 1:3-4); *Daniel* 4:33 (Nebuchadnezzar living like a hermit).

why I prefer to conduct my own investigation of primary sources as to whether there is any relation between the Essenes and Christianity.

Unlike previous theories regarding the historical identity of Jesus, Professor of Religion Richard Horsley advocated a new theory that Jesus was a social revolutionary who "while not necessarily a pacifist, actively opposed violence."<sup>150</sup> Although some may find it difficult to understand, follow and explore the steps of a historical Jesus who was not a pacifist but opposed violence, this was done in a creative way by Professor of Creative Writing Reza Aslan, a liberal Muslim of Iranian descent who presents himself as an expert in Early Christian history and Ancient Greek.<sup>151</sup> Proud for the superiority of Islam, the religion of his ancestors to which he returned after he became disillusioned with Christianity,<sup>152</sup> Aslan was convinced that he was well equipped to conduct scientific research on the historical Jesus. Without any reference to Eisler, Eisenman or Montserrat Torrents, and with mention of Reimarus and Brandon only in his bibliography, Aslan also left aside any first hand research of the primary ancient sources, with the only possible exception being the *NT*. His recycling and interpretation of secondary sources did not bring any new contributions to the "earthly kingdom" hypothesis. Although his book resembles a movie-film scenario based on a novel, rather than a scholarly work, through his study of secondary sources Aslan observed that there are certain important contradictions within the *NT*, and became convinced by previous scholars that certain circles altered the *NT* text and gradually transformed the historical image of Jesus to serve their own aims. One of the notable examples

---

<sup>150</sup> R. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence. Popular Resistance in Roman Palestine* (San Francisco, 1987), p. 319; Also see Marcus J. Borg, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship* (Valley Forge, 1994), p. 32; Dodd, *History*, p. 84: Jesus both as a Zealot and a moderate.

<sup>151</sup> For Aslan's understanding of Greek see, for example, idem, *Zealot*, p. 52, Aslan states: "a Sicarii (plural)" instead of the correct "a Sicarios (singular)"; p. 238, "bar Abbas is always characterized with the epithet *lestai* (plural)," instead of *lestes*/ληστές(singular); p. 239, "into the Greek by using *afulaktos*" instead of *afylaktos*/ἀφύλακτος.

<sup>152</sup> Aslan, *Zealot*, introduction, pp. xviii-xix.

of Christian fabrications in the *NT*, presented by Aslan, is the census in *Luke* 2:1-4 which did take place as a historical event ten years later than the accepted date of Jesus's birth. Contrary to what *Luke* says, it has been confirmed by serious research that the census did not include Galilee, and no Roman census ever asked the taxpayers to return to their birthplace.<sup>153</sup> Aslan emphasised that the census story is one of a series of entirely fictional stories in the *New Testament*. Its authors did not hesitate to present fiction as history. Aslan also pointed that in the original text of *Mark*, which most scholars regard as the earliest *Gospel*, there are no references to the resurrection story.<sup>154</sup> This story is a later addition at the end of *Mark*, that was placed there at an unknown time by someone who did not indicate that he enlarged the original text with his own addition of fiction. Christian fabricators, according to Aslan, altered the historical image of Jesus from a revolutionary nationalist, an enemy of Rome, to a pacifist preacher and miracle worker who loved everybody, Romans included.<sup>155</sup> Aslan also concluded that Jesus was not a member of a certain Zealot revolutionary party because that party emerged thirty years after Jesus.<sup>156</sup> After having examined different views of different scholars on the "earthly kingdom/ Zealot" hypothesis, how could I judge whether any of Aslan's conclusions are valid or not, without studying the relevant references of the primary sources?

---

<sup>153</sup> *Zealot*, p. 30. See also p. xxiv, where Aslan questioned the contradiction between *Matthew* 5:9: "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the sons of God" and *Luke* 22:36: "If you do not have a sword, so sell your cloak and buy one."

<sup>154</sup> *Zealot*, p. 220. There is general consensus among the scholarly world that the original *Mark* ends in 16:8.

<sup>155</sup> Aslan, *Zealot*, p. xxx. Cf. idem, p. 156: "The gospels testify that Jesus was crucified alongside other *lestai*, or bandits: revolutionaries, just like him."

<sup>156</sup> Aslan, *Zealot*, p. 79.

Some scholars do accept that there is much confusion among them as to who historical Jesus was.<sup>157</sup> Criticizing his colleagues, New Testament Professor Dale C. Allison Jr. went as far as to state that an ever increasing number of Early Christianity academics are learning to ignore history.<sup>158</sup> This is exactly what I do not intend to do.

Craig Keener whom we have seen attacking Brandon previously, also observed that so far there is limited research and narrow understanding of the Zealots.<sup>159</sup> John Sweet, who also attacked Brandon above, at some point admitted that the Church did have reason to suppress any evidence that indicated the "Zealot" origin of Early Christianity.<sup>160</sup> Sweet also did not exclude the possibility that Brandon had a case, but he insisted that the surviving evidence is too limited to make Brandon's thesis accepted.<sup>161</sup> From having examined Sweet's answers on Brandon, I am not convinced that Sweet did conduct his own extensive research of the primary sources on this issue.

Professor Louis H. Feldman, an authority on Josephus and the first centuries, also concluded that regardless of the widely accepted view that "Jesus

---

<sup>157</sup> Stanley E. Porter, 'A Dead End or a New Beginning,' pp. 16-35 in Charlesworth-Pokorny, pp. 35 (scholars confused); Garber, 'Jewish,' pp. 13-19: ("it does not make historical sense to examine Jesus in the sphere of the various Christologies that circulate among Christians." Being influenced by Brandon and Maccoby, Garber accepts that Jesus was sympathetic to the Zealots).

<sup>158</sup> Dale C. Allison Jr, *The Historical Christ and the Theological Jesus* (Grand Rapids, 2009), p. 40. Cf. John P. Meier, 'Criteria: How do we decide what comes from Jesus?' in *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research*, eds James D. G. Dunn and Scot McKnight (Winona Lake, 2005), pp. 123-144 at p. 144: "As many a weary quester remarked before, the use of the valid criteria is more an art than a science, requiring sensitivity to the individual case rather than mechanical implementation."

<sup>159</sup> Keener, *Historical*, pp. 350-351

<sup>160</sup> Sweet, 'Zealots,' pp. 1-9 at p. 4.

<sup>161</sup> Sweet, 'Zealots,' pp. 1-9 at p. 6.

repudiated the Zealots," this thesis too, supported mainly by Hengel, has not been proved.<sup>162</sup> From my own investigation of the works of those who opposed the "earthly kingdom / Zealot" theses in the "Problem" section above, I see that Feldman has a very important point here. I agree with him that the opponents of the "Zealot" thesis did not provide satisfactory material to prove their own theses. They are the vast majority who failed and marginalised a tiny minority of scholars (Reimarus, Weitling, Kordatos, Eisler, Brandon, Eisenman, Montserrat Torrents), without providing satisfactory scientific evidence. Hengel himself, in his own doctorate thesis clearly stated that it was beyond his scope to investigate "the relationships between Zealotism and the *New Testament*."<sup>163</sup> Having seen what Hengel admitted, I wonder why Hengel made his own mind up on the relation between Early Christianity and Zealots without having conducted the relevant research.

## SCOPE - METHODOLOGY

In the past two centuries, research on Early Christianity has been dominated by the so called different "Quests" for the historical Jesus.<sup>164</sup> The recent methodologies employed by most academics regarding the investigation of

---

<sup>162</sup> Feldman, *Josephus*, p. 639.

<sup>163</sup> Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 378.

<sup>164</sup> Kissinger, *The Lives*, pp. 23-24, First Quest: Bruno Bauer (1809-1882) was the first to dismiss Jesus as a historical figure and presented him as a literary invention, a combination of certain characteristics of Seneca and Philo. Idem, p. 21-22, David Friedrich Strauss (1808-1874) also dismissed the historical validity of the Gospels, and pointed to their mythological nature. There is general consensus that the first quest began in the middle of the 19th century with Bauer and ended with Schweitzer; the second Quest began with a Ernst Käsemann and ended in the 1970s. Witherington, *Jesus*, p. 12-13, together with a number of other scholars, support the case that a third quest for the historical Jesus began in the 1980s; Cf. Bond, 'Quest,' p. 337: "the Old Quest (from Reimarus to Schweitzer, 1778-1906); the period of no Quest (from Schweitzer to Käsemann, 1906-1953); the New Quest (from Käsemann 1953 to roughly 1985); and the Third Quest (roughly from 1985 to the present)."



historical Jesus, rotate around a selection of different theories which perceive Jesus either a): as a healer and exorcist or magician, b): an eschatological prophet or a rabbi social revolutionary who did not use violence, c): a cynic teacher,<sup>165</sup> d) a leader of a gay movement.<sup>166</sup> Apart from accepting one or more of the above theories, the majority of contemporary Early Christianity scholars I have examined have either a Christian or Jewish religious background and often accept God in their methodologies.<sup>167</sup>

Contemporary scholarship is dominated by the tendency to leave aside the conclusions of the so-called 19th-century First Quest which pointed out that the surviving Christian material is not trustworthy and cannot reveal who historical Jesus was.<sup>168</sup> Instead, modern scholarship tends to accept the main conclusion of the second Quest that some of the material we have in the *New Testament* does contain some historical information. A central common point among modern methodologies of the current Quest for the historical Jesus is that they emphasise on his background as a proper ethnic Jewish man of Jewish

---

<sup>165</sup> Bond, 'Quest', p. 342.

<sup>166</sup> Theodore W. Jennings Jr., 'The Gay Jesus,' in *The Blackwell Companion to Jesus*, ed. Delbert Burkett (Oxford, 2011), pp. 443-457.

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Gerald O'Collins, *Jesus: A Portrait* (London, 2008), p. vii, O'Collins begins his book with the phrase of Pope John Paul I: "It is Jesus Christ alone we must present to the world. Outside of this, we have no reason to exist"; Christopher Stead, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 79-93 (Church Fathers rejecting reason); Eric F. Osborn, *The beginning of Christian Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 174-18 (on the Christian method of explaining history through metaphysics); Donald A. Hagner, 'The New Testament, History and the Historical-Critical Method' in David A. Black and David S. Dockery, eds, *New Testament Criticism and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, 1991), pp. 73-96 at p. 88: "The historical-critical method is indispensable to any adequate and accurate understanding of the Bible, but only where it is tempered by an openness to the possibility of supernatural causation in the historical process. Without this tempering of method it is clearly inappropriate and ineffective, given the fact that the Bible is after all the story of God acting in history." This has been quoted by Bock, *Studying*, p. 138.

<sup>168</sup> The most known 20th century representative of the school which emphasised on the untrustworthiness of the Early Christian sources is Rudolf Bultmann: See idem, *Jesus* (Berlin 1926), trans L. Pettibone Smith et. al., *Jesus and the Word* (NY, 1958<sup>2</sup>), p. 8: "I do indeed think that we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus, since the early Christian sources show no interest in either, are moreover fragmentary and often legendary; and other sources about Jesus do not exist."

religion.<sup>169</sup> It should be clear that none of the current scholarly mainstreams investigate Jesus as any kind of Zealot / militant revolutionary.<sup>170</sup> Montserrat Torrents and Aslan, examined above, are exceptions. Eisenman, who is better known, prefers not to deal with Jesus and his first movement directly, but focuses on James the brother of Jesus and his followers.

In the Problem section above one could observe that those who support that Jesus led a pacifist movement, use their own methodologies to interpret in their own way only certain accounts of the *NT*, which they accept as reliable. On the other hand, the scholars who support the case that Early Christianity did participate in the revolts, do accept that it is their own selection and interpretation of certain *NT* material which reflects the historical identity of Early Christianity. Having made this observation, one should also take into account that after a life-time of examining the works of his colleagues, Professor of Judeo-Christian Studies and Professor of Intertestamental and Early Christian Literatures Michael J. Cook came to the conclusion that so far he has not seen any of his colleagues producing a scientific way of separating what exactly is genuine in the *NT* and what is a later addition.<sup>171</sup> In other words,

---

<sup>169</sup> See Wilson, *Jesus*, p. 151: Edward Schillebeeckx in 1979 faced trial by the Vatican because he argued that "the divinity invested in Jesus at Nicea has perhaps been over-stressed at the expense of his Jewish humanity." Some of the third quest main representatives are Sanders, Vermes, Meier, Whetherington. Not only Christian scholars but also the vast majority of Jewish scholars have accepted that Christianity was a pacifist movement from the very beginning. E.g., Yonah, *Jews*, p. 141: "The Christians who lived in Jewish Jerusalem refused to fight against the Romans"; Herbert W. Basser, 'Avon Gilyon (Document of Sin, b. Shabb. 116a) or Euvangeleon (Good News),' in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011), pp. 93-105 at p. 104 (no political reasons). A notable exception is Yitzchak Kerem, 'The Jewish and Greek Jesus,' in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011), pp. 159-180 at p. 177, Jesus "was associated with rebellion against oppressive Roman rule." The "Greek Jesus" is a postmortem product of the evolving Church.

<sup>170</sup> Cf. C. Behan McCullagh, *Justifying historical descriptions* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 233-235 on the unavoidable biases, preconceptions, selections and limitations characterizing the work of every historian; Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods* (New York, 2001), pp. 147 on the problem of modern censorship.

<sup>171</sup> Michael J. Cook, 'How Credible Is Jewish Scholarship on Jesus?' in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011), pp. 251-270 at p.

Cook brought forward the arguments of the 19th century Quest that what we know from the *NT* about historical Jesus is not reliable. According to Cook and the first Quest, the methodologies employed so far by those scholars who insist they can provide their readership with scientific answers as to who the historical first Christians were, based on the *NT*, should be put into question and not be fully trusted. In their efforts to construct the image of Jesus and the movement he led, most scholars focus mainly on the *NT* and in some cases they also include in their research limited collections of material from other sources which fit their own perceptions of Jesus.<sup>172</sup> In this selective way, each Professor creates his own version of historical Jesus.<sup>173</sup> Of course, one may counter-argue that it is impossible for a scholar to examine all available primary sources with reference to Early Christianity. But how many early sources actually talk about the history of Early Christianity? How much do these sources mention theological, spiritual, moral and supernatural or fictional matters and how much do they say about what the Early Christians did, what their actions were, where did they live, where did they move, what their earthly relations were with others? How much time and expertise is needed to undertake this task of investigating as much of this material as possible, and how could one separate what material from the sources has historical value, and what is fiction or interpolation? My first chapter explores these questions.

---

266 "there is no demonstrable way of confidently isolating the genuine core of such (originally said by Jesus) parables from later church accretion."

<sup>172</sup> See Barnett, *Jesus*, p. 163 "The flood of literature attempting to recover the 'historical' Jesus has limited its field of enquiry to the Jesus of the gospels; the letters and the early church have generally been ignored. Yet the gospels have been used only in a selective manner, with much interest devoted to various proposed contexts for Jesus. In consequence, there is a bewildering list of idiosyncratic Jesuses who now confront us from numerous books, ranging from the esoterically academic to the fantastically bizarre. Some methodological controls are needed." Cf. Bond, 'Quest', p. 346: "It is often said that those who look for the historical Jesus end up seeing only their own reflection at the bottom of a deep well."

<sup>173</sup> Sean F. Everton, 'What Are The Odds?', in *Journal for the study of historical Jesus* 13, (2015), pp. 24-42 at p. 42: "most, if not all, New Testament scholars, they fell prey to the temptation to create Jesus in their own image."

Early Christianity could be better understood starting with an examination of its religious, cultural and geopolitical origins. This is why in the second and third chapters I begin from the BCE era with emphasis to the second century BCE, when for the first time we have extensive written reports about the history of the exact region, Galilee, where Christianity emerged and was active.

Although I realise the importance of sources written in ancient Hebrew and Aramaic, I do not know these ancient languages. Therefore I will try to examine them through translation. Without aiming to conceal or exclude any important information related to Early Christianity that may be contained in any relevant Hebrew or Aramaic sources, I realise that most of the material that has survived with reference to the history of that period is available mainly inside certain ancient Greek sources.<sup>174</sup> These sources are going to form the core of the material I examine. I present them in the first chapter. Latin sources will also not be excluded, but they provide very few direct references to Early Christianity and they are of lesser importance.

---

<sup>174</sup> See below Chapter 1.

## MY THREE ANALYTICAL INSTRUMENTS

The methodology employed to approach the problem and explore the validity of the earthly kingdom / Zealot hypothesis consists, mainly, of three analytical instruments.

1) The first instrument consists of an examination of any references of the names the Christians used to identify themselves, or the names others used to identify Christians. Contrary to popular belief, the first Christians did not call themselves with the term "Christian," and they were not known to others with this name. It is widely accepted that the term 'Christian' derives from the Greek word *χριστός*, the person who has received *χρίσμα* (anointment). Hence *χριστός* (*Χριστός*, Christ) is commonly translated as 'the anointed one'. However, to the best of my knowledge, *χριστός* does not appear to exist as a word on its own in any surviving ancient non-Christian Greek text. It does exist as the second part of the compound words *μυρόχριστος* and *κεχρισμένος*, which seem to be more appropriate to denote 'the anointed one', called *mashach* in Hebrew. This is the root of *messiah*, namely the person on whom the *χρίσμα* was applied in the form of oil or ointment.<sup>175</sup> This was a custom related with the annointment of the priests and the kings in the *Old Testament*.<sup>176</sup> It is in the *New Testament* that for the first time *Χριστός* appears as a word on its own.<sup>177</sup> It

---

<sup>175</sup> *μυρόχριστος*: Euripides, *Cyclops* 501, ed. J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae* (Oxford, 1984); *κεχρισμένος*: Diodorus, *Bibliotheca* 17, 103.4, vol. 4 p. 291. See also *χριστόν* (medication applied as an ointment) in Aeschylus, *Prometheus vinctus*, 480, ed. G. Murray, *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Oxford, 1955<sup>2</sup>). *Χριστόν* also with the same meaning in Euripides, *Hippolytus*, 516, ed. J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae* (Oxford, 1984).

<sup>176</sup> R. Cotton, 'Anointing in the Old Testament,' accessible online at [http://www.agts.edu/faculty/faculty\\_publications/articles/cotton\\_anointing.pdf](http://www.agts.edu/faculty/faculty_publications/articles/cotton_anointing.pdf) (last accessed on 22 December 2012).

<sup>177</sup> E.g., *Matthew* 1:16, 2:4, 16:6; *Mark* 8:29, 12:35, 13:21; The question arises as to whether *Χριστός* is a word coined by Christians, a homophone of the well-known and widely used ancient Greek word *χρηστός*, which means 'good, kind, bestowing health or wealth, true,

seems, therefore, that the term Χριστός was used by the authors of the *New Testament* in order to translate the Hebrew *messiah*.<sup>178</sup> The only case in which the *New Testament* mentions "Christians" appears in the *Acts*,<sup>179</sup> with reference to a congregation in Antioch preached to by Paul.<sup>180</sup>

Epiphanius (c.315-403CE), founder of a monastery in Palestine, and later a Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, in his *Panarion* that is often challenged for its validity as a historical source, is in accordance to the *Acts* that the term "Christians" was first used in Antioch of Syria by a Greek-speaking congregation. It was a new name to identify those who until then were known as Galileans and Nazoreans.<sup>181</sup> Epiphanius is confirmed by a number of earlier sources which also call the Early Christians with these names.<sup>182</sup> It is not known how long it took for the name 'Christians' to replace any other names used

---

honest, upright.' See *LSJ*, s.v. χρηστός and χριστός; I. Stamatakos, *Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἀρχαίας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης* (Athens, 1972; repr. 2002), pp. 1121-1122; E. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100*, vol. 2 (New York, 1887), p. 1172. Also see Walter Shandruk (University of Chicago), which sheds light on how the names "Christ" and "Christians" are spelled in papyri, accessible online at <http://www.uc.edu/news/NR.aspx?id=12285> (last accessed on 22 December 2012) (*Chrestos*, which was pronounced the same way as *Christos*, was a common slave name meaning "good" or "useful."); Voorst, *Jesus*, pp. 30-31, Suetonius wrote "*Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit*." Voorst trans: "He [Claudius] expelled the Jews from Rome, since they were always making disturbances because of the instigator Chrestus." The other popular translation is incorrect, because impulsore clearly means instigator; p. 33-36, Voorst argues that Suetonius might have confused Christus with Chrestus; p. 35 "The Codex Sinaiticus spells Christian with an eta in all three NT occurrences." Third century Phrygian inscriptions use eta for Christians.

<sup>178</sup> *John* 1:41: Εὐηγάμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν (ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον Χριστός); 4:25: Οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. Cf. Kordatos, *Αρχαίες*, p. 223.

<sup>179</sup> 11:26.

<sup>180</sup> W. A. Meeks and R. L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the first four centuries of the common era* (Missoula, 1978), pp. 13-24, on Jews and Christians in Antioch between 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> centuries. Also see Bickerman, 'The name,' p. 143 on a Byzantine forgery which introduced the theory that the Apostles conferred in Antioch and decided to change the name of Galileans with Christians: ref to I. B. Pitra, *Iuris Ecclesiastici Monumnta* I, 1864, 91.

<sup>181</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol.1, pp. 321-322. The Nazoreans are also known as Nazōraioi or Nazirites; Applebaum, 'Zealots,' p. 164, argues that the first person who used the term Galileans to identify Christians is Julian, and that the Christians authors before him believed that the Galileans were a Jewish sect. *Suidae Lexicon* (10<sup>th</sup> c.), s.v. Χριστ., p. 826, presents the additional information that the first leader of that particular congregation in Antioch who used the term 'Christians' was Evodios ordained by Peter.

<sup>182</sup> See below, Ch. 2.2

previously. Apart from **Galileans** and **Nazoreans**, certain sources to be examined in the following chapters show that some of the Early followers of Jesus called themselves and were known to others also as: **Israelites**, **Essenes**, **Eviōnaioi** and **Egkratitai**.<sup>183</sup> Hippolytus of Rome (c. 170-235) in particular, in his *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* is very clear that the **Essenes** were also called by some as **Sikarioi** or **Zealots**: [Ἑσσαιῶν] ὄνομα προσέλαβον, Ζηλωτὰ καλούμενοι, ὑπὸ τινων δὲ Σικάριοι.<sup>184</sup> Although this statement made by Hippolytus is either ignored or it has been dismissed as unimportant or false by the vast majority of scholars,<sup>185</sup> I would like to investigate its historical validity with my own research of the primary sources. What exactly do the sources say about these "Groups"? What is the meaning of all these names? What did these people do during the first century? Is it historical or not, that some of them were followers of Jesus?

Before entering the stage of researching the ancient texts which provide references to the above names, one should take into account that there were at least four different languages used in the region where Christianity first emerged: Aramaic, Greek, Hebrew and Latin.<sup>186</sup> Depending on their knowledge of language, style or familiarity with the subject, certain authors employed one or more of the above names to refer to the first followers of Jesus. From a first look, some of the above names (Essenes, Eviōnaioi, Nazoreans, Galileans) sound to have a Semitic root. "Zealots" is the plural of the Greek epithet *zealot*,

---

<sup>183</sup> See below, Ch. 2.2

<sup>184</sup> E.g., Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9, 26.2, p. 371. In his brief examination of early Christian sects S. Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society 200 BCE to 640 CE* (Princeton, 2001), pp. 91-93, did not refer to Sicarioi or Nazoreans.

<sup>185</sup> Brandon, an exception, in *Jesus*, pp. 45-46, accepts that Hippolytus confused the Zealots to be some of the Essenes, but he accepts other information provided by Hippolytus for the Zealots as historical.

<sup>186</sup> For different languages and traditions in early Christianity see M. Goulder, 'The Two Roots of the Christian Myth', in *The Myth of God Incarnate*, ed. J. Hick (London, 1977), pp. 64-85. Inhabitants in the modern villages Maalula, Jubbaadin, Bakhaa near Damascus, Syria, still speak Aramaic.

used to identify someone who has zeal or fanaticism. The Latin "Sicarii" (*Sicarius* in singular) were those who carried the *sica*, that is a long knife or short sword.<sup>187</sup> According to John Lydos (*fl.* 6<sup>th</sup> c. CE) the Latins called their butchers "Sicarii" (*Sikarioi* in Greek) because they used that long knife.<sup>188</sup>

In the *NT* and other sources the Christians repeatedly called themselves Israelites,<sup>189</sup> and this is why I find it relevant to examine the issue of the BCE Israelite religious, cultural, historical and tribal background of the Christians in my second chapter. It is clear that the name Israelite, apart from the Christians, was also used by a number of others who were not Christians. Therefore, it does not make sense to scan the sources for all references to Israelites, in order to investigate the possibility that they may be talking about Early Christians. In the case of the name Galileans, things are different. There is consensus among all scholars that Christianity first appeared in this particular region, Galilee. Therefore it is imperative for me to examine every possible source and every possible reference it makes to Galilee and the Galileans, because it is within this particular ethnic group and this particular region where Christianity first emerged. In my methodology, the research on Nazoreans is just as important as on Galileans. There is a long lasting dispute among historians as to whether the Christians called Nazoreans were simply those who came from a certain town or village in Galilee called Nazareth, or whether the Christian Nazoreans were those who gave the holy *nazir* vows<sup>190</sup> and were known as a kind of religious

---

<sup>187</sup> Transliterated into Greek as σίκα and translated as ξιφίδιο (short sword) or μάχαιρα (large knife).

<sup>188</sup> John Lydos, *De magistratibus populi Romani*, ed. A.C. Bandy (Philadelphia, 1983), p. 96: σίκαν δὲ τὸ ὑποζώνιον ξίφος Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν, ἐξ οὗ σικαρίους τοὺς κρεουργούς.

<sup>189</sup> See below, section 2.1 Israelites Moses.

<sup>190</sup> For this vow see, for example, *Judges* 13:4-27; *Sept. I Samuel (Regnorum)* 1:11, vol. 1, p. 503 and below, ch. 2.2. For some of the vows see *Nazir*, p. 1 (long hair); p. 7 (abstinence from wine); pp 20-27 (vows for short periods or life-long); *Nazir*, introduction, p. xi: After the destruction of the Temple, naziriteship was no longer undertaken by the Jews because the sacrifices at the Temple, which were associated with the initiation of the vows, could no longer take place; Also, see Tel Ilan, p. 395, the Aramaic meaning of *naser* is "to preserve," "guard." Cf Jastrow, p. 929.



protectors of Israel. I would like to examine every single reference any source makes to Nazoreans, and analyse those references in order to make my own conclusion as to what exactly this name means and what those Nazoreans did. It is important to observe here that if this name was used by the Early Christians with its religious and not with its geographical connotation, **a most appropriate word to translate Nazorean in Greek is Zealot.**

Epiphanius was clear that the Christians called **Eviōnaioi were no others than Essenes**,<sup>191</sup> and explained that when Philo wrote about the *Iesaioi* and their monasteries, located by the Mareia Lake<sup>192</sup> near Alexandria,<sup>193</sup> he was in fact writing about Christians.<sup>194</sup> Eusebius (c.263-339 CE) Bishop of Caesarea Maritima in Palestine, capital of the Judean province since the early fourth century, was of the same opinion.<sup>195</sup> Also, Epiphanius repeatedly stated in his *Panarion* that the **Essenes** were no others than the descendants of Jesse, the father of King David, all of whom were followers of Jesus Christ.<sup>196</sup> In order to test the historical validity of this statement, I will examine everything the primary sources say about the Essenes and investigate further the case

---

<sup>191</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, p. 357.

<sup>192</sup> Modern Mariout.

<sup>193</sup> Also known as Μαρεῶτις. See Aelius Herodianus (fl. 2<sup>nd</sup> c.CE) and Ps.-Herodianus, *De prosodia catholica*, ed. A. Lentz, *Grammatici Graeci*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1867), vol. 3, p. 278: <Μάρεια πόλις> καὶ λίμνη τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παρακειμένη, ἥ καὶ Μαρεῶτις λέγεται.

<sup>194</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp 326-329: ...ἐν τῇ περὶ Ἰησοαίων αὐτοῦ ἐπιγραφομένη βίβλῳ, ὡς τούτων τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τὰ ἐγκώμια διεξιὼν καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν μοναστήρια ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν Μάρειαν λίμνην ἱστορῶν περιουκίδι οὐ περὶ τινων ἐτέρων ὁ ἀνὴρ ἱστόρησεν, ἀλλὰ περὶ Χριστιανῶν. οὗτος γὰρ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ (Μαρεῶτιν δὲ τὸν τόπον καλοῦσι) καὶ καταχθεὶς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν χώρον τοῦτον μοναστηρίοις ὠφέληται.... ἦν δὲ πάντα ταῦτα τῷ ἀνδρὶ πεπραγματευμένα εἰς τὴν περὶ πίστεώς τε καὶ πολιτείας τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὑπόθεσιν. ὡς οὖν τότε ἐκαλοῦντο Ἰησοαῖοι ἐπ' ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ Μάρκου τῇ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώρᾳ κηρύξαντος κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τούτους τινὲς ἐξεληλύθασι πάλιν, τῶν ἀποστόλων δῆθεν ἀκόλουθοι, λέγω δὲ οἱ ἐνταυθα μοι δηλούμενοι Ναζωραῖοι.

<sup>195</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.*, 2, 16-17.18, vol. 1, pp. 72-77.

<sup>196</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp. 321-325: πάντες δὲ Χριστιανοὶ Ναζωραῖοι τότε ὡσαύτως ἐκαλοῦντο· γέγονε δὲ ἐπ' ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ καλεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ Ἰησοαῖους, πρὶν ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἀρχὴν λάβωσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ καλεῖσθαι Χριστιανοί. ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ Ἰησοαῖοι διὰ τὸν Ἰησοαῖ, οἶμαι, ἐπειδὴ περὶ ὁ Δαυὶδ ἐξ Ἰησοαί, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Δαυὶδ κατὰ διαδοχὴν σπέρματος ἢ Μαρία, πληρουμένης τῆς θείας γραφῆς.

supported by Eisenman, as seen above, that the Early Christians were identical with the Essenes. Was there any relation between the Essenes, the Galileans the Nazoreans and the Christians?

Hippolytus's aforementioned statement that the Essenes were called by some as Zealots and Sicarioi, could provide an explanation that the Greeks used the Greek name *Zealots* and the Romans used their own Latin name *Sicarioi* to identify one and the same group whom the Israelites called *Essenes*. If so, the vast majority of scholars who see three different groups behind these names, may be wrong.

If Epiphanius, who often provides unreliable accounts, is right that the first Christians were Essenes, and the Greeks and Roman translated this name as Zealots and Sicarii, the implications of this sequence of analysis are tremendous.

Instead of a selective treatment of the sources, I will try to examine the entire collection of references, passages and chapters if needed, which talk about the Galileans, Nazoreans, Essenes, Zealots, Sicarioi and Engratitai. Did these groups have anything to do with Jesus? Did Jesus say anything about them?

2) My second analytical instrument used to decode the historical identity of Early Christianity is an examination of how the writings and readings of the Early Christians perceived the Greeks, a particular foreign people who were gentiles, used Greek as their language, claimed ancestry from Hellas and dominated the Middle Eastern region. Were the Early Christians pacifist and friendly to their Greek neighbours? Who were the Greeks in the minds of the

Early Christians?<sup>197</sup> What exactly were the relations between Greeks and Early Christianity? Trying to find answers to these questions, I am going to collect and examine every possible reference made to Greeks in Christian readings and writings in Greek. A number of pre-Christian Israelite sources written in Greek, which were accepted as holy by Early Christianity,<sup>198</sup> will also be examined because they influenced Christian perceptions of the Greeks. To the best of my knowledge, no other scholar who tried to investigate Christian perceptions of the Greeks, tried to collect and analyse all those references to the Greeks.

The standard term used in the ancient Greek sources, Christian or Gentile, to define a Greek was 'Hellēn'<sup>199</sup> (Ἕλλην). Therefore this is the term for which I am going to scan the Early Christian readings and writings of the period examined (1st CE-2nd CE). A well established view among some scholars is that Early Christianity was predominantly a peaceful religious movement, whose members often perceived the term 'Hellēn' primarily with reference to religion (i.e., 'pagan' or 'Gentile') at the expense of its ethnic connotation.<sup>200</sup> Some attacks of the Early Christians to the Greeks have been interpreted as theological and rhetorical, unrelated to the aggravated first and second century relations between the Greeks and the Israelites in the wider Middle Eastern region. Is this the case?

---

<sup>197</sup> Cf. Erich Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Harvard, 2002), p. 213: "researchers have directed much energy toward discerning the attitude of Greeks (or pagans more generally) toward Jews. By contrast, little scrutiny has been applied to an equally revealing and fascinating issue: how was the Hellenic achievement-and those who achieved it-perceived (or, rather, conceived) by the Jews?"; pp. 213-231, on Jewish perceptions of Greeks.

<sup>198</sup> Such as the *Septuagint*, Flavius Josephus (c.37- c.100) and the philosopher Philo of Alexandria (c.30 BCE-c.54 AD)

<sup>199</sup> The transliteration of Ἕλλην as Hellēn adopted in the present thesis is in accordance to the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.

<sup>200</sup> E.g., The *King James Authorised Version* translates Hellēnes as 'Gentiles' in *Romans* 2:8-10, 3:9-11; *1 Corinthians* 10:32-11:1, 12:13; *John* 7:35.

3) My third analytical instrument consists of an examination of Gentile and non-Christian Israelite perceptions of the Early Christians. What did the Gentiles and the Jews who did not accept Christianity write about Jesus and his followers? Did they perceive this new religion as pacifist or militant and rebellious? How much acceptance or rejection did Early Christianity have in the Greek world in particular, and for which reasons? The entire surviving relevant material that reveals Gentile and non-Christian Jewish perceptions of the Early Christians, is very limited in terms of size.

The following Chapters do not contain final conclusions. They present my material, my study and cross-examination of the sources, my finds, my understanding of the historical context, my questions, and the possible indications deriving from my analysis. Some of the information provided in the the third Chapter may, by a first look, appear distant, but it is this Chapter which unlocks the background for the emergence of historical Early Christianity.



# CHAPTER 1

## *The main sources*

My examination of almost all available sources made or accepted as core readings by the Christians during the period examined has shown that most of the references to the names of the Early Christians (1st analytical instrument) and most Israelite perceptions of the Greeks (2nd analytical instrument) are contained in the works of Josephus (*fl.* 1st c.), in the *Maccabees* books included in the *Septuagint*, and in the *New Testament*.

### 1.1: Lost sources

By law in 529 the Roman authorities ordered their citizens to burn any works written against Christianity.<sup>201</sup> As I explain in Appendix 2, there were Gentile sources which must have contained information about the first Christians, but these are not extant. How much anti-Christian material has been destroyed or lost in other way, and what historical information that material contained, are questions that may never be answered in full. It is evident that no anti-Christian work survives intact, and therefore an important limitation of most of my material is that it comes from one side: the Christian.

### 1.2: A Selection of Christian Sources

Both *Luke* and *John* indicate that there were numerous authors who tried to write about the same subject as theirs.<sup>202</sup> Some of those authors wrote the *New Testament Apocrypha*. Only a few of these early non-canonical works survive.<sup>203</sup>

---

<sup>201</sup> *Codex Justinianus* ed. Paulus Krueger (Berlin 1877), I, 1.3 (no page number in this ed.).

<sup>202</sup> *Luke* 1:1: "many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events"; Cf. *John* 21:25.

<sup>203</sup> For editions and unedited manuscripts and papyri of the *Apocrypha* see M. Geerard ed., *Clavis apocryphorum Novi Testamenti* (Turnhout, 1992); W. Schneemelcher ed., *E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. R. M. Wilson, 2 vols. (London, 1965), vol. 2, pp. 259-275; Photios,

They are usually classified as fiction novels, often used by different groups of heretics as *Gospels*.<sup>204</sup> It is important to observe here that none of the early Jewish-Christian *Gospels* survives.<sup>205</sup> If the Church made the right selection of the correct four *Gospels* and left aside only the fictitious material, then there is not much to worry about; but the question here is whether the *Gospels* that did not survive did contain some historical information which is not present in the officially accepted *Gospels*.<sup>206</sup> Therefore a second limitation of my main sources is that they are representative of what was approved to survive by a certain Christian denomination only.

### 1.3: Who wrote which work and when?

An ever increasing amount of ancient Israelite sources that were accepted as original for centuries are now proved to be fabrications written much later. Starting from the earliest Israelite text, the Hebrew *Pentateuch* (*Torah*, also known as the *Law*), scientific research has proved that it is not the work of a single author, Moses, but a compilation of works and interpolations made by various authors at different times.<sup>207</sup> For a number of fabricators impersonating Moses and other prophets please see Appendix 3.

---

*Bibliotheca*, codex 114, p. 90b-91a: Λεύκιος Χαρίνος, a heretic, composed *Πράξεις Πέτρου, Ιωάννου, Ανδρέου, Θωμά, Παύλου*. Cf Lenzman, *L'origine*, p. 203, the *Apothegmata of Jesus*, do not survive.

<sup>204</sup> P. Chrēstou, *Εκκλησιαστική Γραμματολογία*, 2 vols (Thessalonikē, 1998<sup>2</sup>), vol. 1, pp. 23-29.

<sup>205</sup> A. F. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 3-27.

<sup>206</sup> On interpolated, censored and altered Christian texts see, for example, Lenzman, *L'origine*, p. 223 (only 1/10 of the *Gospels* survive); idem, pp. 48-50, Eusebius and Irenaeus expressed fear for the alteration of their texts, and Ignatius referred to disputes on the originality and authenticity of the *Gospels*.

<sup>207</sup> See Mosse Koppel, Navot Akiva, Idan and Nahum Dershowitz, 'Unsupervised Decomposition of a Document into Authorial Components', (2011). Available online at: <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology-new/P/P11/P11-1136.pdf> (last accessed on the 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2013). Cf. Lenzman, *L'origine*, pp. 113-114: Scholars claim that the Hebrew text of *Deuteronomy* first appears in the end of the 4th c. BCE The clay tablets discovered in Ras Shamra (Ugarit), dated in c.1200 BCE, reveal that the text of *Genesis* has extensive influences from earlier Canaanite texts. *Leviticus* was composed in Babylon in the middle of the sixth c. BCE, therefore it is not the work of Moses.

Professor of History and Classics Erich Gruen, among other scholars, analysed the case that several Israelite authors re-wrote their ancestral literature and invented fictitious stories in order to promote their political aims and stress the superiority of their faith.<sup>208</sup> There is ample evidence that a number of Israelite pseudepigrapha were in fact produced by a sophisticated<sup>209</sup> industry of anonymous religious men who wrote and published spurious works and altered earlier sources. In certain cases, some members of this particular industry even used Gentile pseudonyms in order to disguise their Israelite identity and present arguments which favoured their religion as supposedly coming from Gentiles who accepted the superiority of the Jewish God.<sup>210</sup> For example, some of those fabricators impersonated the female Greek prophetess Sibyl who according to Greek tradition was active during the archaic period.<sup>211</sup> Scholars indicate that some parts of the pseudo *Sibylline Oracles* were written by Jewish propagandist/s in the second century BCE, at the times of Antiochos IV Epiphanēs (175-164 BCE).<sup>212</sup> Some other scholars argue that the pseudo *Sibylline Oracles* were written by either Jewish or Christian impersonators, or both, some time between the second and seventh centuries CE. Scholars argue that only parts of the early material survive within the extant Byzantine version of the *Oracles* that was compiled and edited at some time between the fifth and the

---

<sup>208</sup> Gruen, *Heritage*, pp. xiii-xx.

<sup>209</sup> Cf. Charlesworth, 'Old' pp. 68-69 (Judaism at the times of Jesus and before was the most theologically sophisticated culture); Also see Lieberman, *Hellenism*, p. 207.

<sup>210</sup> Collins, 'Artapanus,' p. 62: "We have many Jewish writings from the Hellenistic Diaspora that are written under Gentile pseudonyms". Cf. R. Bultmann, *The history of the Synoptic tradition*, trans. J. Marsh (Oxford, 1968), p. 369 (*Gospels*, products of the Hellenistic diaspora).

<sup>211</sup> The earliest attestation to this prophetess is dated c. 500 BCE. Greek emigration to Italy brought the Sibyl cult to the Romans. Cf. North, *Roman*, pp. 54-56, on the religious aspects of the *Sibylline Oracles* within Roman tradition.

<sup>212</sup> *Tusculum*, p. 439; Alexander, *Apocalyptic*, p. 3. See also J. J. Collins, 'The Third Sibyl revisited,' in Collins, *Jewish*, pp. 82-98 at 83: disputes of scholars concerning the dating of this work; p. 98: the author of Sibyl 3 was a Jewish propagandist.



seventh century CE.<sup>213</sup> Israelite fabricators, both Christian and Jewish, also did not hesitate to circulate the stories that Alexander the Great worshipped the God of Israel, and were believed by many for centuries.<sup>214</sup> Others pretended to be Greek authors and by the use of such fake identities, called their readers to fear God.<sup>215</sup>

Professor of Early Jewish Studies James Davila, among other scholars, highlighted the problem that certain Christians not only presented their own works as works of earlier Christian authors, but they also created OT pseudepigrapha, they altered the texts of Philo and Josephus and produced pseudepigrapha attributed to these two authors too.<sup>216</sup> Davila warned: “even if a document has been shown to be Jewish beyond reasonable doubt, we cannot necessarily assume that its text has come down to us undisturbed by its Christian copyists.”<sup>217</sup> The question here is how much has Christianity inherited from the previous Israelite tradition of altering earlier texts and producing

---

<sup>213</sup> H. W. Parke, *Sibyls and Sibylline prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, ed. B. C. McGing (London, 1988), pp. 51-70 (Archaic Sibyl); pp. 71-99 (Sibyl in Italy); pp. 1-3 (they are transmitted in manuscripts dated between the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries. A single fragment is dated to the fourth century); See also Kazhdan, vol. 3, pp. 1890-1891.

<sup>214</sup> Hengel, *Jews, Greeks*, p. 11, with references to Talmudic and Christian legends which present Alexander the Great as a monotheist. See also R. Stoneman, ‘Jewish Traditions on Alexander the Great’, *Philonica* 6 (1994), pp. 37-53. Cf Cohen, *Josephus*, pp. 253-254, who discards the *Talmud* as highly unhistorical.

<sup>215</sup> E.g. Pseudo-Phocylides (1st c. BCE-1st c. CE) impersonated Phocylides (6th c. BCE). See P. W. Van Der Horst, ‘Pseudo-Phocylides: a new translation and introduction,’ in *OTP*, vol. 2, pp. 565-582 at pp. 565-568; idem, vol. 2, p. 574 (God); p. 576 (the only God). Pseudo-Menander (3rd c. CE) impersonated Menander, the Greek historian (fl. early 2nd c. BCE). See T. Baarda, ‘The sentences of the Syriac Menander: a new translation and introduction’ in *OTP*, vol. 2, pp. 583-606 ; pp. 591, 595 (fear God).

<sup>216</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, pp. 74-119 (OT pseudepigrapha, Christian interpolations in Philo and Josephus); pp. 164-179 (Christian pseudepigrapha under their name); p. 175 (disputes between scholars about which treatises were originally composed by Philo, and which are not. Doubts on the originality of *Contemplative Life*, *Eternity*, *Providence*, *Animals and God*). With reference to Philo Royse, *Spurious*, pp. 134-146 (not original works), pp. 146-147 (corruptions and alterations). See also *OTP*, vol. 1, pp. 605-606, the *Apocalypse of Sedrach* has been composed some time in between the second to the fifth c. CE; vol. 1, pp. 729-730, the *Apocalypse of Elijah* (1st to fourth c. CE); vol. 1, pp. 755-756 (*Apocalypse of Daniel*, 9th c. CE); vol. 1, pp. 775-778: *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (sons of Jacob), 2nd c. BCE; vol. 2, p. 715: (*Prayer of Jacob*, 1st to 4th c. CE).

<sup>217</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, p. 235.

pseudepigrapha?<sup>218</sup> Instead of raising this question, Bruno Bauer in the nineteenth century presented a very different hypothesis. He claimed that much of the NT material was pseudepigraphical, produced by forgers employed by the Roman State.<sup>219</sup> The advocates<sup>220</sup> of this Roman State-conspiracy theory did not take into serious account that there have been numerous other religious works written by Christians who lied about the origin of the works they published. Much of what for centuries was accepted as first and second-century original Christian writings, has now been proved pseudepigrapha and other fabrications, often made centuries later.<sup>221</sup>

---

<sup>218</sup> The *Talmud* states that during the second century 'five hundred' young Israelite men were studying Greek in one of their schools. Were these graduates involved in the production of pseudepigrapha? See Alon, *Jews*, vol. 2, p. 627: the 500 were exterminated during the Bar Kochba revolution (132-135 CE). Cf. Lieberman, *Greek*, p. 1: "There were a thousand young men in my father's house, five hundred of whom studied the Law, while the other five hundred studied Greek wisdom said Rabban Simeon (fl. 2nd c.)"; Collins, 'Potter,' in Bormann, pp. 57-69. See also Rajak, *Josephus*, pp. 188-189, on the rabbinic school in Jamnia (Yavneh), and the circulation of propaganda that favoured the position of the Jews. Cf. Gamble, *Books*, pp. 154-161: the first known, non-liturgical Christian Library was in Jerusalem, established by Alexander bishop of Jerusalem (212-250). The second known Christian library was in Caesarea, created probably by Origen. Did the scriptoria/schools of the two earliest Christian libraries in Jerusalem and Caesarea continue any pre-existing Israelite traditions of producing pseudepigrapha and altering earlier texts?

<sup>219</sup> B. Bauer, *Christus und die Caesaren. Der Ursprung des Christenthums aus dem römischen Griechenthum* (Berlin, 1879), pp. 183-228.

<sup>220</sup> The most recent support to this old hypothesis comes from Joseph Atwill in his popularised bestseller, *Caesar's Messiah. The Roman Conspiracy to invent Jesus* (Charleston, 2011) which became a best seller in the German speaking world. Atwill argued in a non-scholarly manner that the Flavians tried to neutralise the revolutionary character of Christianity by altering/fabricating the *Gospels*. In pp. 36, 288, Atwill refers to Suetonius, *Titus* 3 (trans. R. Graves, *The Twelve Caesars*, (Harmondsworth, 1957) that Flavius Titus excelled in shorthand, had a phenomenal memory, could compose speeches and verses in Greek and Latin, and that if he was not an emperor he could easily have been "the most celebrated forger of all time;" Idem, pp. 35-61: each Roman Emperor, being *Pontifex maximus*, was collecting the *Annales maximi* (all prophesies of all religions), and that the governmental institution of *Quindecimviri sacris faciundis* was responsible for regulating the foreign cults of Rome. Therefore they knew about Christianity; Idem, pp. 13, 40, on the relation between certain Jews and Flavians.

<sup>221</sup> E.g. *Apocalypsis Joannis* was not made by John but in the 5th c. or later, and was identified as a fake already in the 9th c. See *Apocalypsis apocrypha Joannis* (versio altera), ed. F. Nau, 'Une deuxième apocalypse apocryphe grecque de saint Jean', *Revue Biblique* 23 (1914), pp. 215-221; *Apocalypsis apocrypha Joannis* (versio tertia), ed. A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1893); *Cohortatio ad Graecos* is not the work of Justin the Martyr but written probably in the 3rd c.; Also, see Hengel, 'Septuagint,' p. 71; *De resurrectione* is not a work produced by Athenagoras (2nd c.) but dates from the 3rd or 4th c. Cf. Robert M. Grant, 'Athenagoras or Pseudo-Athenagoras,' in *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 47 (1954), pp. 121-129 at pp. 128-

The fact that my main sources derive from a period and a culture that specialised in mingling earlier material with fiction and producing numerous pseudepigrapha, interpolations, alterations and other fabrications, raises the question of whether the source material I am going to examine has been touched or even produced by fraudulent circles.

#### 1.4: The *Septuagint* that contains the *Maccabees*

*The Ten Harugei Malkhut*,<sup>222</sup> a Mishnaic<sup>223</sup> text, narrates that God entered the mind of a certain Gentile Roman Emperor and made him want to study the *Torah*.<sup>224</sup> Another story in the *Talmud* "prophesied" that the Gentiles one day will "translate the *Torah* and read it in Greek, and then say: We are Israel."<sup>225</sup> The

---

129, concludes that *De resurrectione* is written against Origen's doctrine of resurrection. It was attributed to Athenagoras by one or two scribes who worked in the 10th century; The works that for long passed as written by a 1st c. author known as Dionysius the Areopagite have also been proved to be the product of a fraudulent author who lived some centuries later. See Gorazd Kocijancic, 'The Identity of Dionysius the Areopagite: A Philosophical Approach', in Filip Inanovic, ed., *Dionysius the Areopagite between Orthodoxy and Heresy* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 3-11 at pp. 5-6. See also Coakley-Stang, p. 1: Scholars date this author in the sixth century.; Ignatius, known as Bishop of Antioch who became a martyr in Rome in 113 CE, has not written *Ad Philippenses*. Not only this but also other epistles accepted as genuine were 'greatly corrupted by obvious interpolations' centuries later. The fabricator of these epistles probably worked some time between c.360 and c.380 CE. See J. Rius-Camps, *The four authentic letters of Ignatius, the martyr* (Rome, 1979), pp. 13-20 at 19, n. 21 (the identity of the interpolator); *Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 166-170. Ch. Trevett, *A study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 29 (Lewiston, 1992), pp. 9-15; The *Martyrium of Ignatius* underwent various interpolations and survives in different variations. According to a version of the text of the *Martyrium*, there were two deacons who followed Ignatius: Philo and Agathopus. Those deacons are considered by certain scholars as the authors of the original *Martyrium*. See Ignatius, *Ad Tarsenses* (Epistle 4), 10.2, ed. Funk, vol. 2, p. 104. Idem, *Ad Philippenses* (Epistle 5), 15.1, ed. Funk, vol. 2, p. 10. Idem, *Ad Antiochenses* (Epistle 9), 13.2, ed. Funk, vol. 2, p. 172. Some other scholars date the *Martyrium* in the 5th c. See L. H. Gray, 'The Armenian acts of the martyrdom of S. Ignatius of Antioch', *Armenian quarterly* 1 (1946), pp. 47-66 at 47; *Acta Pauli et Theclae* is not historical either and was probably composed between 185-195 CE by a Christian priest from Asia Minor, influenced by the cult of Thecla of Seleucia, from where it spread to the rest of the Christian world. Eusebius states that the whole *Acta Pauli* is spurious: *H.E.* 3.3,1-6, vol. 1 (31), pp. 98-99.

<sup>222</sup> Also known as *Eileh Ezkerah*.

<sup>223</sup> C. 1st-3rd c. CE.

<sup>224</sup> *Harugei*, p. 60.

<sup>225</sup> Cf. Lieberman, *Hellenism*, p. 207, this was said by rabbi Judah b. Shalom (fl. 4th c.).

story that the Gentiles themselves realised how important the only real Holy Book was, is mentioned also in an earlier Israelite text, the *Letter of Aristeas*, which claims that king Ptolemaios II Philadelphus of Egypt (285-246 BCE) commissioned seventy scholars to translate it in Greek, so he could read it. Contrary to what was widely accepted for centuries, modern scholarship has convincingly argued that this story is a fabrication of an anonymous author written during or after the end of the second century BCE.<sup>226</sup> Other Israelite sources, both Jewish and Christian, provide different variants as to how and when the translation took place.<sup>227</sup> In relation to the seventy in the *Aristeas* story one should observe that in the *Numbers*<sup>228</sup> Moses invited seventy wise men to consult him, and that the Sanhedrin, the Jewish council of wise men active throughout the Hellenistic period, are also known as a legislative council of about seventy scribes consulting the High Priest and the Pharisees.<sup>229</sup> Therefore, my question here is whether the story of the seventy in *Aristeas* may be an indirect indication pointing to the seventy Sanhedrin as the people who made the translation of the *Torah* in order to spread their faith and to convert the

---

<sup>226</sup> Eissfeldt, *OT*, pp. 603-606; Rajak, *Translation*, pp. 24-63 on the historicity and the narrative of the *Letter of Aristeas*; N. De Lange, *Apocrypha: Jewish Literature of the Hellenistic Age* (New York, 1978), pp. 44-50 (*Aristeas* on the translation); V. Tcherikover, 'The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas', *HTR* 51.2 (April 1958), pp. 59-85; A. Vander Heeren, 'Pentateuch', in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1912), vol. 8, pp. 722-723: "The authenticity of the letter, called in question first by Louis Vivès (1492-1540), professor at Louvain (ad S. August. Civ. Dei, XVIII, xlii), then by Jos. Scaliger (d. 1609), and especially by H. Hody (d. 1705) and Dupin (d. 1719), is now universally denied". A different view presented in the second century anonymous Israelite work *Seniores Alexandrini*, is that the *Hellēnes* themselves translated a verse in Psalm 118. See *Seniores Alexandrini, Psalmus CXVIII, Fragmenta*, Fragment 7, ed. J.B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, 8 vols (Paris, 1876-1891; repr. Farnborough, 1966), vol. 2, p. 341.

<sup>227</sup> Aristobulus (fl. c. 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. BCE), *Fragmenta* 1, pp. 221-222, states that the *Pentateuch* was translated into Greek before philosopher Dēmētrios Phalēreus (c.350-c.290 BCE), was a librarian in Alexandria c. 297. ; Philo's *De Vita Mosis* 2.30-38, ed. R. Arnaldez et al., *Philo, De Vita Mosis* (Paris, 1967), pp. 204-208, does not mention the seventy scholars, but contrary to *Aristeas* states that King Ptolemy II ordered the translation directly to the High Priest King. Cf. Hengel, 'Septuagint,' p. 40. Justin, *Apologia* 31.2-4, p. 46, states that the translation of the books of the Prophets took place some time during King Herod's reign, after the order of a king Ptolemy. One should observe here that the only known king Ptolemaios who lived during King Herod's reign was the young Ptolemaios XV Caesarion (b.47-d.c.30 BCE). Justin, like Philo, also does not mention the seventy.

<sup>228</sup> 11:24.

<sup>229</sup> Michael Grant, *The History of Ancient Israel* (London, 1986), pp. 217-218.

Gentiles. Clearly, *Aristeas* first appears at a time when the Hasmoneans expand their kingdom with the inclusion of a number of Greek cities and try to convert their new subjects to Judaism.<sup>230</sup> My question here is why the circulation of such propaganda that the *Torah* was admired by an important and highly educated Greek should be regarded as irrelevant to the Hasmonean efforts to assimilate their Greek subjects.

The translation took place at times when the Israelites, like many other peoples, lived under the cultural influence of one or more of the four Hellenistic Kingdoms (Antigonid, Ptolemaic, Seleucid and Attalid) which used Greek as their *lingua franca*. In response to this linguistic change certain Israelite circles openly embraced Greek as their own language,<sup>231</sup> while some other Israelites forbade the use of Greek.<sup>232</sup> Although it is widely accepted that the translation began in the third century BCE, it is not clear when it was completed. Therefore one should bear in mind that the term *Septuagint*<sup>233</sup> “does not designate a single translation of the whole *Old Testament* but is an umbrella term for different Greek translations of various Books.”<sup>234</sup> The earliest surviving Greek manuscripts of the *Septuagint* are dated to the fourth century CE and do not provide evidence to support that there was a complete canon of the *Septuagint* even at that time. Scholars conclude that from the time the translation of the *Septuagint* began up to the time when the earliest surviving manuscripts were

---

<sup>230</sup> See below, Ch. 3.

<sup>231</sup> Lieberman, *Greek*, p. 1. See also J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling, *Hellenism in the land of Israel* (Indiana, 2001). Cf. Levine, *Judaism*, p. 180: about 70% of all extant Jewish inscriptions in the Greco-Roman and Byzantine world are in Greek, 20% in Latin and 10% in Aramaic and Hebrew. In Palestine only, “the overall percentage of Greek inscriptions ... jumps to 55 %”; Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, 1993), p. 419, between 2500 and 3000 Greek words have been used inside the *Talmud*. However, Feldman repeatedly argues that the influence of Greek thought to Judaism was minimal.

<sup>232</sup> Feldman, *Judaism and Hellenism*, p. 98 (reference to *m. Sot.* 9:14).

<sup>233</sup> *Τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα*: “of the seventy” scholars, in Latin *Septuaginta*, anglicised: *Septuagint*.

<sup>234</sup> CCB, p. 294; Parker, *Codex*, pp. 31-39. Cf. B. G. Wright III, *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*, JSJ 131 (Leiden, 2008), p. 198, Wright considers the term *Septuagint* as referring exclusively to the *Pentateuch*.

written, apart from the relatively unchanged *Torah*, much of the rest of the text “underwent corruption and interpolation.”<sup>235</sup> Because of the gradual alterations, by the second century CE the differences between the original Hebrew text and the Greek translation we call *Septuagint* led to a revision of the Hebrew text itself and new translations into Greek were produced by the Israelite scholars Aquila (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup> c.), Symmachos the Ebionite (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup> c.) and Theodotiōn (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup> c.).<sup>236</sup> At this point it is important to take into account the studies conducted by Emanuel Tov who compared the Masoretic Text with the Syriac *Bible*, the Targumim, the *Vulgate*, and the Qumran Scrolls which contain the *Septuagint* fragments, and concluded that: “we are only beginning to unravel the mystery of the background of the Hebrew manuscripts used for the LXX (*Septuagint*) and that of the relations between the ancient witnesses in general.”<sup>237</sup> The gigantic and scholarly *Hexapla*, which compared six versions of the text in parallel (one was a transliteration of the Hebrew into Greek), a work compiled by Origen of Alexandria (c.185-254 CE), would have elucidated the transmission of the original texts. Unfortunately only few fragments of it survive.<sup>238</sup>

One should bear in mind that at least up to the second century the *Torah*, the first five books in the *Septuagint*, had a greater impact on most Christians than the teachings of the *Gospels* and other Early Christian texts, for the simple reason that the *Torah* was already an established reading, while the early

---

<sup>235</sup> H. St. J. Thackeray, ‘Septuagint,’ part 2, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Michigan, 1915).

<sup>236</sup> Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 74-75. See also Rajak, *Translation*, pp. 288-290, on the reasons the Jews rejected the *Septuagint*.

<sup>237</sup> Emanuel Tov, ‘The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Simmilar Evidence in Other Sources,’ in Adrian Schenker, ed., *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 121-144 at p. 144.

<sup>238</sup> *Hexapla* was last seen in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea, which was destroyed by Muslims in 638 CE.

Christian texts were recent, disparate,<sup>239</sup> existed in much fewer copies and in general were not circulated as widely as the *Torah*.<sup>240</sup> It is also important to note here that the *Septuagint* was revised extensively by Lucian (c.240-312 CE), a Christian presbyter.<sup>241</sup> A certain bishop Hesychius (fl. c.3rd CE) also revised and enlarged the text of the *Septuagint*.<sup>242</sup> It is not clear how much of Lucian's and Hesychius's changes were incorporated and accepted into the *Septuagint*. Moreover, evidence in the *Codex Sinaiticus* points to further repeated revisions of the text transmitted in this manuscript.<sup>243</sup> Regardless of when exactly the *Septuagint* ceased evolving as a text, Origen, other Early Fathers and the Orthodox Church established the idea that what they called *Septuagint* was the authentic Greek translation of an original *Old Testament* text.<sup>244</sup>

### 1.5: *I* and *II Maccabees*

There is consensus that both *I* and *II Maccabees* are works written in order to justify the legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty and repel Greek cultural influences. Most scholars accept that *I Maccabees* was composed near the end of the second century BCE and was translated into Greek from Hebrew or Aramaic not long after. If there was a Hebrew original as Origen says,<sup>245</sup> it has

---

<sup>239</sup> According to Metzger-Ehrman, p. 53, the earliest surviving papyri fragments of the *NT* including the four *Gospels* are dated to the end of the second century.

<sup>240</sup> Piñero-Peláez, pp. 5-21 (Until the 4th century certain Christian communities were unaware of certain *Gospels* used by other Christian communities).

<sup>241</sup> Certain scholars dispute whether Lucian did revise the *Septuagint*.

<sup>242</sup> Hesychius: see *Septuaginta*, ed. Rahlfs, vol. 1, pp. xxx-xxxi. Cf. Yigael Yadin, *Bar-Kokhba: The rediscovery of the legendary hero of the last Jewish Revolt against Imperial Rome* (London, 1971), p. 23 (Jerome observed that certain passages in the *Septuagint* were written after the Bar Kochba war. Yadin does not give a reference for this.).

<sup>243</sup> Parker, *Codex*, pp. 3-7; The manuscript tradition of the *Septuagint* is subject of the ongoing project "Göttingen Unternehmen" as part of the edition of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum* (Göttingen, 1931-). For a description of Greek *Septuagint* manuscripts see Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 122-170.

<sup>244</sup> Scholarly research on the issues of dating, authenticity, authorship and credibility of the works contained in the *Bible* is characterised by ferocious controversies. See Donald H. Akenson, *Surpassing wonder: the invention of the Bible and the Talmuds* (Chicago, 1998), p. 25.

<sup>245</sup> Origen, *Selecta in Psalmos*, PG 12, col. 1084, states that the original title of *Maccabees* was Σαρκβηθ Σαρκβανὲ ἔλ.

been lost. Because of his good knowledge of the geography of Israel and his poor understanding of the rest of the world, the anonymous author of *I Maccabees* is considered a native of the lands of Israel. The introduction of *II Maccabees* states that it was composed by a group of people who were representatives of Judas Maccabee and the people of Jerusalem, and who addressed their work to the Jews of Egypt and to a certain Aristobulus,<sup>246</sup> a member of the High Priest family and teacher (!) of king Ptolemy.<sup>247</sup> What makes the validity of this story questionable is the second chapter of *II Maccabees* itself, which states that this work is an epitome of an earlier five volumes work written by Jason of Cyrene (*fl.* c. 100 BCE?).<sup>248</sup> If this is correct, then the introduction lies in claiming that its composers were contemporary of Judas Maccabee. This is strengthened by the fact that most scholars do not date *II Maccabees* before Jason.<sup>249</sup> The latest suggested date by scholars is the second half of the first c. BCE.

My question here is who were those authors of *II Maccabees* who concocted the story that they lived some generations before they wrote, and why did they feel the need to produce their own version of what happened long before them? Is the fact that *II Maccabees* is much more anti-Hellenic than *I Maccabees* irrelevant to the actual period when the authors of *II Maccabees* were active? What was happening between the Greeks and the Israelites at the time this work was composed? One should also note here that contrary to *I Maccabees*, *II Maccabees* is not included in the fourth-century Codices *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*, which

---

<sup>246</sup> Possibly Aristobulus the author?

<sup>247</sup> *II Maccabees* 1, *Sept.* vol. 1, p. 1099.

<sup>248</sup> *II Macc.* 2.23. This work has been lost.

<sup>249</sup> Schwartz, *2 Macc.*, p. 15, argues that *II Macc.* was written before *I Macc.*; pp. 36-37 accepts the explanation in *II Macc.* 2.23 that a certain Jason of Cyrene wrote 5 books and concludes that a certain editor abridged them into *II Macc.*, but this editor also had access to some other sources regarding. Schwartz accepts that *II Macc.* received its final form c. 143-142 BCE; p. 41, an inscription dated c. 178 BCE indicates that Epiphanēs gave certain orders to Heliodorus to do something with certain temples in Palestine; p. 42, Schwartz accepts the four documents in *II Macc.* ch. 11 as authentic.



contain the earliest exemplar of the *Septuagint*, though it is preserved in Codex *Alexandrinus* (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE). Does that mean that the circles who published *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* had any objections to the contents of *II Maccabees*, or was this work totally unknown to them? What happened in Byzantium for the anti-Hellenic *II Maccabees* to finally gain wide acceptance?

So far, there is no explanation as to why the *Maccabees* books which clearly refer to pre-Christian Israelite affairs were gradually accepted as important sources by Christianity, while for centuries were rejected by Judaism.<sup>250</sup> None of the scholars I examined analysed the case that at least *I Maccabees* contains a significant link between Galilee, the historical cradle of Christianity, and its central heroes, the Maccabees. More specifically, *I Maccabees* is clear that certain Jewish inhabitants of Galilee sent messengers to "their brothers" Judas (*fl.* 167-160) and Simon, two of the Maccabees brothers, in order to alert them that the Gentiles of Galilee were in alliance with neighbouring cities against them. Simon responded to the plea of the Galilean Jews, fought many battles in Galilee and rescued the Jews of the region by moving them to Judea.<sup>251</sup> One should take into account here that another source, the *Antiquities* of Josephus, reports that certain inhabitants of Galilee were converted to Judaism during their conquest by the grandson of Simon, the Hasmonean king Aristoboulos who invaded Galilee c. 103 BCE.<sup>252</sup> I believe that it is important to observe here that this is near the time when most scholars agree that *I Maccabees* was composed, meaning that this text appears near a time when Aristoboulos is in need of a historical record to justify his military preparations for the invasion

---

<sup>250</sup> The *Maccabees* books were rediscovered by Judaism as proper Jewish readings only in the last few centuries, but they are still not regarded as canonical.

<sup>251</sup> *I Macc.* 5:9-21. Cf. S. Freyne, 'Jesus in Jewish Galilee' in E. P. Sanders: *Redefining First-century Jewish and Christian Identities*, eds F. Udoh et al. (Indiana, 2008), pp. 197-212 at 204. Also see Schrötter, 'Jesus,' pp. 41-42, archaeological evidence on Jewish settlements in Galilee.

<sup>252</sup> A. K. Adam, 'According to whose Law? Aristobulus, Galilee and the ΝΟΜΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ', *JSP* 14 (1995), pp. 15-21, with reference to *Ant.* 13.318, vol. 3, p. 210, concludes that certain Itureans lived in Galilee or were Galileans themselves.

and occupation of Galilee and give him the moral authority to impose his conversion policies on his new subjects. Clearly, *I Maccabees* provides the story that the Jews were attacked first and became refugees. By the help of this text which presents itself as an accurate historical record,<sup>253</sup> the Jews were not invaders of foreign lands but people who returned to reclaim their own land. Little is known as to what happened in Galilee in the years between Simon Maccabee and Aristovoulos, but one should observe that Aristovoulos's brother and successor, Alexander Janneus (103-76 BCE) also invaded Galilee and converted more Galileans to Judaism.<sup>254</sup> There are no records available to speak on behalf of the Gentile Galileans. One should also note here that this particular region is located further north of the Samaritians. Clearly, Galilee was the most distant Israelite area from the heartland of Judaism, Judea. It is also not known and there is no consensus among scholars about how many Jews lived in the region before the conversions took place and whether Judaism was introduced in the region before the Hasmoneans. The *Septuagint* Books of *Joel* and *Isaiah* clearly name the people of Galilee as Gentiles.<sup>255</sup> *Judges*<sup>256</sup> and *Isaiah*<sup>257</sup> claim that the Israelite tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali did settle in Galilee.<sup>258</sup> How many of the converted Galileans became Christian at a later stage is also not possible to tell, but according to my finds, to be examined in detail in Chapter 4, Galilee was a stronghold of the Hasmonean dynasty and fought as no other Israelite region had against Herod the Great, the King who deposed the Hasmonean

---

<sup>253</sup> Bartlet, *1 Macc*, p. 33 and pp. 101-102, Bartlet accepts that the author of *I Macc.* had access to Seleucid, Roman and Spartan archives (!) and that he was a great historian who used reliable sources (!). However, these sources are unknown.

<sup>254</sup> *Ant.*, 13.393-397, vol. 3, pp. 224-225. Also see Jonathan L. Reed, 'Galileans, "Israelite Village Communities" and the Sayings Gospel Q,' in Eric. M. Meyers, ed., *Galilee Through the Centuries* (Winona Lake, 1999), pp. 87-108 at p. 97, the earliest architectural archaeological evidence at Sepphoris is dated during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-77BCE), and is in fact a military complex. They colonised Galilee with Jews from Judea; p. 102, before the Hasmoneans Galilee had a small and mainly non-Jewish population.

<sup>255</sup> *Sept. Joel* 4:4, vol. 2, p. 523; *Sept., Isaiah* 8:23, vol. 2, p. 577.

<sup>256</sup> 1:30-33.

<sup>257</sup> 8:23.

<sup>258</sup> See Hoehner, *Herod*, p. 53, that in the eighth century BCE the Assyrians depopulated Galilee and colonised it with peoples from other regions.

dynasty. My question here is whether *I* and *II Maccabees* were either created or preserved by a certain pro-Hasmonean Israelite party which was particularly strong in Galilee, and whether members of that particular party later passed *I* and *II Maccabees* to Christianity, which also sprang from Galilee.

The central *I* and *II Maccabees* story that aims to prove that the Hasmoneans had the right to seize power and overthrow the previous Israelite regime, is about Judas Maccabee liberating and cleansing the Jerusalem Temple because it was desecrated and defiled both by Gentile Greeks and Israelites who turned into paganism. To the best of my knowledge, it has not been investigated by scholars whether those Jews who for centuries rejected the *Maccabees* books did so because they contain fabricated or over-exaggerated accusations against previous Israelite leaders, in order to justify their extermination by the Hasmoneans. Trying to find an answer on the background of those who composed the *Maccabees*, I believe it is important to observe that both *I*<sup>259</sup> and *II Maccabees*<sup>260</sup> state that the restoration/purification of the Temple took place on the 25<sup>th</sup> of the Israelite month of Kislev.<sup>261</sup> A feast called Hanukkah<sup>262</sup> was introduced to commemorate the restoration of the Temple to its former use. The problem here is that *I Maccabees* states that the Temple was liberated exactly on the same date when the first "pagan" sacrifices took place in the Temple.<sup>263</sup> Is this a bizarre coincidence or is this an indication that the Hanukkah feast was modelled on an earlier foreign tradition that at some stage was "purified" and accepted?<sup>264</sup> One should also observe here that the entire body of works

---

<sup>259</sup> 4:41-59

<sup>260</sup> 10:5

<sup>261</sup> Χασελευ (no accent in the edition) in Greek.

<sup>262</sup> Rankin, *The Origins*, pp. 27-44, on the origin and the meaning of the term Hanukkah (meaning 'dedication') in *Torah*. Cf. VanderKam, 'Hanukkah,' pp. 23-36: regarding Hanukkah, it is most likely that *John* 10:22 and the Chronicle *Megillat Ta'anit* are based on *I Macc*.

<sup>263</sup> *I Macc*. 1:59.

<sup>264</sup> Cf. VanderKam, 'Hanukkah,' pp. 32-34, raised the hypothesis that the author of the *I Maccabees* misinterpreted the celebrations of Sukkot (also known as Tabernacles or Booths) as being a new festival. Cf. Rankin, *The Origins*, pp. 80-88, on the theory that certain characteristics

attributed to Philo completely ignore Hanukkah, while *Mishnah*<sup>265</sup> prefers to pay attention to a certain miracle that is supposed to have taken place at the time of Judas.<sup>266</sup> The earliest Israelite attestation of this feast comes from the *Antiquities* which narrate that Judas found a deserted Temple where plants grew in the Holy of Holies. Judas cleaned it of plants and from that time the Jews celebrated the "festival of the lights."<sup>267</sup> One should note here that contrary to the *Antiquities* both *I* and *II Maccabees* do not mention that the Temple was abandoned, and the question here is why the *Antiquities* provide this variation of the same story? Was Josephus the historian, the accepted author of the *Antiquities*, ignorant of *I Maccabees*? This is not the case, for as we are going to see below, "Josephus" incorporated the entire *I Maccabees* in his own work. Therefore, which version of the liberation events should we accept as historical, and what is fiction here? Did the Temple become a place of pagan worship or was it abandoned? Is it possible that neither of these stories tell the truth? Trying to find answers as to what might have happened during that time between the Greeks and the different Israelite parties, I will further examine this matter in Chapter three.

### 1.6: *III* and *IV Maccabees*

Regardless of its title, *III Maccabees* has nothing to do with the Maccabees revolutionary family. Although it is supposed to contain information about the relations between certain Greeks and Jews in Egypt after the battle of Raphia (217 BCE), there is no consensus as to when this book was composed. Most

---

of Hanukkah were introduced and developed during Herod. Before that it was "celebrated in the manner of Booths." It is not implausible that Sukkot was either related or influenced by the ancient Egyptian festival of the lights, mentioned by Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.62, ed. cit., vol. 1, p. 176, cited by Rankin, *The Origins*, pp.133-134.

<sup>265</sup> That earliest part of the *Talmud*.

<sup>266</sup> Rankin, *The Origins*, pp. 259-260, *Mishnah* mentions Hanukkah at five instances; p. 77, on the first *Talmud* instance about the oil miracle.

<sup>267</sup> *Ant.* 12.316-326, ed. cit., vol. 3, pp. 126-128; 325 (lights on the 25th of Ἑξελέου, also known as Ἀπελλαίου μηνός, meaning that, according to the *Antiquities*, the Jewish month Kislev was identical to those Greek months).

scholars agree that the *terminus ad quem* is the first century CE and the *terminus a quo* is the second c. BCE.<sup>268</sup> There are some parallels between the narrative of this work, Josephus, *Esther* and other works, but there is no research available to examine in detail whether these sources were based on a common single earlier source.<sup>269</sup> The resemblance between the story with the elephants in *III Maccabees* 5-6 and *Contra Apionem*, 2.53-55<sup>270</sup> on the panicked elephants is more than striking, and the question here is whether one of the two authors was based on the other.

The central point of *III Maccabees* is that a Greek King of Egypt, by the help of divine intervention, realised that his persecutions against the Jews were unjust; he supported Judaism and objected to the assimilation of the Jews by the Gentiles. Interestingly, *IV Maccabees* which is also considered a novel, gives exactly the opposite example of a Greek King who attacked Judaism. The commonly accepted dating for the composition of *IV Maccabees* is between the middle of the first century BCE and the last decades of the second century BCE.<sup>271</sup> Jan Willem van Henten, Professor of New Testament, Early Christian Literature and Hellenistic Jewish Literature, argues that this work must have become popular or must have surfaced at about the same time when the Maccabees martyrs cult emerged in Antioch, some time in the second century

---

<sup>268</sup> On the different datings see D. S. Williams, '3 *Maccabees*: a defence of diaspora Judaism?,' *JSP* 13 (1995), pp. 19-24 at 17-29 and Davila, *Provenance*, p. 143; It is included in *Codex Alexandrinus* but not in *Sinaiticus*; N. Clayton Croy, *3 Maccabees* (Leiden, 2006), p. xi-xii, dating.

<sup>269</sup> Hadas, *Macc.*, pp. 2-15.

<sup>270</sup> *Contra Apionem* dated this during the reign of Ptolemy IX Physcon 146-117 BCE.

<sup>271</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, p. 145; Eissfeldt, *OT*, pp. 570-615: Like *I Maccabees* it is included in *Codices Sinaiticus* and *Alexandrinus*; David A. deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Sheffield, 1998), p. 12, *Eus., H.E.* 3.10.6 attributed *IV Macc.* to "Josephus"; pp. 14-18, estimates on the date of its composition vary from the first BCE to the second CE; pp. 144-149 on a significant number of "lexical and ethical influences" of *IV Macc.* to the *NT*; André Dupont-Sommer, *Le Quatrième Livre des Machabées* (Paris, 1939), pp. 82-84 (dating of *IV Macc.* after Kitos, in Trajan).

CE.<sup>272</sup> Although Davila too questioned whether *IV Maccabees* is a Christian composition, for this work has been transmitted by Christians only, he also observed that its author presented his hero-martyrs as strict observers of the Law regarding food taboos and circumcision. This made Davila conclude that the author of *IV Maccabees* must have been very Jewish and not Christian.<sup>273</sup> If so, once more the question here is why this particular Jewish work, together with the other *Maccabees* books, was accepted by Christianity as its own and the same time was rejected by non-Christian Jews? Regardless the fact that this work too, such as all previous *Maccabees* books, was composed long after the events it talked about, and like *III Maccabees* sounds very fictional, certain scholars believe that it contains historical information regarding the martyrdom its central heroes suffered in the hands of the infidel and vile Greeks of King Antiochos Epiphanēs.<sup>274</sup> The question here again is whether the composer of this story reflects in it his own perceptions of the Greeks, as these were formed by historical events that took place during or near the time he lived and not earlier. Both Eusebius and Jerome as well as a number of other Christian scholars after them, believed that Josephus was the author of this work.<sup>275</sup> Extensive analysis on style and language, as well as stylometric scientific investigation prove that this is not a work made by Josephus.<sup>276</sup>

## 1.7: Josephus

It has been widely accepted that the entire *Antiquities*, *De Bello Judaico* (also know as *The War*), *Contra Apionem* (*Against Apion*) and *De Vita* (*Life*) are works of Josephus the Jewish Historian, a Galilean of Israelite priestly status and of

---

<sup>272</sup> Jan Willem van Henten, 'Datierung und Herkunft des Vierten Makabäerbuches in J. W. Henten and H. J. de Jonge et al, eds, *Tradition and Reinterpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Jürgen C. H. Lebram* (Leiden, 1986), pp. 136-147.

<sup>273</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, pp. 145-147.

<sup>274</sup> E.g. Hadas, *Macc.*, p. 100.

<sup>275</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, p. 168.

<sup>276</sup> Williams, *Stylometric*, p. 201.

common ancestry with the Royal Hasmoneans.<sup>277</sup> Also, it is widely accepted that Josephus was active in the circle of the Herodians and he was forced by the circumstances to participate in the Great Revolt of the Israelite rebels against the Herodians and against Rome. Most scholars also accept that at some later stage he decided to change side and he became loyal to the Romans. The Flavians were so impressed by Josephus to the extent that they took him to Rome, they officially made him their client, granted him a generous pension and approved his publications of the history of Israel. The problem in these stories is that they are based entirely on Josephus's own words, for which there are strong warnings that they should not be fully trusted.<sup>278</sup> Regarding Josephus's identity, it is important to observe that there are no testimonies made by Josephus's contemporaries to confirm any of the points of Josephus's life and acts. Eusebius the Church historian who wrote in the fourth century, provided information that the Romans recognised Josephus's importance to such an extent that they even erected his statue in Rome.<sup>279</sup>

Contrary to the general assumption that he first wrote in Greek, no actual evidence has been presented that "Josephus" did in fact have any Greek education,<sup>280</sup> apart from his own words at the "very end"<sup>281</sup> of the *Antiquities*, which states that nobody else apart from him, either Jewish or Gentile, has

---

<sup>277</sup> Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 6.

<sup>278</sup> Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 15 (Josephus was guided by strong political and religious views and in this sense he should not be regarded as an historiographer: "*whenever it suited his purpose, he exaggerated, altered or suppressed facts and events.*")

<sup>279</sup> *H.E.*, 3.9.1-2, vol. 31, p. 115.

<sup>280</sup> E.g. T. Rajak, 'The Greek language in Josephus' Jerusalem' chapter in *Josephus, the historian and his society* (London, 2002), pp. 11-45, 63-64, assumes that Josephus had Greek education. Cf. Rajak, *Josephus*, p. 230, refers to Josephus's statement that he wrote the *War* in his native language. Cf. Rajak, *The Jewish*, p. 273, repeats that Josephus wrote in Greek; Feldman, *Josephus*, p. 22, (Schreckenberg), Josephus writing in Greek.

<sup>281</sup> Editors and interpolators often made additions at the beginning or the end of texts, without revealing their identity.

produced such an accurate record for the Greeks to read,<sup>282</sup> and that he studied Greek but he could not speak it because it was the custom of his own people (the Jews) not to encourage the learning of the languages of the Gentiles.<sup>283</sup> Instead they encouraged the study only of their own holy scriptures (written in Hebrew and/or Aramaic).<sup>284</sup> Contrary to this statement that he knew some Greek and wrote his works in this language, "Josephus" himself in both *De Bello* and *Contra Apionem* stated that he wrote first in his own native language<sup>285</sup> and others translated his writings into Greek.<sup>286</sup> The problem here, which has not been examined by scholars, is whether we talk about two different authors: one in the *Antiquities* who could write but could not speak Greek, and one in *De*

---

<sup>282</sup> *Ant.* 20.263: μήτε Ἰουδαῖος μήτε ἀλλόφυλος τὴν πραγματείαν ταύτην οὕτως ἀκριβῶς εἰς Ἑλληνας ἐξενεγκεῖν.

<sup>283</sup> ἔθνῶν

<sup>284</sup> *Ant.* 20.264-65: τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων... τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δὲ γραμμάτων ἐσπούδασα. I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. David Gwynn for bringing this to my attention.

<sup>285</sup> Heimann Kotték, *Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet* (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 7-16. Kotték edited a Syriac text of the sixth book of *De Bello* and was convinced that the Greek text of Josephus derives from an earlier Syriac text. Cf. Allison P. Hayman, ed. and trans. *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew*, *Corpus Christianorum Orientalium*, 339 (Louvain, 1973), pp. 46-47 who concludes that because of evidence in the quotations made in the Syriac work written by Sergius (fl. 8th c.), the Syriac *De Bello* derives from a Greek text, therefore Kotték is wrong. However, Hayman also concluded that there should be a further study of Sergius's quotations in comparison to the *Slavonic Version*. See also Abraham Schalit, 'Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*' in *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4, (Leiden, 1965), pp. 163-188 at p. 169-171, 176 who questions why Josephus in certain points in the *Antiquities* failed to translate certain Aramaic words into Greek. Schalit questions that Josephus consulted a certain source that was originally written in Aramaic, but later was translated in Greek, and Josephus simply copied the Greek form of the text; Kordatos (vol. 1, p. 36, n. 19), Hengel (*Zeloten*, p. 7), Witherington (*Jesus*, p. 32) among others accept that *De Bello* was first written in Aramaic. According to Rajak, *The Jewish*, p. 138, the language the Jews of Palestine spoke was Aramaic, and Hebrew was known in limited circles for "specific, ideological purposes"; C. Mopsik, 'Late Judeo-Aramaic: The language of Theosophic Kabbalah', *Aramaic Studies* 4.1 (2006), pp. 21-33 at 21-22 on Aramaic as the dominant language in the Near East; Michael Sokoloff, 'A new dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic', *Aramaic Studies* 1.1 (2000), pp. 67-107 at 67-68: the Samaritans used a mixed language of Aramaic and Hebrew. Although Hebrew is known to have been used by certain Jews, Galilean Israelites such as Josephus are known as speakers of Aramaic.

<sup>286</sup> *Bel.* 1.3, vol. 6, p. 3: Ἑλλάδι γλώσση μεταβαλὼν ἅ τοις ἄνω βαρβάρους τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον ἀφηγήσασθαι; *Contra Apionem*, 1.48-50, vol. 5, p. 10: πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς οὕτως ἐποιησάμην τῶν πράξεων τὴν παράδοσιν; Eusebius, *H.E.*, 3.9.3, vol. 1, p. 115, states that Josephus wrote *De Bello* not only in Greek but also in his ancestral language: οὐ μόνον τῇ Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ.



*Bello* and *Contra Apionem* who could not write Greek. It is clear that in the above statements "Josephus" himself admitted that his Greek was either non-existent or poor. Therefore, the researcher has to question how could "Josephus" read, understand and analyse a significant number of (now lost) Greek works which he quotes repeatedly, and which he used as his sources?<sup>287</sup> If one accepts the explanation that Josephus was helped by translators, one should also examine that this "Josephus" who could not translate in Greek, in the *Antiquities*, chapters 7-8 himself consulted a Greek translation of *I Maccabees* and paraphrased it in a way that omitted certain Hebraisms and vulgarisms, he spelled Semitic proper names in a Hellenized way or deleted them, and incorporated most of this Greek version of *I Maccabees* into his own without any mention of where exactly he got this text from.<sup>288</sup> All this process from its first step requires a high command of Greek. Therefore, how could this "Josephus" who in *De Bello* and *Contra Apionem* admitted he was either not good in Greek or did not know any Greek, do all this in the *Antiquities*? Did he commission others who knew Greek to research, translate and edit, or was this work written by somebody else, a later anonymous author who attributed it to Josephus? To what extent was this "Josephus" assisted by others who knew Greek very well?

Another important point in understanding who "Josephus" was and why he produced his works, is that he fabricated numerous texts which he presented as official imperial Roman State documents issued to honour and protect the Jews.<sup>289</sup> Trying to conceal the fact that he fabricated and invented material, he

---

<sup>287</sup> E.g. the works of Nicolaus of Damascus (fl. 1<sup>st</sup> BCE) and of Menander the Greek historian (fl. early 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE).

<sup>288</sup> See Cadbury, *Making*, p. 169-172. Cf. Cohen, *Josephus*, pp. 44-47 (Josephus used *I Maccabees* in addition to one more lost Hellenistic source and his own inventions, regarding the Maccabean period); Bartlett, *1 Macc*, p. 17: Josephus re-wrote speeches presented in *I Macc*. and composed new speeches.

<sup>289</sup> See Gruen, *Heritage*, pp. xiii-xx. For a sample of these "Josephus" documents and the dispute on their authenticity, see M.H. Williams, *The Jews among the Greeks and the Romans: a Diaspora Sourcebook* (London, 1998), pp. 93-95; Rajak, *The Jewish*, pp. 301-332, on the forged documents produced by Israelite circles, used by "Josephus"; Idem pp. 82-84, on different

made statements that he reproduced the ancient writings with accuracy, "without adding or omitting anything."<sup>290</sup> The ordinary reader did not have access to the "original" sources quoted by "Josephus," in order to confirm that this important "Flavian" author was saying the truth. The question here is whether the presentation of himself as a Flavian, the statements on his impartiality and the presentation of numerous "official" documents which were in fact fakes, were all different elements of a single strategy which aimed in adding credibility to "his" works and persuade his reader to accept his own version of history.

From the moment most scholars accept that Josephus did fabricate much evidence contained in the so-called official Roman documents and in other parts of his works, one should question what would have stopped such an honest "Josephus" from fabricating the story that he was made a Flavian client?<sup>291</sup> Should we believe his own words that the Imperial Roman family of the Flavians liked him so much to the extent that they sponsored him? If this is correct, how could an original Flavian client have published and circulated so many fake documents while living in Rome, without being detected as a fraudulent forger? Therefore, could this "Josephus," a "*priest and preacher, a rabbi in all means who centred his own life around God and Israel*"<sup>292</sup> (in Professor Cohen's words), be very similar to the other anonymous religious Israelite authors I

---

accounts provided by Josephus, on the siege of Jerusalem by Antiochus VII (c. 135-104 BCE). Rajak does not explore the possibility that one of the two accounts might be by a different author; Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 13, accepts the Roman documents about the privileges, presented by Josephus in his *Antiquities*, as original; Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 201, accepts that Josephus had access to imperial archives.

<sup>290</sup> Cohen, *Josephus*, p. 24 on Josephus lying in *Ant.* 1.17. Contrary to this statement, Cohen, as well as a great number of scholars, observed that the *Ant.* add many details, change and omit entire biblical episodes.

<sup>291</sup> *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 4: On one more "Christian" tradition that Clement of Rome was no other than Titus Flavius Clemens, cousin of Emperor Domitian (81-96 CE) and family member of the Flavians, who was executed on the orders of the Emperor as a political opponent.

<sup>292</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, 2005, pp. 170-174.

mention above in this Chapter, who did not hesitate to impersonate the prophets, the Greeks, Sibyl and even Moses himself, in order to promote their own propaganda?

There is further evidence that this rabbi "Josephus" was a member of a particular circle of religious men who acted as successors and continuators of the Apostolic tradition, once directed by the central Israelite authorities of the Jerusalem Temple who sent their own Apostles in different parts of the world, in order to direct and instruct the Diaspora communities. This circle which assisted "Josephus" used their own network to distribute their "Josephus" material to their Israelite Diaspora communities.<sup>293</sup> One should also observe here that this Jerusalem Temple practice of sending Apostles to the Diaspora, was also continued by the Christians, and that the works of "Josephus" do survive because Christianity preserved and reproduced them to such an extent that they became a core Christian reading during Byzantium. Just like the *Maccabees* books we have seen above, "Josephus" was accepted as a proper Christian reading, while Judaism rejected "him" for many centuries and reclaimed "him" only in the last few centuries.

Although it is clear that "Josephus" and Christianity were inter-linked from an early stage, a main problem in studying the transmission of his texts is that their earliest surviving Greek manuscripts are of the 11th century.<sup>294</sup> This is a massive ten centuries after these works were first published, and it is almost impossible to tell how many changes were made on them during this long period.<sup>295</sup> One should also take into account that a most important manuscript

---

<sup>293</sup> Rajak, *Josephus*, p. 175.

<sup>294</sup> Voorst, *Jesus*, p. 88.

<sup>295</sup> Feldman, *Josephus*, p. 22: Because of the numerous alterations and variations on "his" texts, it is impossible to establish a stemma manuscript tradition.

on which their 1544 *editio princeps* was based, has disappeared.<sup>296</sup>

The vast majority of scholars study and understand "Josephus" only through the translations of the Greek text of Josephus's works that was edited by Benedikt Niese (1849-1910) in Berlin (1887-1894). This is an outdated edition which is not taking into account all other versions of the "Josephus" texts, published in other ancient languages. The surviving versions in other ancient languages have been dated both earlier and later than the earliest extant Greek manuscripts.<sup>297</sup> It is very important to note here that there is only one extant Greek papyrus fragment<sup>298</sup> containing anything written by Josephus in Greek. This fragment has been dated to the end of the third century and is in fact the earliest surviving sample of *De Bello*, but it contains only 112 words. It is important to note here that this fragment differs significantly with all manuscripts Niese took into account for his edition and as a result, Professor Louis Feldman warned that the text of *De Bello* as we now know it is much less secure than previously thought.<sup>299</sup> In other words, it is very likely that the original text was changed and altered by later editors and *De Bello* as we know

---

<sup>296</sup> (Basel, 1544). Cf. G. A. Williamson, *The World of Josephus* (London, 1964), p. 311.

<sup>297</sup> Feldman, *Josephus*, p. 46, the Latin version of Josephus is about 500 years earlier than the earliest surviving Greek manuscript. Idem, p. 40, there are two Latin versions of Josephus the "Hegesippus" version, originating from the fourth century, and the Cassiodorus version originating from the sixth century. The latter version is considered as more reliable. Idem, p. 41, the Hegesippus version in turn was circulated in differing recessions, making the reconstruction of the primary translation almost impossible. Idem, p. 50, there is agreement that the *Slavonic* Josephus, thought by Berendts and Eisler to be a translation from an Aramaic text, is in fact a translation of a Greek text that took place in the 11th century. Idem, pp. 52-54, the refutation of the hypothesis that the *Slavonic* was based on a smaller original Aramaic version, has not been supported by "a systematic study of the omissions". In other words, there is no scientific explanation as to why this *Slavonic Version* is significantly shorter than the Greek we know. To make things even more complex, there is no scientific explanation for the additional information the *Slavonic* contains. Scholars are divided on this issue and provide a great variety of explanations, spanning from the hypothesis that Josephus himself produced different revisions, to the hypothesis that they are the result of extensive Byzantine interpolations. Idem, p. 59, no critical edition of *Josippon* has been accomplished. Idem, pp. 64-68, it was published in middle of the tenth c. and was based on the Latin "Hegesippus."

<sup>298</sup> *Papyrus Graeca Vindobonensis* 29810.

<sup>299</sup> Feldman, *Josephus*, p. 25.

it today through Niese, who based his edition in manuscripts dated after the 11th century, has little to do with what the original "Josephus" wrote in the first century. Other scholars have also observed that "*the text of the Antiquities is the most corrupt Greek text from antiquity*,"<sup>300</sup> meaning that not only *De Bello* but also the other important work of Josephus, the *Antiquities*, was changed repeatedly by the hands of anonymous editors and scribes who added or altered text according to their own aims. Unfortunately, the vast majority of Early Christianity scholars simply ignore these warnings and keep talking about Flavius Josephus as a historical person who was the single author of everything attributed to him by Niese. Also, the vast majority of scholars tend to accept much of what "Josephus" said as reliable, rather than the opposite.

There is additional evidence that "Josephus's" works were altered by Christians. For example, the report in the *Antiquities* that Jesus was a divine miracle maker and wise teacher who became the leader of numerous Jews and Greeks, is a Christian fabrication.<sup>301</sup> Another example of Christian manipulation of "Josephus" is that the first half of the *Antiquities* has its biblical terminology altered to assimilate an earlier "Josephus" text to the text of the *Septuagint*.<sup>302</sup> In other words, some Christian editor/s altered "Josephus" passages which referred to the *Old Testament*, because they did not come from a version of the *Old Testament* which they did approve. By correcting "Josephus's" knowledge of the *Old Testament* according to their own preferences, they made "Josephus" an author who used the *Septuagint*.

---

<sup>300</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, p. 166.

<sup>301</sup> *Ant.* 18.63, vol. 4 p. 151: πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. On the long lasting controversy about the originality of this statement see A. Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times* (New York, 2003); Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 5 (Voltaire, among many others, was convinced that the *Testamentum Flavianum* was a forgery); Voorst, *Jesus*, p. 104, accepts an imaginary reconstruction of what he things was in place of *Testamentum Flavianum*.

<sup>302</sup> Schreckenberg in Feldman above.

The fact that "Josephus" contradicts himself in a number of important points could raise further questions as to which parts of his works are original, which do have historical value and which are fabrications or later additions. For example, as Hengel observed, *Antiquities* 18.9 state that the sect initiated by Judas the Galilean was unusual and differed greatly<sup>303</sup> from traditional Judaism.<sup>304</sup> The same work, few pages later (*Antiquities* 18.23), in a section that has been designed to explain the differences between Israelite religious denominations, states that this same sect initiated by Judas the Galilean was just like the Pharisees with the only difference being that they did not recognise the authority of any ruler apart from God.<sup>305</sup> The first comment in 18.9 emphasizes the illegitimacy of Judas's revolutionary sect by stressing that it was very different from anything else Jewish, while the second in 18.23 does find it almost identical to a main stream Jewish movement, the Pharisees. In this sense, the second statement does not appear to alienate this Galilean movement. One also should take into account here that this particular sect led by Judas the Galilean was revolutionary and anti-Roman. It makes sense that a pro-Roman "Josephus" must have attacked the anti-Roman Galilean Judas just like the *Antiquities* 18.9 did, by presenting it as totally alien to Judaism. *Antiquities* 18.23 appear to be friendlier to this anti-Roman sect, and the question here is whether this statement was added by a Christian who sympathised with this particular revolutionary Galilean movement.

The comparison of "Josephus's" *De Bello* 2.254-257 and *Antiquities* 20.162-165 also presents an interesting contradiction. The first passage directly blames the Sikarioi, a sect of extremists, for the murder of Jonathan (son of Ananus) the High-Priest of the Jerusalem Temple. This first passage does not involve any

---

<sup>303</sup> *Ant.* 18.9.6, vol. 4, p. 141: τῷ ἀσυνήθει πρότερον φιλοσοφίας τοιαύτης.

<sup>304</sup> *Ant.* 18.9.1, vol. 4, p. 141 : ἡ τῶν πατριῶν καίνισις καὶ μεταβολή

<sup>305</sup> For this contradiction see Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 80 (Hengel does not examine the possibility that one of the two versions may not be original). *Ant.* 18.23, vol. 4, p. 141.

Roman in the murder. The second passage claims that High Priest Jonathan was murdered by anonymous thugs who were bribed by Felix, a Roman Procurator. Just like the Sikarioi hid short swords under their clothes, the bandits employed by Felix also hid short swords under their clothes.<sup>306</sup> The question here is which one of the two accounts is historical?<sup>307</sup> Why the *Antiquities* shift the blame from the Sikarioi to the Roman Procurator and do not name the bandits as Sikarioi? Who exactly conspired for the murder of the High Priest? Felix who was the enemy of the revolutionary Sikarioi and who was fighting against them, or the Sikarioi themselves, as stated in *De Bello*? An original pro-Roman and anti-revolutionary "Josephus" should have blamed the Sikarioi revolutionaries, like *De Bello* does, rather than the Roman Felix, as the *Antiquities* do. The question here is whether certain Christian fabricators who edited the *Antiquities*, tried to alter an earlier anti-revolutionary "Josephus" text and changed it (in some points) in favour of the revolutionary Sikarioi.

Professor of Hebrew Literature and Philosophy Shaye Cohen also observed that *De Vita* and *De Bello* contain further contradictions, provide different accounts of the same episodes and often provide different dates for the same events.<sup>308</sup> However, Cohen did not examine the possibility that some of the contradictions might have been caused by interpolators, or may have not been originally written by Josephus. Further discrepancies, this time in between *Antiquities* and *De Bello* were observed by Professor Hengel who concluded that the *Antiquities* are less political; they are guided more by religion and ethical values and are more critical of Herod the Great than *De Bello* is.<sup>309</sup> However, Hengel too, did

---

<sup>306</sup> *Ant.* 20.164.2, vol. 4, p. 304 : ὑπὸ τὰς ἐσθῆτας ἔχοντες ξιφίδια.

<sup>307</sup> Hengel, *Zealots* p. 47, did not question one of the two as an interpolation. He simply discredited Josephus for his superficial and unreliable presentation of his material.

<sup>308</sup> Cohen, *Josephus*, pp 3-8; Jordan Henderson, 'Josephus's Life and Jewish War compared to the Synoptic Gospels,' pp. 113-131 in *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*, 10 (2014) on the differences between these two works of Josephus on names and numbers. Henderson did not raise questions on the authenticity of these works.

<sup>309</sup> Hengel, *Zeloten*, pp. 12-13.

not question the origin of all these differences between the two works by exploring the possibility that the *Antiquities* or parts of them could have been produced or altered by Christian circles, who traditionally opposed Herod the Great. Although Shayne Cohen conducted a more detailed study of the contradictions in between "Josephus's" *Antiquities* and *De Bello*, Shayne Cohen did not find an answer as to why the *Antiquities* chapters 15-17 are in fact such an independent revision of *De Bello*, in the sense that they contain so little from it and they vary so strikingly.<sup>310</sup> Why exactly "Josephus" who composed *De Bello* before the *Antiquities*, felt the need to present such different versions of the same stories, without consulting his first work? Why should any researcher not question the possibility that one or both works, at least in some parts, have been altered or produced by someone other than the original "Josephus"?

After examining another number of errors and contradictions in the works of "Josephus," Eisler came to the conclusion that "Josephus" composed the history of the years 44-66 CE not from his own memory or by following a single earlier tradition, but simply by cutting, copying and pasting material from different documents - sources written by others, with references to the same period.<sup>311</sup> In my opinion, this observation made by Eisler deserves further investigation because, in juxtaposition to the evidence examined above in this section, Eisler's conclusion supports the hypothesis that some or the entire "Josephus" may not have been a personal witness of the Great Revolt. In other words, there is a possibility that much or the entire "Josephus" texts may be pseudepigrapha similar to those mentioned above in this Chapter. It is also possible that one or more editors of some earlier "Josephus" material manipulated their sources in order to create larger texts which they attributed to a single earlier author called "Josephus." Shayne Cohen also made the important observation that *De Vita*

---

<sup>310</sup> Cohen, *Josephus*, pp. 65-66.

<sup>311</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 207.



and *De Bello* do not have verbal parallels, but contrary to Eisler whom he did not examine, he concluded that both works rewrote and rearranged a separate common source.<sup>312</sup> Cohen did not question that the earliest papyrus fragment which contains material from an early version of "Josephus's" text, and which differs so much from the later Byzantine editions of "Josephus's" text, comes to support the case that the texts attributed to Josephus are in fact a product of extensive writing and editing by others who were active long after the first century. Also, from the moment we do not know the contents of a number of previous sources used by "Josephus" simply because they do not survive, it may not be scholarly to conclude that "Josephus" did not invent "*new episodes, nor distorted the essential content*" of previous sources.<sup>313</sup>

In conclusion to "Josephus," one should also take into account that there is no extensive analysis available on the style and language used in all works attributed to him, in order to prove that they have all been produced by the same author.<sup>314</sup> Perhaps we should better wait for more scientific results before we make our final statements on the originality of the entire body of works attributed to "Josephus."<sup>315</sup> Until such results become available it may be safer to use the name Josephus as an umbrella term that encompasses the works accepted as his. What exactly has been originally written by "Josephus" and when this primary material was altered, should become the subject of further research. Until then, "Josephus" the "Galilean rabbi" remains the main source with reference to the history of the region and the period when Christianity emerged.

---

<sup>312</sup> Cohen, *Josephus*, p. 83.

<sup>313</sup> This was accepted and quoted by Cohen, *Josephus*, p. 47.

<sup>314</sup> Williams, *Stylometric*, p. 203.

<sup>315</sup> Feldman, *Josephus*, p. 22, summarizes an article by Heinz Schreckenberg, 'Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes' in *Theokratia* 2, 1970-72, pp. 81-106, and concludes that Josephus wrote the *Antiquities* alone and received help only for *De Bello*.

## 1.8: The first three *Gospels* (*Holy Synopsis*)

In the middle of the nineteenth century David Friedrich Strauss<sup>316</sup> argued at the university of Tübingen and elsewhere that all four *Gospels* were not written by eyewitnesses, but were produced decades later by anonymous authors who constructed the image of Jesus by distorting and mixing material deriving from previous traditions. Strauss also dismissed the historical value of the miracle stories in the *Gospels* and claimed that they were myths. The academic establishment of his time found his views unscholarly.<sup>317</sup> Contrary to those who, like Strauss, point that the *NT* contains mainly unreliable information,<sup>318</sup> many contemporary Early Christianity scholars conclude that the Synoptic *Gospels* do reveal that Jesus was a historical follower of John the Baptist; Jesus later went to Galilee to gather support, he was a healer, an exorcist and an itinerant sage who taught often in parables and was sentenced to death by the Romans.<sup>319</sup> Some scholars are confident that the "Scripture" is so reliable, that they can use it to

---

<sup>316</sup> *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, 3 vols (London, 1846).

<sup>317</sup> He was not the only one who faced the menace of the establishment because of his views on the validity of the *Gospels* as a historical source. Cf. Wilson, *Jesus*, p. 150: George Tyrell and Alfred Loisy were excommunicated by the Catholic Church in the 20th century because of their critical study of the *NT*; Marvin R. O'Connell, *Critics of Trial: an introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis* (Washington, 1994).

<sup>318</sup> E.g. Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (London, 2010), p. 436: "Our sources (NT material) are complex artefacts, the collaboration of, among other things, fallible perceptions, imperfect memories, linguistic conventions, cultural assumptions and personal and communal agendas. Differentiating an original event or saying from all that has mingled with it and been superimposed upon is often perhaps a bit like trying to separate streams they have flowed into a river." See also Paul N. Anderson, 'Why this study is needed, and why it is needed now,' in *JJH*, pp. 13-70 at p. 67 (Anderson concludes that neither *John* nor the other three *Gospels* are entirely historical or non-historical, and that all *Gospels* should be re-examined in order to establish which of their parts have historical value). See also Ellegård, *Jesus*, p. 31, on the difficulties in ascertaining which parts of early Christian writings are later interpolations. Idem, p. 32, Ellegård argues that the word synagogue became widely used in the second and not in the first century. It is mentioned sixty times in the *Gospels*. Ellegård observed that the word synagogue does not exist in Paul's letters, *Pastor of Hermas*, *Didache*, *The first letter of Clement of Rome*, *The Letter of Barnabas*, *The Letter to the Hebrews* and the *Revelation of John*. The non-original Pauline letters also do not use synagogue. Ellegård concludes that this difference in use of the term Synagogue is evidence for dating the *Gospels* in the second century and the above works, which do not mention synagogue in the first century.

<sup>319</sup> Funk, *Seminar*, pp. 527, for a summary of the widely accepted historical points of the Synopsis.

reconstruct the life of Jesus with much accuracy.<sup>320</sup> In my opinion, the vast majority of scholars do not pay much attention to a particular sequence on which all Synoptic *Gospels* agree, which is that Jesus was a follower of a leader who was executed by the authorities; Jesus gathered followers from Galilee; at some stage attacked the Jerusalem Temple; soon after he was arrested, tried and crucified by the authorities. Instead of building their understanding of historical Jesus on this sequence of events, which is not based on what Jesus preached, for centuries most scholars construct their picture of historical Jesus based primarily on his preaching and miracles. Most scholars are convinced that most parables mentioned in the *Synopsis* come directly from historical Jesus.<sup>321</sup>

Regardless their position on the validity of the *Synopsis* as a historical source, scholars have been puzzled with the differences between the genealogies of Jesus in *Matthew* and *Luke*, but there is consensus that their purpose is to convince that Jesus was a proper descendant of David, hence a legitimate Messiah.<sup>322</sup> Apart from the obvious Messianic Israelite background, scholars come to discover that the Greek *NT* material does have a strong Israelite background also in linguistic terms.<sup>323</sup> This background of the authors of the *Synopsis* is also confirmed by the fact that page after page and almost passage after passage, as one could see in *Nestle-Aland*, the *Gospels* contain a vast amount of information deriving from the *Old Testament* which has been used in

---

<sup>320</sup> Bock, *Studying*, p. 216.

<sup>321</sup> Mack, *Myth*, p. 61: "Scholars have usually assumed that most of the parables came from Jesus."

<sup>322</sup> On claims for the Davidian ancestry of Jesus see below Ch. 2.3. Also see Amram Tropper, 'Tractate *Avot* and Early Christian Succession Lists', in Becker-Reed, pp. 159-188 at pp. 177-182 (*Avot* is a Mishnaic tractate) on the common ways both Jews and Christians emphasized on the legitimate succession of their leaders.

<sup>323</sup> Fiensy, *Jesus*, p. 6, *Luke* contains the best Hebrew/Aramaic than the other two Gospels. Matthew first wrote in Hebrew. Cf. Kümmel, *Das neue*, p. 38, John Lightfoot (1602-1675) "reached the correct conclusion that the language of the *New Testament*, written by and for Jews, could only be understood if one were familiar with the language of the Jews that time."

various ways in order to construct their narrative.<sup>324</sup> In my opinion, only men with professional religious convictions such as the Seventy Sanhedrin, mentioned above, or the rabbis or the literate of the Essenes could have displayed such an in-depth and detailed knowledge of the *Old Testament*. Interestingly, according to Church tradition, Mark and Luke the Evangelists were two of the Seventy Apostles.<sup>325</sup> Clearly, the *Synopsis* is part of the Israelite genre of religious writings<sup>326</sup> such as *The Ten Harugei Malkhut* which narrates that a certain Rabbi Ishmael, a High Priest, "was one of the seven most handsome men in the world, and that his face resembled an angel's."<sup>327</sup> He was conceived after God sent Archangel Gabriel to visit his mother in the form of her husband. The parallel here with the immaculate conception of Jesus by Mary, as this is contained in the *Synopsis*, is striking. Professor of Religion Bruce Chilton also spotted remarkable similarities between certain *Targumim*<sup>328</sup> and some *NT* material, but he could not explain how the *NT* is aware of them because they did not exist in the first century.<sup>329</sup> Henry Cadbury (1883-1974) also observed that there are remarkable similarities in the style *Luke* paraphrased *Mark* and Josephus paraphrased *I Maccabees*,<sup>330</sup> but did not

---

<sup>324</sup> Also see Kessler, *Introduction*, pp. 26-28, on the dependence on- and acceptance of the *OT* by the *NT*.

<sup>325</sup> Cf. *Luke* 10:1-24

<sup>326</sup> E.g. see Fiensy, *Jesus*, p. 1 (identical lines between *Luke* 11:34 and *m.Avot* 2:16 (in Mishnah); *Assumption*, introduction p. 13 (*Matthew* 24:29, *Acts* 7:35, *Jude* 9, 16, 18 and some later Christian works contain lines from *Assumption of Moses*); M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lektion in Matthew* (London, 1974), pp. 66-69 on the pre-existing rabbinic tradition of parables. Cf. Kessler, *Introduction*, p. 65 (it is not clear when the rabbinic period began. The earliest suggested date is in the 5th c. BCE, and the latest during the Hasmonean period. The rabbis dominated Judaism only after 70 CE). Cf. Peter Schäfer, *The Jewish Jesus: how Judaism and Christianity shaped each other* (Princeton, 2012) about certain Christian influences in *Talmud*.

<sup>327</sup> *Harugei*, p. 61. Idem, p. 63, Ishmael was one of ten rabbis executed by a Roman emperor.

<sup>328</sup> Rabbinic explanations and expansions of the Scriptures delivered usually in the Aramaic language.

<sup>329</sup> Bruce Chilton, 'Targum, Jesus, and the Gospels', in *The Historical Jesus in Context*, eds Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison Jr., John Dominic Crossan (Princeton, 2006), pp. 238-255 at p. 251. Idem, p. 252 (Jesus does not cite exact Targumic wording).

<sup>330</sup> Cadbury, *Making*, pp. 173-183; Also see F. Gerald Downing, 'Imitation and Emulation, Josephus and Luke: Plot and Psycholinguistics' in *The Elijah-Elisha narrative in the composition of*

question whether there was a single editor or single circle of editors who were responsible for the paraphrasing of both *I Maccabees* and *Mark* and incorporated material from each one of these works in *Josephus* and *Luke* respectively.<sup>331</sup>

#### *Remarks on the identities of Matthew, Mark and Luke*

According to Church tradition, no other Evangelist apart from Matthew was contemporary to Jesus. Epiphanius's *Panarion*, states that the Eviōnaioi,<sup>332</sup> a very early Christian community, regarded Matthew as the only real Evangelist, who wrote in Hebrew<sup>333</sup> for his own people and not for the Gentiles. In *Matthew* Jesus clearly advised his followers not to talk like the Gentiles<sup>334</sup> and warned that the Gentiles will hate and murder those who follow him.<sup>335</sup> Also in *Matthew*, Jesus advised his disciples not to follow roads which lead to the foreign lands of the Gentiles, and not to visit any Samaritan city.<sup>336</sup> *Matthew* also states that Jesus predicted that the Gentiles will ridicule, torture and crucify him,<sup>337</sup> and the question here is whether this anti-Gentile Jesus is historical.

The *Synopsis* contains some information regarding the identity of Matthew, that escapes the attention of the scholars. *Matthew, Mark, Luke* and the *Acts* refer to

---

*Luke*, eds. John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden (London, 2014), pp. 113-129, on the tradition of imitating earlier material.

<sup>331</sup> Cf. Charles S. C. Williams, *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1985<sup>2</sup>), pp. 19-22, on the arguments of different scholars that the author of *Luke* knew the *Antiquities*, and the counter argument that there is very little, if anything of them, in *Luke*.

<sup>332</sup> On the identity of Eviōnaioi see Appendix 5.

<sup>333</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, p.338: καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους, ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραῖστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποιήσατο.

<sup>334</sup> *Matthew* 6:7.

<sup>335</sup> *Matthew* 24:9. See also G. Vermes, *The authentic Gospel of Jesus* (London, 2003), pp. 376-380 at 380: "Jesus ministered only to the lost sheep of Israel and instructed his disciples to do the same."

<sup>336</sup> *Matthew* 10:5: Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε.

<sup>337</sup> *Matthew* 20:19. Cf. *Mark* 10:33-34; *Luke* 18:32-33.

Jacob (James), the natural brother of Jesus as son of a certain Alphaios.<sup>338</sup> The meaning of this name is not clear<sup>339</sup> and it is not known whether it was a second name used to identify Joseph the father of Jesus. According to the *Letter to the Romans*<sup>340</sup> Jesus was the firstborn among many brothers, meaning that Joseph had a number of sons. The *New Testament* does not provide direct information whether all those sons followed their brother Jesus, but it is accepted that at least some of them became Apostles. It is also accepted that Apostle Matthew was a Levi and tax collector.<sup>341</sup> According to *Mark* this Levi also was son of Alphaios.<sup>342</sup> There is no evidence in the *New Testament* that Apostles Jacob and Matthew had two different fathers who both had the same name, Alphaios, and the question here is whether Apostle Matthew was one of Jesus's natural brothers. If so, this re-enforces the early tradition followed by the Eviōnaioi who claimed direct ancestry from the first Christians and perceived Matthew as

---

<sup>338</sup> *Matthew* 10:3: Μαθθαῖος ὁ τελώνης, Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαῖος; *Mark* 3:18 : Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Καναναῖον; *Luke* 6:15: καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον Ἀλφαίου; *Acts* 1:13: Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμων ὁ ζηλωτῆς; Cf. *Chr. Paschale* (7<sup>th</sup> c. CE), ed. cit., p. 399: Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου κατὰ σάρκα.

<sup>339</sup> Possible Hebrew root/s for the Hellenised Alphaios : Heleph = a location (village?) between the town of Canaa and the city of Tiberias in Galilee mentioned in *Joshua* 19:33; Cheleph = exchange; Halphi = one who passes; Jastrow, p. 472: halfai means 'shoot' (example: "the young shoots of the beet growing out of the root") and/or 'reversion'; Cf Friedrich Preisigke, *Namenbuch* (Heidelberg, 1922), col. 506 on the Arabic names Αλφιος, Αλφοος, deriving from "Half"; idem col. 21. For a list of all known instances of this name and its variants in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek texts, papyri and inscriptions, see Tal Ilan, pp. 381-382. Most notably, Χαψέος in *Anti.*, 13.161.3-4, vol. 3, p. 179: Ἰούδας ὁ Χαψέου, was one of the two commanders who did not abandon High Priest Jonathan. Jonathan's army was based in Galilee, and the greatest battle he gave with the help of Judas, took place in Galilee. This report is based on *I Macc.* In *I Macc.* 11:70 (Rahlfs, p. 1084), Judas is son of Χαλφι, not of Χαψέος. This is either a scribal error or part of "Josephus's" paraphrasing technique, discussed in the Josephus section below, Ch. 1; Yadin, *Masada*, plate 24, presents ostrakon n. 427 with an inscription which mentions this name, but the rest of the text cannot be deciphered because it is damaged. See idem, p. 27.

<sup>340</sup> 8:29.

<sup>341</sup> *Matthew* 9:9; *Matthew* 10:3; *Mark* 2:14: εἶδεν Λευὶν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον; *Luke*, 5:27: τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευὶν.

<sup>342</sup> *Mark* 2:14: Λευὶν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου. Cf *Evangelium Petri*, sect. 60, ed. M. G. Mara, *Évangile de Pierre* SC 201 (Paris, 1973), p. 66: Λευεῖς ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου.

one of their own, the only eye witness who wrote about Jesus.<sup>343</sup> However, it is not clear how early this tradition began.

Most scholars accept that the author of *Mark* never met Jesus in person. Some scholars<sup>344</sup> point to the possibility that the author of *Mark* may be a certain John who also had the name Mark in the *Acts*,<sup>345</sup> and whose mother Mary was visited by Peter. In my opinion it is interesting to observe that according to the *Acts* 12:13-14, when Peter knocked on the door of the house of Mary, a young girl who was inside recognized his voice and was glad to hear that he visited them. This is evidence that Peter did know Mary and her household from before. It is also interesting to note that in *I Peter*,<sup>346</sup> Peter sends greeting to his son Mark. My question here is whether this Mark is a son Peter got from Mary. There is also mention of a certain Mark, a cousin of Barnabas in *Colossians*,<sup>347</sup> and a Mark who is personal assistant to Paul in *Philemon* 24 and *2 Timothy*.<sup>348</sup> It is not clear whether any of the above refer to Mark, the author of the *Gospel*, or whether the tradition that a certain "Mark" wrote a *Gospel* was built on the reputation of one of them. According to Eusebius, Mark the Evangelist was martyred in Alexandria in the eighth year of Nero's reign.<sup>349</sup> The question here is whether Mark was a historical victim of the conflicts between the Israelites

---

<sup>343</sup> For further evidence on the other possible relatives and family of Jesus, see R. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 5-44 (relatives of Jesus), pp. 62-67 (Kokhaba), pp. 79-94 (Simon, son of Κλωπᾶς), pp. 94-106 (the grandsons of Jude, the brother of Jesus who were leaders of the Christian Church). Also see Humphries, *Early*, p. 136 (on the conversion of Sergius Paullus, who before he met Paul was approached by a Jewish magician called Son of Jesus: Bar-Jesus, Βαρισησοῦ in *Acts* 13:5-11). The only other known mention of this rare name is also from the same century, on an ostrakon discovered in Masada. See Yadin, *Masada*, pp. 24-25.

<sup>344</sup> See Edwards, *Gospel*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>345</sup> 12:12.

<sup>346</sup> 5:13.

<sup>347</sup> 4:10.

<sup>348</sup> 4:11.

<sup>349</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.24, vol. 1 (31), p. 91; Guthrie, *NT*, p. 89, along with a number of scholars, suggests that *Mark* was written most probably not long after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. *Mark* does mention the destruction in ch. 13. One should note that according to Church tradition Mark martyred some time between 62 and 68 CE. Cf. *Papias*, fragment 2.15, p. 129.

and the Gentiles that were taking place the same time in the same city.<sup>350</sup>

Interestingly, *Mark* explains to his reader what certain Jewish customs were about, and this could be an indication that he aimed at a Gentile audience who had no idea about these customs.<sup>351</sup> This case is supported also by Brandon's argument that the author of *Mark* did concoct the story that a Gentile Roman centurion was the first human being to "perceive the truth"<sup>352</sup> because he wanted to proselytize Gentiles.<sup>353</sup> One more example which points to the same direction indicated by Brandon, namely that certain Christian authors did not hesitate to concoct stories aiming at proselytising the infidels, comes from the *Apologeticus* of Tertullian (c.160-c.240) where Emperor Tiberius (14-37 CE) appears to insist that the Roman Senate should canonize Jesus Christ as one of the gods, but the Senate refused. As a result Tiberius was upset with their decision 'and threatened the accusers of the Christians.'<sup>354</sup> The similarities here on the way "Josephus," some of the *Maccabees*, *Mark* and Tertullian created such stories in order to promote their religion, is striking.

According to Irenaeus, Luke was in the circle of Paul.<sup>355</sup> In its prologue *Luke* criticizes "many others" without naming them, who "reconstructed" the history of the first Christians according to their own aims. Just like Paul who claimed that he was able to understand Jesus better than others, the author of *Luke* insisted that he knew the history of Jesus better than "many others" because he

---

<sup>350</sup> See below, Ch. 4.

<sup>351</sup> 7:3-4; 14:12; 15:42.

<sup>352</sup> 15:39 (after he witnessed that the Temple was fractured when Jesus expired). Also see *Matthew* 8:10 and *Luke* 7:9 (the faith of the Centurion was greater than the faith anyone in Israel had).

<sup>353</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, p. 279-280.

<sup>354</sup> Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, 5, trans. A. Souter, *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus* (Cambridge, 1917), p. 19; Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.2-3, vol. 1, p. 53. Cf. Paulus Orosius (Western Christian, end of 4<sup>th</sup>–early 5<sup>th</sup> c.), *Seven books of history against the Pagans*, 7.4.6-7, *Translated Texts for Historians*, vol. 54, trans. A. T. Fear (Liverpool, 2010), pp. 325-326. Orosius also contradicts himself that Tiberius who wanted Jesus to be deified, at the end persecuted the Christians.

<sup>355</sup> *A.H.* 3.1.1, vol. 2, p. 6.



heard it from witnesses who lived it.<sup>356</sup> It is not clear whether the author of *Luke* counted the authors of *Matthew* and *Mark* among those who did not produce "correct" versions of history. The author of *Luke* addressed his "accurate" *Gospel* to a certain Theophilus,<sup>357</sup> who, as *Luke* says, had an interest in learning about Jesus. Professor James Edwards conducted systematic linguistic analysis on *Luke* regarding its Hebrew linguistic background and came to the conclusion that this *Gospel* could indeed be more "accurate" because it shows greater familiarity with Hebrew than *Matthew* and *Mark*.<sup>358</sup> This is an important observation in the sense that *Luke*, at least in linguistic terms, stands closer to the *Q* hypothesis<sup>359</sup> that one or more Evangelists used material from an earlier primary Hebrew source on the life of Jesus.

Interestingly, *Luke* contains a prophecy made by Jesus that Jerusalem would be encircled by Gentile military camps of armies who will invade it and make its people slaves,<sup>360</sup> but he promised that by the help of heavenly powers a certain leader<sup>361</sup> will come with extraordinary strength and glory to liberate his people and revenge the fall of Jerusalem. This leader would be feared by the entire world. Unless one accepts that such a prophecy was made by historical Jesus, one could question whether the author of *Luke*, writing after the fall of Jerusalem, did not hesitate to concoct this story and impersonate Jesus because he aimed to maintain the Messianic hopes of his enslaved people. Similarly to the author of *Luke*, the first century author of the *Assumption of Moses* presents a prophecy supposedly made by Moses that a Messiah would come to punish the

---

<sup>356</sup> *Luke* 1:1-4.

<sup>357</sup> *Luke*, 1:3.

<sup>358</sup> J. Edwards, *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition* (Michigan, 2009), pp. 243-250: *Luke* is closer to the "Hebrew Gospel" than *Matthew* and *Mark*. Edwards argues that *Mark* follows *Luke*; Idem, pp. 259-262: according to tradition Matthew the Apostle was the author of the *Hebrew Gospel* which became the primary material for the other *Gospels*.

<sup>359</sup> See below, the *Q* source hypothesis in section "The Texts of the *Synopsis*."

<sup>360</sup> 21:20-25; 21:24 (slaves of the Gentiles).

<sup>361</sup> *Luke* calls him "Son of Man." Usually, this person is identified by scholars as Jesus himself.

Gentiles and destroy all their idols.<sup>362</sup> According to *The Ten Harugei Malkhut*, after the fall of Jerusalem certain Israelite circles defied their military defeat by proclaiming that their sages had the mental strength to convert the Gentiles of the entire world into their own faith.<sup>363</sup> It is evident that those circles perceived their own sages as mentally superior to the Gentiles, hence able to inflict an ideological victory over them. The question here is whether the authors of *Luke* and of other early Christian material were such sages who refused to accept defeat after they became refugees and raised a war of propaganda in the diaspora<sup>364</sup> that they were followers of an undefeated supernatural Messiah. Whatever the answer to this question, one should observe here that the author of *Luke*<sup>365</sup> tells his readers that Mary, soon after she realised that she was pregnant, gave a sermon to Elizabeth<sup>366</sup> regarding the importance of her pregnancy and her coming son. The problem with this sermon is that it is composed of about twenty two verses, all deriving from various works of the *Old Testament*, presented one after the other. Unless one accepts this very young Mary was an expert on the *OT*, and that somebody was in a position to keep notes of what she said to Elizabeth and pass them to the author of *Luke*, it is evident that the author of *Luke*, an expert on the *OT* himself, did not hesitate to impersonate the young Mary and present his own composition of *OT* verses as her own words, in order to emphasise the importance of Messiah Jesus. In this sense, the author of the above story is one more of those Israelite religious professionals who wrote their own stories and specialised in presenting them as earlier.

---

<sup>362</sup> *Assumption*, 10.7, p. 88: "Et palam veniet ut vindicet gentes, et perdet omnia idola eorum."

<sup>363</sup> Trans. David G. Roskies, *The Literature of Destruction: Jewish Responses to Catastrophe* (Philadelphia, 1989), pp. 60-69, at p. 60 (sages).

<sup>364</sup> Burnett H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: a Study of Origins* (London, 1924), p. 488-491 (on evidence from Irenaeus and Clement who point that *Mark* and *Luke* were written in Rome). Idem, pp. 500-511 (*Matthew* came from the East, possibly from Antioch). Idem, pp. 531-539 (on the Roman origin of *Luke* and the *Acts*). Cf. Mack, *Myth*, p. 315-316, *Mark* must have been produced in southern Syria.

<sup>365</sup> 1:46-55.

<sup>366</sup> 1:39-41.

## *The Texts of the Synopsis*

There are various theories as to when the *Gospels* were composed, what their early editions contained and what was added to them during the course of later editions. The earliest samples which contain parts of the *Gospels* are extant in papyri, often surrounded by various controversies regarding the date of their composition.<sup>367</sup> Some scholars assume that from the moment there is a testimony by Irenaeus (fl. end of 2<sup>nd</sup> c.) that by his time there was a "canon" of the NT, its texts must have acquired their final form by that time. The problem with this theory is that Irenaeus does not present the texts of the *Gospels*. He simply gives the names of each one of the four evangelists, and this is what some interpret as the earliest canon.<sup>368</sup> For many centuries there was consensus that *Matthew* was the earliest, the best and most reliable *Gospel* to read, but this is no longer the case. Nowadays there is no agreement as to which of the three *Gospels* was produced first, and this is known as the Synoptic Problem.<sup>369</sup> There are four different hypotheses<sup>370</sup> about which *Gospel* is earlier and which *Gospel* contains what from another *Gospel*. The first argues that the *Gospels* were written independent of one another. The second is that the *Gospels* followed each other in the order *Matthew-Mark-Luke*.<sup>371</sup> The third presents *Matthew* first, *Luke* second and *Mark* third. The fourth hypothesis is that *Mark* comes first, and

---

<sup>367</sup> Comfort-Barrett, pp. 20-29. Papyri fragments contain about two thirds of the entire NT material.

<sup>368</sup> A.H., 3.1.1, vol. 2, pp. 3-6.

<sup>369</sup> Bellinzoni, pp. 3-9 (on the various contradictory theories about which *Gospel* came first); p. 15 (*Matthew* contains 90% and *Luke* 55% of *Mark*). Cf. P. Walters, 'The Synoptic Problem', in Aune, *Blackwell*, pp. 236-253 at 249-250, there is no *opinion communis* on the Synoptic problem

<sup>370</sup> Bock, *Studying*, pp. 171-179.

<sup>371</sup> See B. C. Butler, *The originality of St. Matthew* (Cambridge, 1951), p. 170, who argues that *Matthew* is the source for *Mark* and *Luke*.

this is accepted by most scholars after this theory first appeared in 1838.<sup>372</sup> This fourth case is strengthened by the fact that there is consensus among scholars that there is no resurrection story in the original *Mark* text, meaning that it has been added at a later stage and thus the resurrection doctrine contained in other *Gospels* is posterior to the original *Mark*.<sup>373</sup> In further support of the anteriority of *Mark*, scholars also argue that it contains a smaller text than *Matthew* and *Luke*, meaning that these two *Gospels* are enlarged versions of *Mark*. To the best of my knowledge, trying to date *Mark*, no scholar took into account the possibility that the author of *Mark* was aware of *De Bello* or of a specific story mentioned in *De Bello*. The amateur historian Joseph Atwill, although highly speculative, pointed out that in *Mark* when Jesus was in Gadara, ordered a legion of demons to enter pigs. Those pigs were drowned in a lake.<sup>374</sup> Although I am not convinced by Atwill that Josephus knew the text of *Mark* and the *NT* and mocked them with this and other stories, I agree with Atwill that this story is strikingly similar to *De Bello* where Vespasian attacked rebels in Gadara who "behaved like beasts" and were also drowned at the same lake.<sup>375</sup> My question here is whether the author of this *Mark* story transformed the rebels into pigs and pointed to Jesus as their opponent in order to disorientate his reader from any prospect that any rebels in Gadara had anything to do with Jesus's movement.

---

<sup>372</sup> This hypothesis was first presented by Christian Gottlob Wilke and Christian Herman Weisse in 1838. Kissinger, *The Lives*, p. 23. See also Edwards, *Gospel*, p. 2 (refers to K. Lachman, 1835; C. H. Weisse and C. G. Wilke 1838; H. J. Holtzmann 1863; B. Weiss 1886; B.H. Streeter 1924). On the wide acceptance of this theory see also Hoskyns-Davey, pp. 186-188. One should note here that *Mark* contains only three pericopes that do not exist in the other two Synoptic *Gospels*: see Edwards, *Gospel*, p. 1 (4:26-29; 7:31-37; 8:22-26).

<sup>373</sup> Cf. Wilson, *Jesus*, p. 18, both *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus* do not contain the last eleven verses of *Mark*.

<sup>374</sup> *Mark* 5:1-20. Cf. Funk, *Seminar*, pp. 77-79, the Seminar considers *Mark* 5:9-20 as a fabrication.

<sup>375</sup> Atwill, *Caesar's*, pp. 69-73 with ref. to *Bel.*, 4.7.389-437, vol. 6.2, pp. 398-404. For more points which are considered by Atwill to be parallels between the *NT* and Josephus also see idem, *Caesar's*, pp. 52, 89-90, 137-138, p. 377-378. Cf. *Matthew* 8:28-34 (the demonised were only two); *Luke* 8:26-39 (just one demonised)

An ever increasing number of modern scholars accept a 19th century hypothesis that there once existed an early source (Q),<sup>376</sup> either written or verbal, or a compilation of various smaller sub-sources, and this primary source was first used by *Mark*.<sup>377</sup> The problem with this theory is that *Matthew* and *Luke* share 230 verses (mainly sayings of Jesus and John the Baptist), which do not exist in *Mark*.<sup>378</sup> Some provide an answer to this problem by introducing one more hypothesis that this extra material derives from the lost Q source that could have been used by *Matthew* and *Luke* together with *Mark*.<sup>379</sup> Other scholars claim that *Matthew* and *Luke* contain more primary Q material than *Mark* and as a result there is no agreement as to which *Gospel* should be labelled as more historically accurate than the other,<sup>380</sup> and in which order Jesus performed his actions.<sup>381</sup> At this point I wonder why one should exclude the possibility that much or some of those 230 verses were stories invented by the authors/editors of *Matthew* and *Luke* who presented them as original sayings by Jesus and John the Baptist? As we have already seen above, the author of *Luke* did not hesitate to impersonate Jesus and Mary. We have also seen that a number of other Israelite authors impersonated prophets, Gentiles and even Moses. Did the authors of *Mark*, *Matthew* and *Luke* belong to a different Israelite school which condemned the making of fabrications, pseudepigrapha, alterations and interpolations of texts, or did they have anything in common with the Israelite circles who produced pseudepigrapha at the same time? And how about the author/s of this elusive Q source? Certainly there are disagreements between most scholars on the shape of the hypothetical Q source

---

<sup>376</sup> Source Q (from the German *Quelle*, meaning 'source'); Arnal, p. 119, the Q hypothesis was first presented in the 19th century; Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (Dorset, 1993), pp. 15-27, on the origin and development of the Q hypothesis.

<sup>377</sup> Bellinzoni, pp. 17-19.

<sup>378</sup> Arnal, p. 119.

<sup>379</sup> Arnal, p. 120.

<sup>380</sup> Cf. Witherington, *Jesus*, pp. 48-56.

<sup>381</sup> E.g. the miracle with the disabled child/slave in *Matthew* 8:5-10 and *Luke* 7:1-10 does not exist in *Mark*. The miracle with the two blind men in *Matthew* 9:27-31 does not exist in *Mark* and *Luke*.

and there is no consensus as to when it was composed,<sup>382</sup> let alone if it ever existed. To the Q hypothesis I have to add that according to Epiphanius, the *Gospel of the Ebionites* was a mutilated and castrated *Gospel* of Matthew.<sup>383</sup> My question raised here is whether that *Gospel of the Ebionites* was not mutilated but an early version of *Matthew* that was not enlarged by later interpolations and explanations. This, of course, is one more hypothesis.

As an extension to this medley of the disputes about which *Gospel* is more original, I have seen that the NT Epistles *James* and *Judas*, accepted by Church tradition as works of the two brothers of Jesus, Jacob (James) and Judas, are almost ignorant of *Mark* but often use *Matthew*. *James* also knows *Luke*.<sup>384</sup> The short *Judas* does not contain any parallel phrases with *Mark* or *Luke*. These may be indications that *James* and *Judas* were composed after *Matthew* but before *Mark*, because they do not know its text. *I Peter* is also almost ignorant of *Mark*, but it knows *Matthew*. If these three letters do reflect the work of the members of the first Church, the fact that they know *Matthew* strengthens the case that the material on the anti-Gentile Jesus contained in *Matthew* may be earlier than *Mark* who aimed to Gentiles.

Origen made an important observation regarding the original texts of the *Synopsis*. He pointed out that certain early manuscripts which contain *Matthew* 27:16-17 refer to Barabbas also as having the name Jesus.<sup>385</sup> Later manuscripts

---

<sup>382</sup> Arnal, pp. 120-121.

<sup>383</sup> See Elliott, *Apocryphal*, p. 14.

<sup>384</sup> In *Nestle-Aland*, *James* has a parallel to *Mark* in two lines at the epilogue of the letter. I have not seen any argument that these lines may have been a later addition. *James* has five parallel phrases with *Luke* (one in p. 590, two in 595, one in 596, one in p. 597) and numerous with *Matthew*.

<sup>385</sup> Robert E. Moses, 'Jesus Barabbas, a Nominal Messiah? text and History in *Matthew* 27.16-17' in *NTS* 58.1 (2012), pp. 45-46, Moses examined Origen's *In Matthaeum* through secondary works. Cf. idem, p. 56 Moses concludes that Jesus Barabbas is not historical but the author of *Matthew* invented him in order to denounce the revolutionaries. Idem, p. 44 (an increasing number of scholars accepts the version which presents Barabbas having the first name Jesus).

do not mention Jesus-Barabbas, and this is the tradition that prevailed.<sup>386</sup> *Mark* and *Matthew* were analyzed on this "Jesus Barabbas" point by Eisler, who indicated that *Mark* 15:7 reports that certain rebels were arrested by the authorities. Among them Βαραββᾶς (Barabbas) was a central figure accused for murder. Eisler had also seen that only *Mark* and *Matthew* 27:16-17 mention Barabbas, while a number of early *Luke* manuscripts did not refer to him at all.<sup>387</sup> Interestingly, Barabbas in Hebrew means 'son of the father' and the question here is why the version of *Matthew* which named the rebel Barabbas as Jesus placed him next to the hero of the *Gospels*, Jesus, who is also known as 'son of the Father'? The hypothesis here is that a certain editor or author of an early *Matthew* text invented the story that instead of a single Jesus convict there had been two different Jesuses, one of whom was guilty and the other innocent.<sup>388</sup> In other words, the hypothesis here is that an early *Matthew* version contained information about historical accusations against Jesus, but a later editor tried to conceal them by adding the story that there was another Jesus who was guilty of instigating a murderous revolt, and not Jesus Christ. There are further indications that the editors of an original *Matthew* might have invented even more information in order to distance their hero Jesus from any criminal conviction. The story in *Matthew* 27:17 that Pilate left it to the will of the populace to decide who was innocent and who was guilty does not sound historical to me, unless one accepts that the Roman authorities were so naive to liberate a dangerous rebel and crucify an innocent man, just because some of

---

<sup>386</sup> *Matthew* 27:16-17: Εἶχον δὲ τότε δέσμιον ἐπίσημον λεγόμενον [Ἰησοῦν] Βαραββᾶν. συνηγμένων οὖν αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος, Τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν, [Ἰησοῦν τὸν] Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν; For the manuscript tradition of Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν see Nestle-Aland (2006<sup>27</sup>), p. 81. Cf. Maccoby, *Revolution* pp. 13-21, 159-168 (analysis on Jesus Barabbas).

<sup>387</sup> *Messiah*, p. 10, p. 474.

<sup>388</sup> Cf. Brandon, *Trial*, pp. 95-96, on the Barabbas story, without any reference to Eisler or Origen; Brandon, *Trial*, p. 113, fn 42, about the variants Jesus Barabbas without mentioning Eisler. Brandon, *Trial*, p. 40, accepts that after the revolt the Romans took prisoner a certain Barabbas (he does not mention that Barabbas means son of the father, nor mentions Eisler). Brandon finds it very likely that the two λησται crucified with Jesus were involved in the insurrection mentioned by *Mark* 15:7.

the populace said so.

With regards to the originality and historicity of *Matthew*, I would like to question here one more important contradiction it contains. As already examined above, Jesus in *Matthew* gave his disciples repeated and clear orders to avoid contact with the Gentiles. Despite his previous instructions, after his resurrection Jesus appears in the same *Gospel* instructing his disciples to preach and baptize all Gentiles.<sup>389</sup> The question here is whether this Jesus who resurrected, was constructed by a later interpolator/editor of an earlier *Matthew*. At this point one should also listen to the Eviōnaioi<sup>390</sup> who were clear that an original *Matthew*, just like the original *Mark* we have seen above, knew nothing about the resurrection of Jesus. In my opinion, the indications so far are that the version of the resurrected Jesus is a later addition, while the first version, which presents a Jesus hostile to the Gentiles, appears to be earlier and more historical. Certain scholars have a very different opinion as to how Jesus perceived the Gentiles. In their effort to reconstruct the original contents of the lost *Q*, they denounce the historicity of a number of passages of the *Synopsis* on the basis that the contents of such passages are incompatible with their own preconceptions that Jesus could not have been hostile towards any Gentiles. For example they reject the historicity of *Mark* 7:24-30 which narrates that Jesus called the Greek-Syrophoenician woman and her daughter dogs. Historical Jesus, they thought, could never have called anyone a dog.<sup>391</sup> They also refuted any possibility that Jesus could have used any violent means against anyone, and this is why they rejected the historicity of *Mark* 11:15-19 where Jesus attacked the Temple. They concluded that it was impossible for Jesus and a few others to have caused such a problem within such a huge area, without being

---

<sup>389</sup> *Matthew* 28:19 (baptize all nations).

<sup>390</sup> See Appendix 5.

<sup>391</sup> Funk, *Seminar*, pp. 96-98. Idem, pp. 41-50.



arrested.<sup>392</sup> Such scholars did not take into account that soon after this event in the Temple Jesus was in fact arrested. They also did not relate his arrest to the possibility that the attack on the Temple was a historical event that caused Jesus's arrest and execution. The question here is whether such scholarly efforts to reconstruct the so-called Q source and the original *Mark* are guided by reason and scientific analysis of the surviving evidence, or, instead, they are inspired by strong preconceptions that original Early Christianity had nothing to do with any violent movement.<sup>393</sup> At this point one should also take into account Origen's argument that the pacifist saying "You shall love your neighbour as yourself" in *Matthew*<sup>394</sup> has not been said by Jesus, but is a later addition to this *Gospel*.<sup>395</sup> Origen presented important criticism on the originality and authenticity of the *Gospels* texts, and his central argument on interpolations is supported by the fact that centuries after *Codex Bezae* (5th c.CE) was published, researchers came to the conclusion that this Codex did not contain certain interpolations that have been accepted as original in other early NT manuscripts and later editions. This explains why some modern editors of the NT have deleted some of those passages which are not contained in *Bezae*.<sup>396</sup> It is noteworthy that one of these passages that has been rejected by some

---

<sup>392</sup> Funk, *Seminar*, pp. 121-122; p. 231, again, the Seminar reject *Matthew* 21:12 (the attack of Jesus in the Temple).

<sup>393</sup> Funk, *Seminar*, p. 351, also dismissed the historicity of *Luke* 22:36-37 (sell your cloth and buy sword) as not original, because they cannot imagine that Jesus have said such a thing.

<sup>394</sup> 19:19.

<sup>395</sup> Origen argued that this does not exist in *Mark* and *Luke*. Cf. Kümmel, *Das neue*, p. 43. Richard Simon (1638-1712) attacked Origen for rejecting this line.

<sup>396</sup> E.g. it does not contain *Matthew* 5:30 "And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off and throw it away; it is better for you to lose one of your members than for your whole body to go into hell"; *Matthew* 9:34 "But the Pharisees said: By the ruler of the demons he casts out the demons"; *Matthew* 10:37 "Whoever loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and whoever loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me"; *Luke* 12:21 : "So it is with those who store up treasures for themselves but are not rich toward God"; *Luke* 19:25 :And they said to him: Lord, he has ten pounds"; The following are not included in *Holy Bible* and Nestle-Aland: *Matthew* 23:14 (attack on Pharisees), *Mark* 15:28: "And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors"; *John* 5:4 (miracle with angel and water). The entire *Matthew* 3:7-16, where John the Baptist curses some Pharisee and Sadducee visitors and authorises Jesus to baptise others, does not exist in *Codex Bezae* either.

contemporary editors of the *NT* is *Luke* 23:34 which presents a kind-hearted Jesus asking God to forgive those who crucified him. Again, the question here is how much of this compassionate and peace-loving Jesus in the *Synopsis* is historical, and how much of this picture is the result of later authors, editors and interpolators who had their own reasons to construct the picture of a different Jesus. Tertullian and Epiphanius pointed out that Marcion (fl. 2nd c.) was one of such editors who altered the original *Synopsis* material. More specifically, they accused Marcion of reducing and not enlarging *Luke*, and also of altering some parts of it.<sup>397</sup> The question here is what versions of *Luke* Marcion's accusers used themselves, and what were the exact contents of this altered version of *Luke* produced by Marcion? At this point one should also take into account that, as Eisler observed, according to a certain Adamantius, Marcion was aware that the original Apostles wrote absolutely nothing, and that the *Gospels* were produced by forgers.<sup>398</sup> Although Eisler does not give a reference for his primary source, Eusebius states that Origen was also known with the name Adamantius,<sup>399</sup> but there are indications that there also was a Pseudo-Origen-Adamantius who was active in the fourth c. and who does present the Marcionite views of one of his opponents who attacks the *Gospels* as forgeries.<sup>400</sup> The question here is whether this information does have a basis, and the *Gospels* were made by fraudulent authors who, for their own reasons, tried to pass their own fabrications as history.

So far, even when there is strong evidence that at least certain parts of the

---

<sup>397</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, p. 40.

<sup>398</sup> Eisler, *Enigma*, p. 32.

<sup>399</sup> *H.E.* 6.14.10, ed. cit., vol. 41, p. 108: Ἀδαμάντιος (καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν τῷ Ὠριγένηι ὄνομα)

<sup>400</sup> Most probably, Eisler was based on another secondary source which was aware of Adamantius's dialogue with Marcionite Megethios and a certain Eutropios, as this was presented in Adamantius's *De recta in deum fide* where Megethios insists that the *Gospels* were forgeries (φάλασκα). Adamantios replies he can prove they were not πλαστά (fake). See Adamantius Theol., *De recta in deum fide* (olim sub auctore Origene Adamantio), ed. W.H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *Der Dialog des Adamantius* (Περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν ὀρθῆς πίστεως), (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), p. 10.

*Synopsis* are not original, the response of the scholarly world is not always the same, in the sense that not all such parts have been removed from important recent editions and translations of the *Synopsis* texts. For example, although there is consensus that the ending of *Mark*<sup>401</sup> on the resurrection of Jesus is not original, modern editions of the *NT* continue including it. In my opinion, it is important to observe here that *Matthew*<sup>402</sup> too presents a resurrected Jesus in its last lines, at its end, instructing his disciples to preach to all *ethnē* and my question here is whether this ending in *Matthew* has been produced by the same or similar circles who added the last lines in *Mark*. Once more, my question here is whether this resurrected Jesus who aimed to convert the Gentiles should be accepted as historical, while the earlier Jesus in *Matthew* who repeatedly preached against approaching the Gentiles, should be ignored.

In conclusion to this first approach to the *Synopsis*, I am very much afraid that for a very long time those scholars who have issued repeated warnings on the unreliability of even the earliest *NT* samples and the *textus receptus* have been systematically ignored by many others.<sup>403</sup>

## 1.9: John

Eisler observed that Eusebius quotes a letter of a certain Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, that John whose tomb was in Ephesus was born a priest, a teacher, and wore the "golden frontlet," meaning that he had the status of a Jerusalem

---

<sup>401</sup> *Mark* 16:15-20 has been added in *Codex Bezae* by a later hand. They do not exist in the text of *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus* either.

<sup>402</sup> 28:19.

<sup>403</sup> According to Metzger-Ehrman, pp. 272-274, each of the early manuscripts which preserve one or more *NT* texts, is itself an edition that incorporates various alterations of different previous editions and/or different previous oral traditions. See also Carson, 'Pseudonymity,' p. 862: "Some scholars are convinced that the *NT* contains many examples of literary forgeries." Regardless the above warnings, just like most other scholars, the 'Jesus Seminar' dated the *Q* in the 50s or later, *Mark* in the 70s or later, *Matthew*, *Luke* and *John* in the 90s or later. See Funk, *Seminar*, p. 8.

High Priest.<sup>404</sup> The Greek text of Eusebius I have seen does not mention that the frontlet was golden, but, to make things even more complicated, it states that this particular John was a martyr.<sup>405</sup> Eisler also argued that the Greek form of John, Ἰωάννης is a Grecism of the Israelite name Johanan, which, translated into Greek it becomes Theophilus. Through his own study and interpretation of Hebrew sources, the NT and Josephus, Eisler concluded that this John-Theophilus was the son of Annas ben Sethi, the Sadducean who served as High Priest between 6-15 CE.<sup>406</sup> Eisler also suggested that this particular John knew Jesus in person. He was deposed by Herod Agrippas I and was hiding until the Great Revolt, during which he became the leader of one of the revolutionary armies which controlled Gophnitis and Acrabatene. After the defeat, he was arrested and exiled.<sup>407</sup> Eisler's identification of this John with the author of the homonymous *Gospel* has not met any acceptance or further investigation so far. There are further disputes<sup>408</sup> on the originality and authorship of other works attributed to John the Apostle and most scholars agree that the first three *Gospels* are the main source for the life of historical Jesus, and not *John*.<sup>409</sup>

It is important to observe that one of the most well-known Christian authors of the second century, Justin the Martyr (c.100-165), makes no reference to *John's Gospel*. Those who insist that *John* was already in circulation by that time, often

---

<sup>404</sup> Eisler, *Enigma*, pp. 36-38 with reference to H.E. 3.31.2, vol. 31, p. 141 and 5.24.3, vol. 41, p. 68.

<sup>405</sup> Polycrates, *Fragmentum synodicae epistulae*, ed. M.J. Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1846<sup>2</sup>, repr. 1974), p.14: ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκῶς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος.

<sup>406</sup> Eisler, *Enigma*, pp. 39-54, on Eisler's analysis of Eusebius, Josephus and NT on the High Priestly identity of John, and the case that he is identical to John of the High Priestly status, mentioned in Acts 4:6.

<sup>407</sup> *Enigma*, pp. 205-207.

<sup>408</sup> E.g. Kümmel, *Das neue*, pp. 15-18 (already in the 3rd century Dionysius of Alexandria (fl. 247-65) argued that because of linguistic and stylistic differences the *Revelation* has not been produced by the same author who wrote the *Gospel* of John). Idem, p. 43, (Richard Simon also observed that the trinitarian insertion in I John 5:7-8 is not included in Jerome's *Vulgata*).

<sup>409</sup> Fredriksen, 'Historical,' pp. 251-252 (scholars rejecting *John* as a source). Cf. Moody Smith, 'John,' pp. 165-178. The entire article argues that we should not dismiss *John* in our quest for historical Jesus.

argue that the earliest fragment of papyrus that contains *John* is dated to the first half of the second century. Contrary to this dating, there are other scholars who claim that this fragment dates from the end of the second century and not earlier.<sup>410</sup>

*John* is written in the most elaborate Greek throughout the *New Testament*.<sup>411</sup> Although there are indications that this *Gospel* was first used by the Valentinians,<sup>412</sup> John the "son of thunder,"<sup>413</sup> brother of Jacob and Apostle of Jesus, for centuries has been regarded by the Church as the original author of the homonymous *Gospel*. Who exactly the author of *John* was, has been a matter of dispute both among early and modern scholars.<sup>414</sup> Eusebius, for example, states that there were two different Johns in Ephesus and there were two tombs respectively, with claims that each of the tombs belonged to the author of the *Gospel*.<sup>415</sup> Philip of Side (fl. first half of 5<sup>th</sup> c.) preserved a fragment of a lost work by Papias, bishop of Hierapolis (fl. early 2nd c.), which provides the very different information that John the Apostle was executed by the Judeans together with his brother Jacob on the orders of Herod Agrippas.<sup>416</sup> In support to the historicity of this statement made by Papias, Eisler pointed that *Toldoth*

---

<sup>410</sup> *Raylands Fragment P 52*, cf. Metzger-Ehrman, p. 56.

<sup>411</sup> Piñero-Peláez, pp. 493-496 (its literary style is very different from the other *Gospels*); Guthrie *NT*, pp. 266-267.

<sup>412</sup> Fredriksen, 'Historical,' p. 249.

<sup>413</sup> *Mark* 3:17: καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου, καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα Βοανηργές, ὃ ἐστὶν Υἱοὶ Βροντῆς. One should observe here that Eusebius, *CP, PG* 23, col. 897, corrects this strange βοανηργές with βοανῆργες, which sounds more appropriate. On the "sons of thunder" see also P. Richardson and D. Edwards, 'Jesus and Palestinian Social Protest: Archaeological and Literary Perspectives', in *BDT*, pp. 247-266 at 266; Tal Ilan, p. 431, states that this is an unusual name, and does not appear in any other surviving ancient source.

<sup>414</sup> S. L. Harris, *Understanding the Bible* (Mayfield, 1985), p. 355; *JJH*, p. 19; Schweitzer, *Quest*, pp. 110-123; Eisler, *Enigma*, pp. 36-45.

<sup>415</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.39.4-8, vol. 1, pp. 154-155; 3.31.1-2, vol. 1, p. 141; 5.24.3, vol. 2, p. 68 (about a certain John of High Priest status who lived in Ephesus).

<sup>416</sup> *Papias*, fragm. 11, p. 132: Παπίας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει, ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθησαν.

*Jeshu* also contains the same information that John was executed in Palestine,<sup>417</sup> therefore the original John had nothing to do with Ephesus. Having accepted the validity of Papias and *Toldoth Jeshu*, Eisler also questioned why the *Acts*<sup>418</sup> refer to the execution of only one of the sons of Zebedee, Jacob, and not of his brother John?<sup>419</sup> Could this be an indication that a certain author or editor of the *Acts* concealed the information of John's execution because he wanted to provide support to those who impersonated the deceased Apostle John, and wrote a *Gospel* under his name? Papias, apart from stating that John the Apostle was executed, also mentions that a presbyter by the name of John was aware of the teachings of the first disciples of Jesus.<sup>420</sup> In turn, Irenaeus states that Papias himself was a disciple of a certain John, friend of Polycarp, who lived in Ephesus.<sup>421</sup> Since Papias himself was clear that John the Apostle was executed some decades before him, it makes sense that Irenaeus pointed out that Papias was a disciple of John the presbyter mentioned by Papias himself, who lived in Ephesus, and the question here is whether this particular presbyter is the author of *John*. There is one more indication in *John* which points that someone with links to Ephesus, like John the presbyter, may be its author. *John* begins with an identification of God with *logos*.<sup>422</sup> This concept was already introduced in philosophy by Heraclitus in Ephesus.<sup>423</sup>

The author of *John* 21:24 insists that this *Gospel* should be taken seriously and trusted because he examined all of what the "disciple" (John) of Jesus wrote and found it to be true, meaning that these lines must have been added by an editor

---

<sup>417</sup> Eisler, *Enigma*, pp. 59-72.

<sup>418</sup> 12:2.

<sup>419</sup> Eisler, *Enigma*, pp. 73-77.

<sup>420</sup> Papias, fragm. 11, p. 132: καὶ Ἰωάννην ἔτερον.

<sup>421</sup> Irenaeus, *A.H.*, 5, 33, ed. Harvey, vol. 2, p. 418.

<sup>422</sup> *John* 1:1: καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. The word λόγος is usually translated as *Verbum*, *Word*, a term that by no means represents only the qualities of spoken λόγος.

<sup>423</sup> E.g. W.K.C. Guthrie, *A history of Greek Philosophy*, 6 vols. (Cambridge, 1962-1981), vol. 1: *The earlier Presocratics and the Pythagoreans* (1962), pp. 419-426.

of some earlier material. One should also take into account here that the entire *John* 18:14-20:13, which provides details on the trial of Jesus by Caiaphas, Annas and Pilate, the crucifixion of Jesus and his resurrection, has been added in *Codex Bezae* by a later hand, meaning that it was not part of an earlier version. Also, one should observe that there is consensus that the entire *Pericope Adulterae*<sup>424</sup> is a later interpolation,<sup>425</sup> and although the *Synopsis* mentions only one trip Jesus took to Jerusalem, *John* reports several. Most scholars regard those extra trips as fictional. Apart from this important difference, *John*, unlike the previous *Gospels*, does not present much material before Jesus attacked the Temple. *John* enters this theme within just a few paragraphs from its first line,<sup>426</sup> omits Jesus's family tree, the virgin birth, a number of miracles and a number of parables presented in the previous *Gospels* before Jesus attacked the Temple. My question here is why the author of *John* reports a number of sermons, miracles and travels made in between the attack against the Temple and the trial and execution of Jesus? Could this be an indication that he wanted to disconnect and distance the attack from the arrest and trial of Jesus? There is one more important difference between *John* and the previous *Gospels* I would like to question here. Why Jesus's reply "my kingdom is not from this world" to Pilate in *John*<sup>427</sup> is different to what Jesus replied to Pilate in *Matthew*,<sup>428</sup> *Mark*<sup>429</sup> and *Luke*<sup>430</sup> where he did not deny or accept that he was a king of the Judeans? Is the author of *John* here more reliable than the others, or did he want to emphasise that Jesus's movement and aims should be interpreted in a heavenly and spiritual rather than an earthly way?

---

<sup>424</sup> *John* 8:1-11.

<sup>425</sup> J. Wright Knust, 'Early Christian Re-Writing and the History of the Pericope Adulterae', *J ECS* (2006), pp. 485-536, on evidence deriving from the study of early manuscripts that contain *John*; Wilson, *Jesus*, p. 18, both Vaticanus and Sinaiticus do not contain pericope adulterae in John.

<sup>426</sup> *John* 2:13-16.

<sup>427</sup> 18:36.

<sup>428</sup> 27:11.

<sup>429</sup> 15:2.

<sup>430</sup> 23:3.

## 1.10: Acts

Although most scholars accept that the *Acts* are a historical monograph<sup>431</sup> about the missionary activities of Peter and Paul, some others dismiss this work as a collection of fictitious stories.<sup>432</sup> There is consensus that the author of the *Acts* is the same as the author of *Luke* but there are numerous and long lasting disputes regarding their dating. Some scholars argue that it is hard to exclude with certainty any date in between 60 and the end of the second century.<sup>433</sup> The central argument to support that the *Acts* were produced in the first century is that they do not mention the *Epistles* of Paul, therefore must be earlier.<sup>434</sup> Modern research on the text of the *Acts* has revealed that their author did know some of the *Epistles*; therefore this old argument that the *Acts* predate the *Epistles* is no longer valid.<sup>435</sup> In support of the dating of the *Acts* towards a later date, some scholars argue that their author knew the *Antiquities* of Josephus and altered them.<sup>436</sup> For example, the *Acts* provide information for three important revolutionaries who are also mentioned by Josephus, but they provide different dates as to when they were active.<sup>437</sup> According to Joseph Tyson, Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies, the case that the author of the *Acts* knew the *Antiquities* has already been proved, therefore the *Acts* should be

---

<sup>431</sup> Martin Hengel, *Zur urchristlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, trans. J. Bowden, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (London, 1979), p. 36.

<sup>432</sup> George A. Wells, *The Acts of the Apostles - A historical record?* (London, 2000), p. 46: "Verdicts on Acts have ranged from dismissing it as a bundle of legends to accepting it as history whose trustworthiness is unsurpassed."

<sup>433</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, pp. 1-23. See also Finegan, *Handbook*, p. 273; Guthrie NT, pp. 131-132, 355-365, 399.

<sup>434</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, p. 15-16.

<sup>435</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, pp. 16-22.

<sup>436</sup> Mason, *Josephus*, p. 273, cites Max Krenkel *Josephus und Lukas* (Leipzig, 1894); p. 292-293; p. 251, Mason points that the account of the death of King Agrippas in *Acts* 12:20-23 is similar to that provided by Josephus but gives no Jos. reference. See also Roland Bergmeier, 'Loyalität als Gegenstand paulinischer Paraklese: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm 13, 1 ff und Jos. B.J. 2,140,' in *Theokratia: Jahrbuch des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 1 1967-1969* (Leiden 1970), pp. 51-63 (*Romans* 13.1-3 and *Bel.* 2.140 share a common theological ground on the issue of obedience to authorities).

<sup>437</sup> Mason, *Josephus*, pp. 277-278.



dated some time after Josephus published his *Antiquities*.<sup>438</sup> Tyson also argues that the *terminus ad quem* should be the first time the *Acts* are mentioned by early Christian authors, such as Justin.<sup>439</sup> Tyson also observed that the *Acts* contain much material in reply to the controversies introduced by Marcion himself, and pointed to a more possible post-Marcionite *terminus a quo* c. 120-125.<sup>440</sup> When Tyson presented these dates he did not have the results of the research conducted by Dr Sebastian Moll who presented extensive evidence deriving from a meticulous study of primary sources, that the first years when Marcion was active were 144-145 and not earlier.<sup>441</sup> This new conclusion produced by Moll pushes Tyson's dating of the *Acts* about twenty years later. Even before Moll and Tyson, another scholar, Ernst Haenchen, through a very different methodology and research, observed that the *Acts* present an almost supernatural Paul, an outstanding orator who was able to perform great miracles, and that the *Acts* contradict the *Epistles* on the relations between Jews and Christians (the *Acts* create a distance between the two that did not exist so greatly in the *Epistles*). Haenchen concluded that the *Acts* were not written by a

---

<sup>438</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, pp. 14-15 on the importance of Pervo's work which argues that *Luke* and the *Acts* contain information in the *Antiquities*. See Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa Cal., 2006), p. 161-199; idem, pp. 369-372 that the revolts of 115-117 provide a more probable context for the pejorative portrayal of the Jews in the *Acts*. Cf. Martin William Mittelstadt, 'For Profit or Delight? Richard Pervo's Contributions to Lukan Studies' in *Pneuma* 33.1 (2011), pp. 95-108, at pp. 104-105 on a number of responses to Pervo's conclusion that the *Acts* and *Luke* are fictitious rather than history. Daniel Lynwood Smith, *The Rhetoric of Interruption: Speech making, Turn-Taking, and Rule-Breaking in Luke Acts and Ancient Greek Narrative* (Berlin, 2012), p. 245, Pervo is confirmed by this research that the interruptions in the *Acts* and *Luke* are linked to the style of interruptions contained in other ancient novels, but contrary to Pervo, this research shows that that such interruptions were present not only in the novel writing genre. Idem, p. 246, is surprised that only Aune and Pervo have pointed to the interruptions in *Luke*.

<sup>439</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, pp. 22-23.

<sup>440</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, pp. 50-78. Cf. idem, p. 25, on the unreliability of the sources regarding historical Marcion; Robert M. Grant, 'Marcion and the Critical Method' in Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd, eds., *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare* (Waterloo, Ont., 1984), pp. 207-215, does not examine the hypothesis of how much in *Luke* and *Acts* derive from Marcion.

<sup>441</sup> Moll, *Marcion*, pp. 25-46. See pages 31-38 in particular, on sources (Clement Alex., Irenaeus, Tertullian, Epiphanius and a number of later sources) with reference to the first appearance of Marcion to Rome.

contemporary of "Paul" but much later.<sup>442</sup> It is evident that several scholars who have based their entire life-time scholarly works on different and much earlier datings of the *Acts*, regard Haenchen, Tyson and the newcomer Moll with much suspicion, and reject their findings. However, from my own examination of Haenchen, Tyson and Moll, I conclude that they have presented powerful evidence to support their cases. I do accept that the *Acts* could not have been anti-Marcionite before Marcion became known, and I also accept that the *Acts* do know "Josephus." Therefore I question how much of the *Acts*, a work composed about 100 years later than "Paul," is historical? Before trying to find any answers to this question one should also bear in mind that Marcion was in fact a Paulinist who promoted Paul extensively.<sup>443</sup>

Regardless the disputes on the date the *Acts* were composed, some insist that they contain precise geographical and historical information.<sup>444</sup> This may be a one-sided approach because there are indications that the *Acts* also contain fiction. For example, the *Acts*<sup>445</sup> narrate that handkerchiefs or aprons which touched Paul's skin were brought to people who were possessed by evil spirits, and in this way they were cured. In another instance Paul and Silas appear in a prison that had its foundations shaken by a miraculous earthquake which also broke their chains and opened the door, while their guard next door remained

---

<sup>442</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 113-116. Even before Haenchen, George Ogg, *The Chronology of the Life of Paul* (London, 1968), pp. 155-159, pointed that *Acts* 24.27 uses information provided by *Ant.* 20.182.

<sup>443</sup> Edwin C. Blackman, *Marcion and his Influence* (London, 1948), pp. 103-112; Moll, *Marcion*, pp. 159-162.

<sup>444</sup> Finegan, *Handbook*, p. 273; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Wilmington, Delaware, 1983), pp. 141-152: *Acts* 18:12 mention that when Gallio was proconsul of Achaia, the Jews delivered Paul to him to be tried. A Greek inscription was discovered at Delphi, proves that a proconsul called Iunius Gallio was active during Claudius. The inscription is dated c. 50-52 CE; Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 31.62 ed. W.H.S. Jones, 10 vols. (London, 1938-1963), vol. 8 (1963), p. 416 also refers to a consul Annaeus Gallio. My question here is, how could we be sure that the author of the *Acts* did not consult Pliny?

<sup>445</sup> 19:11-13.

asleep.<sup>446</sup> Also, Julian the Apostate pointed out that the stories in the *Acts* about the conversion of centurion Cornelius<sup>447</sup> and proconsul Sergius Paulus<sup>448</sup> were fictitious, for there was no testimony of them within the works of those who kept records at that time.<sup>449</sup>

### 1.11: "Pauline" *Epistles*

Just like the authors of the *Gospels* and the *Acts*, the authors of the *Epistles* had very extensive knowledge of the *OT*, but generation after generation scholars have been puzzled why Paul's *Epistles* only refer to such a small amount of data from the *Gospels*. The *Epistles* mention very little about the life of Jesus apart from his crucifixion, resurrection and the Last Supper. This led many to believe that the *Epistles* were composed before the *Gospels*, sometime between 44 and 66 CE and that they are 'the earliest surviving Christian documents', dating before the destruction of Jerusalem (70 CE).<sup>450</sup> Others argue that such dates are too early,<sup>451</sup> and date all *Epistles* to the second century.<sup>452</sup> The majority of scholars

---

<sup>446</sup> *Acts* 16:26-27.

<sup>447</sup> *Acts* 10:1-33.

<sup>448</sup> *Acts* 13:7-12.

<sup>449</sup> Julian, *Contra Galilaeos*, ed. W.C. Wright (apud C.J. Neumann ed., *Juliani imperatoris librorum contra Christianos quae supersunt* [Leipzig, 1880]), *Julian*, 3 vols. (Loeb: Harvard, 1923); vol. 3, p. 376. On the validity of similar other Christian stories that important Romans accepted Christianity see Fox, *Pagans*, pp. 302-303 (historians cannot identify any Christian member of the Senate, apart from a single person mentioned by Eusebius).

<sup>450</sup> Hoskyns-Davey, pp. 201-204; Dodd, *History*, p. 45, accepts Paul's *Epistles* as the earliest texts in the NT.

<sup>451</sup> Kümmel, *Das neue*, pp. 33-38, on the work of Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), who, on the basis of textual analysis, came to the conclusion that "the text in the form in which it has been handed down does not correspond to the original, ... the traditional view concerning the time of composition or the authorship of a letter must be abandoned (p. 35)"; Idem, pp. 18-19, Eusebius and Jerome also report a number of disputes on the originality of several *New Testament* works; Ellegård, *Jesus*, p. 3 (the scholarly world has dated the so called "original" *Letters* of Paul and the *Gospels* too early); An indication concerning the later composition of the *I Thessalonians* in particular is that in 2:14-16 it refers to a large scale destruction of the Jews, which echoes either the events during the Great Revolt or during the two large scale Israelite wars that followed in the second century; Lenzman, *L' origine*, p. 14 (Ferdinand Christian Baur and the school of Tübingen date the *Epistles* in the second c.).

<sup>452</sup> Cf. Myriam Klinker-De Klerck, 'The Pastoral Epistles: authentic pauline writings', in *European Journal of Theology* 17:2 (2008), pp. 101-108, on arguments for both the authenticity and the unauthenticity of the *Pastoral Epistles* (*Timothy* 1 and 2, *Titus*) of Paul.

accept that only a certain number of Paul's *Epistles* are authentic.<sup>453</sup> The *Ephesians*, *2 Peter*, *1* and *2 Timothy* and *Titus* are considered as pseudepigrapha by most scholars and some scholars also regard *Colossians*, *2 Thessalonians* and *1 Peter* as pseudepigrapha, too.<sup>454</sup> Because of its style and language, *Hebrews* constitutes a category in itself.<sup>455</sup> Numerous scholars have repeatedly produced various and often contradictory evidence that different *Epistles* were works of different authors and pointed out indications of censorship and interpolations in all *Epistles*.<sup>456</sup> Several persons who appear within certain *Epistles* have been considered as authors or editors of all or some of the *Epistles*.<sup>457</sup> What is clear is that "Paul" was not the only composer of the material attributed to him.<sup>458</sup> There are arguments made by certain scholars that the *Epistles* copied the style and philosophical ideas of Seneca (4 BCE - 65 CE), a figure admired by a number of Early Christian Fathers. Jerome in particular regarded Seneca as a Father of the Church and referred to certain correspondence between Paul and Seneca. This

---

<sup>453</sup> E.g., Gamble, *Books*, p. 100, on the gradual enlargement of the number of *Epistles* attributed to Paul; Rainer Riesner, 'Pauline Chronology,' in *BCP*, pp. 9-29 at p. 9, *Romans*, *1-2 Corinthians*, *Galatians*, *Philippians*, *1 Thessalonians* and *Philemon* are considered genuine. The article accepts Paul as a historical figure who lived some years after Jesus, based on the chronology provided by the *Acts*. Riesner, just like the majority of scholars, does not question whether the author of the *Acts* constructed part of his narrative based on Josephus.

<sup>454</sup> Carson, 'Pseudonymity,' p. 858; Bassler, 'Paul,' p. 388.

<sup>455</sup> James W. Thompson, *The beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Washington, 1982), p. 1 (its literary style is superior to all other NT works).

<sup>456</sup> Lenzman, *L' origine*, p. 47 (on Eusebius and Ireneaus that many Christians of the second century did not accept St Paul's *Epistles* as original. A. Harnack concluded that the Christians of Rome were not aware of the *Epistles* until the end of the first or early second c.); idem, pp. 156-157: (the 14 *Epistles* of Paul were written by different authors, and were not composed in the first century. The earliest group of the *Epistles* is *Romans*, *Corinthians*, and *Galatians*, written at the end of the first century, or in the early second. *Ephesians*, *Philippeans*, *Coloseans* and *Thessaloneans* are later. The third group *Timothy*, *Titus*, and *Philemon* are from the middle of the second century. *Hebrews* is very different from all other *Epistles*, and is written under the heavy influence of Philo).

<sup>457</sup> E.g. Epaphras, Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, Sosthenes, Onesimus, Silvanus. See Richards, *Paul*, p. 34: *Philemon* 23, 24 (Epaphras, Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke). *Philemon* (1:1) was sent by both Paul and Timothy. *1 Corinthians*, 1:1 (Sosthenes, a sender together with Paul); Idem, pp. 210-211 (Onesimus); K. P. Donfield, '1 Thessalonians', in Aune, *Blackwell*, pp. 504-514 at 504 (Silvanus).

<sup>458</sup> Richards, *Paul*, pp. 35-36, 99-108 (on interpolations as product of teamwork and that Paul's texts have not been extensively interpolated); Cf. Bassler, 'Paul,' p. 381 (*Acts*) and p. 384: in certain letters there is evidence that they include components "written at different times."

correspondence has been proven by scholars to be fake, making it one more addition to the numerous pseudepigrapha produced in the first centuries.<sup>459</sup> It is interesting to observe here that just like *Luke* and *John* which claim that there were others who wrote about Early Christianity but were not trustworthy, the author/s of some *Epistles* also criticize other Christians who tried to introduce their own 'fake' information. For example, *II Thessalonians* warns that there were fake *Epistles* in circulation,<sup>460</sup> and *II Corinthians* states that a number of preachers preached a different Jesus, and that there were a number of fake Apostles around.<sup>461</sup> The same argument about the existence of fake 'brothers' is repeated in *Galatians*.<sup>462</sup>

Some scholars point to Alexandria, the city where the Valentinians were active, as the place where the first collection of Paul's *Epistles* first appeared.<sup>463</sup> Elaine Pagels, among other scholars, identified a strong relation between Marcion, the Valentinians and Paul, to the extent that certain works attributed to Paul could have been interpolated or even fabricated by Valentinian circles.<sup>464</sup> In support of this case it is argued that Justin the Martyr and other second-century Christians do not know Paul.<sup>465</sup> Recent research conducted by Jouette Bassler, Professor of New Testament, points to the conclusion that the Church was forced to claim the *Epistles* as its own tradition only after and not before the rise of Marcion who was the first to present any collection of *Epistles* as works of Paul.

---

<sup>459</sup> Elliott, *Apocryphal*, p. 547. The Christian tradition that Seneca became a Christian under the influence of Paul has no scientific foundation.

<sup>460</sup> *2 Thessalonians* 2:2 and 3:17.

<sup>461</sup> *II Corinthians* 11:4 (different Jesus); 11:13-15 (fake Apostles).

<sup>462</sup> *Galatians* 1:6-9; 2:4 (fake brothers).

<sup>463</sup> Richards, *Paul*, pp. 210-211 (ref. to G. Zuntz and F. F. Bruce).

<sup>464</sup> E. H. Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul* (Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 1-5. Cf. Hyam Maccoby, *Paul and Hellenism* (London, 1991), pp. 36-89, who argues that historical Paul is a Gnostic thinker who adopted certain characteristics of the mystery cults. See also Roetzel, 'Paul,' p. 228 (Marcion and Valentinus rescued the writings of Paul).

<sup>465</sup> E.g. see Roetzel, 'Paul,' pp. 227-241 at 228 (Theophilus and Justin do not know Paul); p. 227 (Papias did not know Paul either. *Keregmata Petrou* attack Paul as an impostor. Ps Clement Rom., *Homiliae* 17.19.1-4 which also attack Paul); Ellegård, *Jesus*, p. 48-49 (Hermas never mentions Paul).

According to Bassler, ten *Epistles* together with *Luke* formed the core readings of the Marcionites.<sup>466</sup> The question here is whether some of those works were produced by Marcion or his followers.<sup>467</sup>

The style of Greek *koine* used in the *Epistles* is often perceived as an indication that their authors, just like the Marcionites, were Israelites of the Diaspora who lived and studied in a Hellenised environment.<sup>468</sup> However, who exactly was the author of each *Epistle* and how much its text was altered, may remain a subject of perpetual speculation and disagreements.

### 1.12: Remarks on Paul's historical identity

In the works of the scholarly community, Paul is a very controversial figure. Views vary from that he was a Hellenised opponent of Judaism who made Christianity separate from Israel, to someone who had nothing to do with Hellenism.<sup>469</sup> For centuries most scholars try to construct Paul's historical profile on the basis of the *Acts* and the *Epistles*, after having accepted the wrong dating and the wrong authorship of the above works. According to Jerome (347-420) Paul's parents lived in Giscala, a place which Jerome thought was part of Judea. In fact Giscala was a town or village located in north Galilee. There is no other evidence that any Giscala ever existed in any part of Judea. Jerome also states that because of a Roman invasion of their home town, Paul's parents became

---

<sup>466</sup> Bassler, 'Paul,' pp. 383-384. See also Ellegård, *Jesus*, p. 26 (Marcion and Paul).

<sup>467</sup> Cf. M. D. Nanos, 'Galatians', in Aune, *Blackwell*, pp. 455-474 at 455: the first *Epistle* in Marcion's collection was *Galatians*, which is considered to contain the most anti-Jewish content.

<sup>468</sup> G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (Sydney, 1989), trans. K. Papademetriou, *Η Ελληνική της Καινής Διαθήκης, Γλωσσολογικές μελέτες με τη συμβολή επιγραφών και παπύρων* (Thessalonikē, 2003), pp. 79-94 (on the language of the NT).

<sup>469</sup> John G. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 21-42; Albert Schweitzer, *Paul and His interpreters: a critical history* (London, 1912), pp. 239-240, p. 240: "The solution must, therefore, consist in leaving out the question of Greek influence in every form and in every combination, and venturing on the "one-sidedness" of endeavouring to understand the doctrine of the Apostle of the Gentiles entirely on the basis of Jewish primitive Christianity."

refugees and moved to Tarsus of Cilicia.<sup>470</sup> According to *Luke* Pontius Pilate slaughtered Galileans about one generation before the accepted date of Paul's execution in 64 CE,<sup>471</sup> and my question here is whether Paul's historical parents became refugees because of Pilate's invasion of Galilee.

Paul in *Philippians*<sup>472</sup> and *Romans*<sup>473</sup> insists that he was circumcised in the eighth day of his life; he was an ethnic Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin, a "Hebrew from Hebrews" and a Pharisee who became a persecutor of the Church out of his zeal to keep the Law.<sup>474</sup> This is confirmed also by the author of the *Acts*<sup>475</sup> who refers to Paul with the name Saulos as a persecutor of the disciples of Jesus, feared for his murderous power, who chained men and women and delivered them to Jerusalem. At another point in the *Acts* Paul himself admitted that he was a murderer!<sup>476</sup> According to *Galatians*<sup>477</sup> Paul changed after God revealed to him that he should preach Jesus to the Gentiles! Just after he received this divine instruction he did not contact the Apostles, but instead went to Arabia and Damascus!<sup>478</sup> Three years later he moved to Jerusalem, where he spent fifteen days in the company of Cephas (other name of Peter) and also met Jacob (James) the brother of Jesus.<sup>479</sup> He admitted that he acted without consulting the authority of those appointed as leaders of the Church, but later, James, Peter and John who had the mission to preach to the

---

<sup>470</sup> Jerome (347-420), *Commentary on Philemon*, 23, trans. T. P. Scheck, *St. Jerome's Commentaries on Galatians, Titus and Philemon* (Indiana, 2010), p. 379. This passage in Jerome was cited by Hengel, 'Paul,' p. 23. Cf. Klauss Haacker, 'Paul's life', in James D. G. Dunn, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to St Paul* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 19-33 at 25.

<sup>471</sup> *Luke* 13:1-3: περὶ τῶν Γαλιλαίων ὧν τὸ αἷμα Πιλάτος ἔμιξεν.

<sup>472</sup> 3:5-6.

<sup>473</sup> 11:1.

<sup>474</sup> *Philippians*, 3:6.

<sup>475</sup> 9:1-2.

<sup>476</sup> 22:4: ἐδίωξα ἄχρι θανάτου.

<sup>477</sup> 1:16.

<sup>478</sup> *Galatians* 1:17.

<sup>479</sup> *Galatians* 1:18-20.

circumcised, accepted that Paul and Barnabas should go to preach to the uncircumcised Gentiles!<sup>480</sup> My questioning of this story, told by "Paul," is whether this divine instruction Paul received from God was with reference to a spiritual Jesus who was unknown to those who met historical Jesus and had no interest in approaching the Gentiles themselves. In my opinion, one more problem with this miraculous explanation regarding Paul receiving a mission by God is that the *Acts*<sup>481</sup> clearly state that there was another group of religious leaders, based in Antioch, who themselves gave Paul and Barnabas the mission to preach to the Gentiles. According to the *Acts*,<sup>482</sup> it is this particular community in Antioch who first called themselves as "Christians." It is evident that the *Acts* talk about two different religious centres one in Jerusalem and one in Antioch. The fact that the *Acts*<sup>483</sup> state that one of the main directors of this second centre in Antioch was Manaen "a member of the court and friend (σύντροφος) of Herod," should be further investigated in the sense that this may be an indication that this second centre was linked to Herod Agrippas who just like Paul/Saul also persecuted the Christians. Interestingly, one should observe here that the *Acts*<sup>484</sup> present Herod Agrippas applauding Paul's speech in Caesarea, meaning that he too, just like Paul-Saul, also changed. The question here is whether there was any historical relation between the circle who authorised Paul to preach to the Gentiles and the political authorities commanded by Herod Agrippas and his friend Manaen.

According to the *Acts*,<sup>485</sup> Jacob the brother of Jesus told Paul that his **Zealot** followers became aware that Paul preached to the diaspora Judeans not to

---

<sup>480</sup> *Galatians* 2:6-9.

<sup>481</sup> 13:1-3.

<sup>482</sup> 11.26.

<sup>483</sup> 13:1.

<sup>484</sup> 26.

<sup>485</sup> 21:20-21.



circumcise their children. Soon after, Jacob ordered Paul to follow four men who were under a religious vow and together with them to have his hair cut, so everybody will know that what Paul preached had no value.<sup>486</sup> I would like to indicate here that according to the *Antiquities*, this form of punishment of cutting the hair was also ordered by Herod Agrippas against certain sectarian **Nazoreans** who revolted against him.<sup>487</sup> Clearly, it was an insult to the **Nazoreans** to have their hair cut. Jacob also ordered Paul to go to the Temple, where he was accused of introducing Greeks, and soon after this there was an assassination attempt against Paul. According to the *Acts*, the populace saved him.<sup>488</sup> The question raised by this story is, on whose side were Jacob's followers? On the side of those who tried to save Paul or of those who tried to murder him?<sup>489</sup> Is it irrelevant that Paul in *Galatians*<sup>490</sup> questions, "why am I still being persecuted if I am still preaching circumcision?"<sup>491</sup> As seen above, this is exactly the accusation Jacob raised against Paul. The case that there was friction between two different circles of Early Christianity, the followers of "Paul" and of "Jacob," is also confirmed by the pro-Jacobite *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* which reverse the accusation that Paul was persecuted and attack Paul as a fraudster and instigator of massacres against the original Christians.<sup>492</sup> The question here is why exactly was Paul imprisoned a number of times, as he states in *II Corinthians*?<sup>493</sup> Should this be examined as irrelevant to the

---

<sup>486</sup> *Acts* 21:24.

<sup>487</sup> *Ant.*, 19, 292-294, vol. 4, pp. 260-261.

<sup>488</sup> *Acts* 21:25-30.

<sup>489</sup> See Brandon, *Trial*, pp. 16-21, on the bitter conflict between Jacob and James.

<sup>490</sup> 5:11.

<sup>491</sup> Trans. *Holy Bible*, p. 202.

<sup>492</sup> F. Stanley Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine recognitions 1.27-71* (Atlanta, 1995), p. 1 (it is accepted that the *Pseudo Clementines* derive from a 3rd c. work); p. 2 (1.27-71 is thought to contain very early material); p. 163 (Stanley Jones dates this earliest material in between 173-190); p.166 (Paul as a persecutor of Christianity). The *Recognitions*, 1:70-71, mentioned by Aslan, *Zealot*, pp. 209-210, present Saul of Tarsus attacking James/Jacob inside the Temple.

<sup>493</sup> 11:23.

accusations against him in the *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* that he had an extensive criminal record?

According to the *Acts*, Paul's final arrest took place in Caesarea by procurator Porcius Festus (c.60-62).<sup>494</sup> To the best of my knowledge, no scholar has examined the possibility that his arrest might have been relevant to the murderous conflict that was taking place at exactly the same time in the same city, between the Greek and the Israelite communities. The *Antiquities* clearly report that the previous procurator Felix favoured the Greeks, and the Judeans complained against him to Nero. The Emperor responded by replacing him with Porcius Festus, but this change in administration did not make a real difference because Nero was already convinced by 'Hellenic epistles' to take the side of the Greeks. This conflict which began in Caesarea required the mobilisation of the Roman army against the strongholds of the Israelite revolutionaries in various Middle Eastern locations. By the time the forces of Porcius Festus arrived in Judea the **Sikarioi** had already attacked robbed and burned down several villages.<sup>495</sup> It was during that time when, according to the *Acts*, the Israelite authorities in Jerusalem petitioned Festus to arrest Paul. The *Acts* narrate that Paul became aware that those who requested his arrest set a trap at a certain point on the road between Caesarea and Jerusalem, where they waited to kill him. Paul asked Festus not to be delivered for a trial in Jerusalem but instead to have his case tried in Rome.<sup>496</sup> From the above it is evident that the author/s of the *Acts* indicate/s that Paul was innocent and just like Jesus, he had fallen victim of a Jerusalem conspiracy against him.

---

<sup>494</sup> *Acts* 25:1-12.

<sup>495</sup> *Ant.*, 20.186-189, vol. 4, pp. 305-308.

<sup>496</sup> *Acts* 25:1-12.

Interestingly, according to the *Acts*<sup>497</sup> there is a single soldier appointed to guard Paul in Rome, where for two years in a row he appears to be renting a home, having visitors and preaching.<sup>498</sup> The execution of Paul, if indeed he was a Roman citizen,<sup>499</sup> falls exactly within the same period *De Bello* reports that the Romans for the first time ever executed Judean Roman citizens by crucifixion because of their participation in the revolution against them, when Florus was procurator (62-64).<sup>500</sup> The question here is whether a historical Galilean Paul-Saul was arrested and executed by the Romans because he participated in such revolts. Before Paul's arrest in Caesarea there have been two more instances reported by the author of the *Acts* where Paul was accused to be a warlord. In the first instance a certain Roman officer questioned Paul whether he was a leader of the four thousand revolutionary **Sikarioi**,<sup>501</sup> and in the second, in the presence of another Roman official, Paul is accused by the orator of the Temple authorities to be the leader of the revolutionary heresis of **Nazoreans** (Ναζωραίων αίρέσεως), who "raised war against the entire humanity" and who desecrated the Temple of Jerusalem but failed to maintain its control.<sup>502</sup> In my opinion, it is important to observe here that Paul in his lengthy reply to this accusation clearly states that he was in fact a member of this particular sect, and this was the religious way he preferred to worship the God of his ancestors.<sup>503</sup> If, after this clear admission by Paul himself, one still insists that Paul was not a **Nazorean**, one should pay attention to *Galatians* 1:15 where Paul clearly states

---

<sup>497</sup> 28:16.

<sup>498</sup> 28:30-31.

<sup>499</sup> Ellegård, *Jesus*, pp. 13-14 on the doubts many scholars have whether Paul was a Roman citizen or not. Cf. Hengel, 'Paul,' pp. 30-31 (Hengel accepts that Paul was a Roman citizen). Idem p. 32 (Hengel also accepts that Philo was correct in his statement that all Jews living in Rome, from Augustus on, were Roman citizens).

<sup>500</sup> *Bel.* 2.307-308, vol. 6, pp. 212-213.

<sup>501</sup> *Acts* 21:38.

<sup>502</sup> *Acts* 24.5-6. 24.5: καὶ κινουῦντα στάσεις πᾶσιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην πρωτοστάτην τε τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αίρέσεως.

<sup>503</sup> *Acts* 24:14: ὁμολογῶ δὲ τοῦτό σοι ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αίρεσιν οὕτως λατρεύω τῷ πατρίῳ θεῷ.

that he was called by God even before he was born. This, most probably, means that Paul was dedicated by his parents to God during his mother's pregnancy, according to the religious tradition of the **Nazir vows**, which I am going to present in the following chapter. Many scholars fail to observe that Paul, according to the *Acts* and the *Epistles* above, was a **Nazorean** in religious terms, and this was not simply a generic name used by Christians, without any reference to the ancient religious **Nazir traditions**.<sup>504</sup> Once the above information provided by the *Acts* and the *Epistles* on the Nazorean identity of Paul is dated early and is accepted as historical, I have little doubts that he was a Nazorean. But if the above sources are dated later, I cannot exclude the possibility that this Nazorean image of Paul was created by those who produced the above sources, in order to make him look like the Nazoreans whom I am going to examine in the next chapter.

Trying to understand who historical "Paul" was, and whether he had anything to do with the Israelite revolutions against Rome, the Greeks and Jerusalem that were unfolding, one should also take into account that the *Acts*<sup>505</sup> also narrate that Paul and his associate Silas were arrested in Philippi because they were accused of instigating a Jewish rebellion and tried to introduce unacceptable customs. They were found guilty by certain generals (!), were imprisoned and tortured, but the generals were terrified when they learned that Paul and his men were Roman citizens and set them free.<sup>506</sup> At another point in the *Acts*<sup>507</sup>, the leaders of the Judeans try to assassinate Paul, but Paul insists that he has

---

<sup>504</sup> Cf Petri Luomanen, 'Ebionites and Nazarenes' in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe (Minneapolis, 2007), pp. 81-118 at p. 103, Luomanen, just like most scholars, concludes that Paul accepted to be called a Nazarene simply because this was a name used to define Jesus; pp. 111-114, through his study of Jerome Luomanen concludes that the Nazarenes accepted Paul.

<sup>505</sup> 16:11-27.

<sup>506</sup> *Acts* 16:28-40.

<sup>507</sup> 25:1-8.

done nothing wrong neither against the Law nor against Caesar! At another instance Paul was also arrested by the Judeans in Jerusalem and was delivered to the Roman authorities, but he also insisted he had done nothing wrong.<sup>508</sup> In Thessalonica after Paul and Silas visited the synagogue,<sup>509</sup> the Judeans accused Paul and his followers: "These people who have been turning the world upside down have come here also, and Jason has entertained them as guests. They are all acting contrary to the decrees of the emperor, saying that there is another king named Jesus."<sup>510</sup> Those Judeans also persecuted Paul who then went to preach in the synagogue of Beroea.<sup>511</sup> Regarding Paul having troubles in the places he visited, one should also examine a most strange event in Ephesus<sup>512</sup> where an evil spirit first attacked the seven sons of a Jewish High Priest who, just like Paul, were also trying to perform miracles. The evil spirit respected Jesus and Paul, but could not forgive the seven sons who wanted to compete with Paul in miracle making. This is why the evil spirit beat them, inflicted injuries on them and stripped them from their clothes. As a result of the actions of the evil spirit, the Judeans and the Greeks who lived in Ephesus were terrified and praised the name of Jesus. After that, they threw to the fire a very large number of their own books no matter that they were worth a fortune. What is of further interest here is that the *Acts*<sup>513</sup> clarify that this was the way "the word of the Lord grew mightily and prevailed"! One should observe here that some translations of this event present the Ephesians as burning books of magic,<sup>514</sup> while the Greek text calls them περίεργα<sup>515</sup> meaning elaborate or curious or peculiar rather than "magic." Therefore the question here is what did

---

<sup>508</sup> *Acts* 28:17-22.

<sup>509</sup> *Acts* 17:1.

<sup>510</sup> *Acts* 17:6-7.

<sup>511</sup> *Acts* 17:10-13.

<sup>512</sup> *Acts* 19:14-20.

<sup>513</sup> 19:20.

<sup>514</sup> E.g. *Holy Bible*, p. 145. The older *King James* version used the more accurate "curius arts."

<sup>515</sup> *Acts* 19:19.

those books contain? Were they books of magic or were they mathematics or science that were thrown into the fire?<sup>516</sup> Why the Christian author of the *Acts* appears to applaud that it was through this use of evil violence that people were made to praise Jesus and accept the Lord? Does all that fit in with the explanation that Christianity grew without the use of any violence? One should also observe here that Paul preached in the *Ephesians* against the futile, licentious and unclean Gentiles who do not know God.<sup>517</sup> In *Colossians* he is categorical that the meaning of idolatry is greediness and in *I Corinthians* he attacks idolatry as dominated by demons. In this aspect his preaching does not differ from that of Peter who also attacks the Gentiles as immoral.<sup>518</sup> In *Galatians*<sup>519</sup> Paul appears even more conservative than Peter, whom he attacked for living like the Gentiles. Paul tells him: "we ourselves are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners." This Paul who in *Galatians* declares that before he became Christian he was a **Zealot** for Judaism,<sup>520</sup> more religious than most other Jews of his generation, this Christian Paul who himself preached fiercely against the Gentiles and their idolatry<sup>521</sup> and who received help from the evil spirit in Ephesus, was arrested at some later stage in Caesarea at a time when the city was burning because of the war between Gentile Greeks and Israelites. According to Paul's own words at some point in the *Acts*<sup>522</sup> he says he was chained by the Romans "for the sake of the hope of Israel," while just above this he pointed out that he faced such problems not because the Romans were really against him but because of the influence the Jews exercised on the Romans. In

---

<sup>516</sup> On early Christian views on mathematics and science as works of the devil see below, Epilogue.

<sup>517</sup> *Ephesians* 4:17-19.

<sup>518</sup> *Colossians* 3:5; *I Corinthians* 10:14-22; *I Peter* 4:3.

<sup>519</sup> 2:14-15.

<sup>520</sup> 1:14: ζηλωτής ὑπάρχων.

<sup>521</sup> J. B. Rives, 'Christian expansion and Christian ideology', in *The spread of Christianity in the first four centuries, Essays in Explanation*, ed. W. V. Harris (Leiden, 2005), pp. 15-41 at p. 20 (on Paul's attacks against the idols).

<sup>522</sup> 28:20.

order to test the validity of this statement of a former self-confessed murderer who was miraculously visited by the Lord in a vision,<sup>523</sup> and who miraculously changed from a persecutor of Christianity to its most important Apostle, one ought to examine in further detail what exactly was happening between the Jews and the Romans the time when Paul was active. What exactly was this "hope of Israel" for which this Paul was arrested? Was this "hope" irrelevant to the hope many Israelites had to be liberated by a Messiah who will defeat the Gentiles?

I would like to raise here a last question regarding the historical identity of Paul. Why the *Acts* and the *Epistles*, which refer to his activities, do not say anything about Paul visiting Egypt?<sup>524</sup> One should take into account here that during those years when Paul was supposed to have been active, Egypt contained the largest number of diaspora Israelites. Almost in every single trip Paul made, there is a connection with the local Jews and synagogues. Paul stepped on the diaspora to reach Gentiles, he did not land abroad without local Jewish connections. Therefore, even if one accepts that he looked exclusively for Gentiles, where else could he find more Gentiles than in populous Egypt? Is this exclusion of Egypt, one more powerful indication that the authors of the *Acts* and the *Epistles* knew nothing about Egypt, because they wrote their stories about Paul only after and not before the Israelite communities of Egypt were entirely destroyed during the Kitos war?<sup>525</sup>

---

<sup>523</sup> *Galatians* 1:16-19.

<sup>524</sup> Cf. Moody Smith, 'John,' p. 273 (regions where Christianity spread according to Paul's *Letters* and the *Acts*).

<sup>525</sup> J. Bloom, *The Jewish Revolts Against Rome A.D. 66-135* (North Carolina, 2010), pp. 187-188, 195-196; Dio, *Cassius, Hist. Rom.* 68. 32, vol. 8, pp. 420-422; Gager, *Origins*, p. 52; Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs*, pp. 200-231.

## CHAPTER 2

### *Israelite Nazorean or Essene Christians?*

#### 2.1 Israelites - Moses

According to the *New Testament*, Jesus's birth in Bethlehem fulfilled the prophecies that the leader of Israel will come from this particular place.<sup>526</sup> God sent him to the Israelites.<sup>527</sup> He was a rabbi<sup>528</sup> who preached about the Only God<sup>529</sup> and the whole of Israel knew about him.<sup>530</sup> Nobody before him in Israel performed such great miracles,<sup>531</sup> and this was evidence that he was the real Messiah. Jesus asked his disciples to travel within Israel,<sup>532</sup> to preach to Israelites,<sup>533</sup> and promised that he will make them leaders of the twelve Israelite tribes.<sup>534</sup> He was the glory and hope of Israel,<sup>535</sup> a king of Israel,<sup>536</sup> but some of

---

<sup>526</sup> *Matthew* 2:6. Cf. *Micah* 5:1, *2 Samuel* 5:2 and *1 Chronicles* 11:2. Cf. *Matthew* 2:20-21 for the return of the family of Jesus from Egypt to Israel.

<sup>527</sup> *Luke* 1:54, quotes *Isaiah* 41:8 on God helping Israel; *John* 1:31, Jesus to appear to Israel; *Acts* 13:23.

<sup>528</sup> *Matthew* 26:25,49; *Mark* 9:5, 10:51; *John* 1:19, 1:49, 4:31, 20:16.

<sup>529</sup> Gerald O'Collins, *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic study of Jesus* (Oxford, 1995), p. 264: *Mark* in 12:28-30 presents Jesus quoting *Shema*. Cf. *Deuteronomy* 6:4-5 (*Holy Bible*, p. 181). *Mark* expands and elaborates on this in 12:31-34.

<sup>530</sup> *Acts* 4:10.

<sup>531</sup> *Matthew* 9:33.

<sup>532</sup> *Matthew* 10:23; *Matthew* 15:31.

<sup>533</sup> *Matthew* 10:6; *Matthew* 15:24; *Acts* 2:22-36 and 3:12 Peter preaches to Israelites; *Acts* 5:31 (repentance of Israel); Cf. *Acts* 13:16 (Paul to Israelites); *Romans* 11:1 and *Philippians* 3:5 (Israelite Paul).

<sup>534</sup> *Matthew* 19:28; *Luke* 22:30; Also see Anthony J. Saldarini, 'The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict,' in *LIL*, pp. 23-38 at 24-25, the author of *Matthew* regarded his community as proper Israel.

<sup>535</sup> *Luke* 2:32 quotes *Isaiah* 46:13; *Luke* 24:21.

<sup>536</sup> *John* 1:49 rabbi Jesus, the king of Israel; *John* 12:13, the crowds proclaim Jesus a King of Israel.



them did not accept him as their king.<sup>537</sup> Justin the Martyr argued that Jesus could also be named Israel,<sup>538</sup> meaning that Jesus and Israel were inseparable. One should also take into account that not only the Early Christians in the *NT*, but also later, Christianity continued defining itself as Israel or 'New Israel'.<sup>539</sup>

Apart from the repeated statements of the Early Christians that they were proper Israel, there is evidence that, just like the Jews, they perceived the *OT* Patriarchs and Moses as cultural leaders of the entire world,<sup>540</sup> and they did their best to prove this argument. According to Professor Arthur J. Droge, Eupolemus (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE)<sup>541</sup> was the first author who claimed that Moses was the first wise man in the entire world.<sup>542</sup> Droge also observed that Pseudo Justin copied a statement originally made by Hecataeus of Abdēra that king Mneves was the most important lawgiver, and substituted the name Mneves with that of Moses,<sup>543</sup> meaning that he made a forgery. Droge also observed that another

---

<sup>537</sup> *Matthew* 27:9 (the children of Israel betraying the Messiah for 30 silver coins); *Matthew* 27:41-42 and *Mark* 15:31-32 (High Priests and the Scribes mock Jesus on the cross that he is the king of Israel).

<sup>538</sup> Justin, *Dialogus* 100.1, p. 214: ὅτι γὰρ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ καλεῖται ὁ Χριστός, ἀπέδειξα; 114. 2, p. 231: ἀπέδειξα τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ ἐν τροπολογίᾳ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ. Also see Thomas L. Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: The Quest for the Historical Abraham* (Harrisburg, Penn., 2002<sup>2</sup>), pp. 40-43 on different views of scholars regarding the meaning of Israel.

<sup>539</sup> Eg. *The Epistle of Barnabas* in *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 4.14, pp. 335-409 at p. 352; 5, pp. 354-356; 8, pp. 386-388; 9, pp. 390-392; 16, pp. 396-398; Clement of Rome, *The first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*, 8.3, in *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, pp. 8-120 at 20: (God to the house of Israel); Eus., *CP*, PG 23.1352. Τοῦτον γὰρ τὸν πτωχὸν καὶ πέννητα λαὸν, ἀπὸ τῶν χαμαιζήλων πραγμάτων ἐγείρας, καὶ τῆς ἀτιμίας τῶν παθῶν καὶ τῆς κοπρίας τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν μυσσαγμάτων, καθίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ὄντος λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἄρχοντες τοῦ Ἑβραίων λαοῦ. Eusebius comments on *Sept. Isaiah* 25:2-4 talks about those Israelites who believed in Jesus and who suffered from the dung and dirt of the Greeks, but were honoured by God; Athanasius, *Homilia in sanctos patres et prophetas*, PG 28, 1064.21: Ἡμεῖς δὲ ὁ νέος Ἰσραὴλ; Theodorus Studites, *Homilia in nativitatem Mariae (olim sub auctore Joanne Damasceno)*; PG 96.696.4: νέος Ἰσραὴλ. Also see Harvey, *True Israel*, pp. 225-256.

<sup>540</sup> Droge, *Homer*, pp. 12-13, the first known Jewish historians were quoted by Alexander Polyhistor (1st c. BCE) in fragments of his works preserved in Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica*.

<sup>541</sup> His work survives only in few fragments.

<sup>542</sup> Droge, *Homer*, p. 14.

<sup>543</sup> Droge, *Homer*, p. 18, ref. to Pseudo-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 9 (see ed. Miroslav Marcovich, *Pseudo Iustinus, Cohortatio ad Graecos; De monarchia; Oratio ad Graecos* (Berlin, 1990),

Jewish author, Artapanus (*fl.* 3<sup>rd</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> BCE), intentionally substituted the name of the legendary Greek polymath Musaeus with that of Moses because he wanted to prove that Moses and not Musaios was the teacher of Orphaeus who in turn was regarded by some Greeks as "the ultimate source of Greek wisdom and religion." Artapanus also claimed that the Egyptian philosophy, religion and civilization were based on the achievements of Moses; Abraham taught the Egyptians Astrology and Joseph taught them agriculture and geometry.<sup>544</sup> Another Israelite writer, Aristobulus (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup>? c. BCE), insisted that the Greeks became to know the *Law* of the Jews even before Demetrius Phalireas and Alexander the Great;<sup>545</sup> Orpheas, Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato were influenced by Moses, and this provided an explanation as to why the Greeks kept the seventh day as holy.<sup>546</sup> The Christians Clement of Alexandria (c.150-215) and Eusebius accepted and followed Aristobulus that the Jewish people antedated a number of other peoples and that Greek philosophers copied the teachings of Moses.<sup>547</sup> Justin the Martyr also accepted and propagated that Moses antedated all Greeks, and that Plato and other Greek philosophers copied their theories from Moses and the Prophets.<sup>548</sup> Tatian also argued that his own philosophy, meaning that of the Israelites, antedated that of the Greeks. Moses antedated Homer<sup>549</sup> and even Inachos, the first Argive king.<sup>550</sup> The Greeks received their doctrines from Moses because of the many similarities between what they said and what Moses taught.<sup>551</sup> Theophilus is one more

---

pp. 34-36); Hecataeus in Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica* 1.94.1, ed. Pierre Bertrac, *Diodore de Sicile, Bibliothèque Historique* (Paris, 1993), vol. 1, book 1, pp. 172-173: Μηνᾶν.

<sup>544</sup> Droge, *Homer*, pp. 25-27.

<sup>545</sup> Aristobulus, *Fragmenta* 1, pp. 221-222.

<sup>546</sup> Aristobulus, *Fragmenta* 2, pp. 222-223.

<sup>547</sup> Clement, *Stromata* 1, 15.72, vol. 2, p. 46 (*Hellēnes*, Egyptians, Indians, Germans); Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 13.12, ed. K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke*, DGCS, 8 vols. (Berlin, 1954-56), vol. 8, pp. 190-191.

<sup>548</sup> Justin, *Apologia* 44, p. 57 and 59.1, p. 68 (Plato, Moses antedated Greeks); 54, pp. 65-66 and 44.8, pp. 56-57: (Moses antedated all Greeks); 54.5, p. 65: (Moses antedated all writers).

<sup>549</sup> Tatian, *Oratio*, 31.1-4, pp. 295-97.

<sup>550</sup> Tatian, *Oratio*, 39.1, pp. 302-303.

<sup>551</sup> Tatian, *Oratio*, 40.1, pp. 303-304.

Christian convinced that Moses lived before any of the important Greeks,<sup>552</sup> even before Minos of Crete, and repeated the argument that there were more Israelite authors who antedated the Greeks.<sup>553</sup>

Interestingly, Michael Hardwick observed that a certain list of Pharaohs presented in Theophilus derives from a list contained in *Contra Apionem*, but Theophilus's list contains fewer names of Pharaohs and presents some of them to have reigned for fewer years than what "Josephus" wrote.<sup>554</sup> Although Hardwick could not find an explanation as to how these differences occurred, one should observe here that that "Josephus," or one of his later editors, by adding names of Pharaohs and extra years of reign for some of them, pushed back the date Moses lived. This would have been useful to those who were anxious to prove that Moses antedated any of the important Greeks, and the question here is whether the list in *Contra Apionem* was "enlarged" after Theophilus wrote his own. Whatever the answer to this question, it is evident that the Early Christians can also be called Israelites, for they not only named themselves as such, but they also did their best to prove Moses as more important than any other Gentile. In this sense the Early Christians were not Gentiles, they were Israel.

Apart from the above, the Early Christians appear to be followers of further important Israelite traditions.

---

<sup>552</sup> *Autolycum* 3.21, p. 128.

<sup>553</sup> *Autolycum* 3.29, p. 146.

<sup>554</sup> Hardwick, *Josephus*, pp. 10-14.

## 2.2: Israelite Nazoreans or Christians?

In the established version of *Matthew* 2:23,<sup>555</sup> Joseph the father of Jesus moved his family from Egypt to a place in Galilee called **Ναζαρέτ**.<sup>556</sup> The same passage explains that this is how Jesus became known as **Ναζωραῖος**, and this is the widely accepted explanation as to how Jesus became known as a Nazorean. Eusebius in his *Onomastikon* and *Demonstratio Evangelica* is in agreement with this "Nazorean from Nazareth" explanation, and also provides the additional information that this is why in the early years "us the Christians" were called **Ναζαρηνοὶ**.<sup>557</sup> Epiphanius in his *Panarion* repeats that Jesus Christ was named **Ναζωραῖος** because he came from the city of Nazareth and not because of any other reason.<sup>558</sup>

From as far as I have seen, the problem here is that both Eusebius and Epiphanius in other parts of their works contradict their own explanation that Jesus was called Nazorean because he came from Nazareth. Eusebius in *Demonstratio Evangelica* states not only that Jesus was called **Ναζωραῖος** because he was born in **Ναζάροις** but also that the Hebrew name **Ναζιραῖος** indicates someone who was anointed with the **χρίσμα** and therefore was **Χριστὸς**.<sup>559</sup> One has to observe here that Jesus became known at a later stage

---

<sup>555</sup> Cf. *Mark* 1:9.2 (Jesus came from **Ναζαρέτ** in Galilee).

<sup>556</sup> See also *Luke* 2:4, 2:39, 2:51 and *Acts* 10:38 (**Ναζαρέθ**).

<sup>557</sup> Eusebius, *Onomastikon*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Eusebius, Das Onomastikon*, (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 138-140, s.v. **Ναζαρέθ**: ὅθεν ὁ Χριστὸς **Ναζωραῖος** ἐκλήθη, καὶ **Ναζαρηνοὶ** τὸ παλαιὸν ἡμεῖς οἱ νῦν Χριστιανοί; There is consensus that the *Talmud* refers to the Early Christians as *Notzrim*, known already by J. Toland, *Nazarenus*, ed. J. Champion (Oxford, 1999), p. 154 (Nozerim); For a number of centuries and up to the eighteenth, certain Arabs referred to Christians with the name 'Nazari' and a Shia 'Nusairi' tribe, who claim ancient Christian origin, still exist in modern Syria. See Pritz, *Nazarine*, pp. 17-18, on Pliny's "Nazerini" and the presence of a contemporary Nusairi sect in Syria. Nusairi is also spelled as 'Nosairi'. Some claim that this tribe may be descendants of certain Nazoreans, who, according to Epiphanius, were displaced from the lands of Israel: *Panarion*, vol. 1 pp. 328-330, 333.

<sup>558</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp. 326-329.

<sup>559</sup> *Dem. Evang.*, 7, 2.46-51, pp. 336-337: ἰστέον οὖν ὅτι καὶ τὸ ναζιραῖον ὄνομα ἐβραϊκὸν τυγχάνει ἐν Λευιτικῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ χρίσματος τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς χριστοῦ.

exactly as Χριστός. In this sense, Eusebius pointed to Jesus as Χριστός because he had the χρίσμα of a Ναζιραῖος in terms of being anointed. Contrary to the above information provided by Eusebius, Epiphanius in his *Epistula ad Theodosium* made specific efforts to distant Jesus from the religious Ναζιραῖοι by stating that those who thought that Jesus was called Ναζωραῖος because he followed the Nazirite customs to have long hair and not drinking wine, were wrong. On the contrary, Epiphanius insisted, Jesus Christ was drinking wine and therefore he was not a Ναζιραῖος.<sup>560</sup> The problem with this explanation provided by Epiphanius is that according to *Mark*<sup>561</sup> and *Luke*<sup>562</sup> Jesus gave a vow that he will not drink wine until the kingdom of God will come. The wording of the vow Jesus gave in the two *Gospels* is clear: "*I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.*" I have also observed that In *Luke*<sup>563</sup> an angel also instructed Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist to dedicate his son to God and make him follow the life-long Nazirite vow: "*He must never drink wine or strong drink.*" Paul in *Romans*<sup>564</sup> also advised some of his followers to abstain from the consumption of meat and wine.<sup>565</sup> The interesting point here is that not only the *NT* contradicts "Epiphanius" that Jesus was not a Nazirite, but also Epiphanius himself, if indeed all that is accepted as being his own works are authentic. In his *Panarion* Epiphanius clearly reports that all four sons of Joseph, the father of Jesus Christ,

---

<sup>560</sup> Epiphanius, *Fragmenta*, fragm. 24, ed. K. Holl in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols (Tübingen, 1928), vol. 2, p. 361: κόμην γὰρ ἔχοντα τὸν σωτῆρα γράφουσιν ἐξ ὑπονοίας διὰ τὸ Ναζωραῖον αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ οἱ Ναζιραῖοι κόμας ἔχουσιν. σφάλλονται δὲ οἱ τοὺς τύπους αὐτῷ συνάπτειν πειρώμενοι· οἶνον γὰρ ἔπινεν ὁ σωτῆρ, ὃν οἱ Ναζιραῖοι οὐκ ἔπινον. Also see Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 4.8, ed. E. Evans, 2 vols (Oxford, 1972), vol. 2, pp. 282-284, for the association of Jesus Christ with the Nasarenes of the *OT* and with Nazareth the city.

<sup>561</sup> 14:25.

<sup>562</sup> 22:18.

<sup>563</sup> 1:15.

<sup>564</sup> 14:21.

<sup>565</sup> *Romans* 14:21: καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκίπτει. In *Sept. Amos*, 2.11-12, ed. cit., vol. 2, pp. 503-504, there is a reference to people dedicated to God who did drink wine. For certain customs of the cult of the Naziraiot also see A. Cacciari, 'Philo and the Nazirite' in *Italian Studies of Philo of Alexandria*, ed. F. Calabi (Boston, 2003), pp. 147-166.

were virgin Ναζιραιῶται who abstained from having intercourse and lived under a number of Nazirite vows.<sup>566</sup> My question here is which of the two explanations provided by Epiphanius has historical value? Should I keep accepting that Jesus was called a Nazorean simply because he came from Nazareth and not because of a religious reason?

A further point which raises more questions as to why exactly Jesus was called Nazorean is that the author of *Matthew*,<sup>567</sup> in the same passage where he provided the 'Nazorean from Nazareth' explanation, also claimed that this naming of Jesus was predicted by the prophets. Although *Matthew* does not give any more clues as to who those prophets were, and there is nothing in the OT about any Nazareth, *Luke* 1:26 states that "the angel Gabriel was sent by God to a town in Galilee called Ναζαρέθ."<sup>568</sup> In turn, Nestle-Aland indicate that this verse has a parallel in *Judges* 13:5, where an angel was sent to the wife of Zorah to tell her that she will be pregnant with a boy (Samson). The angel had made it clear that the boy should never have a haircut and be dedicated to God from birth as a Ναζιραιῶς.<sup>569</sup> This boy Samson was pre-destined to make Israel victorious against the Philistines. When he grew up Samson confessed to the gorgeous Delilah that he never had a haircut because he was a Ναζιραιῶς θεοῦ.<sup>570</sup> Apart from the well known case of Samson being a Naziraios, there is one more reference in the *Old Testament* that the mother of Samuel also dedicated her own son, so 'no razor come upon his head.'<sup>571</sup> The question here

---

<sup>566</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 3, pp. 464-465: εἰ γὰρ οἱ παῖδες τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ἠδεδείσαν παρθενίας τάξις καὶ Ναζιραιῶν τὸ ἔργον. See idem, vol. 3, p. 457 and vol. 1, p. 324 for James Naziraios.

<sup>567</sup> 2:23. See also *Mark* 1:9.2 Jesus came from Ναζαρέτ in Galilee

<sup>568</sup> *The Holy Bible, NT*, p. 58; Nestle-Aland p. 152.

<sup>569</sup> 13:5: Ναζιραιῶς (*Cod. Alex.*); ναζιρ θεοῦ (*Cod. Vat.*) For the difference between the two codices see *Judges* 13:5, ed. Rahlfs, vol. 1, p. 460, note. For the dedication of Samson, see *Judges* 13:4-24, vol. 1, pp. 460-463; Glykas (*fl.* 12<sup>th</sup> c. CE) mentions Samson as Ναζαραῖος: see Glykas, p. 310 and p. 314; John Chrysostom (c.347-407 CE), *Fragmenta in Jeremiam* 35, PG 64, 996-997 at 996.10, relates certain Ναζαραῖοι to the circle of the Prophets Helias and Elissaios.

<sup>570</sup> 16:17 (*Cod. Vat.*).

<sup>571</sup> *Sept. I Samuel (Regnorum)* 1:11, ed. cit., vol. 1, p. 503.

is why the author of the above *Matthew* passage wanted to emphasise the importance of Jesus being born in Nazareth if this was not with reference to the above divine Nazirite dedication story which was brought to the surface by the link provided by *Luke*. Mary was visited by an angel, like Samson's mother, and she also dedicated her son to God, just like Samuel. The similarities between the dedications of Samson and Jesus Christ by their mothers before they were born, are striking, but as already mentioned above, there is no Nazareth in the OT and the question here is why *Matthew* and *Luke* mention Nazareth as a location and not as a state of religious dedication? One should take into account here that the earliest text of *Matthew* was first written in Hebrew, and that *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* 2384, palaeographically dated in the third century, instead of Ναζαρέτ mentions **Ναζαρά**.<sup>572</sup> Variants in the spelling of Nazareth also appear in a number of other NT passages and manuscripts,<sup>573</sup> meaning that there was no consensus among the translators on how to spell this name. Like *Matthew* above, the *Acts* also call Jesus Ναζωραῖος,<sup>574</sup> but *Mark*<sup>575</sup> and *Luke*<sup>576</sup> called him **Ναζαρηνός**. All these variants derive from the Hebrew root **Nzr**, usually translated in English as **Nazir**. The *Suida Lexicon* (10<sup>th</sup> c.) explains that the person who came from Nazareth of Galilee was called either Ναζαρηνός or Ναζωραῖος, but the person who was dedicated to God, in the sense that he became a monk, was called Ναζιραῖος.<sup>577</sup> A much earlier source than *Suida*, the *Onomastica Vaticana* (c.4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> c. CE) translates Nazareth as 'cleanness, purification', Nazōraios as 'cleansed' and Ναζιραῖος as 'holy or cleansed or

---

<sup>572</sup> See also Luke 4:16 (Ναζαρά).

<sup>573</sup> *Mark*, 1:9, (Ναζαρέτ), *pauci* Ναζαράτ, see Nestle -Aland, p. 89. *Luke*, 4:16 (Ναζαρά, *pauci* Ναζαρέθ and Ναζαρέτ, see Nestle -Aland, p. 164); *Acts*. 10:30: Ναζαρέθ.

<sup>574</sup> *Acts* 2:22, 3:6, 4:10, 6:14, 22:8, 26:9.

<sup>575</sup> *Mark* 1:24, 10:47, 14:67, 16:6. For the Nazirite identity of the first followers of Christ also see R. Bauckham, 'James and the Jerusalem Community' in O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik, eds, *The Early Centuries, Jewish Believers in Jesus* (Massachusetts, 2007), pp. 55-93.

<sup>576</sup> 24.19

<sup>577</sup> *Suidae Lexicon*, vol. 3 (1933), p. 434, s.v. Ναζαρηνός: ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Ναζιραῖος: ὁ θεῶ κεχαρισμένος, καὶ ἀφιερωμένος· ὁ μοναχός. Ναζωραῖος: ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ.

dedicated to God since an embryo'.<sup>578</sup> In the *Lexicon* of Hesychios (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE), 'Naziraios' is the person dedicated to God, the baptiser and priest.<sup>579</sup> Pseudo-Zonaras's *Lexicon* (c.13<sup>th</sup> c. CE) explains that Naziraios is the monk, sanctified and dedicated to God while Nazōraios means 'saint'.<sup>580</sup>

In light of the various spellings of the same words which contained the **Nzr** root, and in light of the above meanings provided by the *OT*, *NT* and the Byzantine lexa on the Nazir vows, as well as in light of the observation that there is no reference to Nazareth in any prophecy made in the *OT*, my question here is whether a translator of an early Hebrew *Matthew* passage altered (either by mistake or intentionally) the original Hebrew/Aramaic wording which did not present Nazareth as a geographical place but as a spiritual state of Nazorean purification or dedication. *Matthew*<sup>581</sup> also presents a story that Jesus was living in a desert and fasting until he heard that John the Baptist was arrested. He then moved to Galilee and left Ναζαρά.<sup>582</sup> Could this Ναζαρά too be an indication deriving from an original Hebrew passage which said that Jesus left the stage of a vow or purification in the desert in order to move to the inhabited areas of Galilee? Is it possible that *Luke* and a number of subsequent Christian works were based on a mistranslation or intentional alteration of the so called primary Hebrew *Matthew* or *Q* material on Nazareth?

---

<sup>578</sup> *Onomastica Vaticana* in *Onomastica Sacra*, ed. P. De Lagarde (Göttingae, 1887<sup>2</sup>), pp. 205, 206, 220. The *Etymologicum Gudianum* (c.9<sup>th</sup> c. CE), based most probably on the *Onomastica Vaticana*, repeats almost the same information. See ed. F. G. Sturtzcius, *Etymologicum Graecae Linguae Gudianum* (Leipzig, 1818), col. 401: Ναζαρέτ, κάθαρσις· καὶ Ναζαράϊος ὁ καθαριστής. Ναζιραῖος, ὁ καθαρὸς καὶ ἅγιος; <Ναζιραῖος>, ... ἐξ οὗ καὶ ναζιραῖον σχῆμα, τὸ ἀγγελικόν.

<sup>579</sup> *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte et al., 3 vols (Copenhagen 1953-1966, Berlin 2005), vol. 2, p. 694 : Ναζιραῖος· \*ὁ θεῶ κεχαρισμένος, καὶ ἀφιερωμένος, βαπτιστής, ἱερεὺς.

<sup>580</sup> Ps.-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, vol. 2, p. 1383: Ναζιραῖος. μόναχος, ἡγιασμένος καὶ ἀφιερωμένος τῷ θεῷ. Ναζωραῖος. ἅγιος ἐρμηνεύεται.

<sup>581</sup> 4.1-13.

<sup>582</sup> Again some manuscripts of *Matthew* give different spellings here: Ναζαρεθ and Ναζαρετ Nestle-Aland, p. 7.



A further problem with the explanation that the Nazoreans were named after Nazareth is that, as already mentioned, no source before the *New Testament* makes any reference to Nazareth. The only archaeological inscription that such a place did exist dates from the third or the fourth century CE.<sup>583</sup> The archaeological site of a Nazareth village has been located by certain scholars west of Sepphoris,<sup>584</sup> but some other scholars question whether some archaeologists were determined to discover and name a place as Nazareth, regardless whether it existed or not in the first centuries.<sup>585</sup> From the moment there is no earlier record than the *NT* with any reference to any Nazareth, could it be possible that the place where Jesus grew up, gradually became known by this name just because this is how the Greek *NT* called it? Could it also be possible that the name Nazareth was given to a certain place because certain "Nazoreans or Nazirai" had a significant presence there?

According to *Luke*,<sup>586</sup> John the Baptist clearly was a Naziraios dedicated to God. Eusebius also explains that John was called a Naziraios because his hair was dedicated to God,<sup>587</sup> and the *Antiquities* explain that the Nazirai cut their hair and offered it to their priests only once, during their initiation ceremony when they dedicated their lives to God.<sup>588</sup> I have also observed that according to the *Acts* Paul went to Cenchreae of Syria, where he had a haircut because of a

---

<sup>583</sup> The inscription is in Hebrew, found in a synagogue in Caesarea: G. Vermes, *Jesus and the world of Judaism* (London, 1983), p. 3; Talbot, *Dynasty*, p. 50, accepts that Tertullian's reference to Nazareth is not a later interpolation;

<sup>584</sup> Clark, 'Early,' pp 14-15; Keener, *Historical*, p. 182.

<sup>585</sup> See Sanders, *Schismatics*, p. 78; Pritz, *Nazarine*, pp. 95-96: *Talmud* made no reference to any Nazareth. Cf. Joan E. Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places. The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 221-267, on archaeological finds in Nazareth and the history of Nazareth up to the seventh century CE.

<sup>586</sup> 1:13-17: God sent an angel to John's father before he was born and asked him to dedicate his son (he should not drink wine...).

<sup>587</sup> Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* 9, 5.10-12, vol. 6, p. 415: ὁρῶντες ἄνδρα, ναζιραῖον μὲν θεοῦ τὴν τρίχα...

<sup>588</sup> *Ant.*, 4. 72-73, vol. 1, p. 238: ναζιραῖοι δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦνται, κομῶντες καὶ οἶνον οὐ προσφερόμενοι, τούτους δὲ ὅταν τὰς τρίχας ἀφιερῶσιν ἐπὶ θυσία τε δρῶσι τὰς κουράς νέμεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἱερέας. καὶ οἱ κορβὰν αὐτοὺς ὀνομάσαντες τῷ θεῷ, δῶρον δὲ τοῦτο σημαίνει κατὰ Ἑλλήνων γλῶτταν.

certain vow (εἶχεν γὰρ εὐχήν).<sup>589</sup> The text is not clear whether he started or ended the vow with the haircut, but as examined in the first Chapter, Paul admitted that he lived a Nazirite life. Why, then, should this haircut be examined outside the religious Nazirite context? If this was an ordinary haircut, how could one explain that the author of the *Acts* felt the need to report it? One should also take into account here that the same tradition of taking a vow by a haircut called tonsure (κουρά), is followed by the Orthodox Christian monks through the centuries, up to the present day.<sup>590</sup> According to Epiphanius's *Panarion*, Jacob the brother of Christ and first leader of the Eviōnaioi, was also a cleansed (ἡγιασμένος) Naziraios, dedicated to God.<sup>591</sup> The *Chronicle* of George the Monk (842-867 CE)<sup>592</sup> and the *Chronicle* of George Cedrenos (fl. 11<sup>th</sup> c. CE) also explain that Jacob abstained from eating meat, never cut his hair, never had sexual intercourse and that his knees were hard like the knees of a camel because of his constant praying.<sup>593</sup>

The above evidence on the Nazorean/Nazirite identity of John the Baptist, Paul and Jacob has nothing to do with a place called Nazareth, and my question here is why should one accept that Jesus had nothing to do with the Nazir vows

---

<sup>589</sup> *Acts* 18:18. Cf. the contradictions in Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 3, p. 492: ἀλλότριον γὰρ ἐστὶ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας σάκκος προφανῆς καὶ κόμη <μὴ> ἐκτεμνομένη ἀπὸ τοῦ κηρύγματος τῶν ἀποστόλων· «άνθρω, γὰρ φησιν, οὐκ ὀφείλει κομᾶν, εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων». Is <μὴ> and the explanation in brackets a later addition?

<sup>590</sup> D. Sokolof, *Manual of the Orthodox Church's Divine Services* (New York, 1899), p. 118.

<sup>591</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, p. 324. Also see Schaff, *History*, vol. 2, pp. 379-378, St James, the brother of Jesus "was by far the most conservative of all the more prominent apostles, and the least removed from legal Judaism ... He was the head and supreme authority of the stricter party among the Jewish Christians".

<sup>592</sup> Also known as Hamartōlos and Georgius Monachus.

<sup>593</sup> Kedrenos (fl. 12<sup>th</sup> c. CE), *Chronographia*, ed. I. Bekker in *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae opera*, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1838-1839), vol. 1, p. 361: ἐφ' οὗ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν ἀδελφόμενον Ἰάκωβον ἀπέκτειναν, ὃς ἄγνός ὑπάρχων ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐκ ἔπιεν, ἔμψυχον οὐκ ἔφαγε πώποτε, ξυρὸς ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἐλαίῳ οὐκ ἠλείψατο, βαλανεῖον οὐκ ἐχρήσατο. οὗτος ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας κατέστη, τὰ δὲ γόνατα αὐτοῦ ἦσαν ἀπεσκληρότα ὡς καμήλου ἐκ τοῦ ἀεὶ κάμπτειν ἑαυτὸν καὶ τῷ θεῷ προσκυνεῖν. The above statement appears also in Georgius Monachus, *Chronicon*, vol. 1, p. 378; John of Damascus, *Haeresibus* 19, vol. 4, p. 25, also stated that the "Nassariaioi" abstained from eating the flesh of any living creature.

followed by the above Early Christians, but was named a Nazorean simply because he came from a place called Nazareth? At this point I would also like to question whether some Christians like Eusebius, Epiphanius, the Greek *Matthew* or their possible interpolators, had any reasons to conceal or alter the information that Jesus was a dedicated Nazoraioi/Naziraios to God. Was there anything wrong with this? Interestingly, according to Theodoretus of Cyrus (*fl.* 5th c.) the Ναζωραῖοι used Peter's Gospel and "honoured Jesus as a just man,"<sup>594</sup> meaning that they were heretics who did not worship a deified and resurrected Jesus. My question here is how could the Church accept that Jesus was one of those heretics?<sup>595</sup> Could this explain why some in the Church made extensive efforts to disassociate Jesus from the Nazir tradition, or are there any more reasons to explain why certain Christians preferred the Nazareth rather than the Nazir version to call Jesus a Nazorean?

Professor Matthew Black (1908-1994), although based on limited primary references to Nazoreans, contrary to the majority of scholars came to the conclusion that 'the oldest root of the Christian movement in Galilee is to be sought in a group of dedicated Nazirites, sectarians who continued the ancient Israelite institution of the life long Nazirate.'<sup>596</sup> So far, I have seen enough evidence from the analysis of the above sources to make me agree with Black that Jesus and his followers were strongly associated to the religious Israelite Nazorean/Nazirite tradition.

---

<sup>594</sup> *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* PG 83.389.5-10.

<sup>595</sup> Cf. Epiphanius, *Doctrina*, p. 272 (Nazaraioi heretics).

<sup>596</sup> Black, *Scrolls*, pp. 81-83 (NT and Epiphanius); 167.

### 2.3: Essenes or Christians?

A *Dead Sea (Qumran) Scroll* fragment dated in the early first century refers to a Messiah who will come to support the poor, cure the blind, the paralysed, the wounded, and raise the dead.<sup>597</sup> The similarity between this Essene Messiah and Jesus is more than striking.

Professor of Old Testament Criticism and Interpretation John J. Collins concluded that there is no evidence of any notable Messianic movement before the rise of the Qumran community,<sup>598</sup> which is widely accepted as Essene.<sup>599</sup> Most probably, the very first prophecy about the arrival of a Messiah is made in the *Torah*, *Numbers* 24:17, where a resurrected star-descendant of Jacob will come to crush certain enemies.<sup>600</sup> There is evidence that some Israelites believed that this Star-Messiah was David, and were eager to establish David's dynasty, hoping that this will secure a glorious future for Israel. In *II Samuel*<sup>601</sup> God promised David that He would establish his descendants on the throne of Israel forever. This did not happen, but *Isaiah* 11 maintained that a descendant of Jesse (the father of David) will exterminate the wicked and bring justice upon earth. The members of the Qumran community who perceived themselves "as the sole

---

<sup>597</sup> Vermes, *Scrolls*, p. 253. Cf. Dodd, *History*, pp. 89-90, just like the majority of scholars, rejects that there was a connection between Jesus and the Essenes.

<sup>598</sup> John J. Collins, 'Messianism in the Maccabean Period,' in Neusner, *Judaisms*, pp. 97-109 at 106; The majority of scholars accept that the Qumran community was formulated mainly by monastic Essenes.

<sup>599</sup> Although Geza Vermes did not identify the Essenes with the Christians, he observed that they both had Messianic expectations from their leaders and believed that the prophecies of the Bible 'were fulfilled in the persons and events of their own community': Vermes, *Scrolls*, p. 65. The most significant references to the Essenes appear in Josephus, Philo, Hippolytos of Rome, Epiphanius and John Chrysostom. Harvey Falk accepts that the *Talmud*, too, does provide information about the Essenes. See Falk, *Jesus*, pp. 39-69, 129: that some of Hillel's (fl. first half of first c. CE) disciples joined the Essenes some time before or during the times of Jesus.

<sup>600</sup> *Numbers* 24:17: ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ιακωβ, καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ισραὴλ καὶ θραύσει τοὺς ἀρχηγούς Μωαβ καὶ προνομεύσει πάντας υἱοὺς Σηθ.

<sup>601</sup> 7:12-16.

true representatives of biblical Israel,"<sup>602</sup> believed that this Messiah would be one of their own, a descendant of David, and was meant to prevail by military means.<sup>603</sup>

The Christians, just like the Essenes, believed that their Messiah was a proper descendant of David, and this explains why the *New Testament*, in a number of instances, emphasises that Jesus was of Davidic descent.<sup>604</sup> Regardless whether this theory has a historical ground, what matters is that there were many Israelites, at least in the first century, who believed it. A first problem with this theory is that, as far as I have seen in the *Old Testament*, all descendants of David who could claim the throne of Israel, apart from one boy, were massacred by the orders of the queen/princess Gotholia (r. c.842-835) who was

---

<sup>602</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, 'Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters,' in Neusner, *Judaisms*, pp. 111-137 at 117 (quotation above). Idem, p. 122-123 (cites a number of Qumran documents on the arrival of the Messiah). Talmon does not make an reference to the similarities between the Community, who called themselves "Yahad" (Commune), and Christianity; Berger, *Qumran*, p. 86 (Davidic Messianism in certain Qumran scrolls); Craig A. Evans, 'The recently published Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus', in Chilton-Evans, pp. 547-565, the whole article on the messianic aspects of certain Qumran texts.

<sup>603</sup> Hengel, *Zeloten*, pp. 275-276, Hengel cites Qumranic evidence on the Davidic origin of the Messiah who will be accepted; p. 277, Hengel cites an article in Hebrew by Yigael Yadin which states that the War Scroll contains "precise military regulations", most probably deriving from a Hellenistic army manual. pp. 279, Hengel cites *War Scroll* 2.7 and 17.7 that Israel would rule over all peoples; p. 281, Hengel concludes that the *War Scroll*, regardless of its Essene origin, is "completely Zealot". He also observed that there are samples of four different manuscripts which contain it, and he took this as a sign of its importance. Cf. *Psalms of David* 68:21-23 attributed to David, is clear that "God will shatter the heads of his enemies," he will bathe his feet in their blood and feed his dogs with their flesh; William M. Schniedewind, 'The Davidic Dynasty and Biblical Interpretation in Qumran Literature,' in Schiffman, *Dead*, pp. 82-91 (David).

<sup>604</sup> *Luke* 1:32-33; *Matthew* 1:1-16, 9:27, 12:23, 15:22, 20:30-31, 21:9, 21:15, 22:42. *Luke* 3:23-38, 1:24; 1:69, 2.4, 18.38-39, 20:41-42. *Mark* 10:47-48: Jesus, son of David, 11:10; *Acts* 13:22; *Romans* 15:12; *The Didachē* in *Apostolic Fathers* 9.2, p. 322: "the Holy Wine of David" and 10.6, p. 324: "Hossanna to the God of David"; Julius Afr., *Epistula*, p. 55 (Joseph, the father of Christ, was David's descendant); *Matthew* 1 and *Luke* 3 provide different family trees. Cf. R. Williams, 'An Illustration of Historical Inquiry: Histories of Jesus and *Matthew* 1.1-25,' *BDT*, pp. 105-123 at 120-122: (there is no historical evidence for Jesus being of Davidic lineage and that such a story could have been made after his death; the argument that Jesus was an illegitimate child).

not a believer of the One God but of Baal.<sup>605</sup> Whether that boy survived in the long term or not, or whether the survival of a single successor was invented in order to perpetuate Davidic Messianic hopes, is not clear. What is clear is that there is a Christian tradition which emphasises that Jesus was a descendant of Jesse, the father of David,<sup>606</sup> and the question here is whether certain Christians became aware of the above story that David hardly had any surviving ancestors, and tried to link Jesus with David through the ancestry of his father Jesse. It is important to observe here that the Essene *Book of War*<sup>607</sup> highlights the importance of the "shoot from the stump of Jesse" in *Isaiah*<sup>608</sup> and explains that this is the Branch of David.<sup>609</sup> Jesse had other sons, but it is not clear whether they had any ancestors who managed to survive the enemies of David. I have also observed that David had two important wives, Ahinoam of Jezreel and Abigail of Carmel.<sup>610</sup> According to the OT, the paternal and maternal families of those two women were prominent figures who controlled certain areas in the North, and my question here is whether such families were able to offer refuge to David's relatives, the descendants of Jesse who managed to survive. The reason I raise such a question is because I have observed that the area known as Jesus's birth place, as well as most places Jesus Christ visited, are located in the region where the above two wives of David came from: north of mount Tabor, east of mount Carmel and west of the Sea of Galilee. These areas include the

---

<sup>605</sup> Γοθολία in *Sept. Regnorum iv* 11.1, vol. 1, p. 718. Cf. *Sept. Paralipomenon II* 22:10-11, vol. 1, p. 844. She is also known as Athaliah.

<sup>606</sup> Julius Afr., *Epistula*, p. 55; Origen, *Selecta in Psalmos*, PG 12, 1109, repeated the passage ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης Ἰεσσαῖ from *Isaiah* 11, in order to emphasise that Christ was descendant of Jesse; For a similar argument see Oecumenius (fl. c.6<sup>th</sup> cent.), *Commentarius in Apokalypsin*, ed. H. C. Hoskier, *The complete commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse* (Michigan, 1928), p. 78. Oecumenius is clear on Jesus's ancestry from Jesse; L.H. Feldman, 'Josephus' Portrait of David', *Hebrew College Annual LX* (1989), pp. 129-174, disregards the above evidence. Based on his interpretation of the incidence in *Matthew* 22:41-45 and *Luke* 20:41-44, and on the doubts some raised in *John* 7:41-42, he claims that Jesus Christ did not have Davidic ancestry; Also see Eisler, *Messiah*, pp. 320-330, on Jesus Ben David.

<sup>607</sup> Preserved in two scrolls, 4Q285 and 11Q14.

<sup>608</sup> 10:34-11:1.

<sup>609</sup> Flint, 'Jesus,' p. 129 (interestingly, also mentions the corpses of the Kittim).

<sup>610</sup> *Sept. Samuel (Regnorum) I*, 25:38-43, ed. cit., vol. 1, p. 554; 27:3, vol. 1, p. 557.

Valley (Geza) of Jesse, also known as Valley of Jezreel, which is located northeast of mount Carmel, in the lower Galilee region. This valley is also known as the Plain of Esdrēlōn.<sup>611</sup> My hypothesis here, is that this region could have been named as Valley of Jesse because some descendants of Jesse settled there, but it may be impossible to prove this. It is also not clear why exactly the Northern Kingdom of the believers of God was named Israel, and the meaning of the name Israel is also not clear.<sup>612</sup> However, in my opinion, the resemblance in the pronunciation of Israel and Jezreel, and the location of Jezreel the Valley of Jesse in the North is an indication which deserves to be further investigated by those who specialise in earlier periods than mine. Not only the meaning of Israel remains obscure, but scholars are also puzzled by the origin of the name of the Essenes.<sup>613</sup> There is no exact term known that was used by the Essenes to define themselves. The name Essenes does not exist in their literature. It should be clear that the anglicised word 'Essenes' derives from the grecicised word *Essēnoi* (Ἐσσηνοί) of Hebrew or Aramaic origin, first used by Josephus.<sup>614</sup> *Essēnoi* in turn is the vernacular form of the grecicised word *Essaioi* (Ἐσσαῖοι, also written as Ἰεσσαῖοι in *Panarion*).<sup>615</sup> Philo preferred the grammatically

---

<sup>611</sup> *Sept. Judith* 1:8, ed. cit., vol. 1, p. 974.

<sup>612</sup> Because of *Genesis* 32:29 it is widely accepted that the name Israel derives was given to Jacob. However, it is not clear what Israel means. See Harvey, *True Israel*, pp. 148-188: different explanations on the meaning of Israel; pp. 148, 154, 166: (Israel, the northern kingdom)

<sup>613</sup> The etymology provided by Vermes-Goodman, *Essenes*, pp. 1-2, is unaware of the Jesse theory but examines the root-words *hosioi* (Greek), *hasid* (Hebrew) and *hase* (Syriac); Ellegård, *Jesus*, pp. 98-99, on the theory that the name of the Essenes derives from the Aramaic *hasēn*, meaning pious. Its plural is *Hassidim*; Zeitlin, *Rise*, pp. 91-92, accepts that those who opposed the policies of Epiphanēs were Essenes, and that the Christians later followed their example of martyrdom. Cf. Zeitlin, 'Essenes,' pp. 87-88, on the name of Essenes deriving, most probably, from *Hassidim*. (take this together with others in fns above). Most probably, Zeitlin accepted that the *Hassidim* who followed Judas Macc. were Essenes. So far it has not been proved that the *Hassidim* is a synonym to Essenes. Pritz, too, in his *Nazarene* pp. 40-42, does not find a linguistic connection between *Iessaioi* and *Essaioi*.

<sup>614</sup> *Bel.* 2.119, vol. 6, p. 176; 2.158, vol. 6, p. 184.

<sup>615</sup> Used by Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp. 322, 325, 326. Depending on different spelling preferences they are also known as Ὅσσαῖοι (e.g., *Panarion*, vol. 1, p. 226) or Ὅσσηνοί (e.g., Epiphanius, *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 168).

correct Ἑσσαῖοι than the vernacular Ἑσσηνοὶ adopted by Josephus,<sup>616</sup> who used the correct Ἑσσαῖοι only once.<sup>617</sup> Both words, the vernacular Essēnoi and the correct Essaiοι, are the plural of the grecicised word Essaios (Ἑσσαῖος). The *Panarion* provides an explanation that the Essenes, whom Epiphanius named as Ἑσσαῖοι, were called as such because they were Jesse's (Ἰεσσαί) descendants.<sup>618</sup> Although it is hard to prove such a connection between the Essenes and Jesse on the basis of Epiphanius's statement, one should take into account that Jesse is pronounced 'Yishai' in Hebrew. This name transliterated in Greek becomes Ἰεσσαί, and its plural becomes Ἑσσαῖοι. There is a resemblance here with Ἑσσαῖοι, but this is not strong enough evidence to convince that some of the Essenes were Jesse's descendants.

There is wide acceptance of the hypothesis first raised by Professor Geza Vermes (1924-2013) that the Essenes first appear in the scenes during the second century BCE. This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that the coins discovered by archaeologists in Qumran indicate that this area was inhabited from the second century BCE.<sup>619</sup> Vermes, based on the *Damascus Document*<sup>620</sup> of the *Qumran Scrolls*,<sup>621</sup> argued that the Essenes appear for the first time as

---

<sup>616</sup> Philo, *Quod omnis* 75, vol. 6, pp. 21-22; *Hypothetica sive Apologia pro Judaeis*, 7.11, ed. Gifford in F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, *Philo*, 12 vols (Loeb: London, 1921-1962), vol. 9, p. 436.

<sup>617</sup> *Ant.*, 15.371-372, vol. 3, p. 399, where one sees both types of the same name, one after the other. For the use of the singular Essaios see examples in *Ant.* 17.346, vol. 4, p. 135; *Bel.* 1.78, vol. 6, p. 19.

<sup>618</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp. 321-325: ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ Ἑσσαῖοι διὰ τὸν Ἰεσσαί,

<sup>619</sup> Lenzman, *L' origine*, p. 125. See also Flint, 'Jesus,' p. 110, carbon 14 tests date the manuscripts between 250 BCE to 68 CE. Some of the manuscripts could have been produced before Qumran was inhabited.

<sup>620</sup> The *Damascus Document* survives in fragments. It was found among the *Qumran Scrolls*.

<sup>621</sup> Vermes, *Scrolls*, pp. 26, 54-60. C. Sirat, *Hebrew manuscripts of the Middle Ages*, ed. N. De Lange (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 20-26, the earliest surviving samples of ancient Israelite writings are those discovered in 1947 in the Dead Sea region; Golb, *Who wrote*, p. 383, the scrolls did not necessarily belong to the Essenes. Idem, pp. 151-171, on the controversy regarding the origin of the scrolls; Idem, p. 151, concludes that not a single Qumran text, apart from the Copper Scrolls, is an original autograph; Idem, p. 152, 400-500 different scribes/ hands produced the Qumran texts.



followers of a certain 'Teacher of Righteousness.'<sup>622</sup> However, it should be noted here that this evidence does not exclude the possibility that the above group who followed the anonymous 'Teacher of Righteousness,' was already linked to Essenism. Contrary to the widely accepted hypothesis raised by Vermes, the *Antiquities* and *De Bello* are clear that the Essenes pre-existed from times immemorial and that they were one of the three ancient 'philosophical' schools of Israel, the other two being the Pharisees and the Sadducees.<sup>623</sup> Hippolytus of Rome in his *Refutatio omnium haeresium* also claimed that the Essenes antedated all other people in the knowledge of the divine, and the Greeks copied them.<sup>624</sup> The *Antiquities* also provide a statement which indicates the opposite, that the Essenes followed a certain life-style taught by the Greek Pythagoras,<sup>625</sup> but this source does not explain when or how the Essenes came to know the Pythagoreans. Some scholars also question whether the statements made by Philo and Josephus, which idealised the society of the Essenes, were made under the influence of Iambulus's utopian *Islands of the Sun* community,<sup>626</sup> but regardless of any objections on whether certain information about the Essenes has fictional rather than historical value, or has been modelled upon other idealist Gentile societies, there are further strong indications that the Essenes

---

<sup>622</sup> This is the translation of "Moreh Zedekh," see Ellegård, *Jesus*, p. 108.

<sup>623</sup> *Ant.*, 18.20, p. 143; *Bel.* 2, 119, p. 176.

<sup>624</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9. 27, p. 372: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερα τούτων δόγματα πολλὰ οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων <σοφοί> σφετερισάμενοι ἰδίας δόξας συνεστήσαντο· ἔστι γὰρ ἡ κατὰ τούτους ἀσκήσις περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀρχαιοτέρα πάντων ἐθνῶν.

<sup>625</sup> *Ant.* 15.371, vol. 3, p. 399. : ἀφείθησαν δὲ ταύτης τῆς ἀνάγκης καὶ οἱ παρ' ἡμῖν Ἑσσαῖοι καλούμενοι· γένος δὲ τοῦτ' ἔστιν διαίτη χρώμενον τῇ παρ' Ἑλλήσιν ὑπὸ Πυθαγόρου καταδεδειγμένη. On similarities between the Essenes and the Pythagoreans see J. Taylor, *Pythagoreans and the Essenes, Structural Parallels* (Paris, 2004), pp. 15-17 (possessions in common); pp. 19-20 (both regarded the outsiders as impure); pp. 20-22 (probation and preparation for the entry in the sect); pp. 25-26 (both formed groups of ten and made similar preparations for dining); p. 27 (both used white linen); p. 28 (both performed rituals during sunrise); Vermes-Goodman, *Essenes*, pp. 32-33.

<sup>626</sup> D. Mendels, *Identity, Religion and Historiography: Studies in Hellenistic History* (Sheffield, 1998), pp. 420-439, on Iambulus's (fl. 2<sup>nd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE) *Islands of the Sun* and that his utopian presentation of a certain community which lived there could have influenced the way Philo and Josephus idealized the community of the Essenes. M. A. Beavis, 'Philo's Therapeutai: Philosopher's Dream or Utopian Construction?', *JSP* 14.1 (2004), pp. 30-42.

were in fact a historical branch of Israel.

Leaving aside all information provided by the above ancient sources that the Essenes pre-existed since time immemorial, Vermes observed that the *Damascus Document* reports that the group which followed the Teacher became distinct from the rest of Israel about 393 years after the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Jerusalem. This is c.196 BCE. According to the same source, twenty years later this particular group<sup>627</sup> followed the anonymous 'Teacher of Righteousness,' who had a dispute with a 'wicked' High Priest. The *Damascus Document* provides only two clues about the identity of that anonymous High Priest: a) that he was 'wicked' and b) that he 'experienced God's vengeance at the hands of the chief of the Kings of Greece.' Vermes concluded that the 'wicked' High Priest most probably was the Hasmonean King Jonathan (161-143 BCE) because two events from his life fulfil the two criteria/clues mentioned in the *Damascus Document*: a) that Jonathan was not a legitimate successor of the High Priest throne but was a usurper who broke the Sadducee tradition and therefore could be called 'wicked'; and b) that he was murdered by a Greek King.<sup>628</sup> Vermes based his conclusion on the information *I* and *II Maccabees* provide about Jonathan, but I also observed that the same sources indicate that this 'wicked' High Priest may not have been Jonathan but Menelaos, executed not long before Jonathan on the orders of King Antiochos Eupatōr soon after the death of his father Antiochos Epiphanēs. The officer who

---

<sup>627</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*, p. 92, argued that the Essene movement evolved into at least four different groups or branches: those of Qumran, the married Essenes living in Jewish communities, the Palestinian Tertiaries, and the Therapeutai in Egypt.

<sup>628</sup> Vermes, *Scrolls*, pp. 19, 54-60. Milik, *Ten years*, p. 59 (the 'Teacher of Righteousness' leader of the Hassidim group, founder of the Essene monastic movement, most probably a legitimate candidate for the High Priesthood). Also see Black, *Scrolls*, p. 164: "according to rabbinical tradition, the earliest Hassidim were all Nazirites." According to Milik, the *Damascus Document* is sympathetic to the Assideans (Hassidim) who joined the struggle initiated by Mattathias. Cf. García Martínez, *Textos*, p. iv, who is of the opinion that the 'Wicked Priest' in *Habakkuk Pesher* has nothing to do with any of the second century BCE High Priests; p. 199: the *Habakkuk Pesher* refers to a "Man of Lies" as opponent to the Teacher of Righteousness.

carried the execution of Menelaos was general Lysias, a close friend of Epiphanēs, who during that period was considered to be the strongest King of the entire Middle East. Lysias was associated with Epiphanēs rather than with Epiphanēs's successors Eupatōr and Dēmētrios Sōtēr Seleucos. Therefore, I could argue here that Menelaos was exterminated by a general of the famous Greek King (Epiphanēs) 'the chief of the Kings of Greece,' but Jonathan was murdered by the relatively unknown usurper Tryphōn. In this sense, I find Vermes's conclusion not to be in accordance to the *Damascus Document* information that the "wicked" High Priest died during the reign of a famous Greek king. Furthermore, I would also like to point out here that although the dates in the *Damascus Document* have been dismissed by certain scholars as inaccurate and 'literal,' the date in the *Damascus Document* with reference to the departure of the 'Teacher of Righteousness' c.179 BCE, is just seven years before Menelaos became High Priest. This is a far closer date to Menelaos rather than to Jonathan, who became High priest c. 153-152 BCE. This is a second point which brings Menelaos rather than Jonathan closer to the *Damascus Document* information. There is also evidence that Menelaos could have been even more "wicked" than Jonathan because he plotted to murder the legitimate High Priest Onias III, deposed High Priest Jason and prevented the legitimate successor Onias IV from maintaining the throne. The High Priest Alkimos could also be included in the list of legitimate candidates that Menelaos overpowered. Moreover, according to the *Maccabees*, Menelaos was the High Priest who assisted King Antiochos Epiphanēs in plundering the treasures of the Temple and who became the leader of the oppressive regime appointed by the Greek King to suppress Israel. Therefore, there is a serious possibility that the 'Teacher of Righteousness' mentioned in the *Damascus Document* was one of the circle of the legitimate successors or eminent people who survived Menelaos's menace, and had to flee away from Jerusalem.<sup>629</sup> A number of different political parties

---

<sup>629</sup> Gmirkin, 'The War,' pp. 491-492, also sees Menelaos as the possible wicked priest, but

emerged within Israel during Menelaos's reign and it is possible that the followers of the 'Teacher of Righteousness' left their homes during those times of turmoil, civil unrest and violent confrontation.

Simōn was a third High Priest who was also executed by a Greek leader,<sup>630</sup> but regardless of who exactly the 'Wicked' High Priest was, there is sufficient ground to agree that the departure of the 'Teacher of Righteousness' and his followers took place, most probably, some time between c.172 and c.135 BCE, when the three aforementioned High Priests reigned. This is the period when the *Maccabees* books narrate that the "Maccabees Martyrs" the so-called first Christian Martyrs, were active.

In the eighteenth century Humphrey Prideaux (1678-1724) attacked certain 'infidel Deists' and 'Romanists' of his time because they associated the Essenes with the first Christians.<sup>631</sup> Although such views against the relation between the Essenes and Christianity remain predominant, since the 'infidel Deists' and 'Romanists' there were more scholars who claimed that Jesus was instructed by the Essenes or that there was a relation between Christianity and the Essenes.<sup>632</sup>

---

without presenting material for this case.

<sup>630</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*, pp. 74-83, argued that the 'wicked' High Priest was either Jonathan or Simon.

<sup>631</sup> H. Prideaux, *The Old and New Testament connected in the History of the Jews and Neighbouring Nations, from the Declension of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah to the Time of Christ*, 2 vols. (London, 1717-1718), vol. 2, p. 284 ("infidel deists"). Lord Herbert of Cherbury (d. 1648) is considered by scholars as being the first Deist; Prideaux, *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 282, attacked the 'Romanists' Bellarmin (Roberto Bellarmino 1542-1621) and Baronius (Cesare Baronio, 1538-1607), who claimed that the *Therapeutai* were Christians.

<sup>632</sup> K. H. Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des grossen Propheten von Nazareth*, 3 vols (Bethlehem, 1800), vol. 1, pp. 104-111, also linked the Essenes with Christianity; Weitling, p. 59, was aware of the theory that Jesus and John were Essenes, and he did not discard it; Kissinger, *The Lives*, p. 17 (Bahrdt and Venturini); Flint, 'Jesus,' p. 111-112, Karl Bahrdt (1790). Flint, most probably, made a mistake that Renan associated Jesus to the Essenes. Edmund Wilson (1955), Charles Francis Potter (1962) and André Dupont-Sommer, supported that Jesus was an Essene. William LaSor also investigated some similarities between Jesus and a spiritual leader of the Essenes; Barnard, 'The origins,' pp. 164-165 on the affinity between the Christians of Edessa and the Qumran community; Ellegård, *Jesus*, p. 3, identifies early Christians with Essenes.

The debate on this issue continues,<sup>633</sup> but to the best of my knowledge, no convincing work has been published yet to identify Essenism with Christianity. It is noteworthy that in 2007 Pope Benedict XVI did not exclude the possibility that the founder of Christianity and his family were associated with the Essenes.<sup>634</sup> Although the Pope did not provide any analysis or references to support this statement, made in a book addressed to the wider public and not to academics, certain Catholic researchers have officially conducted long lasting and important research on the *Dead Sea Scrolls*.<sup>635</sup> Although there are arguments that the research on the *Scrolls* is not complete,<sup>636</sup> many scholars have already made their mind that there was no relation between the Essenes and the Early Christians,<sup>637</sup> but they, too, to the best of my knowledge, have not produced any convincing scholarly work to prove their case.

One of the main arguments of those who cannot see any continuity or relation between Essenism and Christianity is that they find no evidence that any monastic communities existed after the destruction of the Essenes by the Romans in the first century CE, and that Christian monasticism first appeared

---

<sup>633</sup> S. Rubenson, 'Christian Asceticism and the Emergence of the Monastic Tradition', pp. 49-57, in *Asceticism*, eds V. L. Wimbush and R. Valantasis (Oxford, 1995), p. 50: "The precise origins and earliest development of monasticism ... is still a matter of scholarly dispute". Cf. Humphries, *Early*, p. 200, finds only some similarity between Essene and Christian asceticism and no further links between the two.

<sup>634</sup> Pope Benedict XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth, from the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration* (London, 2007), p. 14: "it appears that not only John the Baptist, but possibly Jesus and his family as well, were close to the Qumran community."

<sup>635</sup> E.g. Fitzmyer, Milik and Daniélou examined below. Berger, *Qumran*, p. 6, attacks a number of Catholic *Qumran Scrolls* scholars in an extreme and unjustifiable way: "They became alcoholics or lost their minds, left their monastic orders, fell out with their (Catholic) Church, or married (despite being priests)... Almost all these persons were and are cursed with scholarly sterility."

<sup>636</sup> Berger, *Qumran*, pp. 7-8: "have not been compared to the *New Testament* in any thorough and systematic way."

<sup>637</sup> Berger, *Qumran*, p. 105; Cf. Idem pp. 94-95, on the similarities between *NT* and *Qumran Scrolls* on the understanding of the Holy Spirit. Golb, *Who wrote*, p. 373 (the *Scrolls* say nothing about early Christianity); Feldman, *Josephus*, pp. 634-637; See also Meier, *Marginal*, vol. 3, p. 293, that the Essenes perceived themselves as proper Israel but there is no connection between Essenes and Christians. Idem vol. 3, pp. 493-532, for certain similarities and differences between the Essenes and Jesus.

two hundred years later in Egypt. There are several indications which point to the case that such an argument may not be as valid as previously thought. For example, the *Acts*<sup>638</sup> clearly state that four of the daughters of Apostle Philipp were virgin prophetesses and my question here is why should one not regard these four as a monastic community? I would also like to question why the Christian author of *Revelation*<sup>639</sup> expressed admiration for 144,000 celibate pure men, if he did not have a high esteem for the Israelite Essene/ Nazorean tradition? Contrary to those who cannot see any Christian monasticism in the first two centuries, Professor John C. O'Neill (1930-2003), argued that according to early evidence in Justin and Hermas, certain followers of Jesus remained celibate,<sup>640</sup> and Professor John C. O'Neill concluded that Early Christian Monasticism was a continuity of the Essene tradition and did not start with Antony and Pachomius in the fourth century CE, as most scholars claim.<sup>641</sup> Eusebius also states that some Christian *therapeutai* (another term for the Essenes) who followed Mark in Egypt were ascetic, virgin, shared all their income with their fellow Christians, were literate, lived all over the ancient world and followed the teachings of the Apostles.<sup>642</sup> It is evident that celibacy is a Nazorean or Essene Israelite aspect which continued in Christianity but not

---

<sup>638</sup> 21:8-9.

<sup>639</sup> 14:3-4.

<sup>640</sup> O'Neill, 'The origins,' p. 283 on a community of virgins in Hermas (various references to this community in *Similitude* 9). In my opinion the evidence from Justin and Hermas do point to custom of celibacy followed by certain Early Christians, but does not prove the existence of monastic communities.

<sup>641</sup> O'Neill, 'Origins,' pp. 270-287 about the continuity between Christian monasticism and Essenes.

<sup>642</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.*, 2.16-17, vol. 1, pp. 72-77: δι' ἀσκήσεως φιλοσοφωτάτης τε καὶ σφοδροτάτης, ὡς καὶ γραφῆς αὐτῶν ἀξιῶσαι τὰς διατριβὰς... θεραπευτὰς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰς σὺν αὐτοῖς γυναῖκας θεραπευτρίδας ἀποκαλεῖσθαί φησιν ... μηδαμῶς τῆς Χριστιανῶν πω προσήρσεως ἀνὰ πάντα τόπον ἐπιπεφημισμένης ... πάντες οἱ τῶν ἀποστόλων γνώριμοι τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις διαπιπράσκοντες ἐμέριζον ἅπασιν καθ' ὃ ἂν τις χρεῖαν εἶχεν... παρθένοι τυγχάνουσιν; Griggs, *Early*, pp. 19-22, disputes the relation between the Therapeutai and Mark and also questions the lack of information on what happened to the Alexandrian Church from the middle of the first century up to the second half of the second century.

in Judaism.<sup>643</sup>

One more striking similarity between Essenism and Christianity is that although the Jerusalem Temple authorities followed a lunar calendar from the second century BCE onwards,<sup>644</sup> both Essenism and Christianity appear to be linked to a different tradition centred around the importance of the sun.<sup>645</sup> Jean Daniélou, on the basis of his study of the *Scrolls*, argued that the Essenes always faced East while praying, and this is in contrast with the tradition of other Jews who prayed facing Jerusalem.<sup>646</sup> Also, *De Bello* states that the Essenes were awake each morning to witness the rising of the sun while praying.<sup>647</sup> Similarly, while in Mount Athos I observed that according to the Orthodox Christian monastic tradition, the sun rise should find the monks praying. I have also observed that Orthodox Church architecture places the *sancta sanctorum* always facing East, providing a narrow small window, the κόγχη, from where the rising of the sun is observed by the priest. In my opinion, the above tradition of facing the sun instead of Jerusalem is one more striking similarity between Christianity and Essenism which distinguishes them from other Israelites. In the course of my research on the historical identity of the Early Christians, I became aware not only of the above striking similarities between Christianity

---

<sup>643</sup> On similarities between Paul and the Qumran teachings on purity, see M. Newton, *The concept of purity at Qumran and in the letters of Paul* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 49-51, 97. See also E. A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton, 1999), pp. 259-329, on Paul's influence to the Church on asceticism. Cf. Naomi Kolturn-Fromm, 'Zipporah's Complaint: Moses is Not Conscientious in the Deed! Exegetical Traditions of Moses' Celibacy,' in Becker-Reed, pp. 283-306. This essay does not examine the Essenes.

<sup>644</sup> Meier, *Marginal*, vol. 3, p. 529.

<sup>645</sup> Ellegård, *Jesus*, p. 58 (on the importance of Sunday). Cf. Daniélou, *Les manuscripts*, pp. 23-25: According to the Eastern Christian tradition, the day changes after the sunset and not at 12 pm. Therefore, Tuesday evening is considered to be the first part of Wednesday. Daniélou adopted the view first presented by A. Jaubert, that the Essenes used an old diary, and the Last Supper is a copy of the meals in Qumran; Golb, *Who wrote*, pp. 371-372, on the striking similarities between the communal meals, as described in the *Manual of Discipline* and the *Messianic Rule*, and the Last Supper; Cf. Fitzmyer, *Essays*, pp. 298, Fitzmyer does not find satisfactory evidence that this was a religious Essene meal.

<sup>646</sup> Daniélou, *Les manuscripts*, p. 39.

<sup>647</sup> *Bel*. 2.128, vol. 6, p. 178.

and Essenism (Davidic-Jesse tradition, celibacy and the importance of the sun), but also of the following:

## 1. The Texts

A number of scholars have observed that various Essene texts contain very similar or identical passages and phrases to certain NT material and various Gnostic Christian works.<sup>648</sup> Some other scholars perceive *Joseph and Aseneth* (1st BCE to 2nd CE) as an Essene work that has been appropriated by Christians.<sup>649</sup> In addition, the *Community Rule* of the Essenes, found among the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, bears strong similarities, in terms of both content and style, with the early Christian *Didachē*.<sup>650</sup> Furthermore, the *Dead Sea Scrolls* contain some parts

---

<sup>648</sup> Fitzmyer, *Essays*, p. 5 (the *Apocalypse* and the *Qumran War Scroll*); pp. 8-16 and 53 (abundance of introductory formulae/phrases used both in the NT in and the Qumran literature in Hebrew. Fitzmyer observed that these formulae have been used in a much lesser extent in *Misnah*); p. 59 and pp. 76-89 (4Q*Testimonia* papyrus fragment contains a small collection an OT florilegio. Fitzmyer presents evidence that the NT does contain passages also used in 4Q *Testimonia*); pp. 93-104, 113-126, 187-204 (on further phrases used in Hebrew/Aramaic in the same way and with the same meaning as they have been used in *Synopsis*); pp. 205-217; 281-283 (Fitzmyer has no doubts that the *Acts* have Essene influences); Fujita, *Crack*, pp. 126-129 (common literary formulae in the NT (especially *Matthew*) and certain Qumran works); Betz-Riesner, pp. 152-156 (NT-Qumran). Cf. Flint, 'Jesus,' p. 112 (regardless the similarities Flint concludes that the Scrolls were not written by Christians); R. McL. Wilson. 'Gnostic Origins', *Vig. Chr.* 9 (1955), pp. 193-211 at 201-202, with reference to Friedlander and Thomas who argued that Gnosticism does have Essene roots. See also A. Welburn, *The Beginnings of Christianity, Essene mystery, Gnostic revelation and the Christian vision* (Edinburgh, 1991), pp. 88-94: Christian Gnosticism is directly related to Essene traditions; G. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1965<sup>2</sup>), pp. 65-74, on the strong relationship between Christian and Jewish Gnosticism.

<sup>649</sup> Randall D. Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion of Joseph and Aseneth* (Sheffield, 1995), pp. 32-35.

<sup>650</sup> Vermes, *Scrolls*, p. 71, regards *Didachē* and *Didaskalia* as two different works, while in fact they are one and the same; Milik, *Ten years*, p. 118, finds remarkable similarities between Essene texts, the Christian *Didachē* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*; P. F. Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds, Social-scientific approaches to New Testament interpretation* (London, 1994), pp. 70-71, based on the study of the *Community Rule*, concluded that the notion of dualism (God "prince of lights" and Satan, "angel of darkness") did exist among the Qumran society and was followed by Christianity. This tradition was followed by Christianity but not by Judaism. Also see Charles Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (Oxford, 1886), pp. 29-30 on Plutarch's Gnostic dualism (Ormuzd-Good, Ahriman-Dark), and the acceptance of this tradition by Christian Gnostics; Lenzman, *L' origine*, p. 125, finds no relation between the "Community Rule" of the Essenes and early Christianity. See also J. L. Teicher, 'The Teaching of the pre-



of certain *Apocrypha* which have not been preserved by Judaism but were included in the Christian *Septuagint*.<sup>651</sup> My question here is how could one explain all these similarities and parallels between Essene and Christian texts if there was no close relation between the Essenes and Christianity?

## 2. Apostles

Professor Jean Daniélou (1905-1974) pointed out that the twelve Apostles have an equivalent in the twelve members of the 'Council of God' in Essene communities, and the three Apostles closer to Jesus (Peter, Jacob and John) are an equivalent to the three priests who led the Essene Council.<sup>652</sup>

## 3. Coins

Hippolytos states that certain Essenes refused to enter a city whose gates were decorated with statues and they also refused to carry any coins in their hands for the reason that they bore images and therefore were objects related to idolatry.<sup>653</sup> I observed that in *Matthew* Jesus advised his disciples not to carry any money with them,<sup>654</sup> and my question here is whether he followed this particular Essene custom. If not, what is the explanation?

## 4. Melchizedek

In *Genesis* the priest-king Melchizedek of Jerusalem offered Abraham bread and wine,<sup>655</sup> which mirrors the Christian tradition of Holy Communion and the

---

Pauline Church in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *JJS* 4 (1953), pp. 1-13, on the similarities between Christian and Qumran terminology.

<sup>651</sup> Vermes, *Scrolls*, pp. 23-24.

<sup>652</sup> Daniélou, *Les manuscrits*, pp. 23-30; Cf. Funk, *Seminar*, pp. 70-72 (the Seminar sees *Mark* 3:13-19 on the 12 Apostles as a fabrication and not historical). See also Fitzmyer, *Essays*, pp. 293-294, on evidence that the Essenes too had bishops (*mbqr*, meaning *overseer*). There is no evidence of Bishops in the Early Church in Palestine. They appear for the first time in the *Acts* 20:28, *Phil.* 1:1; *I Tim.* 3:2, *Titus* 1:7.

<sup>653</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.26.1, p. 371.

<sup>654</sup> *Matthew* 10:9.

<sup>655</sup> *Genesis* 14:18-20.

sacred meal of the Essenes consisted of bread and wine.<sup>656</sup> This is exactly what Jesus Christ offered to his disciples in the Last Supper.<sup>657</sup> *Hebrews* also refers to Jesus Christ as a High Priest 'of the order of Melchizedek,'<sup>658</sup> and certain Essene literature points to the importance of the High Priest Melchizedek, who holds a prominent place in the Last Judgement and whose opponent will be Satan.<sup>659</sup> Is it a coincidence that both the Essene and the Christian traditions emphasize on this Melchizedek?

## 5. Thirty years old

The Essenes were regarded as coming of age, thus becoming eligible for membership in tribunals and assemblies, when they reached their thirtieth year.<sup>660</sup> *Luke*<sup>661</sup> and the *Evangelium Ebionitum*<sup>662</sup> make it clear that Jesus became a leader and started preaching only after he became thirty years old. Much later, the *Concilium Quinisextum* (692) also made it clear that priests should be thirty years of age or older.<sup>663</sup> Is this a tradition initiated by the Essenes?

## 6. Public confess and baptism

The Essenes, just like the Early Christians, before they were accepted as members of their community, confessed their sins (in public) and received

---

<sup>656</sup> Black, *Scrolls*, p. 76. Also see Milik, *Ten years*, pp. 105-106.

<sup>657</sup> *Mark* 26:26-28.

<sup>658</sup> In *Hebrews* 5:6 Paul quoted from *Sept. Psalm* 109 (110):4, vol. 2, p. 124, most probably with reference to king David: Σὺ εἶ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδεκ. Cf. *Hebrews*, 6:20-7:3: πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσηλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισέδεκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου,... The second part of the name Melchizedek derives from the name Zadok, also mentioned in Jesus's genealogy in *Matthew* 1:14. A king named Adoni-Zedek of Jerusalem is also mentioned in *Joshua* 10:1. See also *I Chronicles* 16:39 with reference to Zadok, a priest at the times of David.

<sup>659</sup> Fitzmyer, *Essays*, pp. 221-267, on Melchizedek in *Hebrews* 7:1 and the fragments in Qumran cave 11; Vermes, *Scrolls*, p. 303.

<sup>660</sup> Vermes, *Scrolls*, p. 41.

<sup>661</sup> *Luke* 3:23: Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα.

<sup>662</sup> *Evangelium Ebionitum* 2.5, trans Elliott, *Apocryphal*, p. 14: "And there was a man named Jesus, and he was about thirty years old".

<sup>663</sup> *Concilium Quinisextum*, Canon 14, p. 202.

baptism.<sup>664</sup> Daniélou also observed that both the Essenes and the Christians wore the same white garment Christians when baptised.<sup>665</sup> The resemblance here is striking. Contrary to Christianity, Judaism did not continue the Essene custom of Baptism.

## 7. Hospitality

According to *De Bello* the Essenes maintained hostels in many different places, where members of the sect offered hospitality to other members, some of whom they had never met before.<sup>666</sup> In *Matthew*, Jesus advised his Apostles that in every town or village they entered they should learn who were the 'worthy' there, and ask for hospitality only from these people.<sup>667</sup> The question here is whether Jesus asked them to find their fellow Essenes. If not, who were the 'worthy' willing to offer hospitality to strangers?

## 8. No luggage

*De Bello* reports that the Essenes did not take any luggage with them when travelling.<sup>668</sup> Similarly, in *Matthew* Jesus advised his Apostles not to take any luggage with them.<sup>669</sup>

## 9. Shared ownership

*De Bello* and the *Antiquities* report that the Essenes shared their belongings and their money without having any obligation to return what they owed.<sup>670</sup> I

---

<sup>664</sup> Black, *Scrolls*, p. 97. For the similar concepts between Christian and Essene baptism see Fujita, *Crack*, p. 111.

<sup>665</sup> Daniélou, *Les manuscrits*, p. 39. See also Milik, *Ten years*, p. 104. T. M. Finn, *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: West and East Syria, Message of the Fathers of the Church* vol. 5 (Collegeville, Min., 1992), pp. 71-72, 96, 109, on John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite stating that the baptised wear pure white garments.

<sup>666</sup> *Bel.* 2, 124-125, vol. 6, p. 177.

<sup>667</sup> *Matthew* 10:11.

<sup>668</sup> *Ant.*, 18.20, vol. 4, pp. 143-144.

<sup>669</sup> *Matthew* 10:10.

<sup>670</sup> *Bel.* 2.125-127, vol. 6, p. 177-178

believe that this should be juxtaposed to *Matthew*, where Jesus teaches the Lord's Prayer: *And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.*<sup>671</sup> In my opinion, this makes sense only among people living in a community that shared the same principles in borrowing from others. The *Acts*<sup>672</sup> make it clear that the Early Christians had everything in common, and they were selling their property to share the proceeds. *De Bello* also reports that the Essenes were given what they needed by the authorities of the sect. Their meals, held in common, were blessed by their clergy, while new Essene members had to take an oath of loyalty to the sect and offer their belongings to their leaders.<sup>673</sup> This echoes the incident in the *Acts*, also mentioned in my introduction, where Peter required certain Christians to sell their property and bestow him the proceeds.<sup>674</sup> My question here is whether Peter "Bariona" was an Essene leader.<sup>675</sup>

## 10. Monastic rules

Hippolytos reports that all monastic Essenes held a rank and in case of misdemeanour or misbehaviour they were punished by exclusion from common meals.<sup>676</sup> According to *De Bello* the Essenes did not swear and they prepared novices by placing them on a one-year probation before they were accepted as full members.<sup>677</sup> They avoided physical contact with others and covered their bodies when taking a bath.<sup>678</sup> The same customs continue to the present day in Orthodox Coenobite monasticism.

---

<sup>671</sup> *Matthew* 6:12; trans. *Holy Bible*, p. 6.

<sup>672</sup> 2:44-45.

<sup>673</sup> *Bel.* 2.127, vol. 6, p. 178. Also see Justin Taylor, 'The community of goods among the first Christians and among the Essenes,' in Goodblatt, *Historical*, pp. 147-161, the entire article on similarities between the two.

<sup>674</sup> *Acts* 4:32-37, 5:1-11. See also Fitzmyer, *Essays*, p. 284-288 and Fiensy, *Jesus*, pp. 85-145, on Christian and Essene perceptions of poverty and wealth.

<sup>675</sup> G. Vermes, *Scrolls, Scriptures and Early Christianity* (London, 2005), p. 40.

<sup>676</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.24, p. 369.

<sup>677</sup> *Bel.* 2, 128-137, vol. 6, pp. 178-180.

<sup>678</sup> Black, *Scrolls*, p. 64.

### 11. No second mantle

According to Hippolytos, one of the Essene rules was that they should not own a second mantle.<sup>679</sup> In three different instances in the *New Testament* Jesus advises those who wanted to become his followers not to own a second mantle.<sup>680</sup> The similarity here is more than striking.

### 12. Virtues and Martyrdom

Josephus and Hippolytos praise the Essenes for a number of their virtues and characteristics which strongly resemble ideal Christians: they were dignified and restrained from sin; they supported each other and did not profit from each other; adopted children; disliked riches; did not hate their enemies but prayed for them; were just; were either celibate or married; believed in afterlife and that after death the soul is separated from the body; showed contempt to wealth; were equals among themselves; were subjected to every kind of savage torture but refused to blaspheme against their God or consume forbidden food, preferring to die for their beliefs, thus securing a place in paradise.<sup>681</sup> *De Bello* is clear that when the Essenes were taken prisoners by the Romans during war they were subjected to a number of horrific tortures, but endured the suffering and accepted death cheerfully.<sup>682</sup> The image of the Early Christian martyr readily comes to mind.

### 13. Direct and indirect testimonies that the Essenes were Christians

According to Philo the Jews of the Diaspora in Egypt, called *therapeutai*, were no others than the numerous Essenes who also maintained communities all over

---

<sup>679</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.20, p. 365.

<sup>680</sup> *Matthew* 10:10; *Mark* 6:9, *Luke* 3:11, 9:3.

<sup>681</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9, 18-28, pp. 364-373; *Ant.*, 18.18-22, vol. 4, pp. 143-144; 13.171-173, vol. 3, p. 182 (they were one of the three schools); *Bel.* 2.119-166, vol. 6, pp. 176-184; 2.156, p. 184: δοκοῦσι δέ μοι κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν Ἕλληνες τοῖς τε ἀνδρείοις αὐτῶν, οὓς ἥρωας καὶ ἡμιθέους καλοῦσιν, τὰς μακάρων νήσους ἀνατεθεικέναι; Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 27, p. 372 (on afterlife like the Greeks). (martyrdom).

<sup>682</sup> *Bel.* 2, 151-153, vol. 6, p. 183.

the Greek and Barbarian world.<sup>683</sup> Professor David Runia observed that both Eusebius and Epiphanius remarked on Philo's favourite picture of the Essenes/Therapeutai,<sup>684</sup> and perceived them to be Christian followers of Apostle Mark in Egypt. Eusebius made it clear that some of them were ascetic and shared all their income with their fellow Christians.<sup>685</sup> This was accepted also by some Byzantine scholars.<sup>686</sup>

Jean Daniélou, the eminent Jesuit theologian and Cardinal, though officially rejected an identification of the first Christians with Essenes, nevertheless gave a number of indications for exactly the opposite. For example, he clearly stated that John the Baptist and John the Apostle were Essenes.<sup>687</sup> He also pointed out that the site of the river Jordan where John the Baptist baptised people was near Qumran,<sup>688</sup> and observed that in *John*<sup>689</sup> there is evidence that when some people tried either to stone or arrest Jesus, he escaped and found refuge near where John the Baptist used to baptise. Daniélou also stated that the name of the desert where Jesus withdrew when he faced the temptations was synonymous to the site of Qumran.<sup>690</sup> In other words, the indications provided here by Daniélou are that Jesus found refuge among the Qumran community. One should also take into account that in the *New Testament* Jesus Christ confronted

---

<sup>683</sup> Philo, *Vit. Cont.*, 1- 39, vol. 6, pp. 46-56.

<sup>684</sup> Runia, *Philo*, pp. 4-6.

<sup>685</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.16-17.18, vol. 1, pp. 72-77.

<sup>686</sup> Eg. Georgius Monachus, *Chronicon*, vol. 1, pp. 327-341: Καὶ Μάρκος ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πρῶτος ἐκκλησίας πηξάμενος πολλὰ μοναστήρια συνεστήσατο, ἀπερ σεμνεῖα τότε προσηγορεύθησαν... ἀποστολικοὺς ἀνδρας ἐξ Ἑβραίων, ὡς ἔοικεν, γεγονότας καὶ τῶν Ἑσσαιῶν τὴν ἀσκησιν καὶ πολιτείαν... Ἐκ τῶν δικαίων οὖν τούτων καταχθέντες οἱ Ἑσσαιῶτες οὗτοι ... Cf. Photios, *Bibliotheca*, codex 104, p. 86a: Ἀνεγνώσθη δὲ <καὶ> τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις φιλοσοφησάντων τὴν τε θεωρητικὴν καὶ τὴν πρακτικὴν φιλοσοφίαν βίον· ὧν οἱ μὲν Ἑσσηνοὶ οἱ δὲ θεραπευταὶ ἐκαλοῦντο, οἱ καὶ μοναστήρια καὶ σεμνεῖα, ...

<sup>687</sup> Daniélou, *Les manuscripts*, p. 17; p. 87; pp. 96-97: St. John's *Apocalypse* and *Gospel* are texts of a similar spirit with that of the Qumran scrolls.

<sup>688</sup> Daniélou, *Les manuscripts*, p.13. Cf. Robert L. Webb, 'John the Baptist and his relationship to Jesus,' in Chilton-Evans, pp. 179-229 at 207 (the hypothesis that John the Baptist was an Essene is highly controversial).

<sup>689</sup> 10:30-40.

<sup>690</sup> Daniélou, *Les manuscripts*, p. 23.

the Pharisees and the Sadducees, but never the Essenes.

14. After a detailed and in-depth scholarly analysis of Paul's replies to his Christian adversaries in the *Acts* and the *Epistles*, John J. Gunther concluded that "Paul's literary adversaries were believers whose background was a mystic apocalyptic, ascetic, non-conformist, syncretistic Judaism more akin to Essenism than to any other well-known 'school' or holiness sect."<sup>691</sup>

15. John J. Collins concluded that "The Dead Sea sect and early Christianity were very different movements" on the basis that the first were centered on ritual and purity, while Christianity dispensed such ritual and purity laws. Collins also observed that the Essene aim in participating in an "angelic cult," is alien to Christianity.<sup>692</sup> This may not be the case. Not only the *Onomastica Vaticana* and the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, examined above, but also the entire Byzantine and modern Christian Orthodox tradition, perceive monasticism as an angelic cult. According to this tradition, all monks, by giving the Holy Vows and by living this type of life in a daily routine of strict ritual and purity, are taking the shape of the angels (σχημα, τὸ ἀγγελικόν).<sup>693</sup>

On the basis of the above examination of evidence, I cannot agree that since the first century CE 'Essenism is dead'<sup>694</sup> and that numerous Essenes disappeared at

---

<sup>691</sup> John J. Gunther, *St Paul's Opponents and Their Background. A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings, Supplements Novum Testamentum*, 35 (Leiden, 1973), p. 315; Martin A. Larson, *The Essene-Christian Faith: A Study in the Sources of Western Religion* (Costa Mesa, 1989), pp. 223-229, also lists similarities between certain points in *Synopsis* and Essenism, and concludes that Jesus was an Essene.

<sup>692</sup> John J. Collins, 'Qumran, Apocalypticism, and the New Testament,' in Schiffman, *Dead*, pp. 133-138.

<sup>693</sup> *Onomastica Vaticana*, pp. 205, 206, 220; *Etymologicum Gudianum*; col. 401.

<sup>694</sup> G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London, 1997), pp. 22-27; Also see Zeitlin, 'Essenes,' p. 118 (the Essenes disappeared, without living any influence on Christianity or Judaism); James H. Charlesworth, 'Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?' in Schiffman, *Dead*, pp. 130-131, the digitizing of the *Scrolls* is not complete and is going to reveal much more in the future.

once exactly when Christianity appeared on the scene. I also reject the widely established conclusion that any claims which identify Essenism with Christianity are "exaggerated" or "grotesque."<sup>695</sup> Instead, I believe that one ought to have a second look on Epiphanius's statement that Christianity originated from a certain group of people who called themselves 'Nazōraioi' and 'Iessaioi' before they adopted the name 'Christians'<sup>696</sup>

## 2.4: Holy Warriors?

About two decades before the *Scrolls* were discovered, Eisler observed that in *De Bello* the Essenes carried weapons and a certain John the Essene was a military commander of revolutionaries.<sup>697</sup> Therefore, Eisler warned that the Essenes may not have always been peace-loving.<sup>698</sup> A few years after Eisler's death, scholars have seen that the *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (also known as the *War Scroll*) found in Qumran, calls for a Holy War against the infidel Gentiles.<sup>699</sup> Hippolytus also states that some of the Ἑσσηνοί (Essenes) were known as *Zealots* and *Sikarioi* (Ζηλωταὶ καλούμενοι, ὑπὸ τινῶν δὲ Σικάριοι) combatants who did not hesitate to slaughter their

---

<sup>695</sup> Geza Vermes, 'The Qumran Community, the Essenes, and Nascent Christianity,' in Schiffman, *Dead*, p. 586.

<sup>696</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp. 321-322: οὗτοι γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς ὄνομα ἐπέθεντο οὐχὶ Χριστοῦ οὔτε αὐτὸ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἀλλὰ Ναζωραίων. πάντες δὲ Χριστιανοὶ Ναζωραῖοι τότε ὡσαύτως ἐκαλοῦντο· γέγονε δὲ ἐπ' ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ καλεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ Ἰεσσαίους, πρὶν ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἀρχὴν λάβωσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ καλεῖσθαι Χριστιανοί.

<sup>697</sup> *Bel.* 2.125, vol. 6., p. 177 (they were armed to protect themselves from robbers); *Bel.* 2.567 (Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἑσσαῖος στρατηγῆσων ἐπέμφθη). See also Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.20, p. 365 (the Essenes only carried a weapon with them and nothing else). Cf. Rhoads, *Israel*, p. 156, Rhoads is not sure whether the Essenes participated in the war or not.

<sup>698</sup> Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 23. Cf. Meier, *Marginal*, vol. 3, p. 514, who claims that the Essenes did not permit the making of weapons; Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 3, is categorical that the Zealots had absolutely nothing to do with the Qumran Scrolls.

<sup>699</sup> Bird, *Crossing*, p. 64. See also *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, ed. Y. Yadin (Oxford, 1962), pp. 255-353; p. 334: 'the God of Israel has called a sword upon all the nations, and through the saints of His people He will do mighty.' Idem, p. 243: The Essenes did participate in the destructive revolution of 66-70 AD, and the Romans destroyed Qumran soon after.



opponents.<sup>700</sup> Although most modern scholars disregard Hippolytus on identifying the Sikarioi with the Essenes, on the basis that he must have been confused and he must have made a mistake,<sup>701</sup> Origen, too, accepts that the Essenes were called *Sikarioi* and were no others than *Zealots*.<sup>702</sup> John Chrysostom also adopted this explanation that the Essenes were called Sikarioi and Zealots and added that they were called Essenes because they were *Hosioi*, meaning ‘pious, blessed.’<sup>703</sup> According to Athanasios the Great the *Zealots* and *Hosioi* were ‘**the avengers of God who hated evil**.’<sup>704</sup> In my opinion, it is evident that Hippolytus, Origen, Chrysostom and Athanasios above, being aware that the name Essenes does not mean anything in Greek, provided to their Greek readership its Greek translation: Zealots. These significant Early Christian authors were aware that those Zealots-Essenes, were also known with the name Sikarioi. As stated in my introduction, this is exactly how the Romans called the butchers, and the question here is why certain Zealots-Essenes also became known as butchers, if they were not ferocious warriors? The *Antiquities* explain that the *Sikarioi* were called as such because they carried with them a

---

<sup>700</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.26, p. 371: οὐ φείδεται ἀλλὰ καὶ σφάζει· ὅθεν ἐκ τοῦ συμβαίνοντος <καὶ> τὸ ὄνομα προσέλαβον, **Ζηλωταὶ καλούμενοι, ὑπὸ τινων δὲ Σικάριοι**. ἕτεροι δὲ αὐτῶν οὐδένα κύριον ὀνομάζουσι πλὴν τὸν θεόν, εἰ καὶ αἰκίζοιτο τις <αὐτῶν> ἢ καὶ ἀναιροῖτο. Start reading from 9.18.3 Ἑσσηνοί. οὗτοι τὸν βίον σεμνότερον ἀσκοῦσι ...; Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.20-26.2, pp. 365-371 (they also enforced circumcision to any Gentile who dared speak about God, for they considered that only the circumcised had this right).

<sup>701</sup> Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 72.

<sup>702</sup> Origen, *Catena in Acta (catena Andreae)* 21.39, ed. J.A. Cramer, *Catena in Acta SS Apostolorum* (Oxford, 1838), p. 355: Παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις τρεῖς αἱρέσεις γενικαί· Φαρισαῖοι· Σαδδουκαῖοι· Ἑσσηνοί· οὗτοι τὸν βίον σεμνότερον ἀσκοῦσι, φιλάλληλοι ὄντες, καὶ ἐγκρατεῖς· διὸ καὶ Ἑσσηνοὶ προσαγορεύονται, ἡγουν ὅσιοι· **ἄλλοι δὲ αὐτοὺς σικαρίους ἐκάλεσαν, ἡγουν ζηλωτάς**.

<sup>703</sup> John Chrysostom, *In Acta Apostolorum*, Homilia 46, PG 60, 321-326 at 324: Τρεῖς γάρ εἰσι παρ’ αὐτοῖς αἱρέσεις αἱ γενικαί, Φαρισαῖοι, Σαδδουκαῖοι, καὶ Ἑσσηνοί, οἱ καὶ Ὅσιοι λέγονται (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ Ἑσσηνοὶ ὄνομα) διὰ τὸ τοῦ βίου σεμνόν· **οἱ αὐτοὶ δὲ καὶ Σικάριοι διὰ τὸ εἶναι ζηλωταί**. Cf. the name Ὅσαῖος in *CPJ* 1 (1957), p. 125.

<sup>704</sup> Athanasius, *Quaestiones in scripturam sacram*, PG 28, 712-796 at 749.35-752: Ὅσιους λέγει τοὺς πνευματικὸς καὶ ἁγίους ἀνθρώπους, οἵτινες καυχῶνται μετὰ θάνατον ἐπὶ ταῖς κοιταῖς αὐτῶν. Κοῖται δὲ εἰσιν αἱ μοναὶ τῶν ἁγίων ... **ζηλωταὶ καὶ ἐκδικηταὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ**, καὶ μισηταὶ τοῦ κακοῦ.

small sword called *sika* (*sica* in Latin), with which they murdered;<sup>705</sup> the *Sikarioi* attacked, robbed, murdered, looted and burned villages. Moreover, the *Sikarioi* were trained assassins who mingled with crowds and targeted certain victims, whom they slaughtered.<sup>706</sup> The fact that Josephus does not provide a Hebrew/Aramaic name for the *Sikarioi*<sup>707</sup> made a number of scholars, who were unaware of the sources I mention above, unable to connect the *Sikarioi* to the Essenes. It is not clear whether Josephus himself or some of his later editors preferred not to connect the *Sikarioi* with the Essenes. In my opinion, the identification of the Essenes with the *Sikarioi* can no longer be denied, unless one can prove that the above Christian authors were incapable of distinguishing between different groups, and that the so-called butchers/*Sikarioi* had nothing to do with the Essenes. Both the Christian authors and the Essenes, were believers of the same God who himself was a Zealot warrior.<sup>708</sup> Their ultimate spiritual leader, Moses, made this very clear: the Lord is a warrior.<sup>709</sup> *Psalm 149* also advised the believers to have *"high praises of God in their throats and the two-edged swords in their hands, to execute vengeance on the nations and punishment on the peoples, to bind their kings with fetters and their nobles with chains of iron, to*

---

<sup>705</sup> Transliterated into Greek as σίκα and translated as ξιφίδιο (short sword) or μάχαιρα (large knife).

<sup>706</sup> *Ant.*, 20.185-188, vol. 4, pp. 307-308: Ἀφικομένου δὲ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν Φήστου συνέβαινεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ὑπὸ τῶν ληστῶν κακοῦσθαι τῶν κωμῶν ἀπασῶν ἐμπιπραμένων τε καὶ διαρπαζομένων. καὶ οἱ σικάριοι δὲ καλούμενοι, λησταὶ δὲ εἰσιν οὗτοι, τότε μάλιστα ἐπλήθουν χρώμενοι ξιφιδίοις παραπλησίοις μὲν τὸ μέγεθος τοῖς τῶν Περσῶν ἀκινάκαις, ἐπικαμπέσι δὲ καὶ ὁμοίαις ταῖς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων σίκαις καλουμέναις, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν οἱ ληστεύοντες ἔλαβον πολλοὺς ἀναιροῦντες. ἀναμιγνύμενοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἐορταῖς, καθὼς καὶ πρότερον εἶπομεν, τῷ πλήθει τῶν πανταχόθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν συρρεόντων οὓς βουληθεῖεν ῥαδίως ἀπέσφαττον, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ μεθ' ὅπλων ἐπὶ τὰς κώμας τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀφικόμενοι διήρπαζον καὶ ἐνεπίμπρασαν. Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.20.1, p. 365 (certain Essenes had a weapon with them). See also M. Smith, 'Zealots and Sicarii: their origin and relations', *HTR* 64 (1971), pp. 1-19 at 9, on the kannaim / sikarin in rabbinic literature who are called murderers.

<sup>707</sup> Zeitlin, 'Essenes,' p. 90, highlights the problem that Josephus did not provide a Hebrew name for Sicarii.

<sup>708</sup> *Psalm 24:8* (God warrior in battle); *Isaiah 42:13* (God the Zealot warrior).

<sup>709</sup> *Exodus 15:3* (*The Lord is a warrior*). Cf. *Exodus 14:4-14* (The Lord fought the Egyptians); *Numbers 21:14* (reference to a Book (now lost) of the Wars of the Lord, meaning that there were Holy Wars recorded in a certain holy book); *Deuteronomy 20:4*.

*execute on them the judgement decreed. This is glory for all his faithful ones. Praise the LORD!*"<sup>710</sup> God frequently turned into a warrior in order to punish the infidels and the sinners. Tertyllos in the *Acts* must have been afraid that the 'Nazōraioi' were followers of a certain God who instructed them to fight, not to submit,<sup>711</sup> and the question here is whether those 'Nazōraioi' were irrelevant to 'four thousand' revolutionary *Sikarioi* who were wanted by the Romans, also in the *Acts*.<sup>712</sup> And who were the 'myriads of believers, all Zealots of the Law,'<sup>713</sup> once more in the *Acts*, who followed the Nazorean Jacob the brother of Jesus? Did they have anything to do with the Nazoreans who instigated the Jews to raise war against the entire world?<sup>714</sup> And why in both cases above did Roman officers question the Nazorean Paul on his relation to them? I have also observed that the exact number Philo, the *Antiquities* and *De Bello* provide for the total of the Essenes who lived in Palestine was also four thousand,<sup>715</sup> and my question here is whether we are talking about one and the same group which was known as Nazoreans in Hebrew because of the holy vows they gave, Essenes in Hebrew or Aramaic because they claimed to be a certain branch (religious and/or tribal) or sect of Israel, Sicarii in Latin (meaning butchers) because they were ferocious warriors, and Zealots in Greek because they were devoted to their religious tasks with extreme zeal. In conclusion, one should bear in mind that the Notzrim (Hebrew), Hassidim (Aramaic), Sicarii (Latin, transliterated as *Sikarioi* in Greek), Essenes (Hebrew/Aramaic, not known) can all be translated into Greek as Zealots. This conclusion is also confirmed by the results of my research of the entire *Septuagint*, which does not use the term

---

<sup>710</sup> *Psalm 149, Holy Bible*, p. 646.

<sup>711</sup> *Acts 24:5*.

<sup>712</sup> *Acts 21:38*: οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχίλιους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων;

<sup>713</sup> *Acts 21:18-20*: (20) ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου.

<sup>714</sup> *Acts 24:5*: κινοῦντα στάσεις πᾶσιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην πρωτοστάτην τε τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἰρέσεως, ὃς καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπέειρασεν βεβηλῶσαι.

<sup>715</sup> Philo, *Quod omnis* 75, vol. 6, p. 22; *Ant.*, 18.20, p. 143; *Bel.* 2, 119, p. 176 (Essenes 4000; 17.42: Pharisees 6000; 18.17: Sadducees very few). Despite this clear division, Falk, *Jesus*, pp. 39-69, 61-62 Falk objects the division between Essenism and Pharisees.

Zealot to define a man devoted to religion, but names such men with the transliterated Hebrew/Aramaic terms (Hassid-aioi, Nazir-aioi). I have also observed that the *Antiquities*, contrary to *De Bello*, do not use the term Zealots with reference to the revolutionaries or another group, but instead they use *Sikarioi* to define such groups. All these instances will be examined in the fourth Chapter.

## CHAPTER 3

### *"BCE Christianity" and the emergence of Anti-Hellenism*

According to Gregory of Nazianzus (c.329-390),<sup>716</sup> seven brothers, their mother and an elderly priest who were tortured under the orders of Antiochos IV Epiphanēs (175-164 BCE), were the first Martyrs of the "true faith," meaning Christianity.<sup>717</sup> The source upon which Gregory based his knowledge of the martyrs, *IV Maccabees*<sup>718</sup> makes it clear that they sacrificed their lives in the struggle against "Hellenic" heathenism. This cult appears to predate Gregory, but it is not clear when it first emerged. There is a serious possibility that this cult appeared as late as in the fourth century,<sup>719</sup> and this raises further questions on when exactly the Maccabees texts were "finalised." John Malalas (c.490-c.570s) reports in his *Chronographia* that certain Jews kept the relics of the

---

<sup>716</sup> One of the three Capadocian Fathers. The other two were St Basil of Caesarea (c.329-c.379) and his brother St Gregory of Nyssa (c.335-c.394).

<sup>717</sup> *To the Maccabees Martyrs: Εἰς τοὺς Μακκαβαίους*, also known as *Oration 15* (In *Machabaeorum Laudem*, PG 35, 912-933) is an oration dedicated to those martyrs. For the dating of the martyrdom see ibidem 916, 920, 932. Without referring to St Gregory, Frend, *Martyrdom*, p. 570, states: 'the appreciation of Christian history can perhaps be started profitably with the Maccabean wars.' Cf. Frances M. Young, *The use of sacrificial ideas in Greek Christian writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom* (Cambridge Mass., 1979), pp. 68-69 (the notion of martyrdom as a form of purification pre-exists in *IV Macc*).

<sup>718</sup> Contrary to the Orthodox, the Catholic Church and some other Western Christian denominations do not include this book in their own versions of the *Old Testament*.

<sup>719</sup> Johannes Hahn, 'The Veneration of the Maccabean brothers in fourth century Antioch: religious competition, martyrdom, and innovation,' in Signiori, *Dying*, pp. 79-104 at pp. 82-86 and 91, the earliest reports of a holy site in Antioch come between 386 and 400 CE and are exclusively Christian.

'Maccabees'<sup>720</sup> martyrs in a Synagogue in Antioch.<sup>721</sup> At some stage after Christianity established itself as the main religion of the Roman Empire, there is a tradition that some or all the relics of the martyrs were transferred from Antioch to the new centre of the empire, Constantinople, the New Rome, where a *martyrion* (church-shrine for martyrs) was constructed to honour their memory.<sup>722</sup> *Chronicon Paschale* (7th c.) reports that a certain 'Maccabees' church in Constantinople continued to function in the seventh century,<sup>723</sup> and the *Synaxarion of Constantinople* (10th c.) reveals that the 'Maccabees' cult was so well known among Byzantines that although the surviving *IV Maccabees* mentioned only the elderly martyr's name, Eleazar,<sup>724</sup> the Byzantine Church actually "knew" the names of all martyrs.<sup>725</sup> Contemporary Christian churches are still dedicated to the 'Maccabees Martyrs,'<sup>726</sup> and their memory is celebrated in the Orthodox Church on 1<sup>st</sup> August.<sup>727</sup>

---

<sup>720</sup> Regardless of the fact that they do not appear to be related to the revolutionary family of the Maccabees, they became known as the 'Maccabees martyrs.' Thus, whenever one reads 'Maccabees' in an early or Byzantine Christian text, one should distinguish for which 'Maccabees' the text refers to; that is either to the *Maccabees* Books, or the Maccabees revolutionary family, or the 'Maccabees' martyrs.

<sup>721</sup> Malalas, *Chronicle* 23, ed. J. Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (Berlin, 2000), p. 156; trans. Jeffreys, pp. 108-109.

<sup>722</sup> J. H. Lowden and C. B. Tkacz, 'Maccabees', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A.P. Kazhdan (Oxford, 1991), vol. 2, p. 1261; E. Ferguson ed., *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* (New York, 1990), pp. 580-583, s.v. Martyrion.

<sup>723</sup> *Chr. Paschale*, vol. 1, p. 718. The church was in the Sykais district of Galata; Albrecht Berger, 'The cult of the Maccabees in the eastern Orthodox Church,' in Signori, *Dying*, pp. 105-123 at p. 108, Maccabees churches in Constantinople.

<sup>724</sup> Also mentioned in *II Macc.* 6:18, vol. 1, p. 1113; 6:24, p. 1114; 8:23, p. 1119.

<sup>725</sup> It is not clear whether their unknown to us source was as fictional as *IV Maccabees*. See *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae: Propylaeum ad Acta sanctorum Novembris*, ed. H. Delehaye (Brussels, 1902), p. 859: Aveim, Antōnios, Gourias, Eleazaros, Eusevōnas, Aheim, Markellos, Solomonis (mother); *Hōrologion*, p. 416.

<sup>726</sup> For churches dedicated to the Maccabees in Constantinople, see R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin: Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1969), p. 313. See also Deschner, *Kriminalgeschichte*, p. 144, on the Catholic Church celebrations of the Maccabees Martyrs, and Churches dedicated to them in Europe. Nowadays there is a functioning church dedicated to the Seven Maccabees in Loutraki, Attica, Greece. Further evidence for an ancient Maccabees church comes from Cookbury, Devon, UK.

<sup>727</sup> *Hōrologion*, p. 416.

The first question here is what exactly had happened in the background of the Greek - Israelite relations which led to the formation of this 'anti-Hellenic' religious cult? What did the BCE Israelites say about the Greeks in their sources, and how did the BCE Gentile Greeks perceive the Israelites in their own sources? Should the appearance of the first "Christian Martyrs" be examined as irrelevant to the evidence examined in the second Chapter that the Zealot Essenes who opposed the Gentiles also appeared in history for the first time at the same period? These are the questions I will try to explore in this Chapter.

### 3.1: A first approach of the *Septuagint* and "Josephus" to the Greeks

Long before Alexander the Great (356-323 BCE) there was significant Greek presence in the Middle East.<sup>728</sup> For example, since at least the seventh century BCE, some Greeks had served as mercenaries in Middle Eastern armies,<sup>729</sup> and by the sixth century BCE they had built in Naucratis of Egypt their own temple, the *Hellēnion*.<sup>730</sup> However, there is no historical record of any relations between Greeks and Israelites before Alexander, apart from some limited *OT* references. The greatest problem in analysing what historical value these *OT* references have, is that there are numerous and long-lasting controversies regarding their dating and originality. However, we know for sure that the *Septuagint* was studied by Christians, its books were accepted as authentic and highly important by the Church, and in turn they influenced the way the Christians perceived the Greeks.

---

<sup>728</sup> Eissfeldt, *OT*, pp. 101-102. Extensive Greek colonization took place throughout the Mediterranean in the pre-classical period: see J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas, Their Early Colonies and Trade* (New York, 1999<sup>4</sup>), pp. 35-54, 84-102, 111-141. Stephanos Byzantios (*fl.* 528-35) also mentioned Greek presence in Gaza long before the Hellenistic period: see *Ethnika*, pp. 193-94. Gager, *Origins*, p. 35, claimed that Jews and Greeks lived together in Sardes of Asia Minor already by the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BCE.

<sup>729</sup> Hengel, *Judentum*, pp. 12-18; Herodotus *Historiae* 2.152.20 and Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca* 1.66.12: Ψαμμήτιχος (r. 664-610 BCE) employed Ionian mercenaries; Diodorus, *Bibliotheca* 1.61.3: Daidalos in Egypt, modeled the labyrinth on an Egyptian design.

<sup>730</sup> See Herodotus, *Historiae* II, 178, vol. 1, p. 250.

*Joel* contains one of the first such *Septuagint* references in a passage which states that the Gentiles of Tyre, Sidon and Galilee attacked, enslaved and sold the sons of Judah and Jerusalem to ‘the sons of the *Hellēnes* (Greeks),’ a people who lived far from the lands of Israel. The Hebrew version of this passage mentions the Greeks with the name ‘Yāwānim’ (Ionian Greeks).<sup>731</sup> There is no consensus as to when the Hebrew *Joel* was composed, but most scholars date the whole or parts of it near or after the arrival of Alexander in the region.<sup>732</sup> The *Septuagint Ezechiel*, also composed by different authors at different times,<sup>733</sup> translated the Hebrew ‘Yāwān’ (Ionia) as ‘Hellas’ (Greece), one of the countries which traded slaves and merchandise with the prosperous city of Tyre.<sup>734</sup> Two further passages in the interpolated *Daniel*<sup>735</sup> mention the ‘king of *Hellas*’ (βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων) and ‘archon of *Hellas*’ with reference to a conflict between the Persians and the Greeks.<sup>736</sup> The interpolated Hebrew *Daniel*, just like like *Joel* and *Ezechiel* above, also uses ‘Yāwān’ to indicate Greeks and Greece, and there is consensus among scholars that these interpolated passages in *Daniel* were written after Alexander the Great.

---

<sup>731</sup> *Joel* 4:4-6, ed. Rahlfs, vol. 2, pp. 519-524 (τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων). Most scholars accept that the Yāwānim are Ionian Greeks. It is evident that the Israelites were familiar with a tradition which used the term Yāwān/im to define the entire Greek people, in a similar way the Arabs for centuries call all Greeks with the name Yunan (Ionians).

<sup>732</sup> On the basis of this reference to Greeks, Eissfeldt, *OT*, p. 394, among other scholars, suggested that the passage should be dated sometime between the fourth and third century BCE. For a later dating cf. CCB, pp. 198-200. *Joel* is a work initially compiled in Hebrew by different authors in different times. All subsequent references to the *Septuagint* are from the Rahlfs edition.

<sup>733</sup> CCB, pp. 189-190; Eissfeldt, *OT*, pp. 367-374. Ezechiel was in exile in Babylonia at the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BCE.

<sup>734</sup> *Ezechiel* 27:13, in *Sept.*, vol. 2, p. 818 (ἡ Ἑλλάς). Also see *I Maccabees* 8:9, *Sept.* vol. 1, p. 1067 (Ἑλλάς). Cf. *Holy Scriptures*, p. 677. Another instance in *Ezechiel* 7:15 refers to some people from the Greek island of Rhodes who traded ivory with some Jews.

<sup>735</sup> See Appendix 3.

<sup>736</sup> The three passages are sections of supposed prophecies of the conflict between the Persians and the Hellēnes: *Daniel* 8:21, *Sept.*, vol. 2, p. 919: (βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων); 10:20, vol. 2, p. 927; 11:2, vol. 2, p. 928. Also see *I Maccabees* 6:2, vol. 1, p. 1059; 1:1-4, vol. 1, p. 1039: Alexander the Great, the king of *Hellēnes*, reigned in *Hellas* before his victory over Darius.



In all the above instances within the *Septuagint*, the term Hellēn and its derivatives were mentioned in a geographical and historical context, showing awareness that the Greeks were a certain Gentile people who came from a certain region. Although the name ‘Yāwān’ was translated as ‘Hellas’ or ‘Hellēnes’ in all above *Septuagint* instances, it is interesting to observe that the translator of a Hebrew *Genesis* passage simply transliterated ‘Yāwān’ in Greek as ‘Ιωυαν.’<sup>737</sup> *Genesis* explains that this Ιωυαν was one of the grandsons of Noah. The first question here is why Yāwān in this particular case was not translated as Hellēn-Greek? According to the results of recent research the *Pentateuch* was translated into Greek by a single person,<sup>738</sup> who was not involved in the translation of the books of the Prophets examined above. This means that this translator had his own reasons and style in transliterating and not translating this name, and that the following translator/s of the Prophets followed a different way.

According to the general view held among most scholars, the Israelites initially looked upon Alexander and his troops as their allies.<sup>739</sup> The *Antiquities* report that Alexander approached the High Priest of the Jews with the intention to ratify an alliance. In his reply to Alexander, the High Priest Jaddua<sup>740</sup> stated that he could not break his oath of alliance to the Persian King Darius II (r. 336-330 BCE), but as Alexander advanced on the Persians, Jaddua changed his mind and finally welcomed Alexander and his men in Jerusalem.<sup>741</sup> The question here is whether the author of the *Antiquities* presents an accurate story, or whether

---

<sup>737</sup> *Genesis* 10:2-6. Without breathing or accent.

<sup>738</sup> Russell E. Gmirkin, *Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch* (N.Y., 2006), p. 251 (the translation of the *Pentateuch* was made by a single person).

<sup>739</sup> See Hengel, *Jews, Greeks*, p. 11, with references to Talmudic and Christian legends which present Alexander the Great as a monotheist. Idem, pp. 6-7 (the fabricated visit of Alexander to Jerusalem). See also R. Stoneman, ‘Jewish Traditions on Alexander the Great’, *Philonica* 6 (1994), pp. 37-53.

<sup>740</sup> Also known as ‘Jaddous.’

<sup>741</sup> *Ant.* 11. 317-347, vol. 3, pp. 64-70.

he indicates in an indirect way that the Jews honoured their traditional alliance to the Persians and changed camps only when they were forced by military means to do so. What follows in the text raises further questions on its historicity, for it presents Alexander bowing to the 'Name of God' and to the High Priest of the Jews because he had seen a vision that a man dressed exactly like the High Priest will deliver Persia to him.<sup>742</sup> The High Priest confirmed the vision by explaining to Alexander that there was an ancient prophecy made in *Daniel* about his victory against the Persians. There is little question here that the author of the *Antiquities* fabricated this story, and that he used another fabricated text, the interpolation in *Daniel*, in order to make his case stronger that the Jews and their High Priest had a very important role to play in Alexander's struggle against Persia, and that they were a highly important player in the game of the Greek expansion into Persia. At this point one should also take into account that both according to the *Antiquities* and Quintus Curtius (*fl.* 1<sup>st</sup> c.), Alexander invaded and destroyed Samaria.<sup>743</sup>

Following Alexander's death (323 BCE) civil conflicts erupted among some of his generals who divided much of his vast empire into rival Kingdoms. In the process of dividing the Empire, two of the successors, Ptolemaios Sōtēr (r. 305-282 BCE) King of Egypt, and Seleukos Nikatōr (r. 305-281 BCE) King of Syria, both claimed some of the same lands in between their newly formed kingdoms. Within two decades after the death of Alexander these areas were crossed or

---

<sup>742</sup> *Ant.* 11.31-39, vol. 3, pp. 68-69. Most probably inspired by this report in the *Antiquities*, the anonymous interpolator of version 3 of Pseudo-Kallisthenes's *Historia Alexandri Magni* (3<sup>rd</sup> c. CE?) mentions a friendly meeting between Alexander and Jewish leaders. See Recensio 3, sect. 24, ed. H. Engelmann, *Der griechische Alexanderroman, Rezension G.*, 3 vols. (Meisenheim-am-Glan, 1963), vol. 2, p. 216.

<sup>743</sup> According to both the *Ant.* 11.340-345, vol. 3, p. 70 and Quintus Curtius Rufus, *Historia Alexandri*, 4.8-11, trans. J. Rolfe, *Quintus Curtius, History of Alexander*, 2 vols (Loeb: London, 1936), vol. 1, pp. 238-241, the Samaritans did not join the alliance between Jews and Greeks, for they already were enemies of the Jews. As a result, Alexander's army destroyed Samaria.

occupied by different Greek armies no less than seven or eight times,<sup>744</sup> and the local Israelite population must have suffered to a great extent.<sup>745</sup>

After a battle between the two Kings at Ipsos (301 BCE), certain Israelite areas were annexed by Ptolemaios Sōtēr, who incorporated them into his own Egyptian kingdom. *Contra Apionem* quotes a "lost work" of a Greek historian called Agatharchidēs (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE), according to which, after the battle of Ipsos, Ptolemaios Sōtēr invaded Jerusalem on a Saturday, without meeting resistance because the natives refused to fight during that holy day. However, according to the same narrative, the King established an oppressive regime over the Jews.<sup>746</sup> Contrary to "Agatharchidēs" in *Contra Apionem* above, "Hecataeus," also quoted by the author of *Contra Apionem* claims that many Judeans followed Ptolemaios to Egypt because he was a gentle philanthropist.<sup>747</sup> Regardless of the differences between the accounts of "Agatharchidēs" and "Hecataeus," one should also observe that both "sources" are eager to present the encounter between Ptolemaios and the Judeans as almost non-violent. The problem here is that another testimony, this time coming from the Greek historian Appian (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE), reveals that Ptolemy demolished Jerusalem.<sup>748</sup> Could this account made by **Appian**, which has not been produced much later than *Contra Apionem*,<sup>749</sup> provide a more rational explanation that Ptolemy demolished Jerusalem and took the natives as slaves to Egypt, because they were allies of Seleukos Nikatōr? The *Antiquities* also quote "Agatharchidēs" that the people of

---

<sup>744</sup> See Zeitlin, *Rise*, pp. 67-73, on the wars between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids for the control of Coele-Syria in the years before Epiphanes. Also see Hengel, *Judentum*, pp. 12-18, on the presence of Greek armies in the Middle East since the 7<sup>th</sup> c. BCE.

<sup>745</sup> See Portier, *Apocalypse*, pp. 64-73.

<sup>746</sup> *Contra Apionem* 1.208-212, vol. 5, pp. 37-38.

<sup>747</sup> Hecataeus of Abdera "quoted" in *Contra Apionem*, 1.186-189, vol. 5, pp. 34-35. Also see Peter Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Hellenistic Age* (London, 1993), pp. 499, Green accepts that High Priest Hezekiah went voluntarily to Egypt with Ptolemy. Green accepts Ptolemy invaded Jerusalem at a later stage on Saturday. Ptolemy's forces re-gained Jerusalem four times. Antigonos died in Ipsos (301), Ptolemies kept Judea until Antiochos III won in Panion in 200.

<sup>748</sup> Appian, *Syriaca* 252, p. 398: κατέσκαψεν.

<sup>749</sup> If it is right this work has not been against this Appian, but against the earliest Appian.

Jerusalem refused to fight and that Ptolemaios Sōtēr took many Jews as prisoners in Egypt. They served him so well as warriors against Dareios to the extent that the Greek King recognised the Judeans as equal citizens (ἰσοπολίτας) to the Macedonians of Alexandria and placed them in a number of fortified locations. Few lines later, the *Antiquities* explain that Sōtēr's successor Ptolemy Philadelphos (r. 283-246 BCE) decided to free the "120000" Judeans,<sup>750</sup> but the question here is why did the Judeans need Philadelphos to give them their freedom? Were they not given "equal rights" just few lines earlier by Sōtēr? One should also take into account here that soon after the *Antiquities* claim that the kings of Seleucid Asia also offered their Jewish soldiers equal status with that of the Macedonians and other *Hellēnes*,<sup>751</sup> (ἰσοτίμους ἀπέφηνεν Μακεδόσιν καὶ Ἑλλήσιν). The question here is why should one accept that the "120000" ended up as slaves in Egypt after they refused to fight against Ptolemaios Sōtēr because it was Saturday; then Ptolemaios realised how loyal they were and granted them equal rights; after that the following King also admired them and granted them their freedom, and a third King in a row, this time a Seleucid, also offered them great privileges? Do these stories remind us here of the one examined above, when Alexander the Great granted rights to the Jews after he had a vision about them? Is "Josephus" reporting history here or is he creating history according to his own visions? The greatest problem in understanding the history between Greeks and Jews of that period is that the details provided by a number of "trustworthy" Greek historians exist almost exclusively in the works of "Josephus."

---

<sup>750</sup> *Ant.* 12.5-11, vol. 3, pp. 73-74 (12.8: ἰσοπολίτας)

<sup>751</sup> *Ant.* 12.119, vol. 3, pp. 92-93: (παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων τῆς Ἀσίας..., ἰσοτίμους ἀπέφηνεν Μακεδόσιν καὶ Ἑλλήσιν). On the co-operation between certain Greek Kings and Jews also see Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 2. 42-47, vol. 5, pp. 59-60.

Therefore, it is not clear whether "120000" left Egypt because Ptolemy Philadelphos granted them their freedom, or whether this King used them as settlers in order to colonise the newly acquired lands at the borders with his enemies.

Returning back to the conflicts between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, the Israelites had to accept reality and form alliances with the winners, in order to survive. Some Israelites must have been forced by circumstance to change sides in order to avoid extermination. For example, according to the *Antiquities*, when the Seleucids succeeded (c.201 BCE) in re-gaining control over the long disputed border-lands,<sup>752</sup> the Israelites who up to that time were subjects of the Ptolemies, welcomed the new victor Antiochos III the Great (223-187 BCE) and offered him their support for the removal of the Ptolemaic guards from the city of Jerusalem.<sup>753</sup> The loyalty of certain Israelites towards Antiochos was rewarded by the King, who employed them in his military service and supported their settlement in several parts of Mesopotamia, Babylonia and Asia Minor.<sup>754</sup> Again we see the same "Josephus" pattern here, namely that an important King realised that the Jews were wonderful allies, and granted them privileges. One should observe that so far, according to "Josephus," all those Greek Kings were brilliant, no matter of the indications we have seen above that the Jews must have suffered by some of those Kings. If so, why does "Josephus" alter history in this way? Why did he try to conceal any points of friction between the Israelites and the superpowers of that time, and is it possible that this was a specific historiographical method that was used also by other Israelite historiographers?

---

<sup>752</sup> Tomasz Grabowski, 'Achaeus, the Ptolemies and the Fourth Syrian War,' in Edward Dabrowa, *New studies on the Seleucids. Electrum* vol. 18 (2011), pp. 115-124, on the massive losses of the Seleucids during the second half of the 3rd century, and the constant wars with the Ptolemies.

<sup>753</sup> *Ant.* 12.129-150, vol. 3, pp. 94-97; *Ant.* 12.119, vol. 3, pp. 92-93.

<sup>754</sup> P. Treblico, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 5-7.

The *Septuagint III Maccabees* reports that some time before Antiochos III prevailed in the area, Ptolemaios IV Philopator (c.244-205 BCE) took certain measures against the Israelites of his kingdom. Although *III Maccabees* is considered mainly as fiction written long after the events it talks about, it seems that at certain times it does reflect the same story reported by the *Antiquities* above, namely that Jerusalem changed hands between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, and just before this happened, some Jerusalemites abandoned their alliance to the Ptolemies.<sup>755</sup> The author of *III Maccabees* claimed that Ptolemaios IV at some stage was refused entry to the Holy of Holies in the Jerusalem Temple<sup>756</sup> and the populace demonstrated against him. The King was embarrassed and soon after his return to Alexandria, he issued a decree for a special tax on the Jews, and compelled them to sacrifice to pagan deities or else face the capital punishment. Only the Jews who participated in pagan cults were to be recognised as equal to the Alexandrian Greeks.<sup>757</sup> *III Maccabees* emphasised the unjust case of the King by stating that the Greeks (Ἕλληνες) of Alexandria supported their Jewish friends, neighbours and business associates, and protected them in secrecy.<sup>758</sup> *III Maccabees* also reports that due to divine intervention, Ptolemaios's plans for a massacre of the Jews were ended. The King finally sided with the Jews who remained faithful to their ancestral religious laws and gave them permission to exterminate the profane deserters of Judaism who by that time had changed religion. Soon after, the leaders of the traditionalist Jews, having secured the King's permission, abided to the commandments of the *Torah* which instructs the Israelites to kill any of their

---

<sup>755</sup> *Ant.* 12.129-146, vol. 3, pp. 94-97. Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs*, pp. 56-57: *III Maccabees* does refer to a certain Dositheos son of Drimylos (*fl.* c. 240 BCE), who is a historical and not a fictional person.

<sup>756</sup> It was forbidden for Gentiles to enter.

<sup>757</sup> *III Macc.* 1-7, vol. 1, pp. 1139-40.

<sup>758</sup> *III Macc.* 3:8, vol. 1, p. 1140: (Ἕλληνες).

own who turn to worship other gods.<sup>759</sup> They murdered no less than three hundred profaners "and they kept the day as a joyful festival."<sup>760</sup> From the way he described these events, it is evident that the author of *III Maccabees* approved of their outcome; his message was clear: there was no way out of Judaism; the Jews should not be assimilated by the Greeks; if the Jews wanted to have good relations with the Greeks, they simply had to obey the *Law* and their religious leaders who instructed them on the extermination of the profaners. It is also interesting here to observe that, just like in "Josephus" examined above, one more Greek King appears to understand that he should better protect rather than harm the Jews. At the end, this King too was a good one, but one more question here is how a book like this, which appears to have been produced by a hardliner/Zealot, was rejected by Judaism and ended up as a work published by Christians?

### 3.2: Anti-Hellenism in the *Septuagint*

Unlike the *Septuagint* references examined above, certain references to Greeks in *I, II* and *IV Maccabees*, as well as some in other parts of the *Septuagint*, express enmity towards the Greeks and delineate how the Israelites were involved in a violent conflict against them.

The highest office among the Israelites was that of the High Priest, a hereditary religious throne belonging to a priestly family/class. The incumbent wielded great power over his people. At some stage, according to *I* and *II Maccabees*, the involvement of the Greek authorities of Antioch over the issue of the succession to the throne of the High Priest intensified internal Israelite conflicts, which in turn agitated the newly acquired *status quo*<sup>761</sup> between the two Kingdoms of Egypt and Antioch. This story, which is going to be examined in detail below, is

---

<sup>759</sup> *Deuteronomy* 13:6-10.

<sup>760</sup> *III Macc.* 5:18-7:15, vol. 1, pp. 1149-1156.

<sup>761</sup> After the battle of Ipsos above.

of importance because it provides a "historical explanation" as to how "anti-Hellenism" emerged.

The author of the *Antiquities* claimed that he had in his possession an "original"<sup>762</sup> and "official" recommendation letter written by King Antiochos the III to a Ptolemy King, written exclusively about the Jews, which praised their qualities and listed a number of financial privileges granted to them for their loyalty to him.<sup>763</sup> *II Maccabees* confirms that relations between Antiochos III and his contemporary High Priest Onias III were excellent until a certain Jewish 'protector of the Temple,' called Simōn, had a dispute with the High Priest.<sup>764</sup> The problem here is that the *Antiquities* do not mention this dispute between Onias and Simon. Instead, they present a complicated account of the issue of succession and refer to the family of Onias the elder as having two brothers, Jesus (also known as Jason) and another Onias, also known as Menelaos. These three brothers were all sons of Simōn. Onias the elder also had a little son also called Onias when Jason became High Priest.<sup>765</sup> The question here is which of the two above accounts is more reliable? It must be clear here that the *Antiquities* appear not to know anything about *II Maccabees* or its contents, thus increasing the chances that *II Maccabees* was written after the *Antiquities*. Therefore, is it possible that the author of *II Maccabees* altered and "enriched" the

---

<sup>762</sup> See above, Chapter 1, my discussion on the originality and identity of "Josephus."

<sup>763</sup> *Ant.* 12.138-44. Cf. Honigman, *Tales*, p. 302, Honigman accepts this as original, without having compared it with the evidence examined above on similar stories presented by the author of the *Antiquities*.

<sup>764</sup> *II Macc.* 3-4, ed. cit., vol. 1, pp. 1104-1110. For the alliance between the Jews of Jerusalem and Antiochos III which began in 200 BCE also see Portier, *Apocalypse*, pp. 55-58 and Rajak, *The Jewish*, p. 448 (as part of this alliance 2,000 Jewish mercenaries were settled in Phrygia and Lydia).

<sup>765</sup> *Ant.* 12.237-241, ed. cit., vol. 3, pp. 112-113. Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs*, p. 125, most probably under the influence of *II Maccabees*, concludes that Menelaos was not brother of Onias and that this text was fabricated in order to legitimize Menelaos.



information provided by the *Antiquities*<sup>766</sup> according to his own political interests?

According to *II Maccabees*, Simōn approached a Greek governor<sup>767</sup> and informed him that Onias hid a large amount of undeclared money in the Temple of Jerusalem. The governor reported the matter to King Antiochos III, who in turn appointed an investigator named Heliodōros to verify the information and collect the relevant taxes upon the undeclared amount hidden by Onias. Though Heliodōros failed to find the supposedly hidden funds, 'the wicked' Simōn did not hesitate to accuse Onias for secretly sharing the money with Heliodōros. Furthermore, Simōn instructed his supporters to attack and murder some of Onias's followers. In the meantime, King Antiochos III died and was succeeded by Antiochos IV Epiphanēs.<sup>768</sup> There are indications that the author of *II Maccabees* may be presenting a conspiracy theory above, namely that the Greeks of Antiochos III came to search for money because of a wicked Simōn. This may be fictional because Antiochos III was defeated by the Romans in Greece,<sup>769</sup> and according to Polybius (c.200-118 BCE), in the treaty of Apamea that followed c. 188 BCE, Antiochos III was forced by the Romans to pay the highest tribute ever: 15,000 talanta,<sup>770</sup> meaning that Antiochos III did not need any Simōn to tell him to start looking for hidden funds; he was already desperate to find them himself.

---

<sup>766</sup> Cf. Honigman, *Tales*, pp. 189-214 Hellenism in *Maccabees*, pp. 324-404, based on works of earlier scholars, tends to accept the plots of II Macc which do not exist in I Macc as historical. This is also the case with Daniel R. Schwartz mentioned in the first chapter.

<sup>767</sup> Apollōnios.

<sup>768</sup> *II Macc.* 3-4, ed. cit., vol. 1, pp. 1104-1110.

<sup>769</sup> In Thermopylae (191 BCE) and in Magnesia (190 BCE).

<sup>770</sup> Polybius of Megalopolis (fl. 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE), *Polybii Historiae* 21.43, ed. L. Dindorfus and T. Büttner-Wobst, 4 vols (Leipzig, 1866-82), vol. 3 (1867, Dind.), p. 338.; Honigman, *Tales*, p. 319-320, on the treaty of Apamea.

Epiphanēs, the son of Antiochos III was a strong King at that time, but the question here is how much of his father's financial strains he inherited, and how he managed to finance his own large scale military and building projects? It is important to observe here that according to Appian's *Syriaca*, Epiphanēs lost his own life (164-3 BCE) in a battle trying to confiscate the treasures of the Temple of Aphrodite in Elymais of Parthia.<sup>771</sup> Thus, if Epiphanēs was not short of funds, why did he risk his own life trying to steal cash? It is interesting to note here that although the author of *II Maccabees* appears to know about the historical circumstances under which Epiphanēs met his death while trying to rob the Temple of Aphrodite,<sup>772</sup> he does not report that Epiphanēs died there, but instead he continues with a story that Epiphanēs survived and in a state of frenzy because of his defeat in Elymais, he decided to turn against the Jews and 'make Jerusalem a cemetery for the Jews,'<sup>773</sup> but that God sent a painful and fatal disease to Epiphanēs; his body was filled with worms and his entire army was disgusted by the stench of their rotten King. Only at that stage Epiphanēs changed his mind and decided to grant them equal rights to the Athenians. He also returned to them all that he stole from the Temple, along with additional offerings, and praised the Jews with one more "official" and "original" letter which asked his successor to honour the Jews.<sup>774</sup> Does this not sound familiar to the style of the previous stories in "Josephus" and *III Maccabees*, where one after the other the Greek Kings realised that they should always seek the alliance of the Jews? Here, the author of *II Maccabees* makes Epiphanēs one more of those Kings who, in essence, serve Israel.

---

<sup>771</sup> Appian, *Syriaca* 352, vol. 1, p. 415; Cf. Portier, *Apocalypse*, pp. 78-91 (Portier must have made a mistake that the father of Epiphanes died in similar circumstances, while looting a Temple); Also Honigman, *Tales*, p. 326, on Epiphanes and his father looting more Temples in times of war.

<sup>772</sup> *II Macc.* 9.1-2.

<sup>773</sup> *II Macc.* 9.4.

<sup>774</sup> *II Macc.* 9.5-27.

Coming back to the plot of *II Maccabees* regarding the challenges High Priest Onias faced, a certain Jason<sup>775</sup> took advantage of the recent change in the throne of Antioch by making a financial offer to Epiphanēs to depose his own brother High Priest Onias from the vassal Israelite throne, so that he could become High Priest himself. Epiphanēs accepted Jason's offer and recognised him as the new leader of Israel.<sup>776</sup> Also according to *II Maccabees*, as part of the deal between the two new leaders, Jason asked King Epiphanēs for permission to establish a gymnasium and an *ephēbeion*, a place to educate the youth,<sup>777</sup> evidently because he wanted to make Jerusalem a *polis*.<sup>778</sup> One should also take into account here that Epiphanēs was building a number of polis/city-states within his Empire at that time because he wanted to develop the economy of his kingdom, but the author of *II Maccabees* again interprets certain events or constructs his own in a religious fashion. Just like he attacked Simōn before, he also blamed Jason that he turned his people to the 'Hellenic way of life,' (Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα)<sup>779</sup> which was against the ancestral teachings of Judaism. As a result, the vile *Hellenism* spread (ἀκμή τις Ἑλληνισμοῦ) among Israelites, meaning that the Greek Gentile culture was contrary to the fundamentals of Judaism. One should take into account here that there is no record of any BCE Greeks using this term (Hellenism) to define their own culture,<sup>780</sup> thus this the first time this term was used in this way. *II Maccabees* goes on to say that *Hellenic* beliefs had prevailed over Jewish traditions to such an extent, that even the priests preferred to attend sport events rather than

---

<sup>775</sup> Also known as Jesus.

<sup>776</sup> *II Macc.* 4.7-8, vol. 1, p. 1107.

<sup>777</sup> *II Macc.* 4.9, vol. 1, p. 1107.

<sup>778</sup> A *polis* should have sufficient population, a temple, a *dēmos* (a council of citizens), a *boulē* (a law making assembly), an *agora* (an organized regulated market that functioned in a certain place), a gymnasium (a stadium for training and sport events), a theatre for cultural events and educational foundations. See A.H.M Jones, *The Greek City, from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford, 1998<sup>2</sup>), pp. 27-50.

<sup>779</sup> *II Macc.* 4.10, vol. 1, p. 1107.

<sup>780</sup> The term *Hellēnismos* was used by ancient Greek writers to connote the proper Greek (Hellenic) literary style. Also see Honigman, *Tales*, pp. 189-214 (Hellenism in *Maccabees*).

serve in the Temple.<sup>781</sup> Offended by these changes brought to their land by the Greeks, the traditionalists looked upon Jason and his followers with suspicion, dislike and abomination.

The problem with the above narrative on Jason's conspiracy and the Hellenic culture in Jerusalem is that it derives solely from *II Maccabees*. *I Maccabees*, which for long has been considered an earlier source, although also not contemporary to Epiphanēs, does not report anything on Simōn's plot, nor even mentions Jason and his Hellenism. "Josephus" who tends to "know" more than anybody else regarding the history of Israel, is also unaware of these plots. Instead of the lengthy conspiracy stories provided by *II Maccabees*, *I Maccabees*, in just a few sentences, simply reports that during the reign of Epiphanēs some "renegades" of Israel allied themselves with the Gentiles by building a gymnasium in Jerusalem according to 'the laws of the Gentiles,' and had stopped being circumcised. Things were so wrong that some dared to marry Gentiles.<sup>782</sup> One should also observe that *I Maccabees* does not use any of the derivatives of the term Hellēn to define or attack the heathen changes, and the question here is whether this anti-Hellenic rhetoric which was used by the author of *II Maccabees*, reflects anti-Hellenic trends and influences from a later period, when the historical relations between the Greeks and his people were in a much worse state.

---

<sup>781</sup> *II Macc.* , 4.13-15, vol. 1, pp. 1107-1108: (ἀκμή τις Ἑλληνισμοῦ... καὶ τῶν θυσίων ἀμελοῦντες ἔσπευδον μετέχειν τῆς ἐν παλαίστρῃ ..., τὰς δὲ Ἑλληνικὰς δόξας).

<sup>782</sup> *I Macc.* 1.11-15, vol. 1, p. 1040. The Greek text states that they "made" (1.15: καὶ ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκροβυστίας) the skin they lost from circumcision. It is possible that the text simply refers to the *epispasma*, the protective leather device used by ancient athletes to protect their genitals while wrestling. Cf. Aharon Oppenheimer, 'The Ban on Circumcision as a Cause of the Revolt: A Reconsideration', in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome* ed. Peter Schäfer (Tübingen, 2003), pp. 55-69, pp. 62-65 on *mashukh*, the restoration of the foreskin by operation. Oppenheimer did not consider that they could simply have used the *epispasma*. Most scholars who are not familiar with medical studies are not aware that the surgical operation to restore the foreskin had little or no success to adults, but was more effective to children. See also Goldstein, 'Jewish,' pp. 64-87 at 87 (after Jason the Jews never built a gymnasium in Judea).

What raises further questions on the reliability of the history provided by the author of *II Maccabees* is that he continues with more fascinating plots and conspiracies, none of which exists in *I Maccabees*. Did this anonymous author of *II Maccabees* have unique sources in his hands, or is it possible that he was inventing the conspiracies because he wanted to discredit those who deposed Onias, and emphasize on their sinister nature? *II Maccabees* narrates that Menelaos, the brother of Simōn who had accused the former High Priest Onias for hiding money, in turn outbid High Priest Jason<sup>783</sup> and plotted to exterminate Onias.<sup>784</sup> Jason, having lost his throne, fled to Egypt to seek alliance with the Greek kingdom of the Ptolemies, the enemies of Epiphanēs. Not long after, *II Maccabees* explains that Menelaos had difficulties in paying the agreed revenues to Epiphanēs, and this is why Menelaos asked his brother Lysimachos to confiscate valuable offerings from the Temple and deliver them to Antioch. Some traditionalists perceived this act as a desecration of their Temple and reacted by going as far as to organise an active militant movement against Menelaos. As a result, Lysimachos led an army against the revolutionaries, but he lost the battle and was murdered.<sup>785</sup> At about the same time (c.168-167 BCE), Jason believed in false rumours that Epiphanēs died in a battle against the Ptolemies, and thought that this was a good chance to regain his position. With the help of the Ptolemies he led an army from Egypt against Menelaos, on the way slaughtering many of his fellow Israelites who resisted his return. Jason managed to encircle his opponent, who was defended by his supporters in the acropolis of Jerusalem, but had to flee soon after he realized that Epiphanēs was

---

<sup>783</sup> *II Macc.* 4:23-25, vol. 1, p. 1108.

<sup>784</sup> *II Macc.* 4:34, vol. 1, p. 1109.

<sup>785</sup> *II Macc.* 4:41-42, vol. 1, p. 1110.

alive and heading towards him with a powerful army. This time Jason did not return to Egypt but sought refuge in the land of the Spartans.<sup>786</sup>

*I Maccabees*,<sup>787</sup> not knowing anything about these internal conflicts in Jerusalem, simply states that Epiphanēs, on his way back from a war against the Ptolemies, looted the Temple and murdered many civilians because he was wicked. Right after this, *I Maccabees*<sup>788</sup> leaves an unexplained gap of two years, and then presents Epiphanēs leading a new army against the Jews and plundering Jerusalem for a second time without providing an explanation as to why Epiphanēs did so. The question here is whether *I Maccabees* conceals that Epiphanēs attacked the Jews because they sided with the Ptolemies, and alter the record in order to prove that the Jews had done nothing wrong. One should take into account here that the Jews, up to the father of Epiphanēs, had been the subjects of the Ptolemies, and that Onias who appears to have been deposed when the father of Epiphanēs was King, sought refuge to the Ptolemies. Does it make sense that Onias preferred to keep his family's oath of alliance to the Ptolemies, rather than co-operate fully with Antiochos III? If so, there is one more indication that the author of *II Maccabees* appears to have created his own conspiracies and plots in order to fill the "un-explained" gaps in *I Maccabees* and provide convincing explanations as to why the Jews were in troubles during

---

<sup>786</sup> *II Macc.* 5:5-10, vol. 1, pp. 1110-1111. At this point one should observe that *I Maccabees* also confirms the excellent relations between certain Jews and Spartans in three instances, and calls the two peoples 'brothers.' See In *I Macc.* 12:6-11, vol. 1, p. 1085 (brothers and friends of the Jewish people). In 12:19-23, vol. 1, pp. 1085-1086, King Arius of the Spartans confirmed in a letter that Jews and Spartans are brothers of the family of Abraham. In 14:20, vol. 1, p. 1092, a Spartan letter sent to the High priest Simōn Maccabee calls the Jews as 'brothers of Spartans.' My question here is whether the author of *II Maccabees* modeled a fictitious story of Jason's flee to Sparta on the earlier reports in *I Maccabees* which mention good relations between the Jews and the Spartans but say nothing about any Jason High Priest visiting them. It should be noted here that *I Maccabees* also calls the Romans as brothers of the Jews, at a time when the Romans were building an alliance with certain Israelites against certain Greeks. It may be wrong, therefore, to interpret those remarks as evidence of a racial/tribal or religious relation between Israelites, Spartan Greeks and Romans.

<sup>787</sup> 1.20-28, vol. 1, pp. 1040-41.

<sup>788</sup> 1. 29-34, vol. 1, p. 1041.

that period. *II Maccabees* appears to "know in detail" that the reaction against Menelaos evolved into a full-scale revolution against him and his patron Epiphanēs. According to the same source, no fewer than "80,000" of the Israelites, who participated in the revolution, were slaughtered by Epiphanēs's army.<sup>789</sup> Soon after his victory he removed the newly acquired status of *polis* from Jerusalem,<sup>790</sup> and with the help and guidance of the traitorous High Priest Menelaos he plundered the treasures of the Jerusalem Temple.<sup>791</sup> Instead of this plot, *I Maccabees* simply presents the story that Epiphanēs was an evil man because he issued a decree that all his subjects throughout his kingdom 'should be one people, and that all should give up their particular customs.'<sup>792</sup> According to this decree, the Jews had to stop the sacrifices to their God, stop keeping the Sabbath and their holy festivals; defile their Temple; built new temples for idols; sacrifice swine; stop circumcision and abandon the *Law*, or else face the death penalty.<sup>793</sup> As a result of this policy, according to *I Maccabees* pagan temples were built in the towns of the tribe of Judah; books that contained the *Law* were burned; those who kept copies of the *Law* were murdered; the women and the families who had their children circumcised were also murdered; the circumcised children were hanged from the necks of their murdered mothers and many Israelites preferred to die than eat unclean food.<sup>794</sup> It is important to observe here that *I Maccabees* also reports that on the 25th day of Kislev the profaners offered sacrifices on the Holy Altar of the Jerusalem Temple.<sup>795</sup> *II Maccabees* further elaborates on this story that Epiphanēs renamed the Temple of Jerusalem to 'Temple of the Olympian Zeus' and decorated it with statues of

---

<sup>789</sup> *II Macc.* 5:14, vol. 1, p. 1111.

<sup>790</sup> *II Macc.* 5:22-23, vol. 1, p. 1112: he appointed his own governors, Phillip in Jerusalem and Andronicus in Gerizim.

<sup>791</sup> *II Macc.* 5:15-16, vol. 1, p. 1111.

<sup>792</sup> *I Macc.* 1:41, vol. 1, p. 1042.

<sup>793</sup> *I Macc.* 1:42-50, vol. 1, p. 1042.

<sup>794</sup> *I Macc.* 1:54-63, vol. 1, p. 1043; Cf. *II Macc.* 6:10, vol. 1, p. 1113 (two women who circumcised their children had their infants hanged from their breasts and after they were paraded in the city so everyone will see them, were thrown to their death from a high wall).

<sup>795</sup> *I Macc.* 1:59, vol. 1, p. 1043.

Gods and of himself. He also transformed the Israelite Temple in Gerizim to a 'Temple of Xenius Zeus,' meaning Zeus guardian of hospitality to strangers and foreigners. According to the author of *II Maccabees*, these changes transformed the Temple of Salomon into a place of 'idolatry and prostitution,' for even Gentiles and women were free to approach the courtyard of the Jerusalem Temple.<sup>796</sup> Epiphanēs also sent a distinguished Athenian teacher of advanced age in order to persuade the Jews to change religion. The text is clear that the situation was so seriously wrong that a festival of Dionysus was introduced in Jerusalem on the strength of a decree. Neighbouring Greek cities (Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις) were ordered to compel the Israelites to participate in pagan sacrifices and execute those who refused to follow Greek rituals (ἐπὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικά).<sup>797</sup>

Just like in the aforementioned events when Jason introduced "Hellenism" in Israel, one should observe here that it is *II Maccabees* again, and not *I Maccabees*, which systematically uses derivatives of Hellēn in a pejorative context.<sup>798</sup> The question remains, why the author of *II Maccabees* is obsessed with naming the religion and the changes introduced by Epiphanēs as Hellenic? And why is he so eager to prove that a number of High Priests were corrupt traitors and illegal usurpers?

To make those "events" even more tragic, the author of *IV Maccabees* provides a "detailed and accurate historical report" on how Epiphanēs tortured and murdered Eleazar, a man of priestly status of advanced age, together with a

---

<sup>796</sup> This was and still is unthinkable in the minds of certain hard-liners, for even up to nowadays women are not permitted to approach certain remains of the ancient courtyard of the Jerusalem Temple.

<sup>797</sup> *II Macc.* 6:1-9, vol. 1, pp. 1112-1113: ... γέροντα Ἀθηναῖον ... Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου καὶ τὸν ἐν Γαριζίν,... Διὸς Ξενίου... ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπεπληροῦτο ῥαθυμούντων μεθ' ἑταιρῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς περιβόλοις γυναιξὶ πλησιαζόντων..., γενομένης δὲ Διονυσίων ἑορτῆς... Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις..., τοὺς δὲ μὴ προαιρουμένους μεταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικά κατασφάζειν.

<sup>798</sup> *I Maccabees* used Hellēnes in two instances and in a more neutral historical context: 1:10, vol. 1, p. 1040: βασιλείας Ἑλλήνων. Also see 8:18.



pious woman and her seven innocent sons.<sup>799</sup> Epiphanēs tortured the seven brothers in order to force them to adopt the "Greek way of life" (μεταλαμβάντες Ἑλληνικοῦ βίου).<sup>800</sup> They were exterminated because they refused to live like the Greeks; they refused to eat pork and other unclean food from sacrifices to the idols. Most scholars conclude that this story is fictional, and the fact remains that even "Josephus," a foremost authority of Israelite history, was not even aware of the existence of *II* and *IV Maccabees*.<sup>801</sup> The question, therefore remains: when exactly did this anti-Hellenic rhetoric of *II* and *IV Maccabees* emerge? Did anti-Hellenism emerge in history at the period the two sources talk about,<sup>802</sup> or do they reflect an anti-Hellenism that flourished at the time when these authors were active, and which influenced the way they interpreted and understood the distant past? Were there any future developments in the relations between the Greeks and the Israelites, which led certain religious men to re-examine the past and re-write it enriched with anti-Hellenism?

### 3.3: The *Maccabees* and "Josephus" from Mattathias to Simon

According to both Brandon and Montserrat Torrents, the first followers of Jesus were inspired by the "Maccabean tradition of holy war,"<sup>803</sup> but these two scholars did not provide a convincing analysis on how this notion of "holy war" emerged and by what means Early Christianity embraced it as its own.

According to *I Maccabees* a hard-line priest called Mattathias, the grandson of Hasmon,<sup>804</sup> fled to the mountains together with his five sons, some relatives and

---

<sup>799</sup> *IV Macc.* 5:3-18, vol. 1, pp. 1163-1164; *II Macc.* 6:18-7.42, vol. 1, pp. 1113-1118.

<sup>800</sup> *IV Macc.* 8:8-13, vol. 1, pp. 1168-1169: καὶ μεταλαμβάντες Ἑλληνικοῦ βίου καὶ μεταδιδιαιτηθέντες ἐντροφίσατε ταῖς νεότησιν ὑμῶν.

<sup>801</sup> Shepkaru, *Jewish*, p. 41: Josephus was aware only of *I Maccabees*. .

<sup>802</sup> J. J. Collins, 'The limits of Hellenization in Judea', in Collins, *Jewish*, pp. 21-43 at 33-40, just like the majority of scholars, accepts the explanation provided by the *Maccabees* on the religious persecutions initiated by Epiphanēs.

<sup>803</sup> Brandon, *Trial*, p. 144; *Jesús*, pp. 51-58.

<sup>804</sup> His descendants who became leaders and Kings of Israel were also known as the 'Hasmoneans.'

"the **Hassidim** (Ἀσιδαῖοι), the powerful force of Israel who all were dedicated to the *Law*," organized militant resistance against Epiphanēs and slaughtered the sinners and those who abandoned the *Law*.<sup>805</sup> One should observe here that the term 'Hassid,' the singular of Hassidim, appears also in the *Psalms* of David. The *Septuagint* version of the *Psalms* translates Hassid/im (ὅσιος, ὅσιοι in plural) as 'pious' or 'holy.'<sup>806</sup> As already examined above in the second chapter, some ancient Christian scholars used this term (ὅσιοι), as synonymous to the Essenes. Some modern scholars<sup>807</sup> also find this explanation possible, but so far there is no evidence that this term can be applied exclusively to the Essenes and not also to other 'pious' devoted believers who kept the *Law* with zeal. However, there may be one more point which connects the Hassidim with the Essenes, in the sense that Russell Gmirkin presented strong evidence that the *War Scroll* refers to weapons used by the Roman army in the 2nd c. BCE and must have been published c. 163 BCE or later because it refers to the "restoration of the Temple" and, most probably, to the battle against Lysias c. 163-164. Gmirkin clearly identifies the Hasidim holy warriors who supported Judas to the circle who published the *War Scroll*, meaning the "Essenes."<sup>808</sup> Brian Schultz also clearly identified "the sons of darkness (Kittim)" mentioned in the *War Scroll*,

---

<sup>805</sup> *I Macc.* 2, pp. 1043-1047; 2.42: συναγωγή Ἀσιδαίων, ἰσχυροὶ δυνάμει ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ; 2:44 (ἐπάταξαν ἀμαρτωλοὺς, ... ἀνόμους). Cf. *II Macc.* 14.6.

<sup>806</sup> The Hassidim are also known as Hasideans, Hassidic or 'Asideans'; See *OT, Psalms* (e.g., 30, 31 and 37). In *Sept.* see *Psalms* 29:5, vol. 2, p. 27; 30:24, p. 29; 31:6, p. 30; 36:28, p.37. Cf. P. R. Davies, 'Hassidim in the Maccabaeian period,' *JJS* 28.2 (1977), pp. 127-40 at p. 140, the Hassidim were not a specific group of people.

<sup>807</sup> Eg. John Kampen, *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (Atlanta, 1988), pp. 2-17 (on the thirty two instances of hasyd in the Psalms) pp. 32-40, and pp. 151-161 on the various linguistic arguments which identify the Hassidim with the Pharisees and the Essenes. pp. 161-171 on various and numerous evidence from Greek inscriptions and texts which confirm *Ant.* 3:163 that *essen* in Greek means logion; pp. 217-218, evidence from the Hebrew Scriptures that any pious Israelite could be called hassid. Also see the relevant section of Chapter 2.

<sup>808</sup> Gmirkin, 'War ' in Schiffman, *Dead*, pp. 486-496 at 487-488.

with the Seleucids.<sup>809</sup> Therefore, according to Gmirkin and Schultz, both the Essenes and the Hassidim appear to have exactly the same enemies.

Trying to investigate who exactly those Hassidim were, I observed that "Josephus" does not use the term Hassidim anywhere in his works. This does not mean that Josephus was not aware of the existence of these pious people. Instead of using the term Hassidim, which makes no sense in Greek, I observed that "Josephus" used the Greek term **Zealots** to name them. For example, according to the *Antiquities*, those who followed Mattathias, after he killed a Greek "general of the King," are not called Hassidim; they are called Zealots. Those Zealots followed Mattathias to the desert and the caves.<sup>810</sup> It is also important to observe that "Josephus" in his *Vita* stated that he was an Essene for three years, and during that period himself said that he was a Zealot follower of an Essene teacher.<sup>811</sup>

It is important to make it clear here that according to the narrative of *I*, *II* and *IV Maccabees* the "Maccabees martyrs" who later were accepted by Christianity as its own first martyrs, were either allies or sympathisers or identical to the Hassidim who fought against the Greeks of Epiphanēs and his Israelite allies. *I Maccabees* states that c.166 BCE, Mattathias with his Hassidim/Zealots conducted guerrilla warfare in mountainous areas against those who were loyal to Epiphanēs. His first victims were a Jew who sacrificed to the idols and an officer (referred to as a General in the *Antiquities*) of the King.<sup>812</sup> According to both *I* and *II Maccabees*, in response to Mattathias's aggression, the Greek King increased his military presence in the area and appointed a General called

---

<sup>809</sup> Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* (Leiden, 2009), p.393-394.

<sup>810</sup> *Ant.* 12.270-73, vol. 3, p. 118 : "εἴ τις ζηλωτής ἐστὶν τῶν πατρίων ἔθων καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ θρησκείας, ἐπέσθω, φησὶν, ἐμοί," ... ἔφυγον εἰς τὴν ἔρημον καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις διῆγον. This is the first time *Ant.* use the term Zealot.

<sup>811</sup> 10-12, vol. 4, pp. 322-23.

<sup>812</sup> *I Macc.* 2:23-25, vol. 1, p. 1044.

Lysias (d.162 BCE) to suppress the revolutionaries. The anti-Hellenic *II Maccabees* provides an extra "explanation" that Lysias intended to colonise Jerusalem with Greeks (Ἑλλησιν οἰκητήριον), without respecting that Israel belongs to God (θεοῦ κράτος). Lysias, we are told, also wanted to auction the High Priest Throne on an annual basis, just like it happened at all other Gentile Temples.<sup>813</sup> Again, the question here is whether *II Maccabees* gives as a historical or fictional account regarding Lysias's intentions to colonise Jerusalem with Greeks, for *I Maccabees* does not mention this.<sup>814</sup> Also, one should take into account that the only other record of Jerusalem colonised by Greeks is by Hadrian in the second century. Could this be an indication that the author of *II Maccabees* enriched his narrative with events he witnessed during his lifetime, possibly in the second century CE? Does his anti-Hellenism reflect CE rather than BCE Israelite perceptions of the Greeks?

*II* and *IV Maccabees* are not the only *Septuagint* books, which present pejorative perceptions of Ἕλλην and its derivatives. The *Septuagint Isaiah* states that both the Syrians from the East and the *Hellēnes* from the West devoured Israel.<sup>815</sup> The Hebrew text, however, instead of *Hellēnes* has Philistines.<sup>816</sup> Unless the Philistines were a people of Greek descent, the question here is why the translator/editor opted for *Hellēnes* instead of Philistines? Did he want to emphasise the ferocity of the Greek wars against Israel? *Zacharias* also presents the *Hellēnes* as enemies of the sons of Sion.<sup>817</sup> There are two more altered

---

<sup>813</sup> *II Macc.* 11:1-4, vol. 1, p. 1126: τὴν μὲν πόλιν Ἑλλησιν οἰκητήριον ποιήσιν, τὸ δὲ ἱερόν ἀργυρολόγητον, καθὼς τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τεμένη, πρῶτην δὲ κατὰ ἔτος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ποιήσιν, οὐδαμῶς ἐπιλογιζόμενος τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος.

<sup>814</sup> *I Macc.* 3:32-41.

<sup>815</sup> *Isaiah* 9:11, vol. 2, p. 578: Συρίαν ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀφ' ἡλίου δυσμῶν τοὺς κατεσθίοντας τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ὅλῳ τῷ στόματι.

<sup>816</sup> The Hebrew text of *The Holy Scriptures*, 9.11, p. 489, states: "The Arameans on the east and the Philistines on the west; and they devour Israel with open mouth".

<sup>817</sup> Hebrew *Zacharias* 9:14 (Yāwān) is extant in *Sept. Zacharias* 9:13, vol. 2, p. 554: καὶ ἐπεγεῶν τὰ τέκνα σου, Σιών, ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τῶν Ἑλλήνων. CCB, p. 226: these chapters of *Zacharias* are "a collection of disparate material dating from the exile (6<sup>th</sup> c. BCE) to Hellenistic." Eissfeldt, *OT*, p.

passages in the *Septuagint Jeremiah*. The first gives the adjective *Hellenic* to the destructive sword under which the Jewish people suffered when the Jews were slaves of the ancient Egyptians,<sup>818</sup> while the second passage refers to a *Hellenic* destructive sword when the Babylonians enslaved the Jews.<sup>819</sup> In both passages the Hellenic swords indicate the destruction of the Jews at the hands of the Egyptians and Babylonians. The problem here is that the Hebrew text in both instances does not call the sword Greek or anything else. Why then the *Septuagint* names the "swords" which devastated Israel as Greek? Were these swords called Greek in an early BCE version of the *Septuagint* or have they been named as such at a later stage, when the *Septuagint* was revised during or after relations between Greeks and Israelites reached their worse point?

Going back to the narrative of *II Maccabees* after Epiphanēs lost his life trying to loot the Temple of Aphrodite, its anonymous author presents one more "official" letter written by King Antiochos Eupatōr (r. 164-162), sent to general Lysias with orders to re-establish the former status of the Israelites, to allow the Jerusalem Temple to return to its previous traditional use, and not convert them to Hellenism (ἐπὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μεταθέσει).<sup>820</sup> Menelaos, the illegitimate and wicked High Priest installed by King Antiochos Epiphanēs, was arrested and

---

437, suggested that this passage was composed between the end of fourth and early third c. BCE. *Isaiah* states that *Hellas* is a country of people who 'have not heard the name and glory of God: *Isaiah* 66:19, *Sept.* vol. 2, p. 655: καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ εἰς τὰς νήσους. The Hebrew *Isaiah* text, as in *Ezekiel* 27:13, uses *Javan* (Yāwān) instead of *Hellas*: see *Holy Scriptures*, 66:19, p. 559. The book of *Isaiah* was originally written in the second half of the 8<sup>th</sup> c. BCE, but ch. 66 examined above and chs. 1-35 (to be examined below) have undergone various changes over a long period of time: Eissfeldt, *Old Testament*, pp. 304-346. See also CCB, p.171. Scholars have suggested that *Isaiah* 66 was probably the work of an author who wrote between 539 and 520 B.C.: CCB, p.180.

<sup>818</sup> *Jeremiah* 26:16, vol. 2, p. 698: ... πρὸς τὸν λαὸν ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα ἡμῶν ἀπὸ προσώπου μαχαίρας Ἑλληνικῆς. 'Hellēnikēs' does not exist in the Hebrew text: see *Jeremiah* 46:16, in *Holy Scriptures*, p. 627. *Jeremiah* is a Book whose narrative covers the historical period from the last decades of the 7<sup>th</sup> c. to the first decades of the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BCE. The original size and date of *Jeremiah* is disputed: CCB, pp. 185-186.

<sup>819</sup> *Jeremiah* 27:16, vol. 2, p. 700: ἐξολοθρεύσατε σπέρμα ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος, κατέχοντα δρέπανον ἐν καιρῷ θερισμοῦ· ἀπὸ προσώπου μαχαίρας Ἑλληνικῆς. As in the case above, 'Hellēnikēs' does not exist in the Hebrew text: see *The Holy Scriptures*, 50.16, p. 628-29.

<sup>820</sup> *II Macc.* 11:22-26, vol. 1, p. 1127.

thrown from the top of a tower by Lysias on the orders of the new King.<sup>821</sup> Lysias filled the vacant High Priest throne with a person called Alkimos (also known as Joakimos, or Joakim), who had served as High Priest some time in the past.<sup>822</sup> According to *I Maccabees* General Lysias was later executed on the orders of the King that followed, Dēmētrios Sôtēr Seleucos (r.162-150BCE), who murdered his own cousin Eupatōr to claim the throne for himself. Contrary to *II Maccabees* which claims that Eupatōr appointed Alkimos, *I Maccabees* is clear that it was Dēmētrios who supported Alkimos to become High Priest.<sup>823</sup> *II Maccabees* reports that when Alkimos took over, the Jerusalemites who participated in the revolution initiated by Mattathias gradually abandoned resistance. Even the son of Mattathias, Judas the first Maccabee,<sup>824</sup> who in the meantime had inherited the leadership of the Zealot Hassidim (Ασιδαῖοι) from his deceased father,<sup>825</sup> made peace with the new Greek envoy Nikanōr, abandoned his vow of celibacy and got married.<sup>826</sup> The question here is whether Judas gave a Nazirite vow, as examined previously in the second Chapter. *I Maccabees* is clear that the followers of Judas Maccabee prepared for battle, prayed, fasted, gathered the Nazirites and were ready to go to war against the Gentiles.<sup>827</sup> In other words, the Nazirites were an essential force that were called to participate in the war, and there more indications that those Nazirites were no other than the Hassidim followers of Judas's father Mattathias, mentioned by the same source above. Also according to *I Maccabees*, the Hassidim who

---

<sup>821</sup> *II Macc*: 13.1-8, vol. 1, pp. 1131-1132.

<sup>822</sup> *II Macc*. 14:1-13, vol. 1, pp. 1133-1134.

<sup>823</sup> *I Macc*. 7:1-4, vol. 1, p. 1063.

<sup>824</sup> Zeitlin, *Rise*, p. 96, Makkaba in Hebrew means "hammer-head". Judas was called as such "because of the shape of his skull." He also proved to be a hard "hammer" warrior. Judas's brothers also became known as Maccabees for they, too, were mighty warriors.

<sup>825</sup> *II Macc*. 14:1-6, vol. 1, p. 1134; 14:6. Ασιδαῖοι

<sup>826</sup> *II Macc*. 14:10-25, vol. 1, pp. 1134-1135. Cf. M. Aquilar, 'Maccabees - Symbolic Wars and Age sets', in *Ancient Israel, the Old Testament in its social context*, ed. P. Esler (London, 2005), pp. 240-253 at 251 (Judas Naziraio). See also *II Macc*. 5:27 (Judas and nine others lived for some time in the desert).

<sup>827</sup> *I Maccabees* 3:42-60, (44: battle; 47: fasted; 49: ἡγειραν τοὺς ναζιραῖους; 45: υἱοὶ ἀλλογενῶν; 52,58: ἔθνη).

later wanted peace, trusted the "ungodly" Alkimos soon after his arrival because he was a proper descendant of Aaron, but later, for a reason that is not explained, he ordered for the execution of sixty of them.<sup>828</sup> *II Maccabees* elaborates on this; the Hassidim challenged the authority of High Priest Alkimos and increased their opposition with the aim to depose him. Soon after, Alkimos complained to King Dēmētrios Sotēr that the rebels collaborated with Judas Maccabee.<sup>829</sup> The indication here is that this is based on *I Maccabees* which reports that Judas was working behind the scenes to undermine the unjust Alkimos who was helped by "the renegades and godless men of Israel."<sup>830</sup> From the above it is evident that both books present history from the side of the Hassidim/Naziraii and not from the side of Alkimos and his Greek allies. Interestingly, the *Antiquities* take this anti-Alkimos sentiment a step further by indicating that he was illegitimate because he was not a member of a High Priest family,<sup>831</sup> something that even *I Maccabees* accepted (line of Aaron).

So far, we have seen that the *Maccabees* books, as well as "Josephus," not only sided with those whom the *Maccabees* called Hassidim/Naziraii and Josephus called Zealots, but have also attacked every single High Priest who co-operated closely with the Greeks as a traitor of Judaism. There are further important indications that our sources (the anti-Hellenic *II Maccabees* in particular), did not hesitate to fabricate fiction and present it as undisputable historical fact in order to legitimise the struggle of the Hassidim/Naziraii.

Regardless the above report in *II Maccabees* that the ancient Jewish religious order was re-established in the Temple on the orders of King Eupatōr, the same source provides contradictory evidence that when Epiphanēs died, Judas

---

<sup>828</sup> *I Macc.* 7:12-16, vol. 1, p. 1064.

<sup>829</sup> *II Macc.* 14:3-8, vol. 1, pp. 1133-1143.

<sup>830</sup> *I Macc.* 7:24-25, vol. 1, p. 1065; 7:5 (renegade, godless)

<sup>831</sup> *Ant.* 12. 387, vol. 3, p. 139.

Maccabee gradually gained control of Jerusalem, and on the 25<sup>th</sup> of Kislev of that year, it was him and not the party of Alkimos and Lysias who re-established the former use of the Temple.<sup>832</sup> The question arises as to which of the two accounts is accurate. What had really happened in Jerusalem that time? Was it King Eupatōr as according to *II Maccabees*, King Dēmētrios Sōtēr Seleucos as according to *I Maccabees*, or Judas as according to the second version in *II Maccabees* who "restored" the Temple? At this point it is important to pay attention to the finds of Professor Daniel R. Schwartz who observed that *II Maccabees* 10:1-8 (Judas liberated the Temple on the 25<sup>th</sup> of Kislev) is written in a very different style of language to the rest of the text. It is of a noticeably poorer standard. This difference, along with the fact that this statement contradicts information provided in the same source, brought Schwartz to conclude that this story that Judas liberated the Temple has been interpolated at a later stage.<sup>833</sup> My question here is why there was need for such an interpolation, if not to magnify the struggle of the Hassidim/Naziraiot,<sup>834</sup> and where exactly is the solid evidence that the Temple ceased at any time to function as the religious centre of Judaism? According to what the *Maccabees* books have told us so far, there was always a High Priest together with his followers serving in the Temple until Judas "liberated it."<sup>835</sup> Therefore, what exactly did these Hassidim/Naziraiot do in Jerusalem Temple and when?

The Jews appear to celebrate the restoration by Judas Maccabee on the date mentioned in *I Maccabees*<sup>836</sup> and *II Maccabees*<sup>837</sup> (the 25<sup>th</sup> of the Israelite month of

---

<sup>832</sup> *II Macc.* 10:1-8, vol. 1, p. 1123. Lysias re-established the Temple: *II Macc.* 11:16-12.1, vol. 1, pp. 1126-1128.

<sup>833</sup> Schwartz, *2 Macc.*, p. 8.

<sup>834</sup> Cf. J. W. van Henten, 'Royal Ideology, 1 and 2 Maccabees and Egypt,' in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, eds T. Rajak, S. Pearce et. al. (Berkeley, 2007), pp. 265-282 at 266: *I Maccabees* emphasises on the legitimacy of Judas and his relatives as leaders of Israel.

<sup>835</sup> Also cf. *I Macc.* 4:34-44, vol. 1, pp. 1052-1053 (Lysias lost a battle from Judas, whose soldiers liberated the Temple).

<sup>836</sup> 4:52-59.

<sup>837</sup> 10:5.



Kislev),<sup>838</sup> which, as already mentioned above, is exactly the same date reported in *I Maccabees*,<sup>839</sup> when the first Gentile sacrifices took place in the Temple. It is important to observe here that, as examined in the first Chapter, it is not clear when exactly these celebrations became established on an annual basis. The Karaites, a certain Jewish group which claims to be the original continuator of ancient Judaism, appear never to have accepted this festival as legitimate or their own.<sup>840</sup> Regardless of any objections that the Karaites are continuators of an original and more ancient Judaism, the question is still here: why did the authors/interpolators of the *Maccabees* choose the 25th of Kislev for their festival? This is exactly the same date as when the Gentiles, together with the profaners and the heretics, celebrated and sacrificed together in the Temple. Could this be the festival of Dionysus mentioned in *II Macc.* 6:1-9, which was celebrated on the 25th of December?<sup>841</sup> Is it possible that a High Priest moved a few weeks forward in the calendar the Sukkot celebrations in order to bring together Israelite and non-Israelite religious traditions? Is this why Hanukkah (the liberation festival) has the same duration as Sukkot?<sup>842</sup> There is a case where the Early Christians did something very similar with one of their own festivals. It appears that Christianity initially celebrated the birthday of Jesus on the 6<sup>th</sup> January, but it moved this festival backward to the 25<sup>th</sup> December, when the celebrations of Natalis Invicti and of other pagan cults were held.<sup>843</sup>

---

<sup>838</sup> Χασελευ (no accent in the edition ) in Greek.

<sup>839</sup> 1:59.

<sup>840</sup> Rabbi Samuel Schafler, *The Hasmoneans in Jewish Historiography* (Jerusalem(?), 1973), p. 24 "The Karaites refused to accept the holiday of Hanukah on the basis that it is a post-biblical festival."

<sup>841</sup> For the 25<sup>th</sup> of December: Rankin, *The Origins*, pp. 105-106; Bartlet, *1 Macc*, p. 74, has also observed the similarities with the Dionysus festival.

<sup>842</sup> VanderKam, 'Hanukkah,' pp. 32-34, trying to solve the mystery of how exactly and why the Hanukkah celebrations began, raised the hypothesis that the author of the *I Maccabees* misinterpreted the celebrations of Sukkot (also known as Tabernacles or Booths) as being a new festival, and for this reason he moved its date forward a few weeks. For the eight days festival of Sukkot see *Leviticus* 23:36.

<sup>843</sup> E. Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Michigan, 2003), pp. 318, on Saturnalia (the birth of the invincible sun, *Solis invicti*), and Christmas. Cf. G. H. Halsberghe, *The cult of Sol Invictus* (Leiden, 1972), p. 174 (the birth of Sol Invictus on the 25th December); pp. 82-83

According to Persian tradition, God Mithra was also born on 25 December not from the womb of a woman but from a ray of light that fall on a rock, in the presence of shepherds. This strongly resembles the Christian tradition that the light of a star struck the rocky cave where Christ was born on 25 December, also in the presence of shepherds. It is relevant to examine here that according to Jerome (c.348-420), the cave in Bethlehem was an ancient place of worshipping God Thamuz Adonidēs, also known as Osiris-Tammuz.<sup>844</sup> It is clear that after the change of dates, the birthday of the Liberator of Humanity coincides with the birthday of other important gods, thus making Jesus more familiar and easier to accept. One should also observe here that apart from the similarity between the Christmas and the Temple liberation/Hanukkah dates, one can also find similarities between the spiritual meanings of the two religious festivities. On 25<sup>th</sup> December Christianity celebrates the birth of Christ who came as a liberator/saviour in order to restore mankind to the spiritual condition before the *original sin*. Similarly, on the 25<sup>th</sup> of Kislev, Judaism celebrates its rebirth after the sinful conversion to Greek paganism.

According to *I Maccabees*, after his success in "liberating" the Temple, Judas Maccabee returned to the employment of militant methods in his struggle against his political opponent, High Priest Alkimos, and his Greek allies.

---

(Emperor Elagabalus [218-222], the so-called Sol invictus, abstained from the consumption of pork, and some followers of the the cult were circumcised); Not only gods Mithras and Istar, but also their Latin equivalent God Sol Invictus (the undefeated Sun) were also born on the 25<sup>th</sup> December. It should be noted that during the early centuries many Christians did not celebrate Christmas, for they considered the celebrations for the birth of Christ as sinister fabrications, far from original Christianity. For example, Origen, *Matthaei* 10.22, p. 248, attacked the introduction of birthday celebrations on the basis that they were a sinful tradition introduced by the vile Pharraohs. Christmas were introduced gradually. In the fourth century they gained some official recognition in Constantinople, but it took a long time until Christmas became widely accepted and established as mainstream tradition.

<sup>844</sup> Jerome, *Epistula* 58, ed. I. Hilberg, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, 4 vols (Vienna, 1996), vol. 1, p. 532. J. M. Robertson, *Pagan Christs, studies in comparative Hierology* (London, 1911<sup>2</sup>), pp. 315- 338 (influences of Mithraism to Judaism and Christianity); p. 321 (both Mithra and Jesus were born in a cave). T. Harpur, *The Pagan Christ, recovering the lost light* (Toronto, 2004), pp. 76-90 (on similarities between Egyptian God Horus, son of Osiris, and Christ).

Initially, Judas was victorious against the troops of Dēmētrios Sotēr who supported his trusted friend Alkimos, but Judas was later killed during this new war.<sup>845</sup> The youngest son of Mattathias, Jonathan, inherited the leadership of the revolutionary movement and it was he who later became the first Hasmonean High Priest (c.153-152 BCE) with the support of his own political ally, the Greek King Alexander Balas (r. 150-145 BCE), a usurper supported by the King of Pergamum Attalos II Philadelphos (220-138 BCE).<sup>846</sup> Both usurpers, the Jewish Jonathan and the Greek Balas co-operated in order to secure their own political survival, but Jonathan faced serious internal opposition on the grounds that he did not come from a High Priestly family and as such he did not have legal rights to become High Priest. It is important to note here the two different priestly traditions, that of the Sadducees, the traditional class of the High Priests, and the Levite priests, the class where the Hasmoneans belonged. It is not clear whether these two different traditions derived from two different Israelite ethnic groups: the Sadducean from the Jebusites who appear in a Temple in Jerusalem before the Jews arrived, and the Levite from the tribe of Judah.<sup>847</sup> One should also note here the important difference in the beliefs of the Sadducees from the beliefs of other Israelites on life after death. My question

---

<sup>845</sup> *I Macc.* 9:1-22, vol. 1, pp. 1069-1070.

<sup>846</sup> *I Macc.* 10:15-21, vol. 1, p. 1074.

<sup>847</sup> The name of the Sadducees appears as a derivative of the name of a certain priest called Saddouk (also known as Shaddock, Zadok, Zedek or Zedeq, most probably meaning 'just'). In the OT a certain Saddouk was a priest with a high status in the court of the most important king of Israel, David (c.1037-967 BCE?): *Sept., Samuel (II Regnorum)* 8:17, vol. 1, p. 581; *Sept., III Regnorum* 4:4, vol. 1, p. 635. For descendants of Saddouk see *Sept. II Ezdras* 7:2-8:2, vol. 1, pp. 913-915; 13:29, p. 927; 20:2 and 22, p. 941; 21:11, p. 943; 23:13, p. 949; *Sept. Ezechiel*, 40:46, vol. 2, p. 847; 42:13, p. 850; 43:19, p. 852; 44:15, p. 853; 48:11, p. 861. According to I. M. Gafni, 'Pre-histories of Jerusalem in Hellenistic, Jewish and Christian literature', *JSP* 1 (1987), pp. 5-22 at 5, Joshua executed the Jebusite king of Jerusalem Adoni Zedek: *Joshua* 10:1-27; Jerusalem was burned by Jews after Joshua's death: *Judges* 1:1-8. According to *Judges* 19:11-12, regardless of any defeat the Jebusites might have suffered, Jerusalem remained inhabited by Jebusites and was regarded by the Israelites as a city of foreigners. Some scholars indicate that the Temple of Solomon was in fact the evolution of a previous Temple dedicated to a Jebusite deity that was served at some stage by the High Priest called Saddouk. See B. F. Batto, 'Zedeq', in *DDD*, cols. 1750-1758; E. Hirsch and M. Seligsohn, 'Jebusites', in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 12 vols. (New York, 1907), vol. 7, p. 81; K. Kaufmann, 'Sadducees', *ibid.*, vol. 10, pp. 630-633.

here is whether two different priestly traditions competed for the control of the Temple. It is also important to note that according to Christian tradition, the leaders of early Christianity were also Levites and did not identify themselves with the Sadducee class. This provides one more link between the *Maccabees* books, which praise the Levite Hasmoneans, and the Christians who also appear to have Levite leaders and who preserved the *Maccabees* books as their own.

Another problem, which questions the reliability of *I Maccabees*, upon which most scholars accept Judas as liberator of the Temple, is the explanation this source provides on how High Priest Alkimos lost his throne.<sup>848</sup> Alkimos ordered for the demolition of a wall in the Temple, but "this was against what the Prophets taught," and Alkimos was "stricken," then paralysed and died in "great agony."<sup>849</sup> Although *I Maccabees* dates Alkimos's death at a time when Jonathan was leader, thus after the death of Judas, the *Antiquities* date it to when Judas was still alive and add that after Alkimos died the people proclaimed Judas as their own High Priest.<sup>850</sup> The question here is which of these two sources is correct, and whether Alkimos was executed by the Zealot Hassidim/Naziraii who followed Judas. The next question is whether Judas "cleansed" the Temple with the execution of a legitimate High Priest. If the Maccabees revolutionaries had done nothing illegal, then why are there so many contradictions, gaps and fictitious explanations in the narratives of the *Maccabees* books about what happened in the Temple during those years?<sup>851</sup> Is it

---

<sup>848</sup> There are different accounts as to when exactly Alcimus became High Priest. See Benjamin E. Scolnic, *Alcimus, enemy of the Maccabees* (Lanham, 2005), pp. 143-144. Also, pp. 170-171, on Scolnic's view that Alcimus was legitimate.

<sup>849</sup> *I Macc.* 9.54-56.

<sup>850</sup> *Ant.* 12.413-4, vol. 3, p. 144.

<sup>851</sup> See David Goodblatt, 'Judean nationalism in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in Goodblatt, *Historical*, pp. 3-27 at pp. 3-4 (death of Alcimus dated c. 160 and Jonathan becomes a High Priest in 152). Scholars research the Scrolls trying to find answers for these years, but so far there are no solid results.

possible that there was much more bloodshed in Jerusalem at that time, between different factions who all claimed leadership? Did the Ptolemies had any reason to support any revolt against the collaborators of the Seleucids? Unfortunately, there is no record to speak on behalf of those High Priests who preceded the Hasmoneans.

*I Maccabees* attacks certain Israelite "renegades" who tried to influence the new Greek King Demetrius II Nicator (d. 125 BC) against Jonathan. Interestingly, the same source reports that Jonathan prepared to invade Jerusalem, meaning that he did not have control of the Temple, and there was another High Priest there.<sup>852</sup> However, the author of *I Maccabees* appears anxious to report that Demetrius II confirmed Jonathan as High Priest.<sup>853</sup> The strange point here is that the same text also reports that just before the King confirmed Jonathan as leader of the Israelites, Jonathan was fighting against the King's troops in Azōtos (Asdot), which he destroyed together with its Temple dedicated to the god Dagon.<sup>854</sup> Therefore, does it make sense that King Demetrius recognised Jonathan as a High Priest when Jonathan was on his way from Asdot to invade Jerusalem? Does it make sense that the King rewarded his enemy who was in between fighting him from one front to another? And why did Alexander Balas also appear to send gifts and award privileges and extra land to Jonathan, just before Demetrius also benefited Jonathan?<sup>855</sup> How come both conflicting Greek parties, those of Balas and Demetrius, appear to honour Jonathan and reward him with the High Priest office, one after the other? According to the same source, *I Maccabees*, Jonathan later lost his life against Tryphōn, another usurper of the throne of Antioch.<sup>856</sup> While the Antiochian kingdom continued to decline due to internal conflicts, *I Maccabees* explains that the second son of Mattathias,

---

<sup>852</sup> *I Macc.* 11.16-25, vol. 1, pp. 1080-1081.

<sup>853</sup> *I Macc.* 11.57

<sup>854</sup> *I Macc.* 10:84, vol. 1, p. 1079.

<sup>855</sup> *I Macc.* 10.88-89

<sup>856</sup> For Jonathan's wars and his end see *I Macc.* 9:31-13.26, vol. 1, pp. 1070-1089.

Simon (d. c.135 BCE), became the new High Priest of Israel with the approval of King Demetrius II.<sup>857</sup> Soon after *I Maccabees* continues that Simon advanced against certain cities owned by Demetrius,<sup>858</sup> when Demetrius was at war against the Persians. The *Antiquities* and *De Bello* clearly call those cities Greek (Ἑλληνίδες εἰσὶν πόλεις).<sup>859</sup> Later, regardless of Simon's wars against Demetrius, which indicate that Simon could have acted as an agent of Persia, *I Maccabees* insists that the Greek King Demetrius honoured Simon and confirmed his position as High Priest. This time *I Maccabees* explains that Demetrius did so because he was scared of the contacts Simon had with Romans.<sup>860</sup> Once again, one should observe the repeated efforts of the author of *I Maccabees* to present Jonathan and Simon as legal leaders of Israel and not as usurpers. The question here is whether all those privileges and the recognition bestowed upon the Hasmoneans by the Greek Kings, presented in *I Maccabees*, have the same "historical" value as the similar stories presented previously in "Josephus," and *Maccabees II, III and IV*.

It is important to note here that according to *I Maccabees* the first time the Israelites gained independence from the Gentiles<sup>861</sup> was at the time when Simon liberated Jerusalem by expelling the Gentiles,<sup>862</sup> meaning that all the above recognition the Greek Kings offered to Simon and Jonathan may not be historical, for it makes no sense that the Kings were repeatedly granting rights and recognition to their enemies, and the same time the Kings maintained forces in Jerusalem which opposed the rule of Hasmoneans. Does it make sense

---

<sup>857</sup> *I Macc.* 13.36.

<sup>858</sup> *I Macc.* 13.41-14.37.

<sup>859</sup> *Ant.* 13.215, vol. 3, p. 191; 17.320, vol. 4, p. 130: καὶ ἦσαν πόλεις αἱ Ἀρχελάῳ ὑπετέλουν Στρατώνος τε πύργος καὶ Σεβαστὴ σὺν Ἰόππῃ καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις· Γάζαν γὰρ καὶ Γάδαρα καὶ Ἰππον, Ἑλληνίδες εἰσὶν πόλεις; *Bel.* 2. 97, vol. 6, p. 172: τὰς γὰρ Ἑλληνίδας Γάζαν καὶ Γάδαρα καὶ Ἰππον.

<sup>860</sup> *I Macc.* 14.38-40.

<sup>861</sup> *I Macc.* 13.41-42.

<sup>862</sup> *I Macc.* 14.36-37.

that Jonathan and Simon were recognised as High Priests, but were not given access to Jerusalem? Why was this author so desperate to legalise the Hasmoneans?

The same author explained that when a Greek delegate visited Jerusalem to complain of Simon's hostilities, and ask for compensation, the Greeks observed that Jerusalem was flooded with gold and silver. Simon replied that he did not steal anything, but simply liberated what belonged to his forefathers.<sup>863</sup> Whom should we believe here? Did the Hasmoneans liberate, steal or ruin their own property, or did they damage the property of the Greek Kings? My question here is whether this was the beginning of a period when the Hasmoneans needed to present "reliable historical records" in order to support a legal case for the possession of the newly acquired cities which were built with the revenues of the Greek Kings. One should also take into account here that most scholars, as stated in the first Chapter, date the composition of *I Maccabees* near or after Simon. It is important to observe that this appears to be the first time when "Eupolemus" (meaning "the man who is good at war") was published. As mentioned in the second Chapter, he was the first to fabricate the story that Moses antedated all other wise men in the world. Therefore, I question here: is it possible that Eupolemus did so because he wanted to prove that the Jews were there, in those lands, long before the Greeks? *The Letter of Aristeas* is also dated to exactly the period after Simon. The same source also highlights the fallacy of the idolatry of the Greeks (Ἑλλήνων) in a fashion followed by most of the second century CE Christian Apologists.<sup>864</sup> These stories seem to come into

---

<sup>863</sup> *I Macc.* 15.28-34.

<sup>864</sup> *The Letter of Aristeas (Aristeae Epistula)* 134-140, ed. A. Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* (Paris, 1962), pp. 168-172:... ἀγάλματα γὰρ ποιήσαντες ἐκ λίθων καὶ ξύλων ... Καὶ νομίζουσιν οἱ ταῦτα διαπλάσαντες καὶ μυθοποιήσαντες τῶν Ἑλλήνων οἱ σοφώτατοι καθεστάναι. See also J. R. Bartlett, *Jews in the Hellenistic World, Josephus, Aristeas, the Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus*, Cambridge Commentaries on writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200BC to AD 200 (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 11-32 (Aristeas); Collins, *Jewish*, pp. 1-20 at 15-18 (Aristeas against

surface when for the first time in history the Israelites tried to create a single united state,<sup>865</sup> unless one accepts that David's Kingdom is historical. Even in this case, this was several centuries before. It is also important to observe that this was exactly the time when *I Maccabees* makes it clear that "the Jews and their priests resolved that Simon should be their leader and high priest forever (thus securing hereditary rights to his descendants), until **a trustworthy prophet should arise**,"<sup>866</sup> meaning that, according to the author of *I Maccabees*, those who supported the Hasmoneans (Hassidim/Naziraiot), just like the Essenes, also had hopes that an important Prophet - Messiah will come to lead them. Could this observation provide part of the answer as to why the Christians embraced the *Maccabees* books and the anti-Hellenic Maccabees martyrs as their own? Did the Christians perceive themselves as continuators of the same Messianic movement, which brought the Hasmoneans into power? Here I would like to point again that there is no record of any Messianic movement before the rise of the Essenes. We have also seen in the second Chapter that most scholars conclude that the Essenes were an anti-Hasmonean force for two reasons: a) because the scholars assume that the "wicked" High Priest in the Damascus Document was a Hasmonean, and b) because another Qumran text appears to be against another Hasmonean.<sup>867</sup> In the second Chapter I indicated that those who raised the hypothesis that the "wicked" High Priest was a Hasmonean, based their argument on thin evidence, and there is much stronger evidence that the actual High Priest was Menelaos, who was not a Hasmonean. My case here is that there were pious "Essenes" (Hassidim/Naziraiot) who fought with the Hasmoneans from the very

---

idolatry). For the dating of Aristeas to the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE, see U. Rappaport, 'The Letter of Aristeas Again', *JSP* 21.3 (2012), pp. 285-303.

<sup>865</sup> Niels Peter Lemche, *The Israelites in History and Tradition* (1998), pp. 131-132.

<sup>866</sup> *I Macc.* 14.41. Trans. *Holy Bible*, p. 187.

<sup>867</sup> See Nadav Sharon, 'Between Opposition to the Hasmoneans and Resistance to Rome: The *Psalms of Solomon* and the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *Reactions to Empire: Sacred Texts in their Socio-Political Contexts*, eds John A. Dunne and Dan Batovici (Tübingen, 2014), pp. 41-54.



beginning and at a certain point they agreed under the condition mentioned in *I Maccabees*, that the Hasmoneans should give up their leadership when the "prophet" comes. At this point, does it make sense that this "prophet" must have legitimate rights to the High Priest throne? Why, then, one should not examine what happened to the legitimate High Priest family, the Oniads, the trusted allies of the Ptolemies who could not come back to Jerusalem? Did the pious men of religion accept the Hasmoneans as an intermediary solution, because it was not possible for the Oniads to come back?

So far, we came across many indications that the authors of *I* and *II Maccabees* took the side of the Hasmoneans, but I would also like to know what their stance was towards the legitimate heirs of Onias III, who were expelled from Jerusalem when either Jason or Menelaos took over their throne. Is there any record of any relations between the Hasmoneans and the Oniads, and what exactly had happened between these two dynasties who appear to be active in the same period? Our *Maccabees* sources are silent on this matter, and the question here is whether this silence is not coincidental, because according to other sources it appears that the Oniads remained strong and active throughout all this period when the "profane" High Priests and the Hasmoneans were sat on their own throne.

*II Maccabees* states that when Antiochos IV Epiphanēs (175-164 BCE) came into power, Menelaos, who later became the illegitimate High Priest of Jerusalem, persuaded a Greek official called Andronikos to execute the legitimate High Priest, Onias III.<sup>868</sup> Contrary to this widely accepted anti-Hellenic explanation provided by *II Maccabees* that the legitimate and highly respected Onias died by the hands of a Greek man, Fausto Parente observed that both *De Bello* and the *Antiquities* present a different story. According to these two works, Onias III

---

<sup>868</sup> *II Macc.* 4:34, vol. 1, p. 1109.

escaped to Egypt and died a natural death.<sup>869</sup> King Ptolemaios VI Philomētor (r. c.180-145 BCE) of Egypt granted permission to Onias IV, the son of Onias III, to build a Temple in Heliopolis/Leontopolis.<sup>870</sup> The Greek King also donated considerable land to honour the legitimate leader of Israel and secure an income for the new Temple.<sup>871</sup> Fausto Parente also observed that *II Maccabees* says nothing about the Heliopolis/Leontopolis temple or about Onias IV.<sup>872</sup> The choice of the location to build the new Temple may not be a coincidence, for *Contra Apionem*, refers to a certain statement made by Apiōn (fl. 1<sup>st</sup> c. CE) that Moses himself was from Heliopolis.<sup>873</sup> The new question here is whether a historical Moses was from this place or whether this story surfaced in order to provide an explanation why Onias moved there. A significant number of Israelites moved as settlers to the lands donated by King Ptolemy VI, but where exactly these settlers came from is not clear. According to *De Bello* the new Temple was modelled on the Jerusalem Temple and became one more centre of worship for Israel.<sup>874</sup> There is further evidence that this third<sup>875</sup> centre of Israel continued to exist for a long time. It is important to observe here that according to the finds of Fausto Parente from his study of ancient papyri, the descendants of Onias who founded the Heliopolis Temple in Egypt were not just spiritual leaders, but also led the army of the Jews who lived in Egypt.<sup>876</sup> At this point I would like to refer to the *Antiquities*, that when Felix was the Roman procurator (52- c. 60 CE) in Judea, an Egyptian Israelite who claimed he was a prophet, led

---

<sup>869</sup> Parente, 'Onias,' pp. 69-98, p. 95: *Bel.*, 1.31-33, vol. 6, pp. 9-10 (Onias III fled to Egypt); *Ant.* 12.237-239, vol. 3, pp. 112-113 (Onias III dies a natural death and the Heliopolis Temple was made by his son).

<sup>870</sup> In the suburbs of modern Cairo, not to be confused with another Heliopolis, the modern Baalbek. Parente, *Onias*, pp. 74-77, on different traditions that Onias III (and not Onias IV) was the founder of Leontopolis / Heliopolis Temple.

<sup>871</sup> *Bel.* 7.426, vol. 6.2, p. 624.

<sup>872</sup> Parente, 'Onias,' p. 95.

<sup>873</sup> *Contra Apionem* 2.10, vol. 4, p. 55.

<sup>874</sup> *Bel.* 1.31-34, vol. 6, p. 9-10: Onias the High Priest expelled the sons of Tobias from Jerusalem, who in turn allied themselves to Epiphanēs and deposed him. He then fled to Egypt where he made the Temple in Heliopolis. Cf. Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs*, pp. 124-133.

<sup>875</sup> After Jerusalem and Gerizim.

<sup>876</sup> Parente, 'Onias,' pp. 85-86, p. 97.

his congregation to the Mount of Olives, from where he instructed them to assault Jerusalem. Four hundred of his men were killed, and two hundred were arrested, but their leader escaped.<sup>877</sup> The *Acts*, too, present a similar story, according to which an unnamed Jew from Egypt, led four thousand Sikarioi.<sup>878</sup> Could these be historical reports, indicating that the Sikarioi were connected to the Heliopolis Temple in Egypt? One should observe here that there is one more report in *De Bello* that after the Great Revolt (c. 60-73 CE) other Sikarioi continued fighting in a number of cities in North Africa.<sup>879</sup> It was during this time when, according to *De Bello*, Emperor Vespasian ordered the demolition of the Israelite Temple at the nomē of Heliopolis in Egypt, built by Onias IV.<sup>880</sup> Brandon also pointed to further evidence in *De Bello* that the Sikarioi revolutionaries during the Great Revolt found refuge in Egypt and that soon after the Romans attacked the Jews in the Temple of Onias in Egypt, they confiscated its treasures and closed it down.<sup>881</sup> These observations made by Brandon invalidate the argument of most scholars who see no relation between the revolution and the destruction of the Heliopolis Temple.<sup>882</sup> This evidence indicates that the Sikarioi were related to Egypt, and that the destruction of the Heliopolis Temple took place right after their arrival there. The hypothesis here

---

<sup>877</sup> *Ant.*, 20.167-172, vol. 4, pp. 304-305: ... οἱ δὲ γόητες καὶ ἀπατεῶνες ἄνθρωποι τὸν ὄχλον ἔπειθον αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν ἔπεσθαι... ἀφικνεῖται δὲ τις ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα προφήτης εἶναι λέγων ... ὄρος τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἐλαιῶν...

<sup>878</sup> *Acts* 21:38: οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων. For the NT account of the incident on the Mount of Olives see *Matthew* 21:1-15, from where the attack against the merchants in the Temple started. See also *Matthew* 26:30-35; *Acts* 1:9-12. For further evidence on the battle in the Mount of Olives see Eisler, *The Messiah*, pp. 381-385. The *Talmud* refers to Jesus Christ as having lived in Egypt: P. Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton, 2007), p. 113. *Matthew* 2:13-23, also mentions that Jesus was from Egypt.

<sup>879</sup> *Bel.* 7.437-446, vol. 6, pp. 625-627.

<sup>880</sup> *Bel.* 7.420-432, vol. 6, pp. 623-625.

<sup>881</sup> *The Trial*, p. 77: *Bel.* 7.409-411 (flee to Egypt); 7:420-421 (Roman attack); 7: 433-436 (treasures). See also *Jesus and the Zealots*, pp. 292-3.

<sup>882</sup> Martin Goodman, 'Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple,' in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 27-38 at p. 31, sees absolutely no relation of Leontopolis to the revolts, and simply states that it was closed down "arbitrarily."

is whether the Essenes-Sikarioi mentioned by both "Josephus" and the *Acts*, who came from Egypt, were no others than political descendants of the party who followed Onias IV, and who prepared for war, with the aim of restoring an ancient order disturbed by Menelaos.<sup>883</sup> In relation to this hypothesis, it is important to examine here that Eisler observed that both the Greek and the Slavonic version of *De Bello* begin with the schism between Jerusalem and Heliopolis.<sup>884</sup> However, Eisler wrongly interpreted that *Antiquities* 13.3.1-2 present evidence that "Josephus" despised Heliopolis, because what follows in the text after Eisler's quotation, makes it clear that those attacked by "Josephus" as opponents of Judas Maccabee were under the command of Vakchidēs.<sup>885</sup> Most probably Eisler did not observe that this Vakchidēs was on the Seleucid side, and not an ally of the Ptolemies, as the Oniads were. Eisler also observed that Josephus displayed familiarity with amazing details regarding the way the interior of the Heliopolis Temple was decorated.<sup>886</sup> In the light of the above observations made by Eisler, despite that Eisler made the mistake to accept the followers of Vakchidēs as followers of Heliopolis, my question here is whether a historical "Josephus," a self-confessed Essene at least for some part of his life, and an admirer of the Essenes, was familiar with this Temple because he had once worshipped his God there, together with the other Essenes/Sikarioi. If not, why did he opt to close his *De Bello* with the detailed information about this Temple, and how did he know its interior so well? *De Bello* also reports that

---

<sup>883</sup> On the difficulties identifying the Teacher of Righteousness with Onias IV and a different account of the events see Paul A. Rainbow, 'The last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness', *JJS* 48.1 (1997), pp. 30-52. Also see John J. Collins, 'Potter,' pp. 62-64, Collins observed that the potter who made a prophecy in the *Potter's Oracle* was buried in Heliopolis, and that some of the contents of this text might have been known to the author of *Sibyl 1*; p. 66, the Potter's Oracle is anti-Hellenic, it calls for the destruction of the Greeks; Collins is not aware of the connection between the Sicarioi and Heliopolis Temple.

<sup>884</sup> *Messiah*, pp. 123-124. Cf. *Bel.* 1.31-33 vol. 6, pp. 9-10 and 7.420-436, vol. 6, pp. 623-625.

<sup>885</sup> *Ant.* 13.4: Βακχίδης δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τοὺς ἀποστάντας τῆς πατρῴου συνηθείας καὶ τὸν κοινὸν βίον προσηγμένους συναθροίσας τούτοις... Eisler also repeated the wrong calculation provided by *Bel.* 7.436 that the Heliopolis Temple existed for 343 years. This is an extra 100 years on top of the most probable dating.

<sup>886</sup> *Messiah*, p. 125. Cf. *Bel.* 7.427-30, vol. 6, pp. 624-25.

after the Romans prevailed in Judea, certain *Sikarioi* who were defeated moved to Alexandria. There they murdered some of their fellow Jews because they denied participating in the revolution. About six hundred of those *Sikarioi* were arrested and subjected to torture but they all refused to proclaim Caesar as their 'Lord.' Josephus states that even their young children refused to do so and as a result they were punished with frightful deaths.<sup>887</sup> The similarity with the Christian tradition, which often portrays its martyrs on similar lines, is striking.

So far, to the best of my knowledge, scholars have overlooked this case. This theory which links Heliopolis to the Essenes provides an explanation that the rise of Messianism has its roots in the hopes of the traditionalists that the legitimate order will be restored in the Temple. At this point I would also like to indicate that *Mishnah*<sup>888</sup> (c. 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup>c. CE ?) is categorical that any Nazir vow given in the Leontopolis/Heliopolis Temple is not valid,<sup>889</sup> meaning that this tradition in the *Talmud* derives from Jewish circles who opposed the Heliopolis Temple. The Nosrim/Notzrim (Nazirai) were also attacked in *Birkat ha-Mînîm* and other parts of the *Talmud*.<sup>890</sup> Apart from Parente (who also does not examine the

---

<sup>887</sup> *Bel.* 7.409-419, vol. 6, pp. 622-623.

<sup>888</sup> The first part of *Talmud*.

<sup>889</sup> Parente, 'Onias,' p. 77 (illegitimate priests), p. 81 (*Mishnah*).

<sup>890</sup> Some of the earliest samples which contain the malediction *Birkat ha-Mînîm* in the *Amidah* prayer, come from the *Cairo Genizah Specimens* and the manuscript *Seder R. Amran Gaon*. This malediction was issued or edited by religious circles most probably related to Rabban Gamaliel II (fl. c.85-95 CE?). See S. Katz, 'The Rabbinic Response to Christianity', *CHJ* 4 (2006), pp 259-298 at 280-298: both sources (*Cairo Genizah Specimens* and *Seder R. Amran Gaon*) are associated to the old Palestinian order of Service. The earliest surviving version of this malediction with reference to Notzrim (Christians) was discovered by Solomon Schechter (1847-1915) in the *Cairo Genizah*; Also see A. Cohen, 'A theological polemic with Christianity?', in *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. D. Jaffé (Leiden, 2010), pp. 67-84 at 79-84; Pritz, *Nazarene*, pp. 102-107; For a different dating of this malediction in between 70-132 CE see Giorgio Jossa, *Jews or Christians?: The Followers of Jesus in Search of their own Identity* (Tübingen, 2006), pp. 42-44; Although it is not possible to know what exactly the non-Christian Rabbis wrote against the Notzrim, because a large number of references to them have been systematically censored by Christians, see M. C. De Boor, 'The Nazoreans', *TIEJ*, pp. 239-262 at 247: Yet about a dozen passages referring to them still remain; For a number of destroyed and censored manuscripts on Notzrim see Eisler, *The Messiah*, pp. 93-112; Also see Falk, *Jesus*, pp. 120-121, on *Mishnah*

Christian/Sikarioi connection), the scholarly world does not seem to be aware of the first condemnation of the Heliopolis Notzrim, but there is consensus that the second, well known condemnation in *Birkat ha-Mînîm*, has been made with reference to the Christians. The problem here is whether the Notzrim in both texts are no others than "Christians." Other parts of the rabbinic literature do not specify in which Temple the "Notzrim" gave their holy vows, meaning that Heliopolis remains a candidate for the origin of more, if not all "Christian" Notzrim.

Although there is lack of information regarding the emergence of Christianity in Egypt during the first century,<sup>891</sup> in my opinion, the above evidence is strong enough to point to new directions regarding the origin of the first Christians.

### 3.4: "Josephus," from John Hyrkanos to the arrival of the Romans

The next in line to the throne after Simōn's execution by his Greek enemies was his son John Hyrkanos (r. 134-104 BCE), who, like his father, took advantage of the continuous decline of the Seleucid kingdom to expand the borders of his own state. The *Antiquities* present a collection of "official" and "original" letters sent by a number of Greek cities in Asia Minor to support Hyrkanos against Antioch.<sup>892</sup> *I Maccabees*, which the author of the *Antiquities* used as his source, also claims that a number of Greek Kings and Cities were on the side of

---

attacking the Zealots; Sanders, *Schismatics*, p. 58: the rabbis called the Notzrim as murderers; Cf. Reuven Kimelman, 'Birkat ha-Mînîm and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity', *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, eds. E. P. Sanders et al. (London, 1981), pp. 226-244 at 232-244.

<sup>891</sup> Cf. Griggs, *Early*, p. 13: there is lack of evidence to define when Christianity was founded in Egypt. However, Davila, *Provenance*, p. 189 observed that *5 Sibyl* does refer to a mysterious Temple in Egypt.

<sup>892</sup> *Ant.* 14.241-267, vol. 3, pp. 284-289, a number of Greek cities and certain Romans wrote letters of support to Hyrkanos and the Jews.

Simon.<sup>893</sup> The question here is whether the author of the *Antiquities* modelled his "collection" of these documents after he was "inspired" by the above *I Maccabees* report. However, there must have been many Greeks who had reasons to support any action that could harm the aggressive Greek Seleucids. According to the *Antiquities*, Hyrkanos became famous for capturing and destroying the region of Samaria,<sup>894</sup> the cities Adōra and Marisa, and for converting the Idoumean people to Judaism by circumcision.<sup>895</sup> Interestingly, the author of the *Antiquities* also presents one more collection of "official" letters written by Julius Caesar to Hyrkanos, which repeatedly declare that Hyrkanos was a legitimate High Priest of Israel and his offspring should always inherit his office.<sup>896</sup> As already analysed above, this is exactly what the author of *I Maccabees* did in the case of previous Hasmoneans, namely that he too produced a number of "official royal epistles" which confirmed that they had every King's recognition and approval. Clearly, both the *Maccabees* and the *Antiquities* repeatedly struggle to prove that the Hasmoneans were legitimate Kings, recognised internationally. My question here is whether those repeated efforts betray the fact that there was something seriously wrong in the way the Hasmoneans took over the High Priest throne, namely that they murdered the legitimate Alkimos and possibly more.

According to the *Antiquities*, Aristovoulos (r. 104-103 BCE), the son of John Hyrkanos, also destroyed other significant Greek and Hellenised cities,<sup>897</sup> but the Ἕλληνες (Greeks) organised a counter attack against Aristovoulos, and managed to reclaim Gadara and Amathus after they exterminated "ten thousand Jews." Regardless of the wars against certain Greeks, the *Antiquities*

---

<sup>893</sup> *I Macc.* 15.22-24.

<sup>894</sup> *Ant.* 13.280-281, vol. 3, p. 203.

<sup>895</sup> *Ant.* 13.257-258., vol. 3, p. 199.

<sup>896</sup> *Ant.* 14.190-216, vol. 3, pp. 275-279.

<sup>897</sup> For a detailed account of Jonathan's expeditions and the fate of Greek or Hellenised cities, see *Ant.* 13.5-212, vol. 3, pp. 149-190.

report that Aristovoulos became known as a *philhellene*. In parallel to his philhellenism, he also expanded the influence of his ancestral religion by forcing the Ituraean people to circumcise and adopt Judaism.<sup>898</sup> Most probably, in the case of people like Aristovoulos, Judaism as a religion was compatible with cultural "Hellenism," but this may not have been the case with some other Israelites. For example, certain scholars argue that according to the *Talmud* some rabbinical circles forbade the study of 'Greek wisdom' during Aristovoulos, and/or at some other times.<sup>899</sup>

According to the *Antiquities*, Aristovoulos proclaimed himself a King, and this was the first King Israel had in centuries, if one does accept that the *OT* presented historical information about an older Israelite Kingdom.<sup>900</sup> This must have been a fundamental change in Israel. Also according to the *Antiquities*, Aristovoulos loved his brother Antigonus dearly, but at some stage, fearing that his brother will take the throne from him, he plotted to kill him. The interesting point here is that, soon after Aristovoulos thought this, the *Antiquities* explain that Antigonus was attacked and killed by the Essenes who acted under the leadership of a man called Judas. The *Antiquities* also demonize philhellene Aristovoulos for imprisoning and starving his own mother to death.<sup>901</sup> Soon after Antigonus was murdered the *Antiquities* present Aristovoulos mourning his brother and then suffering from a painful fatal disease.<sup>902</sup> One should question what exactly the Essene "Josephus" tells us here? Who murdered Antigonus and why? At this point I would like to come back to the fragment on

---

<sup>898</sup> *Ant.* 13.318, vol. 3, p. 210: χρηματίσας μὲν Φιλέλλην, πολλὰ δ' εὐεργετήσας τὴν πατρίδα.

<sup>899</sup> Feldman, *Judaism and Hellenism*, pp. 22-23, 98, refers to three instances in the *Talmud*: *b. Menahoth* 64b, 99b; *b. Sotah* 49b, *b. Baba Qamma* 82b.

<sup>900</sup> *Ant.* 13.301, vol. 3, p. 207; Cf. Uriel Rappaport, 'The Hellenization of the Hasmoneans,' in Mor, AAA, pp. 1-13, at p. 8, "the first Hasmonean King was either Aristoboulos I (104-103 BCE) or Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE)."

<sup>901</sup> *Ant.* 13.302-313, vol. 3, pp. 207-209.

<sup>902</sup> *Ant.* 13.314-319, vol. 3, pp. 209-210.



the history of the Jews, presented by Photius, that it was against the *Law* for the Jews to proclaim a King. Although I am not aware of the exact part of the *Torah* which says so, it is possible that such a law did exist.<sup>903</sup> We have also seen above that the "pious" men agreed to recognise the Hasmoneans but only until the "Messiah" prophet will come, and we have also seen in the second chapter the repeated Essene emphasis that the Messiah will come from the house of David. Under the light of this information, does it make sense that the Messianic Essenes were furious with Aristovoulos because he declared himself King? Does it make sense that for the Essenes the notion of King of Israel was inseparable to the Messiah who will be a descendant of King David? Is this why the Essenes decided to act against the Hasmoneans just after Aristovoulos declared himself King? Is this why they killed his trusted and beloved brother, sending in this way a message to Aristovoulos that he may be next? There is further evidence to be examined before one tries to solve this problem.

High Priest Alexander Jannaeus<sup>904</sup> (103-76 BCE), brother and successor of Aristovoulos, just like his brother and father, forced more Gentiles to convert to Judaism<sup>905</sup> and used Greek mercenaries, while *c.* 88 BCE a number of Jews appear in *De Bello* to fight on the side of the Greek King Dēmētrios Philopatōr (d. 88 BCE) against Jannaeus.<sup>906</sup> This is the time when Alexander Jannaeus crucified "eight hundred" of his own people because they collaborated with his Gree enemy. According to the *Antiquities*, Alexander Jannaeus went as far as to

---

<sup>903</sup> Cf. *Deuteronomy* 17:15 "One of your own community you may set as king over you; you are not permitted to put a foreigner over you, who is not of your own community." Trans. *Holy Bible*, p. 193. The Greek text does not mention King (βασιλέα). It mentions leader: ἄρχοντα. Also cf. *Genesis* 17:6 βασιλεῖς ἐκ σοῦ ἐξελεύσονται; 35.11: βασιλεῖς ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας σου ἐξελεύσονται; 37.8.2 Μὴ βασιλεύων βασιλεύσεις ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἢ κυριεύων (this was said to Joseph by his brothers).

<sup>904</sup> Also known as Yannai.

<sup>905</sup> The famous Hellenized cities Gaza, Raphia and Anthēdōn (later called Agrippias), among other cities, fell to his dominion: *Ant.* 13.356-364, vol. 3, pp. 217-218; cf. *Ant.*, 13.393-397, vol. 3, pp. 224-225.

<sup>906</sup> Philopatōr is also known as Εὐκαιρος; *Bel.* 1.93-95, vol. 6, p. 23: ("Ἕλληνες mercenaries). Cf. Rajak, *The Jewish*, p. 139, insists that these mercenaries were not ethnic Greeks.

exterminate their wives, children and mistresses.<sup>907</sup> *De Bello* provides different details to the *Antiquities* on how the eight hundred were executed, and states that they were of the Pharisaic branch. When Alexander Jannaeus died, some Pharisees befriended his wife Queen Alexandra, and took bloody revenge against those who helped Alexander for the crucifixion of the eight hundred men.<sup>908</sup> At this point it is important to observe that the Qumran text *Pesher on Nahum*,<sup>909</sup> believed to have been produced by Essenes, is on the side of the eight hundred crucified by Alexander Jannaeus. As seen above, those who murdered the brother of Jannaeus and Aristovoulos, were also Essenes, and the indication here is, once again, that the pious Essenes had a serious problem in accepting a Hasmonean as King.<sup>910</sup>

The entire Middle East for a long time was a politically complicated and unstable region. The *Antiquities* report that further, different, mixed Israelite-Greek parties fought against each other during a Ptolemaic civil war, which took place at the time of Alexander Jannaeus and Cleopatra III (r. 142-101 BCE).<sup>911</sup> Before that, King Ptolemaios Sōtēr II Lathouros (r. 116-110, 109-107, 88-81 BCE) and his Greeks had also successfully fought on the side of Samaritan Israelites against the Judean Israelite troops of John Hyrkanos.<sup>912</sup> The pattern of mixed Greek-Israelite parties, which fought against each other, was repeated in the struggle between Cleopatra VII (b. 69, d. 30 BCE) and her young brother Ptolemaios VIII (b. 63, d. 47 BCE), both of whom had claims to the same Egyptian throne. The *Antiquities* report that a certain Onias and a certain Dositheos Josephus led the Israelites of Egypt on the side of Cleopatra's Greeks against other Greeks in Alexandria, who were on the side of the young

---

<sup>907</sup> *Ant.* 13. 372-381, vol. 3, pp. 220-222.

<sup>908</sup> *Bel.* 1. 96-119, vol. 6, pp. 23-28; 1.110 (Pharisees, traditionalists).

<sup>909</sup> Flint, 'Jesus,' p. 127-128 (4Q169).

<sup>910</sup> Farmer, *Macc.*, p. 161, accepts that the Essenes opposed the Hasmoneans from Alexander Jannaeus onwards.

<sup>911</sup> *Ant.* 13. 328-357, vol. 3, pp. 212-217.

<sup>912</sup> *Ant.* 13.278-279, vol. 3 p. 203.

Ptolemaios VIII.<sup>913</sup> Also, the *Antiquities* state that some Israelites, under the leadership of Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, together with the Greeks of Mithridates (134-63 BCE), supported Caesar (100-44 BCE) in the struggle against the kingdom of the Greek Ptolemies.<sup>914</sup>

It is evident that the Israelites fought against each other with the same menace and ferocity the Greeks fought amongst themselves. The continuous strife for power between different parties, Greek or Israelite, or a mixture of alliances of both, brought much destruction to the area and did not produce any real winners but weakened everybody's position at times when the Romans were approaching the region to become its new masters. According to *I Maccabees*, long before the arrival of the Romans, Judas Maccabee sent the "Eupolemus" seen above, along with others to secure an alliance against the *Hellēnes* (Greeks), the people who 'enslaved Israel.'<sup>915</sup> This is the only time *I Maccabees* names the Greeks. The same source also claims that Jonathan and Simon too, asked in the past for the alliance of Rome and Sparta.<sup>916</sup> However, the *Antiquities* report that Sulla, when at war with Mithridates, sent (c. 85 BCE) Lucullus to suppress the Jews in Cyrene, because they participated in a revolt of "our ethnos,"<sup>917</sup> meaning that the Jews must have participated in the first Mithridatic war against Rome. One should also observe that when Pompey (106-48 BCE)<sup>918</sup> annexed the Kingdom of Antioch c.64 BCE, in the same year his army intervened in an Israelite civil conflict between the sons of Queen Alexandra Salomē, the wife of the deceased Hasmonean Alexander Jannaeus. Later on, a new war of the Romans against certain Israelites lasted three months. According to Appian (*fl.*

---

<sup>913</sup> *Contra Apionem*, 2. 48-58, vol. 5, pp. 60-68. Could this Onias be a descendant of Onias IV who fled to Egypt at the times of Antiochos III?

<sup>914</sup> *Ant.* 14.127-139, vol. 3, pp. 263-265.

<sup>915</sup> *I Macc.* 8.17-18, vol. 1, pp. 1067-1068: ... τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καταδουλουμένους τὸν Ἰσραὴλ δουλείᾳ.

<sup>916</sup> *I Macc.* 12:1-4.4, vol. 1, pp. 1088-1091 (Jonathan); *I Macc.* 14.16 (Simon).

<sup>917</sup> 14.114, vol. 3, p. 260.

<sup>918</sup> Pompeius Gnaeus.

2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE), Pompey demolished Jerusalem,<sup>919</sup> and according to the *Antiquities*, by the end of that conflict "twelve thousand" Jews lost their lives and Israel became subject to Roman taxation. In addition, the Romans also granted independence to a number of Greek cities, which were incorporated by the Hasmoneans into their own kingdom.<sup>920</sup> The Romans not only transformed Israel to a kind of vassal state but they also reduced its size to about what it used to be before the expansionist wars of the Hasmoneans. The new geopolitical developments brought the Greeks of the region to the same camp as the Romans, against those Israelites who wanted independence, and this is also reflected in Josephus's ironic introduction to *De Bello* where he states that his aim was to 'offer to the Greeks and the Romans a permanent record of their triumphs' against the Jewish people.<sup>921</sup>

So far we have seen that relations between Israelite and Greek leaders fluctuated in the course of time and often resulted not only in conflicts but also in amicable co-operation and alliances,<sup>922</sup> but it should be made clear here that from the moment the Romans were established in the region there is no record of any mixed Judeo-Hellenic alliance against the Romans. In the eyes of the ordinary pro-independence Israelite both the Roman and Greek infidels were idolaters, believed in similar deities, followed a similar way of life,<sup>923</sup> and were obsessed with making wars. Also, the Roman army that occupied the Middle

---

<sup>919</sup> Appian, *Syriaca*, p. 398: καὶ τὴν μεγίστην πόλιν Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ ἀγιοτάτην αὐτοῖς κατέσκαψεν.

<sup>920</sup> *Ant.* 14. 74-76, vol. 3, pp. 252-253: the Romans rebuilt Gazara, which was razed to the ground by the Jews. They restored or freed Hippos, Scythopolis, Pella, Samaria, Jamnia, Marisa, Azotus, Arethusa, Gaza, Joppa, and Dora, where Herod later built Caesarea :

<sup>921</sup> *Bel.* 1. 16, vol. 6, p. 6: καὶ γὰρ μὲν ἀναλώμασι καὶ πόνοις μεγίστοις ἀλλόφυλος ὢν Ἑλληνσί τε καὶ Ῥωμαίοις τὴν μνήμην τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἀνατίθημι. Trans. Williamson, *Josephus*, p. 23.

<sup>922</sup> Cf. Gager, *Origins*, pp. 42-43 (concludes that Greek anti-Semitism is in fact a phenomenon of the first century CE and later, not earlier); *ibid.*, p. 39 (a number of Greek writers who expressed positive views of the Jews); pp. 41-42 (Varo's syncretism between pagan and Jewish religion).

<sup>923</sup> For the Hellenisation of the most important cities of the Roman world see P. Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom* (London, 2003<sup>2</sup>), pp. 54-55.

East and was sent to oppress the Israelite revolts, to a great extent consisted of Greeks,<sup>924</sup> most probably *peregrini*. From now on the Greeks were always against any Israelite opposition to the Romans, and the question remains whether the anti-Hellenism expressed in *II* and *IV Maccabees* reflects Israelite perceptions of Hellenism which were formed after the arrival of the Romans.

---

<sup>924</sup> *Bel.* 2.268-270, vol. 6, p. 205. Also see Zeev Safrai, 'The Roman Army in the Galilee,' in LIL, pp. 103-114 at 104, until 66 CE the Roman army in Judea was consisted in part of local militias from Sebaste and Caesarea (cites. M. Mor, 'The Roman Army in Eretz-Israel in the years A.D. 70-132' in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, eds P. Freeman and D. Kennedy (Oxford, 1986), p. 577-588 on the 3000 recruits from Caesarea and Sebaste who evolved out of six units served in Herod's and Archelaus's army. Later they served Agrippa I and were moved from Judea by Vespasian; Sanders, 'Jesus,' pp. 10-11, the prefect sent by Augustus to govern Judea in 6 CE had an army of only 3000 men: *Ant.* 20.176 (from Caesarea and Sebaste). After the Kitos war 2 Roman legions stationed in Palestine, one of which in Galilee. During Jesus's years, there only were minor military forces in Jerusalem (a single garrison) and in Caesarea. No Romans in Galillee. They arrived during the Great Revolt, not before; p. 14, Greeks settled in Samaria (renamed Sebaste) since Alexander the Great.

## CHAPTER 4

*Zealots, Sikarioi, Galileans,  
and the followers of the Messiah*

### 4.1 Do any sources name the first Christians as revolutionaries?

Brandon observed that in the years between 6 to 73CE there were several revolts and outbreaks of violence against the Romans, and *De Bello* has many lacunae during that period. He argued that certain Christian censors must have removed some material they did not approve.<sup>925</sup> Eisler claimed that the surviving Slavonic version of *De Bello* contains some information, which was censored in the Greek version. For example, it states that the rebels who had occupied Jerusalem during the Great Revolt placed an inscription over the entrance of the Temple, saying 'Jesus was a King who did not reign.'<sup>926</sup> On the basis of textual analysis of the surviving Greek text of *De Bello*, Brandon rejected the widely accepted view that the Slavonic version does not have value as a historical source, for it appears that it fills some of the lacunae in the Greek version.<sup>927</sup> However, Eisler's and Brandon's case that "Josephus" has been censored by Christians, remains marginalised. The problem here, which, in my

---

<sup>925</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 65-145; p. 66 (*lacunae*). Cf. Crossan, *Historical*, pp. 451-452: Appendix 2, 'Types and Trajectories of Peasant Unrest in Early Roman Palestine (4BCE-70CE).' On Christian censors also see R. Bultmann, 'The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus', in *The historical Jesus and the kerygmatic Christ, Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, eds C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville (New York, 1964), pp. 15-53 at 22: (the problem of reconstructing the image of historical Jesus from what has survived the censors).

<sup>926</sup> Eisler, *Ἰησοῦς*, vol. 2, pp. 533-541: "a fourth inscription hung, in those letters (Hebrew) declaring Jesus, [a] king who had not reigned." Cf. Josephus, *Slavonic Version*, 5, 195, p. 484. The inscription was placed by the revolutionaries on top of the inscriptions in Greek and Latin, which forbade the entrance to the Temple to any foreigner. Cf. *Bel.* 5.194-195, vol. 6, p. 460. Cf. Jack, *Christ*, pp. 157-158, concludes that the inscription "Jesus, a king who did not reign, was crucified by Jews because he foretold destruction of the city and desolation of the temple" contradicts Eisler that Jesus was a rebell; p. 162, this inscription is evidence that Jesus was "a true messianic king."

<sup>927</sup> Brandon, *Fall*, pp. 114-118.

opinion, should be examined by those who reject Eisler and Brandon on this issue, is that a number of ancient sources confirm that important information has been removed with the intention to obscure what the first Christians did during a period of revolts. For example, Origen's *Contra Celsum* refers to (now lost) passages that once existed within the *Antiquities* chapter eighteen, with reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by the followers of Jesus Christ and his brother Jacob. Origen states that Josephus who did not accept Jesus as a Messiah was clear that Jerusalem and the Temple fell into the hands of Jesus's followers. According to Origen's version of *Antiquities*, the Christians took revenge for the deaths of Jesus and of his brother Jacob.<sup>928</sup> Eusebius, too, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, was aware of the lost passage in the *Antiquities*, mentioned by Origen, and also quoted further lost passages with reference to High Priest Ananos who plotted for the extermination of Jacob, the brother of Jesus, and his followers.<sup>929</sup> George the Monk in the ninth century also clearly referred to the passages of Josephus concerning the Great Revolt as an act of revenge for the execution of Jacob, the brother of Christ.<sup>930</sup> I have also observed that the author of the *Suida Lexicon* quotes further lost passages that when Josephus was imprisoned he wrote that Jesus Christ was among the priests who practised rituals in the Temple.<sup>931</sup> This is contrary to what we know about "Flavius Josephus," the protégé of Rome. The author of this information in *Suida* is assertive that he spent much time to confirm that Josephus originally wrote this

---

<sup>928</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 1, 47.6-27, vol 1, pp. 198-200: ... ὁ Ἰώσηπος ... ζητῶν τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων πτώσεως ..., δέον αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἡ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπιβουλὴ τούτων αἰτία γέγονε τῷ λαῷ, ἐπεὶ ἀπέκτειναν τὸν προφητευόμενον Χριστόν. ... ταῦτα συμβεβηκέναι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου τοῦ δικαίου, ὃς ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ... Cf. Origen, *Matthaei* 10.17.30-40, p. 218.

<sup>929</sup> H.E. 2, 23.19-25, vol. 1 (31), pp. 89-90, trans. K. Lake, *Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History*, 2 vols (London, 1926), vol. 1, pp. 177-179.

<sup>930</sup> Georgius Monachus, *Chronicon*, vol. 1, p. 379: μετὰ δὲ τὸ μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ παρὰ πόδας Ἱερουσαλήμ πολιορκεῖται. φησὶ γὰρ Ἰώσηπος· ταῦτα δὲ συμβέβηκεν Ἰουδαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου τοῦ δικαίου, ὃς ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ...

<sup>931</sup> *Suidae Lexicon*, vol. 2 (1931), p. 624, s.v. 'Ἰησοῦς', refers to a lost passage from *De Belo*: εὗρομεν οὖν Ἰώσηπον, ... φανερώς λέγοντα ἐν τοῖς τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας αὐτοῦ ὑπομνήμασιν, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ μετὰ τῶν ἱερέων ἡγίαζε. τοῦτο οὖν εὐρόντες λέγοντα τὸν Ἰώσηπον,... ἐζητήσαμεν εὐρεῖν καὶ ἐκ τῶν θεοπνευστῶν γραφῶν τὸν τοιοῦτον λόγον βεβαιούμενον.

testimony, but before one accepts or rejects his discovery, one should also examine whether other sources also report that Jesus was in the Temple.

In light of the above ancient and Byzantine indications that there was another "Josephus," now lost, I believe that one should return to one more story contained in the Slavonic version, that Jesus Christ had one hundred and fifty assistants and many other followers, many of whom were slaughtered by Pilate's Roman soldiers on account of their revolutionary activities.<sup>932</sup> Contrary to this, *Luke*<sup>933</sup> states that Jesus advised his disciples to repent, or else they will end up like those slaughtered by Pilate. Before accepting any of the above two versions as historical, I would like to proceed to a more detailed juxtaposition, cross-examination and investigation of "Josephus," the *NT* and any other relevant source with reference to the history of those events.

The Slavonic version also provides information that John the Baptist preached to a multitude of Jews to earn their freedom and that a king of their own would come to liberate them.<sup>934</sup> One should observe that according to *Mark*,<sup>935</sup> they wore the sack-cloth at exactly the same time they decided to start the war for the liberation of Israel.<sup>936</sup> Also according to the Slavonic version, some of Jesus's adherents were arrested by the soldiers commanded by procurator Cuspius Fadus (44-46 CE) and Tiberius Alexander<sup>937</sup> on the grounds that the Romans feared that Jesus's movement might cause a 'major upheaval'. These Christian prisoners were sent to Rome and Antioch for trial and were subsequently exiled

---

<sup>932</sup> *Slavonic Version*, 2, 9, pt. 3, pp. 260-262; Cf. Pilate again Galileans: *Bel.* 2.181-188, vol. 6, pp. 189-191; *Luke* 13:1. Also, see R. Eisler, *The Messiah*, pp. 393-396: on the lost Josephus.

<sup>933</sup> 13:1-5.

<sup>934</sup> *Slavonic Version*, p. 248.

<sup>935</sup> 1:6.

<sup>936</sup> *Sept. I Macc.*, 2:14, p. 1043; 3:46-47.

<sup>937</sup> Philo's nephew.



to different places.<sup>938</sup> It is noteworthy that Suetonius appears to confirm that some Christians were punished in Rome during Claudius's reign (41-54 CE).<sup>939</sup>

Eisler also pointed to Celsus,<sup>940</sup> who called Jesus a cunning chief-robber (λήσταρχος πονηρὸς) and chief-leader of a revolution (στάσεως ἀρχηγέτης). Celsus also challenged the (now lost) view expressed by certain Christians that Jesus was a good military general, and explained that his followers called Jesus 'son of God' not because they respected God, but because they wanted to magnify their leader's importance.<sup>941</sup> Eisler also pointed to Lactantius's (c. 240 - 320 CE) refutation of a (now lost) work of the Greek philosopher Hieroclēs (fl. first half of 2<sup>nd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> c.?) who stated that Jesus was a leader of nine hundred revolutionary robbers.<sup>942</sup> Eisler also pointed to Tertullian who, in his refutation of the teachings of the 'heretic' Marcion (c.85-160 CE), states that Marcion rejected historical Jesus whom he perceived as a warlord.<sup>943</sup>

To the above direct indications that at least some of the first Christians were revolutionaries, one should also add that Marcus Minucius Felix (fl. 200-240) in his *Octavius* quotes the (now lost) *Adversus Christianos* of Marcus Cornelius

---

<sup>938</sup> *Slavonic Version*, pp. 269-270.

<sup>939</sup> *Nero* 16, vol. 2 (1997), p. 107.

<sup>940</sup> To his Ἀληθὴς λόγος quoted by Origen's *Contra Celsum*.

<sup>941</sup> Celsus, Ἀληθὴς, 8.13-14, p. 197; 2.12, pp. 65-66; Cf. J. A. Francis, *Subversive Virtue, Asceticism and Authority in the Second-Century Pagan World* (Pennsylvania, 1995), pp. 137-139, takes the accusations made by Celsus metaphorically; J. W. Hargis, *Against the Christians: The rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic* (NY, 2001), pp. 17-40, who does not see that Celsus perceived Jesus and the Christians as instigators of turmoils.

<sup>942</sup> Lactantius, *Divine Institutions*, 3.1, trans. A. Bowen and P. Garnsey (Liverpool, 2003), p. 287; Eisler in *Messiah*, p. 10, Christians in *latrocinia* (high way robberies).

<sup>943</sup> Eisler, *Enigma*, p. 177, cited Tertullian that Marcion rejected the Messiah as 'militant fighter and armed war-lord' (iv.20: *militaris et armatus bellator*; iii.21, *bellipotents*). See *Tertullianus against Marcion*, 20, trans P. Holmes (Edinburgh, 1909), p. 257.

Fronto (c. 95-170) that the early Christians were conspirators and that Jesus was punished because he had been a criminal.<sup>944</sup>

Although the above evidence in this section points to the direction that Jesus was arrested and tried by the Roman authorities because he was leading a militant revolt against them, the scholarly world is almost unanimous in condemning efforts to investigate the historicity of this theory.<sup>945</sup> However, I am eager to proceed with my own investigation starting from the region where Christianity first appeared.

#### 4.2: Galileans and the massacre of the innocent infants.

The *New Testament* and a number of later sources confirm that Jesus Christ was 'Galilaïos.' He was born lived and taught in Galilee, and multitudes of Galileans were his followers who often protected his life from his enemies.<sup>946</sup> "Josephus," a former leader of militant Galileans himself,<sup>947</sup> stated that Galilee was densely

---

<sup>944</sup> Minucius, *Octavius* 9, p. 336; 9, pp. 337-338 (Christians sacrificing babies, drinking their blood and consuming their flesh). Also see Hardwick, *Josephus*, p. 20: *Octavius* was written in between 160 and 260 CE.

<sup>945</sup> See my Introduction and Cf. Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 1-21 (Jesus as a rebel against Rome). J. Carmichael, *The death of Jesus* (New York, 1963), pp. 24-45 (on the trial of Jesus and how Christian tradition presents it with many inconsistencies); pp. 133-162 (Jesus as leader of revolutionaries).

<sup>946</sup> *Matthew* 4:23; 27:55; 2:22; 3:13; 4:12; 4:18; 15:29; 17:22; 19:1; 26:32; 28:7; 28:10; 28:16; 4:25; 21:11; 26:69; *Mark* 3.7 et al. See also John Chrysostom, *In Joannem*, Homilia 30, 123.60, PG 59, 123-128; Theodoretus, bishop of Cyrrhus in Syria, *Commentaria in Isaiam*, 3.739-803, 8.36-39, ed. J. N. Guinot, *Théodoret de Cyr, Commentaire sur Isaïe*, 3 vols (Paris, 1980-1984) vol. 1, pp. 318-322; vol. 2, p. 234; John Malalas, *Chronographia* 24, p. 187 (the Nazōraioi and Galilaioi were named Christians by Patriarch and bishop Evodios of Antioch): trans. Jeffreys, p. 131. See also *Suidae Lexicon*, vol. 1, p. 506, s.v. Γαλιλαῖοι· ζῆται ποτὲ μετωνομάσθησαν Χριστιανοὶ ἐν τῷ Ναζιραῖοι. Cf. Sanders, *Schismatics*, p. 1 (Christianity began in Judah, "the original Jewish home of Christianity." Galilee, according to Sanders is a second place where Jesus simply taught, and where Christianity flourished in later centuries but not when Jesus was active; Despite the above extensive evidence Martin Hengel concluded that the name Galilean "was only very rare applied to Christians before the time of Julian the Apostate." Hengel, most probably, repeated the views of previous scholars and did not examine the primary sources on this issue: Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 59, with reference to A. von Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, 1908.

<sup>947</sup> *Josephus Vita*, 228-243, vol. 5, pp. 359-362.

inhabited.<sup>948</sup> Given the limited geographical size of Galilee, it is highly possible that, as the *New Testament* indicates, many or most of the Galileans were familiar either with Jesus in person or with some of the members of his extended family and his Galilean Apostles. It is also widely accepted that Jesus was a member of a priestly family, and this increases the chances that he was well known to the region.<sup>949</sup> *Mark*<sup>950</sup> is also clear that Scribes and Pharisees came from Jerusalem to Galilee to confront Jesus and his disciples.<sup>951</sup> The question here is whether Jesus's movement posed a threat for the political stability of the region, and this is why the authorities sent a mission to Galilee against him.

*De Bello* states that during and after Pompey, there were more Israelite revolutions.<sup>952</sup> According to the *Antiquities*, c. 53BCE, the forces of Cassius Longinus along with the Idumaeans commanded by Antipater, gave a battle in Galilee against the supporters of the last Hasmoneans, and took "thirty thousand" slaves.<sup>953</sup> Following the death of his father Antipater, Herod the Great (c.73-4 BCE) became the new trusted ally of the Greco-Romans in the region. He married a Hasmonean princess in 37 BCE, and with the support of

---

<sup>948</sup> *Bel.* 3.41-43, vol. 6, pp. 279-280; Hoehner, *Herod*, p. 52, and pp. 292-295, estimates the population of the '204' villages and towns/cities of Galilee c. 200,000. Other scholars go up to one million. Also see Fiensy, *Jesus*, pp. 25-26, on the diametrically different views between scholars as to the historical identity of first century Galilee; p. 26, some scholars estimate that Sepphoris had 30000 inhabitants, some others 7500; p. 40, Fiensy accepts that the population of Galilee was 175000; p. 61 "There is an absence of pig bones (cf. *Lev.* 11:7) in most sites. Including Sepphoris, the occurrence of pig bones is so slight as to be statistically non-existent." None of the coins produced during Herod Antipas in Galilee present any human like figures or any animals. Fiensy considers Sepphoris and Tiberias not to have been hellenised; p. 66, Fiensy accepts that Sepphoris and Tiberias had a population of 10000 each. Of course, not all Galileans were followers of Jesus. See Alon, *Jews*, vol. 2, pp. 506-514.

<sup>949</sup> Freyne, 'The Galilean,' p. 118, observed that as priesthood in Judaism is inherited from father to son, and as some of the Galileans were converts to Judaism, their first priests had arrived from elsewhere. Therefore, it is likely that Jesus's paternal lineage, at some stage, was not Galilean, because Jesus was of a priestly family.

<sup>950</sup> 3:22 and 7:1.

<sup>951</sup> See S. Freyne, 'The Galilean,' p. 118.

<sup>952</sup> *Bel.* 1. 133-213, vol. 6, pp. 30-48.

<sup>953</sup> Freyne, *Galilee* p. 65-67 (Galileans on the side of the Hasmoneans deposed by Herod).

Mark Antony (c.83-30 BCE), became the new King of the Israelites.<sup>954</sup> He built Caesarea, and furnished it with a theatre, an amphitheatre and an agora. According to *De Bello* he also dedicated statues to Caesar and Rome, and also built *gymnasia*, theatres and temples in a number of Greek cities. Nearer home, he also improved Jerusalem.<sup>955</sup> Contrary to the above narrative in *De Bello*, which magnified Herod's importance, the *Antiquities* criticised him because he rebuilt the destroyed cities by following the *Hellenic* way (Ἑλληνικὸν τρόπον). The *Antiquities* also state that Herod apologized to the Judeans that he was ordered to do so by the Romans, and was not able to do otherwise.<sup>956</sup> Contrary to those who insist that 'no ancient Jewish or Christian writer attacks Herod for being a Hellenizer',<sup>957</sup> apart from the above attack against Herod's Hellenism, the author of the *Antiquities* also reports that the cultural changes the King introduced were contrary to Israelite religious laws, and this is why Herod faced the opposition of his people.<sup>958</sup> The *Antiquities* also state with bitterness that Herod the Great was closer to the Greeks than he was to the Jews (Ἑλλησι πλέον ἢ Ἰουδαίοις οἰκείως ἔχειν ὁμολογούμενος): he built cities for the Greeks with theatres and Temples, but did not built anything for the Jews.<sup>959</sup> This anti-Hellenic sentiment is also confirmed at another point in the *Antiquities*, which states that in c.15 BCE some Jews who lived in cities as far as Asia Minor and Libya complained to Herod that they suffered discrimination from the Greeks.

---

<sup>954</sup> *Bel.* 1.240-241, vol. 6, pp. 240-241.

<sup>955</sup> *Bel.* 1.403-428, vol. 6, pp. 92-98; Also see Michael Grant, *Herod the Great* (New York, 1971), pp. 14, 170-174; There may be some over-exaggerations here, for there is no archaeological trace of any stadium or theatre in Jerusalem: see Dan Bahat, 'Jerusalem between the Hasmoneans and Herod the Great,' in Rami Arav, ed., *Cities through the Looking Glass: Essays on the History and Archaeology of Biblical Urbanism* (Winona Lake, 2008), pp. 126-127.

<sup>956</sup> *Ant.* 15.329-330, vol. 3, p. 391: ... ἐκβαίνειν τῶν ἐθῶν ἡναγκάζεται καὶ πολλὰ τῶν νομίμων παραχαράττειν,... οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἡνέσχοντο τῶν τοιούτων ἀπηγορευμένων ἡμῖν ὡς ἀγάλματα καὶ τύπους μεμορφωμένους τιμᾶν πρὸς τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν τρόπον.

<sup>957</sup> Goldstein, 'Jewish,' p. 85.

<sup>958</sup> *Ant.* 16.1-5, vol. 4, pp. 4-5; 17.41-46, vol. 4, p. 77-78, also reports friction between certain Pharisees and Herod; Also see Zeitlin, *Rise*, pp. 100-104, on the fate of the Sadducees whose leaders were exterminated by Herod.

<sup>959</sup> *Ant.* 19.329-330, vol. 3, p. 391: Ἑλλησι πλέον ἢ Ἰουδαίοις οἰκείως ἔχειν ὁμολογούμενος... ἀλλὰ Ἰουδαίων οὐδεμίαν πόλιν οὐδ' ὀλίγης ἐπισκευῆς ἡξίωσεν.

The Greeks, regardless that Greek Kings “had granted to the Jews equal rights,” confiscated the taxes they collected for Jerusalem.<sup>960</sup> The author of the *Antiquities* calls the Greeks ‘inhuman’ (τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπανθρωπίας) for the devastation the Jews suffered from such treatment.<sup>961</sup> There are a number of problems with this explanation that has been accepted as historical by many scholars. First of all, there were no Greek Kings in command of those cities, nor there is other evidence that the Greeks conspired simultaneously in a number of regions against the Jews during that time. Instead Cicero (106-43 BCE) in c. 59 BCE praised the Senate and other Roman officials who, by law and in a number of occasions confiscated the gold sent to Jerusalem by the Jews, not only because the Jews revolted against the Romans, but also because the demands of the Jewish religion were insulting to Rome.<sup>962</sup> Why then one should trust the *Antiquities* that the confiscation of the religious tax sent to Jerusalem was the work of an evil international Greek conspiracy and not of the Romans? Apart from this questioning of “Josephus's” anti-Greek argument, one should also pay some attention to the fact that the religion of the Israelites required them to pay taxes to their spiritual motherland, Jerusalem. It also makes sense that the Greek cities where the Israelites lived, and the Romans as well, asked the Israelites to pay taxes. Therefore, is it possible that some Israelites complained to Herod on the issue of double taxation?

Returning to Galilee, *De Bello* and the *Antiquities* provide clear information that Herod met fierce opposition near the well-known Canaa village<sup>963</sup> where battles

---

<sup>960</sup> *Ant.* 16. 27, vol. 4, p. 8.

<sup>961</sup> *Ant.*, 16. 160-161, vol. 4, pp. 27-28.

<sup>962</sup> *Pro Flacco* 66-69, ed. A. C. Clark, trans. C. MacDonald, *Cicero* (Harvard, 1977), pp. 514-519. Also see Poseidōnios (c.135-c.51 BCE), *Fragments*, fragm. 131a, ed. W. Theiler, *Posidonios, Die Fragmente*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1982), vol. 1, pp. 111-112: (the Jews refused to mix and communicate with other people; they attacked everybody who was not Jewish; they were hated by the gods who sent them diseases; it was a Jewish tradition to hate other people; Moses instructed them to hate foreigners).

<sup>963</sup> Jesus, wine-miracle.

took place between Herod's forces and rebels,<sup>964</sup> resulting in massive losses. This was not the first time Herod invaded Galilee. At the beginning of his career as a military commander, when he fought under the leadership of his father Antipater, the young Herod led his troops against the Galilean chief-robber rabbi Ezekias and executed him along with a great number of his followers.<sup>965</sup> According to the *Antiquities*, Herod kept ravaging Galilee also with the help of the Romans.<sup>966</sup> *De Bello* also makes it clear that the revolutionary movement that began in Galilee spread to other regions, and at some stage Herod's control of Jerusalem was established only after a massacre that included children, women and the elderly.<sup>967</sup> The *Antiquities* also provide the story that Herod ordered for the installation of a decorative 'golden sculpture' of an eagle over the entrance of the Temple of Jerusalem. This was perceived by the hard-liners as a blasphemous act against the *Law*, and they responded with a plot to assassinate Herod. Although they failed, the massive civil unrest was so strong that Herod had to rely on the force of Roman soldiers to suppress it.<sup>968</sup> When at a later stage Herod became ill, the leaders of the rebels<sup>969</sup> preached for the destruction of Herod's golden eagle and their followers destroyed this abominable idol. In retaliation, according to the *Antiquities*, King Herod ordered the culprits to be burnt alive. From then on his health declined rapidly, as if this were a divine

---

<sup>964</sup> *Bel.* 1.328-334, vol. 6, pp. 75-77. Cf. *Ant.* 14.429-30, vol. 3, p. 319.

<sup>965</sup> *Bel.* 1.203-205, vol. 6.1, p. 46: Herod exterminated robbers in Galilee.

<sup>966</sup> *Ant.* 14.394-95, vol. 3, p. 312 : Many Galileans took Herod's side, but some supported Antigonus. Herod returned in Galilee to exterminate them: *Ant.* 14.413-30, vol. 3, pp. 316-319: atrocities against Galileans; *Ant.* 14.431-33: another invasion of Galilee followed. *Ant.* 14.450, vol. 3, p. 322: ἀποστάντες Γαλιλαῖοι τῶν παρὰ σφίσι δυνατῶν τοὺς τὰ Ἡρώδου φρονοῦντας ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ κατεπόντωσαν. *De Bello*, in the account of the same events, does not know those Galileans drown in the lake. Cf. Jesus, Gadara, pigs; *Ant.* 14.452-453, vol. 3, p. 323: Herod invaded Galilee with the help of Romans. For the same period cf. *Bel.* 1:290-330, vol. 3, pp. 67-75.

<sup>967</sup> *Bel.* 1.347-353, vol. 6, pp. 79-353; *Ant.*, 14.488, vol. 3, p. 329: a war against the Galileans lasted 4 months; Also see *Ant.* 15.370-379, vol. 3, pp. 399-401: Some Pharisees and the Essenes were excused by Herod the Great to take an oath of fidelity to him. The *Antiquities* are categorical that Herod had great respect for them (372); they lived like to the Pythagorians. When Herod was a child, one of the Essenes prophesized that he would become King (373). The text is again praising the Essenes as men of virtue and able to foresee the future (379).

<sup>968</sup> *Ant.* 15. 267-330, vol. 3, pp. 380-391.

<sup>969</sup> Judas, the son of Sarifaios, and Matthias, the son of Mergalōthon.

punishment.<sup>970</sup> The problem here is that Epiphanēs and Alkimos were also "made" to die in similar "horrific" circumstances by the authors *Maccabees*, meaning that the author of the *Antiquities* appears to be following a similar school of defamation.

Following Herod's death (4 BCE), conflicts continued between those who succeeded him and those who never accepted them as a legitimate dynasty. As we shall see below, Galilee remained at the epicentre of this opposition. According to surviving fragments from the work of Nikolaos of Damascus (c.64 BCE- early 1<sup>st</sup> c. CE), over ten thousand Jews revolted against Herod's sons and their Greek allies (τοις Ἑλλησιν), but the Greek troops prevailed (νικᾷ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν). The text is clear that another three thousand Judeans were murdered during a new conflict, and then some Greek cities (Ἑλληνίδες πόλεις) asked the Emperor to support them and recognise their freedom from the Israelites.<sup>971</sup> The Roman army intervened, and this time, according to the *Antiquities*, the Romans crucified a further two thousand rebels and the Greek cities were rewarded for their co-operation with the Romans: they were set free from the Israelite yoke.<sup>972</sup> The Romans imposed a tetrarchy by dividing Herod's kingdom among his four descendants. The tetrarch King Antipas (d. after c.39 CE), received Peraia and Galilee. According to *De Bello*, Antipas's brother, Archelaos (4 BCE-6 CE), soon after he was crowned tetrarch of Judea, Samaria and Idumaia, ordered his army to suppress the rebellion that started before the death of their father because of the installation of the eagle in the Jerusalem

---

<sup>970</sup> *Ant.* 17.149-167, vol. 4, pp. 96-100.

<sup>971</sup> Nikolaos, *Fragmenta*, fr. 5, ed. K. Müller, *Nicolai Damasceni, De vita sua*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1841-1883), vol. 3, pp. 348-356 at 353-354: τὸ ἔθνος ἐπανίσταται τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν... νικᾷ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν... ἐπροσβέυσαντο δὲ καὶ αἱ ὑφ' Ἡρώδῃ Ἑλληνίδες πόλεις αἰτούμεναι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν παρὰ Καίσαρος... τὸν μέντοι πρὸς τὰς Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις οὐκ ἤξιον.

<sup>972</sup> *Ant.* 17.209-314, vol. 4, pp. 108-129. Also see 14.74-76, vol. 3, pp. 252-253; Cf. *Bel.* 2.97, vol. 6, p. 172: eg. τὰς γὰρ Ἑλληνίδας Γάζαν καὶ Γάδαρα καὶ Ἴππον.

Temple.<sup>973</sup> Apparently, King Archelaos inherited from his father not only a throne but also his political enemies.<sup>974</sup> One of the additional reasons that made him disliked by some of his Jewish subjects was that his mother was Samaritan.<sup>975</sup> His unpopularity increased to the extent that some time c.6 CE a Jewish delegation invited Augustus (27 BCE–14CE) to depose Archelaos and take the entire Judea under his direct control. From what follows, it becomes evident that some Israelites did not welcome this development and perceived those who delivered Jerusalem to the Romans as traitors.

According to *De Bello*, rabbi Judas, the son of rabbi Ezekias executed by Herod, was the leader of the Zealots who rejected the authority of both the Herodians and the Roman occupation. Similarly to the provincial heroes Mattathias and Judas Maccabee in the past, the new provincial hero Judas the Galilean openly preached the Israelites to reject the Gentile yoke and claim their political independence.<sup>976</sup> The *Antiquities* report that the Galilean rebels also tried to assassinate the tetrarch King Herod Antipas. In response, the King invaded their strongholds in Galilee and suppressed them,<sup>977</sup> but did not manage to eliminate their opposition. Later, they appear to attack him for decorating his palace in Tiberias, the capital of Galilee, with images of animals.<sup>978</sup> According to the *Antiquities*, the Galilean Judas declared God as 'the only ruler and despot' and refused to obey any other authority. This made the author of the *Antiquities* to call Judas "the leader of the fourth philosophy." Most scholars identify the

---

<sup>973</sup> *Bel.* 2.1-13, vol. 6, pp. 155-157.

<sup>974</sup> *Bel.* 2.39-83, vol. 6, pp. 162-169.

<sup>975</sup> *Bel.* 1.562, vol. 6, p. 128.

<sup>976</sup> *Bel.* 2.117-118, vol. 6, p. 176. Cf. S. Freyne, 'The Geography of Restoration: Galilee-Jerusalem Relations in Early Jewish and Christian Experience,' in *NTS* (2001), vol. 47. 3, pp. 289-311, the entire article on the relation between Jerusalem-Galilee. Freyne examines both as part of the same tradition.

<sup>977</sup> *Ant.* 14.451-454, vol. 3, p. 322-323; 17.271-272, vol. 4, p. 121; 17.288, vol. 4, p. 125.

<sup>978</sup> Morten H. Jensen, 'Herod Antipas in Galilee: Friend or Foe of the Historical Jesus?', *JSHJ* 5.1 (2007), pp. 7-32 at 15. Cf. *ibid.* pp. 26-30, the coins issued by Herod Antipas bore inscriptions in Greek; p. 32, Jensen concludes that Antipas did not persecute Jesus.



Zealots exclusively with this "fourth philosophy,"<sup>979</sup> simply because "Josephus" opted to name with this term. The other three philosophies were the Sadducees, the Pharisees and the Essenes.<sup>980</sup> Judas also declared that Sepphoris, the city he controlled in Galilee, was the capital of his own new kingdom. In response, Antipas demolished Sepphoris,<sup>981</sup> but the defeat of Judas was not an easy task. *De Bello* made it clear that all Galileans were trained to become fighters from childhood,<sup>982</sup> and during the Great Revolt, among the revolutionary *Zealots* the 'Galilean contingent was pre-eminent in the originality and audacity of their crimes'.<sup>983</sup> Despite the repeated defeats they suffered from the Romans and the Herodians, Galilee continued to be the epicentre of revolutions.<sup>984</sup> It is evident from the examination of the above reports that from the moment the Romans arrived in the area, Galilee maintained the strongest revolutionary spirit and kept fighting against the new order as no other Israelite region. This is the region and the period in which Jesus was born and raised. However, *Matthew* provides a very different story with reference to the history of that period. Instead of any violent revolts in Galilee, it only reports that Herod exterminated exclusively a large number of innocent infants<sup>985</sup> because he feared that one of them might challenge his dominion, depose him, and become king in the future,<sup>986</sup> something never mentioned by "Josephus." Although some scholars

---

<sup>979</sup> Uriel Rappaport, 'Who Were the Sicarii?,' in *The Jewish Revolt Against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Mladen Popovic (Leiden, 2011), pp. 323-342 does not see any connection to Christianity either; pp. 330-331, the dynasty of the Zealot leaders was as such: Ezekias (active circa 45 BCE); Judas (active c. 4 BCE and 6 CE); James and Simon (47 CE); Menahem (66 CE); Eleazar son of Yair (67-73 CE). Rapaport connects the Sicarii exclusively with the fourth philosophy.

<sup>980</sup> *Ant.* 18.23, vol. 4, p. 144; 18.4-10, vol. 4, pp. 140-141 (fourth philosophy). Judas had an important ally also from Galilee, called Sadouk, who was a Pharisee.

<sup>981</sup> *Ant.* 18.23-27, vol. 4, p. 144-145; 17, 271-272, vol. 4, p. 121 (Sepphoris); 17.289, vol. 4, p. 125 (destruction of Sepphoris).

<sup>982</sup> *Bel.* 3.42-43, vol. 6, p. 279.

<sup>983</sup> *Bel.* 4.558, vol. 6, p. 419; trans. Williamson, *Josephus*, p. 267.

<sup>984</sup> *Bel.* 1.21-22, vol. 6, p. 7. For Vespasian's military expedition and invasion in Galilee see *ibid.*, 5.408-ff, vol. 6, p. 490.

<sup>985</sup> *Matthew* 2:16.

<sup>986</sup> This story is mentioned only in *Matthew* 2:16-18.

accept this story in *Matthew* as historical,<sup>987</sup> my question is whether it was said metaphorically. Is it possible that the Galilean<sup>988</sup> author of *Matthew* modelled this story upon one of the slaughters the Galileans suffered from Herod's forces?

The *Antiquities* report one more large scale massacre which took place just when Herod the Great was dying, namely that of the extermination of "three thousand" men of the same tribe,<sup>989</sup> whom his son Archelaos slaughtered inside the Temple. In my opinion, the same text reveals that this mass slaughter took place after the war against the Galileans who fought on the side of Judas in Sepphoris, many of whom ended up as prisoners.<sup>990</sup> The indication here is that those "three thousand" victims must have been the captive Galileans. The question, therefore, remains whether the Galilean author of *Matthew* modelled his innocent infants story upon this or on a similar massacre of his compatriot Galileans. Given the fact that Jesus Christ and his first followers appeared in Galilee after Herod's invasions of Galilee,<sup>991</sup> one should observe that our sources contain some very interesting information about what the parents of the first Christians might have been doing during those turbulent years. I observed that according to Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius, Joseph the father of Jesus had a

---

<sup>987</sup> Eg. Merrill C. Tenney, *New Testament Times* (London, 1965), p. 143, accepts the massacre of the infants as historical, on the basis that Herod was evil. He also accepts that there are no other reports about it because such a crime could go unnoticed. Cf. *Exodus* 1:22 where a certain Pharaoh ordered the extermination of Hebrew newborn boys. In support to the case that this story must be a fabrication, one should also observe that it has been placed in between quotations from the *Old Testament*.

<sup>988</sup> *Mark* 2:1-2:14 (Jesus found him in Capernaum of Galilee and asked him to follow him). *Mark* 2:14 (Levi, the son of Alphaeus is St Matthew).

<sup>989</sup> *Ant.*, 17.313, vol. 4, p. 129: τρισχιλίων ὁμοφύλων ἀνδρῶν σφαγὴν ἐν τῷ τεμένει ποιησάμενον.

<sup>990</sup> *Ant.* 17.271-289, vol. 4, p. 123.

<sup>991</sup> *Ant.*, 14.450, vol. 3, p. 322. At some stage before the conflict there was an alliance between Herod and Galileans: *Ant.*, 14.396, vol. 3, p. 312. For the conflict between Herodians/Romans from one side, and the Galileans/Idumeans on the other, see also Josephus, *Ant.*, 17.254, vol. 4, p. 118.

brother named Κλωπᾶς.<sup>992</sup> I have researched the meaning of this peculiar word, and it should be clear that in ancient Greek it means robber, bandit or thief.<sup>993</sup> This Κλωπᾶς is also mentioned by *John* as father of Jesus's aunt Mary.<sup>994</sup> Also, it is known that according to Celsus, Jesus's father was called Πάνθηρ (Panther),<sup>995</sup> but it is not so well known that according to Epiphanius Jesus's uncle Κλωπᾶς and his father Joseph, both had a father called Jacob who was also known with the name Πάνθηρ.<sup>996</sup> It is also known that according to *Mark* the Galilean apostles Jacob and John were called 'the sons of thunder,'<sup>997</sup> in the sense this was the meaning of their father's name Zebedee. Regardless whether all above reports are accurate, does it make sense that people with such names were peace-loving at times of conflict, or it is more reasonable to conclude that a

---

<sup>992</sup> *Fragmenta Hegesippi*, ed. Routh, vol. 1, p. 215; p. 219: Τὸν γὰρ οὖν Κλωπᾶν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὑπάρχειν Ἡγήσιππος ἱστορεῖ (fragm. in Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.11); pp. 207-208 (fragm. in Eusebius *H.E.* 3.32); Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 3, pp. 456-7: οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἀδελφὸς γίνεται τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ἦν δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰακώβ, ἐπὶ κλην δὲ Πάνθηρ καλουμένου· ἀμφότεροι οὗτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πάνθηρος ἐπὶ κλην γεννῶνται (Josef the father of Jesus and his brother Klōpas the robber were sons of a certain Panther); vol. 3, p. 43: αὐτῶν Συμεών, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ, υἱὸς τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἰωσήφ. See also *Hōrologion*, 9<sup>th</sup> and the 23<sup>rd</sup> of October, pp. 224, 233. There is evidence in *John* that Klōpas, the brother of St Joseph had a daughter called Maria, who was by the side of Virgin Mary when Jesus Christ was crucified.

<sup>993</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Alcestis*, 766, ed. A. Garzya, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana* (Leipzig, 1980), p. 29: πανούργον κλῶπα καὶ ληιστὴν τινα; cf. Plutarch, *Vitae parallelae*, *Romulus* 6.5.5, ed. K. Ziegler, *Plutarchi vitae parallelae, Romulum*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1957-1959), vol. 1, p. 41. Cf. Herodotus, *Historiae*, 6.16.9, ed. H. B. Rosén, 2 vols (Leipzig, vol. 1-1987, vol. 2-1997) vol. 2, p. 86; Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes* 66.23, ed. J. von Arnim, *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1893-1896), vol. 2, p. 167: τοὺς μὲν ὡς κλῶπα, τοὺς δὲ ὡς βίαιον; Philoxenus, a grammarian of the 1st century CE, who is also clear of the meaning of the word: *Fragmenta*, fragm. 518, ed. C. Theodoridis, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos* (Berlin, 1976), p. 325: <κλώψ>· καὶ “κλῶπα καὶ ληιστήν.”

<sup>994</sup> *John* 19:25: εἰστήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀδελφή τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαгдаληνή. Despite *John*, Hegisippus and Eusebius above, some claim that this is a mistake, and the correct form of this name is Cleopas, as in *Luke* 24:18.

<sup>995</sup> Celsus, *Ἀληθείας λόγος* 1.28, p. 53: ἀπὸ τινος στρατιώτου Πανθήρα τοῦνομα (Celsus accused Virgin Mary for adultery and Jesus of being son of a soldier called Panthēr). Cf. Talbot, *Dynasty*, pp. 58-65 (on Panther, possibly the father of Jesus).

<sup>996</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 3, pp. 456-7: οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἀδελφὸς γίνεται τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ἦν δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰακώβ, ἐπὶ κλην δὲ Πάνθηρ καλουμένου· ἀμφότεροι οὗτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πάνθηρος ἐπὶ κλην γεννῶνται.

<sup>997</sup> *Mark* 3:17: ὁ ἐστὶν Υἱοὶ Βροντῆς. On the meaning of this name see Richardson-Edwards, in BDT, p. 266. Richardson and Edwards also questioned whether Jesus' movement was involved into the greater social unrest of the time, but they concluded that Jesus was not sympathetic to violence.

Panther, a Robber and a Thunder were some of the mighty Galilean warriors? The name Peter also derives from the Greek Petros, which in turn is the translation of the Aramaic Kepha meaning hard as stone or rock, and the question remains here whether this "Barjona," as examined in the Introduction, was called as such not because of his great faith, but because he was tough.

Despite the above evidence for the repeated revolts of the Galileans, and further clear evidence to follow that the Galileans revolted against Rome also during Pontius Pilate (26-36 CE), Petronius (37-? CE), Cumanus (?-52 CE) and some other times in between, some of the most eminent scholars who specialise in Galilee claim that in between 37 BCE and 66CE there was only one Galilean revolt,<sup>998</sup> and attack any attempt to associate this region with revolutionaries.<sup>999</sup> I leave the above and the following sections to provide a reply to such scholarly views.

---

<sup>998</sup> Eg. Seán Freyne, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary approaches and historical Investigations* (Dublin, 1988); Schrötter, 'Jesus,' p. 48 (rejects that Galilee was revolting); Uriel Rappaport, 'How Anti-Roman Was the Galilee', in LIL, pp. 95-102 at 97, in between 37 BCE and 66 CE, Rappaport sees only one Galilean revolt against Rome in 4 BCE (the attack against the royal palace at Sepphoris by Judas); p. 101, only minor pockets of resistance existed in Galilee during the Great Revolt; p. 101, Rappaport observed that in *De Bello* Josephus claims to have been a leader of a large scale revolt in Galilee, and in his *Vita* he claims he opposed it; he paid attention to some Galileans who supported Herod the Great against Antigonus (*Ant.* 14, 15.1.395; 15.10.450); E. Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, trans. William G. Hutchinson, *Renan's Life of Jesus* (London, 1897), pp. 22-23 Galilee was a paradise of peace at the time of Jesus. Cf. Seán Freyne, 'Urban-Rural Relationships in First Century Galilee' in LIL, pp 75-94 at 78-81 on the different factions of Galileans during the Great Revolt; William R. Herzog II, *Prophet and Teacher: An Introduction to the Historical Jesus* (Louisville, 2005), pp. 57-67, on the socioeconomic conditions of Galilee.

<sup>999</sup> Seán Freyne, 'The Galileans in Light of Josephus' *Vita*' in *NTS* (1980), 26, pp. 397-413; Seán Freyne, 'Geography, Politics and Economics of Galilee and the Quest for the Historical Jesus,' in Chilton-Evans, pp. 75-122 at 94-96, Freyne insists there is no evidence that there were bandits in Galilee throughout the first century (he attacks Horsley for saying the opposite). He also insists that they were active just before and during the Great Revolt; One should consider here is that Freyne(d. 2013) was an associate of Martin Hengel.

#### 4.3: Galilee and the *signa*.

In the years that followed the aforementioned massacres of the Galileans, political instability in Jerusalem reached such levels that a single Roman Procurator, Valerius Gratus (15-26 CE) had changed four High Priests.<sup>1000</sup> Later, according to *De Bello*, when the Roman Prefect of Judea, Pontius Pilate (26-36 CE), introduced the *signa*<sup>1001</sup> of the emperor in Jerusalem, a multitude of natives perceived them as idols and demonstrated against their installation in their land. Apparently, the rejection of the Emperor's *signa* sent the strong political message that the protestors did not recognise the authority of the Emperor.<sup>1002</sup> However, *De Bello* insists that the main reason the Israelites reacted against the presence of the *signa* in Jerusalem was religious and not political.<sup>1003</sup> Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium* provides additional details which point to the conclusion that religion alone was not the only reason behind the rejection of the *signa*. It states that Pilate erected two gold plated shields in his palace, inscribed only with letters. They were not decorated with forbidden images but, nevertheless, the shields too embarrassed the Jews. Pilate at the end was forced to remove the

---

<sup>1000</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, p. 67.

<sup>1001</sup> These were images, emblems and/or sculptures.

<sup>1002</sup> Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*, vol. 6, p. 180, instead of worshiping the Emperor, like all other subjects of the empire, the Israelites dedicated objects in their synagogues on behalf of the Emperor, as if the Emperor himself was dedicating and sacrificing to their own God. In other words, they were willing to accept the Emperor only as a worshipper of their own God, and not as a separate deity; Also see G. Wissowa, 'The historical development of Roman Religion: an overview,' in *Roman Religion*, ed. C. Ando (Edinburgh, 2003), pp. 330-357 at 345-350, for the introduction of the *Divi imperatores* cult by Augustus in honour of Julius Caesar and the evolution of the cult; The cult of worshiping the *Divus* emperor was introduced in the Roman world since 42 BCE, and spread gradually, to the extent that by the times of Philo it was well established all over the Empire; North, *Roman*, pp. 60-61 on worshiping the Emperor-Divus; D. Winslow, 'Religion and the Early Roman Empire', in Benko-O' Rourke, pp. 237-254.

<sup>1003</sup> *Bel.* 2, 169-174, vol. 6, pp. 187-188; There is archaeological evidence that not all Israelites held the same views on statues of men and images of animals. See Levine, *Synagogue*, pp. 613-630.

shields, because it was against the *Law* to install images in the Holy Land.<sup>1004</sup> Despite that this source, similarly to "Josephus," also used religious excuses to conceal the rejection of Roman occupation, it is evident that the political anti-Roman sentiment was strong in that region. According to *De Bello*, the thousands of demonstrators against the *signa* remained still, facing the ground for five days. Pontius Pilate ordered his soldiers to prepare for the execution of the demonstrators, but they remained calm, still and passive, offering their necks to be slain. Surprised by their religious faith and determination, Pontius Pilate decided to spare their lives and finally withdrew the *signa* of the Emperor from Jerusalem. Not long after, Pilate confiscated a sacred treasure, called 'Corban,'<sup>1005</sup> to finance the construction of an aqueduct. Certain Israelites perceived this act as blasphemy and tried to assassinate Pilate, who in turn ordered his troops to suppress the rebellion, leaving many dead.<sup>1006</sup> In other words, the explanation here is that Pilate was a thief, and any massacre that took place was his fault and not because the Judeans rejected the *signa*. At this stage one should recall *Luke* which states that Pontius Pilate slaughtered Galileans,<sup>1007</sup> and also examine that according to the *Antiquities*, Pilate invaded Samaria and slaughtered many because he was informed that they were preparing to revolt.<sup>1008</sup> In my opinion, the above information should be juxtaposed to the evidence presented in the Slavonic version of *De Dello* where Pilate confronted Jesus and his Galilean revolutionaries.

---

<sup>1004</sup> Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 299-305, vol. 6, p. 211; J. P. Lémonon, *Pilate et le gouvernement de la Judée, textes et monumnets* (Paris, 1981), pp. 265-271, pointed out that the legend about Pilate's divine punishment (because he crucified Jesus Christ) does not exist in sources of the first centuries.

<sup>1005</sup> Meaning 'gift.'

<sup>1006</sup> *Bel.* 2, 169-177, vol. 6, pp. 187-188.

<sup>1007</sup> *Luke* 13:1-3, ed. Nestle-Aland (2001<sup>27</sup>), p. 205: τῶν Γαλιλαίων ὧν τὸ αἶμα Πιλάτος ἔμιξεν μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν.

<sup>1008</sup> *Ant.* 18.85-89, vol. 6, 155-156: ἐπὶ τὸ Γαριζεῖν ὄρος.

Not long after the execution of the Galilean Jesus, when Pilate was in charge of the region, *De Bello* claims that Agrippas (d. 44CE) the grandson of Herod the Great and Gaius Caligula (37-41CE) conspired against the alliance of Agrippas's uncle Antipas the Tetrarch and Emperor Tiberius. When Caligula became Emperor he rewarded Agrippas for his co-operation and sent Petronius, the *proconsul* of Asia (29-c.35) and *legatus* of Syria (39-42) with "three legions" to invade Galilee, which means that even after the death of Jesus, this region remained a stronghold of revolutionaries.<sup>1009</sup> The army sent by Caligula failed to pacify Galilee, for there is evidence to follow that by the time of the Great Revolt,<sup>1010</sup> the Galileans engaged into an even greater struggle.<sup>1011</sup> It is also important to note here that during the years of the Great Revolt, "Josephus" in his *Vita* reported that the Galileans had a leader called Jesus, who led them to slaughter the Greeks (Ἕλληνας) of Tiberias, the capital of Galilee. The same source clearly states that the Greeks became enemies of the Galileans, even before that war began.<sup>1012</sup>

Petronius faced fierce resistance against the installation of the *signa*. *De Bello* reports that at a certain point, on his way from Antioch to Jerusalem, Petronius and his army were stopped by thousands of unarmed Galileans along with their women and children at Ptolemais in Galilee. They warned Petronius that should the Emperor wish to install his *signa* in their land, he should first sacrifice the entire Jewish race, for they were prepared to die in order to remain faithful to their religious beliefs. *De Bello* also states that due to the

---

<sup>1009</sup> *Bel.* 2,181- 188, vol. 6, pp. 189-190.

<sup>1010</sup> 66 and 64 CE are both widely known as the first year of the Great Revolt, depending on scholar. An even earlier date, c. 60, should also be considered, for as we are going to see later, this is the years when Josephus said that the Great Revolt started in Caesarea.

<sup>1011</sup> *Ant.*, 20, 118-120, vol. 4, p. 296.

<sup>1012</sup> *Josephus Vita*, 62-100, vol. 4, p. 331-338; 67, vol. 4, p. 332: ἀναιρουσιν δ' οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντας τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας Ἕλληνας ὅσοι τε πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου γέγονεσαν αὐτῶν ἐχθροί; Sanders, 'Jesus,' pp. 28-29, argues that Tiberias was inhabited mainly by Jews and only a few Greeks were massacred (*Vita* 67). Sanders insists that there was no theatre, no amphitheatre, no gymnasium and no pagan Temples in Tiberias.

demonstration of the Galileans, which lasted seven days, Petronius avoided military retaliation and he followed Pilate's policy of not installing the *signa*.<sup>1013</sup> For once more the question here is whether Petronius, just like Pilate, respected the pious and pacifist Galileans and did follow the Imperial orders to install the *signa*.

The Israelite resistance against the *signa* was unravelling not only in Galilee, Samaria and Judea, but also in Egypt, where one should recall that, as discovered by Parente, the Oniads had been in charge of the Israelite population. Philo's *In Flaccum* explains that since the reign of Augustus a kind of poll-tax was introduced in Alexandria, but the Greek aristocracy were exempted on the grounds of their status as founders of the city. The Jews of Alexandria protested that they were discriminated and refused to pay the tax. Philo accused the Greeks that, out of hatred for the Jews, they persuaded the Roman prefect of Egypt, Flaccus (32-38 CE) to install the *signa* of the Roman Emperor inside Jewish synagogues.<sup>1014</sup> According to Philo, the *signa* conspiracy was successful in the sense that the Roman authorities followed the advice of the Greeks, but the Jews of Alexandria reacted because this was contrary to their religious beliefs. As a result, violent conflicts broke out. Philo subsequently accused the Greeks of arresting the Jews from all parts of Alexandria and, under the leadership of Flaccus, of forcing them to live in a small part of the city, which strongly resembled a ghetto.<sup>1015</sup> Philo also accused

---

<sup>1013</sup> *Bel.* 2.188-203, vol. 6, pp. 190-194; 2.181- 188, vol. 6, pp. 189-190, for the invasion of Petronius into Galilee.

<sup>1014</sup> Philo, *In Flaccum*, 73-74, vol. 6, p. 133; *ibid*, 116-117, vol. 6, p. 141. Also see Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, pp. 136-160 (Alexandria, Egyptians in the revolt); Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs*, p. 165, accepts Josephus that the Jews enjoyed equal status with the Greeks in Alexandria since Alexander and that the Jews, too, were also called Macedonians; pp. 163-164, on the Roman discrimination between Greeks and Jews on the issue of citizenship and taxation in Egypt. Also see H. I Bell, 'Anti-Semitism in Alexandria', *JRS* 31 (1941), pp. 1-18.

<sup>1015</sup> Philo, *In Flaccum*, vol. 6, 55-57, p. 130; Also Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 128-129, vol. 6, p. 179. Shepkaru, *Jewish*, pp. 36, stated that the Jews crucified by Flaccus were peace-loving. See also J. J. Collins, 'Anti-Semitism in antiquity? The case of Alexandria', in Collins, *Jewish*, pp. 181-201 at



the Greeks for vandalizing certain synagogues and destroying others.<sup>1016</sup> According to the *Antiquities* the conflict between Greeks and Jews in populous Alexandria did not stop with the removal of Flaccus. Right after the news of Caligula's death reached Alexandria, the Jews of the city attacked the Greeks.<sup>1017</sup>

At this point one should consider that during the same period Pilate and Petronius too, had attempted to install the *signa* in Galilee and Judea. One should also take into account that according to *De Bello* the orders for the installation of the *signa* in Jerusalem came directly from Emperor Gaius Caligula himself, who instructed Petronius to install them inside the Temple of Jerusalem.<sup>1018</sup> It makes sense that the Emperor gave the same order for other parts of his empire, such as Alexandria. The problem here is why Philo put the blame for the installation of *signa* to the Greeks?<sup>1019</sup> We have already seen above that "Josephus" too, instead of pointing to Rome for the confiscation of the Jewish religious taxes sent to Jerusalem, also attacked the Greeks. And why exactly "Josephus" above did not explain that the image of the eagle Herod tried to install was the *signa*, but instead he provided the explanation that Israel revolted against the *Hellenic* way adopted by Herod?<sup>1020</sup> To which extent this anti-Hellenic pattern of blaming the Greeks or their culture for any disaster, influenced the future generations of Christians who adopted "Josephus" and "Philo" as their own essential sources?

---

181-197, who does not examine that the persecutions against the Israelites in Alexandria and elsewhere could have been a response to Israelite revolutionary activities, nor that in Alexandria the persecutions against them were initiated by the Jewish refusal to pay the laographia tax.

<sup>1016</sup> Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*, 132-3, ed. cit., vol. 6, p. 180.

<sup>1017</sup> *Ant.* 19.278, vol. 4. pp. 258-259.

<sup>1018</sup> *Bel.* 2.188-203, vol. 6, pp. 190-194.

<sup>1019</sup> See S. Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 C.E. and the Persecution of the Jews: A Historical Reconstruction* (Leiden, 2009), p. 250, who highlights Philo's 'silences', 'selectivness', 'inconsistencies' and 'misleading reports' regarding the friction in Alexandria (35-38 CE).

<sup>1020</sup> *Ant.* 15. 267-330, vol. 3, pp. 380-391.

#### 4.4: Buy a *sica*, get a whip and fight for the Lord?

After Jesus instructed his followers who did not have a *machaira* (μάχαιρα) to sell their cloth and buy one,<sup>1021</sup> he explained that he said this in order to fulfil the prophecy that he would be "*counted among the lawless*". Jesus also said that this would explain the way his life is going to end, meaning that he would be crucified because he would be perceived as a leader of lawless bandits.<sup>1022</sup> In the lines which follow this explanation, the disciples said that they had two *machaires* and Jesus replied they were enough. Another detail, which escapes the attention of the scholars I examined, is that a *machaira* is a large knife or short sword. The most appropriate Latin word to translate this Greek *machaira* is *sica*. The holder of the *sica* in Latin is no other than a *Sicarius*. As already examined in the second Chapter, the Romans applied this name to their butchers, most probably because they used the *sica* more than any others, but the problem here is that both the *Antiquities* and *De Bello* repeatedly state that the Sikarioi were notorious revolutionaries who committed atrocities not only against the Romans but also against their own fellow Israelites.<sup>1023</sup> Of course, these sources do not mean that the butchers left their trade en masse and turned against the flesh of their fellow citizens, but they use this Latin term as a derogatory against the extremist revolutionaries. Although it is evident that the verses in *Luke* 22:28 which followed Jesus's instruction to buy *sica*, tried to put an end to the story that Jesus advised his followers to become Sikarioi, I believe that one should cross-examine *Mark* here, where a young follower of Jesus ran

---

<sup>1021</sup> *Luke* 22:36.

<sup>1022</sup> *Luke* 22:37: μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη; *Holy*, p. 89. Cf. *Isaiah* 53:12.

<sup>1023</sup> *Ant.*, 20.185-186, vol. 4, p. 307: Sicarioi criminals damage cities; 208-210, vol. 4, p. 311: Sicarioi took the son of Ananias hostage; *Bel.* 2.254, vol. 6, pp. 202-203; 7.262, vol. 6, p. 604 (they were more violent than others); 4.400, vol. 6, p. 399 (Sicarioi in Masada), and 4.516, vol. 6, p. 411 (Sicarioi fought against the Romans in Masada); 7.254, vol. 6, p. 603 (Sicarioi in control of Masada); 7.275, vol. 6, pp. 605-606; 7.297, vol. 6, p. 608; 7.410-444, vol. 6, pp. 622-623 (Sicarioi participate in the revolution); 7.253, vol. 6, p. 603 (Eleazar the leader of Sicarioi); *Bel.* 4.514-517, vol. 6, p. 414; 7.252-265, vol. 6, pp. 602-604.

away from the scene of conflict in the Mount of Olives.<sup>1024</sup> He was wearing nothing but a sheet, which he lost as he was on the run, leaving himself naked. Although there are well known groups of scholars<sup>1025</sup> and others who see here an indication that there must have been some homosexuality in the scene, my question is whether this young man ended up dressing himself with a valueless piece of textile because he was one of those who did listen to Jesus's advice and sold their clothes in order to buy a *sica*, meaning that this young man could have participated in the conflict as a Sicarios. It is widely known that in *Matthew* too, Jesus preached that he did not come to bring peace on earth, but *machaira/sica*,<sup>1026</sup> and the question here, once more, is why should all the above indications be examined solely in a theological or metaphorical/parabolic sense and not within the historical context of the Galilean resistance against Rome? Also, why exactly in the same *Gospel, Matthew*,<sup>1027</sup> Jesus appears to reverse his previous statement, and says to his followers "*all who take the machaira will perish by the machaira*"?<sup>1028</sup> Of course, there is much scholarship upon these controversial passages, which does not see any "revolutionary" indications here, but the *NT* contains a further large number of controversial statements, which, in my opinion, deserve to be re-examined before one makes his mind on their meaning.

---

<sup>1024</sup> This is when Peter pulled out a knife and cut the ear of a servant of the High Priest, then Jesus was arrested. See *Mark* 14:51-52.

<sup>1025</sup> Also based on the widely known discovery made by Morton Smith.

<sup>1026</sup> *Matthew* 10:34; *Matthew* 10:35 quotes a passage from *Micah* 7:6: "for the son treats the father with contempt, the daughter rises up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; your enemies are members of your own household". The question here is whether the addition of the *Micah* passage is an attempt to disguise or alter the meaning of the previous passage. Cf. Hoehner, *Herod*, pp. 317-33, who concludes that Jesus was wanted by Herod Antipas and that is why he often withdrew away from Galilee.

<sup>1027</sup> 26:52.

<sup>1028</sup> Cf. E. Bammel, 'The poor and the Zealots,' in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 109-128 at 126, Bammel is convinced that *Matthew* reports exactly what historical Jesus said and believed.

*John*<sup>1029</sup> states that there was a massive crowd, which welcomed Jesus on his way to the Temple, holding palm branches. The resemblance here with *I Maccabees* on the way the liberator of Israel Simon Maccabee was welcomed in Jerusalem, is striking.<sup>1030</sup> *John* also reports that Jesus himself made and used a heavy whip<sup>1031</sup> to attack the merchants in the Temple of Jerusalem.<sup>1032</sup> According to *Mark*<sup>1033</sup> Jesus entered the Temple, expelled the sellers and the buyers, destroyed their tables and “the high priests and the scribes” were looking how to murder him, but they were terrified of the large mob (ὄχλος) which followed Jesus.<sup>1034</sup> Later the High Priests and the Scribes tried again to confront Jesus, but they were scared of the multitude of people who all were followers of John the Baptist, and who stood on the side of Jesus.<sup>1035</sup> *Luke*<sup>1036</sup> also reports that the scribes and the priests were terrified because of the crowd who supported Jesus. At this point one should recall that the Sikarioi in the *Acts* were four

---

<sup>1029</sup> 12:13.

<sup>1030</sup> *I Maccabees* 13:51.

<sup>1031</sup> Φραγγέλιον, Lat. *flagellum*. A complex of ropes used to make a heavy type of whip.

<sup>1032</sup> *John* 2:15; Strauss, *Life*, pp. 214-216, questions the historicity of this incident because he observed that this event has some parallels in *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*, which forbid the Temple to be used as a nest for robbers, and *Malachi* 3:1-3, which predicts that God will come at some stage to the Temple to purify it. Strauss argues that this story was concocted. Cf. Funk, *Seminar*, p. 338, on *Luke* 19:28-40, that “It is possible that the story was originally a parody of the freedom marches organised zealots and rebels that occasionally began on the Mount of Olives and descended into Jerusalem.” The Seminar cannot find any OT roots or parallels to this parable; For a variety of scholarly views on Jesus attacking the Temple see Craig A. Evans, ‘Jesus’s Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction,’ in *Jesus in Context: Temple, Purity and Restoration*, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans (Leiden, 1997), pp. 395-439; David R. Catchpole, ‘The Triumphal Entry’, pp. 319-334 in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge, 1984), who believes that both the Triumphal entry of Jesus, and his action in the Temple, have been modelled upon both pre-existing Jewish and posterior Christian traditions.

<sup>1033</sup> 11:15–17. Also see E. P. Sanders, ‘Jesus and the Temple’, in *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research* eds James D. G. Dunn and Scot McKnight (Winona Lake, 2005), pp. 361-381, entire article on *Mark* 11:15-19 on the “cleansing” by Jesus and the robbers inside it; p. 367-368, on the accusation made by the Dead Sea sectarians that the wicked High Priest defiled the Temple, and robbed the poor; p. 368-369, most scholars agree that *Mark* 11:17 “for the gentiles.”; This is a verse taken from *Isaiah* 56:7 “for my house should be called a house of prayer for all peoples.” Cf. *Matthew* 21:12-13 (attack at the Temple).

<sup>1034</sup> *Mark* 11:18.

<sup>1035</sup> *Mark* 11:27-33.

<sup>1036</sup> 20:19. Also see *Matthew* 26:3-4, *Mark* 14:1, *Luke* 22:2: the High Priests and the Scribes plotted to arrest Jesus and murder him.

thousand;<sup>1037</sup> the *Corinthians*<sup>1038</sup> report that after his resurrection Jesus was seen by his brother Jacob, plus over five hundred other men,<sup>1039</sup> and in *Luke* there is further evidence that Jesus Christ was associated with a large group of people, because he was able to choose only seventy among his numerous followers.<sup>1040</sup> Although it is hard to accept that all Sikarioi and all Galileans were followers of Jesus, the indications here are that there was an entire "Christian" ὄχλος, which was feared by the authorities. However, Jesus was arrested soon after, and was crucified within just a few days after this attack. At this point one should also examine the *Acts*, where Tertyllos, the spokesman of the authorities of the Temple accused the Nazōraioi for desecrating the Temple in Jerusalem.<sup>1041</sup> Under the light of the above observations, I would like to question here what exactly did this ὄχλος do when Jesus attacked the Temple? Does it make sense here that the Christians/Nazōraioi were persecuted solely for what they said and not for their violent actions?<sup>1042</sup>

There is one more important detail regarding what Jesus did when he left the Temple right after the attack. According to *Matthew*,<sup>1043</sup> Jesus was hungry in the following morning and approached a fig tree, but found no fruits on it and cursed it, with the result that "the tree withered" at once. In *Mark*<sup>1044</sup> Jesus also cursed the tree, and the following day Peter saw that "the tree withered" and recalled that Jesus cursed it.<sup>1045</sup> By a first look this story does not sound relevant to any violent or revolutionary activity in the Temple, but the problem here is that the above two *Gospels* are not the only sources which report that Jesus

---

<sup>1037</sup> *Acts* 21:38

<sup>1038</sup> 15:4-7.

<sup>1039</sup> Also see Glykas, p. 418.

<sup>1040</sup> *Luke* 10:1-17.

<sup>1041</sup> *Acts* 24.1-5: τῶν Ναζωραίων αἰρέσεως.

<sup>1042</sup> *Acts*, 8:1; 8:3; 9:1-2; 20:19; 26:9-11.

<sup>1043</sup> 21:18-21.

<sup>1044</sup> 11:12-14.

<sup>1045</sup> 11:20-21. Cf *Nazir*, pp. 28-29: a Nazirite vow of abstaining from "dried figs and pressed figs."

caused withering by his curses. I observed that according to the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* (c. 180 CE?) which is considered to be a collection of earlier disparate stories,<sup>1046</sup> when Jesus was a child he cursed the son of High Priest Annas and his followers because they disturbed his play, and they all "withered," meaning that they all dropped dead.<sup>1047</sup> Before one makes his mind whether those witherings had anything to do with any historical Jesus who might have used violence, one should also examine not only who High Priest Annas was, but also what was his son's relation to Christianity and what other sources reveal about the historical circumstances under which this son of the High Priest met his death.

As mentioned in my introduction, Kordatos pointed out that according to *Luke*<sup>1048</sup> Jesus delivered a parable before he attacked the Temple, which ended with the phrase of a King: "But as for these enemies of mine who did not want me to be king over them-bring them here and slaughter them in my presence."<sup>1049</sup> I observed that the King in this parable had a son who was about to be married, and the King invited the guests to attend. Having in mind what followed in the Temple, my proposed interpretation of this parable is that the father King is God, his son was Jesus and his bride was Israel or the Temple.

---

<sup>1046</sup> See *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*, ed. Tony Burke, *De Infantia Iesu Evangelium Thomae, Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum* 17 (Turnhout, 2010), p. 201; pp. 202-205, Irenaeus knows it. Burke does not exclude the third century either; p. 207, a hypothesis that it is of Valentinian origin, Egypt.

<sup>1047</sup> *Ibid*, *Recension S*, 3.1-5.2, pp. 305-306. Soon after, Jesus cursed another child who also dropped dead. The child's parents complained and Jesus made them blind; p. 329, 13.2, Jesus, now 8 years old, cursed his teacher who immediately dropped dead. In 13.3, Josef asked Mary to keep Jesus inside home and not let him meet other people, because those who made him upset were dropping dead; pp. 345-346, *Recension A*. 3.1-3 (the son of Annas drops dead); p. 347, 4.1, another child dropped dead after Jesus cursed it because it fall on him by accident, while playing; p. 349, 4.2, the the parents of the dead child complained to Josef and asked him to teach his son to bless and not to curse. In response (5.2) Jesus cursed them as well, and they became blind. The death of the son of Annas is repeated in *Recension D*.

<sup>1048</sup> 19:27. Cf. 14:1-34.

<sup>1049</sup> Trans. *The Bible*, p. 85. *Luke* 19:27-28: πλὴν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς μου τούτους τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεῦσαι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀγάγετε ὧδε καὶ κατασφάξατε αὐτοὺς ἔμπροσθέν μου. Καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

God asked for the punishment of those who would not come to the Messianic marriage. *Matthew* provides a different version of this parable. It states that those who were invited to the wedding murdered the servants of the King who brought them the invitations and my question here is whether this indicates the punishment of the Christian servants of God. The King responded by sending his army, which exterminated the murderers and burned their city.<sup>1050</sup> My next question here is whether this variant of the same parable reveals information about what happened in Jerusalem at a later stage, when the King (God) destroyed the people of the city of the murderers of his servants. Before one makes his mind up about the meaning of the parable in *Matthew*, one should observe that in the following two chapters of the same *Gospel*,<sup>1051</sup> Jesus appears in a wisdom competition against both the Pharisees and the Sadducees. It must be clear that Jesus attacked the Scribes (Sanhedrin) and the Pharisees because he sent them prophets, teachers and scribes, but they killed and crucified some of them, while others they persecuted. Jesus also accused them of the human sacrifice of Zacharia son of Baruch (Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου) in between the sanctuary and the altar, and warned them that they will pay for all this within due course.<sup>1052</sup> Jesus also cursed the Temple that none of its stones will be left on another,<sup>1053</sup> and warned his followers that they will be persecuted.<sup>1054</sup> After this, *Matthew* narrates that people ordered by Caiaphas the High Priest tried to arrest and kill Jesus.<sup>1055</sup> In other words, *Matthew* presents the story that Jesus was arrested and murdered simply because he had verbal disagreements with the establishment, and not because of any illegal activities such as fighting in the Temple. The serious problem with the above version of events is that according to *De Bello* it was not the authorities of the Temple but the Zealots themselves

---

<sup>1050</sup> *Matthew* 22:1-14.

<sup>1051</sup> 22 and 23.

<sup>1052</sup> *Matthew* 23:34. Also see *Luke* 11:51.

<sup>1053</sup> *Matthew* 24:1-2.

<sup>1054</sup> Chapters 24-25.

<sup>1055</sup> 26:1-5; 27.

who decided to exterminate the distinguished citizen Zachariah son of Bareis (Ζαχαρίαν υἱὸν Βάρεϊς). They accused him for plotting to deliver the country to Rome and Vespasian, but the council of the 70 (Sanhedrin) found him not guilty. Regardless this decision, the Zealots slaughtered him and threw his body in a ravine beneath the Temple.<sup>1056</sup> For once more the question here is whether one of the above two sources was based on the other, and whether one of the two intentionally twisted the record.

*Matthew* in previous chapters also stated that Jesus taught against the 'eye for an eye' command<sup>1057</sup> and instead, just like *Isaiah* 50:6,<sup>1058</sup> he advised his followers to turn the other cheek to those who attacked them and let the attackers take their cloth.<sup>1059</sup> More emphatically, also in *Matthew*, Jesus criticised the use of violence in Peter's attack on the man who tried to arrest Jesus.<sup>1060</sup> In other words, we are directed by the author/editor of *Matthew* to believe that Jesus was a wanted man in Judea and that there were assassination attempts against him,<sup>1061</sup> regardless that he preached non-violence. The problem here is that in *Luke* Jesus Christ was accused for misguiding the Jews against the authority of the Romans, for advising his people not to pay taxes, and for presenting himself as King.<sup>1062</sup> On the basis of the aforementioned analysis, I question why should one accept that a historical Jesus believed that God is Love and had nothing to do with violence,<sup>1063</sup> and not explore the possibility that a historical Jesus also

---

<sup>1056</sup> 4.335-344, vol. 6, pp. 390-392.

<sup>1057</sup> *Exodus* 21:24.

<sup>1058</sup> *I gave my back to those who struck me, and my cheeks to those who pulled out my beard.* Tr. *The Bible*, p. 755.

<sup>1059</sup> *Matthew* 5:38-41.

<sup>1060</sup> *Matthew* 26:52; Also see Farmer, *Macc.*, p. 198, who argues that Jesus did not have anything to do with any revolutionary Zealots because he permitted the authorities to arrest him.

<sup>1061</sup> Also see *John* 7:1, 8:59 (assassination attempt inside the Temple), 10:31.

<sup>1062</sup> *Luke* 23:2.

<sup>1063</sup> *1 John* 4:8. See D. C. Allison Jr., 'The problem of the historical Jesus', in Aune, *Blackwell*, pp. 220-235, on different scholarly views about historical Jesus, none of which examines the possibility that Jesus was a leader in revolts.



believed that “The Lord is a warrior,” and under certain circumstances the only option was to raise a Holy War?<sup>1064</sup> If the first Christians were harmless, then how could one explain that according to the *Acts*, King Agrippas ordered for the imprisonment of the Galilean Apostle Peter (Barjona) in 42 or 44 CE? Why the King also ordered for the execution by sword of the Galilean Apostle Jacob, the son of the Thunder?<sup>1065</sup> Papias (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE) reported that St John the Apostle, the other son of the Thunder, was also executed together with his brother Jacob.<sup>1066</sup> Brandon indicated that the Aramaic name Kananaean given by *Mark*<sup>1067</sup> to Apostle Simon, is translated by *Luke*<sup>1068</sup> into Greek as Zealot.<sup>1069</sup> Both Brandon and Eisenman pointed out that the Kananaean is the singular form of the Aramaic *kannaim* meaning Zealots,<sup>1070</sup> and both accepted that *Luke* provided the correct translation.<sup>1071</sup>

The question here is whether any of the above Christian Galileans were executed because they were counted on the side of those Galileans who opposed King Agrippas. Although this is hard to be answered, for sure the *NT* does present evidence that Jesus had many Galilean followers. In *Mark*<sup>1072</sup> soon after Jesus acquired a multitude of followers in Galilee, he chose twelve of them and withdrew on a mountain. One should observe here that the Zealot

---

<sup>1064</sup> *Exodus* 15:3. Tr. *The Bible*, p. 68. The warrior God exterminated the entire populations of Sodom and Gomorrah (*Genesis*, 19:25), He gave the lands of seven other peoples, more numerous and stronger, to the Israelites, and instructed them to utterly destroy the infidels without mercy (*Deuteronomy* 7.1-2).

<sup>1065</sup> *Acts* 12:1-8 (St Peter and St Jacob, son of Zebedee). Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.5. 2, vol. 1 (31), p. 102 (St Jacob).

<sup>1066</sup> *Papias*, fragm. 11, p. 132.

<sup>1067</sup> 3:18 (Σίμωνα τὸν Καναναῖον).

<sup>1068</sup> 6:15 (Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν).

<sup>1069</sup> Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 42-43.

<sup>1070</sup> Apostle Simon Kananaïos: *Matthew* 10:4; *Mark* 3:18. Brandon, *Trial*, p. 65, on Kananaïos; pp. 31-33, Kannaim/Zelots; Eisenman, *James*, pp 33-34: Talmudic references for the kannaim (trans. Zealots).

<sup>1071</sup> Regardless this evidence from the *NT*, Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 70 rejected that Simon was called a Zealot. Most probably Hengel was not aware of this *NT* evidence.

<sup>1072</sup> 3:7-14.

revolutionaries often appear in "Josephus" to be camping in the country-side. *Luke*<sup>1073</sup> also reports that Jesus sent a large number of his followers in pairs, each pair in advance to each city he was planning to visit. In *Matthew* he advised them to be careful like snakes and remain unharmed like pigeons, because they had to face wolves,<sup>1074</sup> and the authorities will try to arrest and punish them<sup>1075</sup> because of a conflict,<sup>1076</sup> which almost all scholars regard as spiritual or metaphorical. Jesus also advised his followers to flee from one city to another.<sup>1077</sup> The problem here is that, soon after this, he explained that he did not come to bring peace on earth, but knife.<sup>1078</sup> Therefore, the previous advise to flee to the mountains is hard to be interpreted solely on metaphorical terms. The other problem is that in *Matthew*<sup>1079</sup> Jesus curses some cities, which did not repent after his "deeds of power."<sup>1080</sup> Jesus threatened the people of Capernaum in particular, that their city "will be brought down to Hades" and that "in the day of judgement it will be more tolerable for the land of Sodom" than for Capernaum. These threats sound more like the voice of someone who wants to terrify his opponents at times of conflict. In *Luke*,<sup>1081</sup> there is also another incident where Jesus tries to enter a Samaritan town, but the people send him away because "his face was set toward Jerusalem," meaning that he did not worship in Gerizim. Jacob and John, the sons of Thunder, were angry with those Samaritans because they rejected Jesus, and asked him his permission to arrange for a heavenly fire to burn those people. Jesus stopped them, but why

---

<sup>1073</sup> 10:1 (72 missionaries).

<sup>1074</sup> Matthew 10:16: πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων· ...φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί; φρόνιμοι means carefull (not wise as the *Holy Bible*, p. 10 says; ἀκέραιοι means unharmed (not innocent).

<sup>1075</sup> *Matthew* 10:17-18

<sup>1076</sup> *Matthew* 10:21-22.

<sup>1077</sup> *Matthew* 10:23.

<sup>1078</sup> *Matthew* 10:34-39.

<sup>1079</sup> 11.20-24.

<sup>1080</sup> Cf. Douglas Edwards, 'The Socio-Economic and Cultural Ethos in the First Century,' in LIL, pp. 53-73 at 73, argues that Jesus and his followers avoided urban centres because the authorities were there.

<sup>1081</sup> 9:52-55.

should one accept that Jacob and John were capable of commanding supernatural destructive forces against those who rejected the Messiah? Is there an indication here that the sons of Thunder were able to command earthly and not heavenly forces against those who opposed their leader? It is also interesting to observe here that in *Luke*<sup>1082</sup> Jesus appeared in a Synagogue in Nazara, quoting to his disciples *Isaiah* 61:1-2 which prophesised the release of the captives, and said to them that he had the mission to liberate the captives. The same author who produced *Luke*, in the *Acts*<sup>1083</sup> reported that many Christians were arrested.<sup>1084</sup> Are these the captives whom Jesus wanted to release? Why exactly were they arrested and how could Jesus liberate them? Are all the above unrelated to *John*<sup>1085</sup> that some Pharisees were anxious and fearful that if the people believe in Jesus, then the Romans would invade and destroy their country? Was it entirely without foundation that in *Luke*<sup>1086</sup> Jesus was accused that he forced the people not to pay taxes to Rome and that he proclaimed himself an earthly King? Another problem with the explanations that the first Christians had nothing to do with violent events is that in the *Acts* Judas the traitor had a very strange fall in his land, and as a result all his intestines came out,<sup>1087</sup> but *Matthew* provides a very different explanation that Judas hanged himself.<sup>1088</sup> I observed that there is a third Early Christian source, *The Martyrdom of St Polycarp*, which states that those who betrayed St Polycarp "were to meet with the same punishment as Judas," with reference to Judas the traitor.<sup>1089</sup> At this point, I would like to question whether this means that those

---

<sup>1082</sup> 4:16-21. Also, see 4:23-25 the indications that Nazara was his hometown.

<sup>1083</sup> 8:1-3.

<sup>1084</sup> 9:1-2.

<sup>1085</sup> 11:46-48.

<sup>1086</sup> 23:2.

<sup>1087</sup> *Acts* 1:18: καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησεν μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.

<sup>1088</sup> *Matthew* 27:5.

<sup>1089</sup> *Martyrium Polycarpi* 6, *Epistula ecclesiae Smyrnensis de martyrio sancti Polycarpi* in ed. H. Musurillo, *The acts of the Christian martyrs* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 2-21 at p. 6: οἱ δὲ προδόντες αὐτὸν τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὑπόσχοιεν τιμωρίαν. Trans. Kleist, *Ancient*, vol. 6, p. 93.

who betrayed Polycarp all together hanged themselves, or does it mean that they all had an "accident" and their intestines came out? Does it make sense here that Judas and those who betrayed Polycarp were gutted for being traitors?

#### 4.5: Christian participation in the Great Revolt?

*De Bello* is clear that the rebellion was inspired by sacred prophecies that a Messiah, descendant of David, was about to become the leader of the entire world (ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης).<sup>1090</sup> In the *Acts*<sup>1091</sup> too, Jesus was asked by his followers whether he would restore the kingdom of Israel, something that he did not deny or confirm. Although it is often argued that Jesus's movement had nothing to do with any kind of earthly violent Messianic movement, it is important to observe here that in *Luke*,<sup>1092</sup> Simon the Just in Jerusalem, prophesized to Mary that her "child is destined for the falling and the rising of many in Israel." Again, this could also be interpreted solely on a spiritual, theological or metaphorical way, but if so, how could one explain that, according to Eusebius, Emperor Vespasian (r. 69-79 CE) tried to exterminate all descendants of David,<sup>1093</sup> and this was a persecution against Christianity? Should this be examined in parallel to *De Bello* where, when Vespasian became emperor, he sent his army in Galilee because, for once more, it was the stronghold of a rebellion?<sup>1094</sup>

It is widely accepted that Jesus was born some time between c. 6-4 BCE.<sup>1095</sup> This

---

<sup>1090</sup> *Bel.* 6.312-313, vol. 6, p. 554. Cf. S. Freyne, 'Galilee and Judea in the first century', *CCOC*, vol. 1, pp. 37-52; p. 50, on the socio-economic conditions which promoted Essenism in the first century.

<sup>1091</sup> 1:6.

<sup>1092</sup> 2:34; *Holy Bible*, p. 60.

<sup>1093</sup> *H.E.* 3.12, vol. 1 (31), p. 118.

<sup>1094</sup> *Bel.* 6.339, vol. 6, p. 557.

<sup>1095</sup> Bock, *Studying*, p. 66.

is based on the information provided by the author of *Matthew*<sup>1096</sup> who reports that Jesus was born during the reign of Herod the Great in Bethlehem, and was visited there by the three magicians (μάγοι).<sup>1097</sup> A prophecy<sup>1098</sup> "predicted" that the Messiah would be born there. Although *Mark* reports nothing about the birth of Jesus, the author of *Luke*<sup>1099</sup> states that the Messiah Jesus was born at the time of a census organised by Quirinius.<sup>1100</sup> The well-known problem here is that this census is dated in 6 CE, and the general consensus is that *Matthew* is right and *Luke* made a mistake. In my opinion, this disagreement deserves a more careful examination.

According to the *Antiquities*, the census organised by Quirinius for taxing the Israelites was unwelcomed by the people. A Galilean movement led by rabbi Judas, the son of revolutionary rabbi Ezekias executed by Herod, revolted against the census and advised the Israelites not to pay taxes.<sup>1101</sup> It may not be irrelevant here that this is exactly the same accusation levelled against Jesus.

Also according to the *Antiquities*, soon after Archelaus was exiled and the Romans arrived to administer the region, the Galileans of Judas rejected their dominion.<sup>1102</sup> The movement had a great impact, for Quirinius removed High Priest Joazar who stood on the side of Romans, because he became unpopular, and replaced him with Ananos Sethi.<sup>1103</sup> This statement contradicts an earlier one in the same source, that Joazar appointed his own brother Eleazar as the

---

<sup>1096</sup> Also 2:1-6.

<sup>1097</sup> Often mistranslated as "wise men."

<sup>1098</sup> *Micah* 5:2. Also see *John* 7:42.

<sup>1099</sup> 2:1-6.

<sup>1100</sup> See Wilfred L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic elements in Primitive Christianity* (London, 1944), p. 10, note 1, *Luke* most probably was aware of a certain tradition that placed the birth of Jesus at the same time when the Zealot movement began by Judas.

<sup>1101</sup> *Ant.* 18.1-10, vol. 4, pp. 140-141.

<sup>1102</sup> *Ant.* 17.355, vol. 4, p. 137 (Archelaos goes, Quirinius comes).

<sup>1103</sup> *Ant.* 18.26, vol. 4, p. 144.

leader of the rebels.<sup>1104</sup> According to this second statement, the indication is that Quirinius deposed Joazar not because he was afraid of the revolutionaries, but because Joazar was either against the Romans or was playing a double game. The fact that according to the second statement Joazar was himself appointed as a High Priest by Archelaos and the information that Archelaos was exiled by the Romans, may once more, raise questions on whether there was a different history from what we have been told by certain passages in "Josephus," namely that Archelaos and Joazar were deposed by the Romans because they plotted against Rome. My question here is whether the Evangelists and/or their Christian editors/alternators also followed a similar style of "historiography" in disguising some friction between the Christians and Rome.

It is evident that both *Matthew* and *Luke* date the birth of the Galilean Messiah at times of significant Galilean revolutionary activities. My question here is whether they both opted in purpose to place his birth during such "preparatory" events, which gave birth to the Galilean Messianic movement, regardless when exactly this Messiah was born. The Galilean Israelites must have had some memory of the Maccabee heroes who came to support them and made them masters of the Gentile cities in the region, but this time how could they succeed in humiliating the powerful Greco-Roman alliance in the region? Could they do it alone, or did *Matthew* call the magicians to come from the East in support to the Messiah? Are there any indications behind this story that the Messianic movement received valuable financial support (the precious presents to Jesus) from any Parthians/Persians who often were at war against some Greeks or Romans? One may keep speculating on either the theological or political meaning behind all these peculiar stories, but the point here is whether our sources contain any further information to help us exclude or confirm any historical involvement of the first Christians in the revolts.

---

<sup>1104</sup> Ant. 17:339, vol. 4, p. 134.

According to *De Bello*, when Cumanus was procurator a soldier insulted a crowd of Jews who came to Jerusalem for a festival, by exposing his behind to them. This is how a great rebellion started which left three thousand dead.<sup>1105</sup> Right after this, another soldier, while searching for robbers, he found a copy of the *Torah* and threw it to the fire. As a result, the entire Judea was engulfed in flames and Cumanus was forced to decapitate this soldier.<sup>1106</sup> A savage civil conflict followed after some Samaritans murdered a Galilean, and the entire Judea prepared for war against Samaria, but in the meantime Cumanus exterminated many Galileans. From then on, some who were not identified, became bandits, robbers and revolutionaries, while Numinius Quadratus, *legatus* of Syria and superior to Cumanus, sided with the Samaritans and ordered for the crucifixion and decapitation of the Galileans arrested by Cumanus. Later, under the influence of his friend King Agrippas, Claudius sided with the Jews and ordered for the execution of three Samaritans and a Roman officer. Also, Claudius deposed Cumanus and replaced him with Felix (procurator 52- c.60 CE).<sup>1107</sup> The *Antiquities* provide an "enriched" version of the above events: the soldier did not expose his behind, but his genitals; the dead from the revolt that followed were not three but twenty thousand, all because of the fault of the soldier; Cumanus sided with the Samaritans not because the Galileans did anything wrong, but because he was bribed; the Galileans revolted because Cumanus was corrupt, and under the leadership of Eleazar son of Deinaios they attacked and robbed Samaritan villages; Claudius was influenced by his wife Agrippina to side with the Jews and punish the Samaritans.<sup>1108</sup> Apart from these indications that the *Antiquities* sound less historical and more "Galilean" than *De Bello*, the other problem here is that other

---

<sup>1105</sup> *Bel.* 2.223-227, vol. 6, pp. 197-198.

<sup>1106</sup> *Bel.* 2.228-231, vol. 6, pp. 198-199. Cf. *Ant.* 20.113-17, vol. 4, pp. 295-296.

<sup>1107</sup> *Bel.* 2.232-247, vol. 6, pp. 199-201.

<sup>1108</sup> *Ant.*, 20.105-137, vol. 4, pp. 294-297.

sources paint a different picture as to the policy followed by Claudius towards the Jews. According to Roman reports attested by Dio Cassius, Emperor Claudius from the first year of his reign (c. 41) wanted to force the Jews outside Rome because since their last expulsion by Emperor Tiberius in 19 CE their numbers had increased once more.<sup>1109</sup> The *Acts* also report that Claudius did evict all Jews from Rome.<sup>1110</sup> Suetonius makes it clear that the expulsion came as a punishment for the public riots instigated by "Christ"<sup>1111</sup> and Dio Cassius also states that the synagogues of the Jews in Rome were closed that time.<sup>1112</sup> The problem here is that instead of the explanation provided by "Josephus" that Claudius helped the Jews, the other three sources indicate that he expelled them. Therefore, is it possible that "Flavius Josephus" for once more, just as he often did with the Ptolemies and the Seleucids in the third Chapter, twisted the historical record and created his own stories in order to conceal the friction between his people and the powerful Gentile Kings or Emperors? Does it make sense that the authors of the *NT* too, might have written "history" in a similar way, trying to conceal any problems/friction between the first Christians and Rome?

The *Antiquities* also report another very interesting story, which sheds further light on the internal Israelite conflicts that must have affected the first Christians. The *tribe* of the Levites (Τῶν δὲ Λευιτῶν, φυλὴ δ' ἐστὶν αὕτη) persuaded King Agrippas (who reigned over Galilee and not over Jerusalem) that they, too, should be permitted to wear the same linen garments as the priests of the Temple wore. The text is clear that up to that moment the tribe of

---

<sup>1109</sup> Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom.*, 60, 6.6-7, vol. 7, p. 382; Cf. Shaye J. D. Cohen, 'Was Judaism in Antiquity a Missionary Religion?', in Mor, *AAA*, pp. 14-23 at p. 18, rejects Dio that the Jews were expelled in 19 CE because of their missionary activity, on the ground that no other source mentions there was such activity.

<sup>1110</sup> *Acts* 18:2.

<sup>1111</sup> Suetonius, *Claudius* 25, vol. 2 (1997), p. 51: "Since the Jews constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he expelled them from Rome."

<sup>1112</sup> Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom.*, 6, 6.6-7, vol. 7, p. 382.



the Levites were permitted to participate in the liturgies only as cantors and not as priests. On the other hand, the King permitted the other *tribe* who were the priests of the Temple (meaning the Sadducees) to learn the hymns of the tribe of the Levites. The *Antiquities* continue that all these changes were contrary to the ancestral laws.<sup>1113</sup> Interestingly, *John*<sup>1114</sup> also mentions this clear distinction between the Priests and the Levites. This important difference does not seem to have been analysed, and the general assumption among the scholarly world is that the priests in command of the Temple were Levites. The problem presented here by the *Antiquities* is whether the King recognised the Levites to become priests in the Temple only under pressure from the recent revolts. Also, in the previous Chapter I have examined in detail that there was another, earlier conflict between the Levites (Maccabees family and supporters) and the Priests in the Temple (the "profaner" High Priests), and my question here is whether the *Antiquities* report the revival of a long lasting and historical conflict between two different Israelite tribes who both had leadership claims. Given the tradition that the Christians themselves did have Levite and not Sadducee leaders, does it make sense that the Christians could have participated in this conflict?<sup>1115</sup> According to the *Acts*<sup>1116</sup> a multitude of priests were followers of Jesus. *Codex Justinianus* and Canon 33 of the *Quinisextum* Council (692 CE) provide evidence that the Israelite Levite tradition of passing priesthood from father to son was also a Christian tradition for a long time.<sup>1117</sup> In my opinion, it

---

<sup>1113</sup> *Ant.* 20.215-218, vol. 4, pp. 312-313. This dispute was observed by M. Goodman, *The ruling*, p. 5. However, Goodman did not analyse this. One should also note here that in *Ant.* 14.175 Herod the Great πάντας ἀπέκτεινεν τοὺς ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ (exterminated the entire Sanhedrin).

<sup>1114</sup> 1:19 (ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας).

<sup>1115</sup> Cf. Brandon, *Trial*, pp. 54-57, ref to *Ant.* 20.180-1, vol. 4, pp. 306-307, about the problems between High Priests and the simple priests who fought against them.

<sup>1116</sup> 6:7.

<sup>1117</sup> *Codex Justinianus*, *Novela VI*, pp. 35-47 in *Corpus Iuris Civilis, Novellae*, eds R. Schoell and G. Kroll, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1895), pp. 36-37: Bishops should not have sons or grandsons. Clearly, this law aimed at breaking an older tradition of inheriting the office. See also *Concilium Quinisextum*, p. 224, which states that the Armenians continued the Judean tradition of inheriting priesthood from father to son. The Canon advises all Christians that the priests should be chosen among

is important to observe here that just before the report on the conflict between the Levites and the Sadducees, the *Antiquities* make it clear that High Priest Ananias whose father High Priest Annas tried Jesus Christ, faced the opposition of the revolutionaries, who kidnapped members of his family. He was forced to exchange them with imprisoned *Sikarioi* (συκάρριοι).<sup>1118</sup> My question here is why exactly these Sikarioi should not be examined as allies or identical to those Levites, who wanted to be priests in the Temple, meaning that they had claims to become the leaders of Israel. Later on, the revolutionaries burned the house of the High Priest and killed him, along with his brother Hezekiah.<sup>1119</sup> At this point I would like to return to the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* where the son of High Priest Annas dropped dead after Jesus cursed him, and I would also like to indicate that the *Acts*<sup>1120</sup> too curse Ananias, and warn him that he will be punished by God.<sup>1121</sup> Does it make sense here that both the *Infancy Gospel* and the *Acts* are on the side of the Sikarioi, for it was the Sikarioi who slaughtered this High Priest? In *De Bello* it is clear that these Sikarioi assassins were guided by a Galilean.<sup>1122</sup> In other words, the son of the murdered Ananias, High Priest Ananos, who ordered the execution of the Galilean leader of Christianity Jacob, the brother of Jesus, himself dropped dead from the knife of the Sikarioi.<sup>1123</sup> At this point, one should also observe that the *Antiquities* are critical

---

the most capable, regardless if they are sons of priests or not. These are indications that up to the seventh century, when the council took place, priesthood was often inherited. Also see Fox, *Pagans*, p. 511, on same family members who all were bishops in the middle of the second century.

<sup>1118</sup> *Ant.*, 20.208-210, vol. 4, p. 311.

<sup>1119</sup> *Bel.* 2.441, vol. 6, p. 235.

<sup>1120</sup> 23:3.

<sup>1121</sup> Paul said to Annanias: "God will strike you, you whitewashed wall! Are you sitting there to judge me according to the Law, and yet in violation of the Law you order me to be struck?" (tr. *Holy Bible*, p. 150). Soon after, in Acts 23:5 Paul "apologised" because he did not realise that Ananias was the High Priest, and the question here is whether this has been a "correction."

<sup>1122</sup> *Bel.* 2.433-448, vol. 6, pp. 234-236. Called Menahem.

<sup>1123</sup> See Eusebius, *H.E.*, 2.23, ed. cit., vol. 1, pp. 85-90; Sordi, *The Christians*, p. 13, states that it was Ananias who ordered the execution of Jacob. I have seen that both Josephus and Eusebius were clear that it was Ananos and not Ananias.

of Ananos and the Sadducees,<sup>1124</sup> and report that the *Sikarioi* exterminated the Israelite upper classes all over the country. The *Sikarioi* also killed High Priest Jonathan and threatened to kill King Agrippas on the grounds that being a Hellenised Jew he was not circumcised.<sup>1125</sup> *De Bello* also reports that, although at a certain stage there was an agreement for a Roman garrison to surrender, certain *Zealots* slaughtered the Romans as soon as they put their weapons down. Only a single officer survived because he professed conversion to Judaism and accepted circumcision in order to save his life.<sup>1126</sup> At this point, one should recall Hippolytos who also reported that the religious fanaticism of a specific branch of the Essenes whom he called Zealot Sikarioi, arrested the uncircumcised who conversed about God, and slaughtered them unless they accepted circumcision.<sup>1127</sup>

Menahem, the Galilean leader of the *Sikarioi*, who organised the murder of Ananias, was son of a certain Judas, a Galilean rabbi who preached the Jews for liberation.<sup>1128</sup> One should observe here that Jesus Christ also had a brother named Judas.<sup>1129</sup> It should be clear that both Judas the father of Menahem and Judas the brother of Jesus were rabbis, they both came from Galilee and they

---

<sup>1124</sup> *Ant.*, 20.199-203, vol. 4, pp. 309-310, is critical of Ananos and the Sadducees.

<sup>1125</sup> *Ant.*, 20.118-162, vol. 4, pp. 296-303: at the time when Cumanus was officer. *Bel.* 2.235-238, vol. 6, pp. 199-200: Eleazar son of Dinai slaughtering people. The Roman procurators Festus (60-62) and Albinus (62-64) continued persecuting rebels and procurator Florus (64-66) intensified the operations against them: *Bel.* 2.271-279, vol. 6, pp. 206-207.

<sup>1126</sup> *Bel.* 2. 451-454, vol. 6, p. 237.

<sup>1127</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.26.2, p. 371: ἐπὶ ἀνὰ κούσῳ σί τινος περὶ θεοῦ διαλεγομένου καὶ τῶν τούτου νόμων, εἰ ἀπερίτμητος εἴη, παραφυλάξας <τις αὐτῶν> τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ μόνον, φονεῦν ἀπειλεῖ εἰ μὴ περιτμηθεῖ· οὐ, εἰ μὴ βούλοιο πείθεσθαι, οὐ φείδεται ἀλλὰ καὶ σφάζει· ὅθεν ἐκ τοῦ συμβαίνοντος <καὶ> τὸ ὄνομα προσέλαβον, Ζηλωταὶ καλούμενοι, ὑπὸ τινων δὲ Σικάριοι.

<sup>1128</sup> *Bel.* 2.433-438, vol. 6, pp. 234-235: Menahem, son of Judas the Galilean and a capable sophist, armed robbers. As a king, he led his army into besieging Jerusalem; *Bell.* 2.444-447, vol. 6, p. 236: Eleazar, son of Iaeiros, another leader of revolutionaries was related to Menahem.

<sup>1129</sup> *NT*, *Epistula Juda*, 1: ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου; *Mark* 6:3: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας καὶ ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήτος καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος. Jesus's brothers were mentioned also in *Mark* 3:31-34. Hegesippus, *Fragmenta*, ed. T. Kock (Leipzig, 1888), p. 212, talks about the sons of Juda, brother of Jesus Christ by flesh: ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου υἱῶν οἱ Ἰούδα, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ.

both were members of leading families. Is there a possibility here that we are talking about the same family? Did Menahem with his Sikarioi murder the High Priest as retaliation to the execution of his uncle Jacob and his "cousin" Jesus?<sup>1130</sup> There are more sources, which point to this direction, but which do not fully answer this question. According to Eusebius Jacob the brother of Jesus commanded five thousand *Zealot* men,<sup>1131</sup> and the *Acts*<sup>1132</sup> state that he had myriads of Zealot followers. One should observe here that the revolutionary rabbi Judas from Galilee who was active after Jesus's crucifixion, and who was the father of Menahem, also commanded Zealot Sikarioi the same time.<sup>1133</sup> The additional problem here is that those who went to arrest some Apostles in the *Acts*, were fearful of their supporters,<sup>1134</sup> and Hegesippus also states that certain grandsons of this particular Judas, the brother of Jesus and Jacob by flesh, were arrested by the Roman authorities on the accusation of participating in the revolts.<sup>1135</sup>

It may not be a coincidence that a number of violent episodes in which Menahem's Zealots were protagonists, are missing from the Slavonic version of *De Bello*.<sup>1136</sup> Is it possible that a Christian editor who was aware of the relation between Menahem and Jesus removed them? Is it also possible that Menahem wore kingly robes in the Temple because he too, just like his cousin Jesus, also

---

<sup>1130</sup> The populist P. Cresswell, *Jesus the Terrorist* (Ropley, 2010) pp. 308-309, and Eisler before him, on the basis of a smaller body of evidence, also came to the conclusion that Menahem must have been of the same family with Jesus.

<sup>1131</sup> Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, p. 87: χιλιάδες πέντε...«θεωρεῖς, ἀδελφέ, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τῶν πεπιστευκότων, καὶ πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου». Cf. Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 26-64: Zealots in the revolts against Rome. Cf. Yonah, *Jews*, pp. 138-139, that Early Christianity was just a small minority in Palestine.

<sup>1132</sup> 21:20.

<sup>1133</sup> *Acts* 5:37.

<sup>1134</sup> 5:26-33.

<sup>1135</sup> See below, p. 275.

<sup>1136</sup> One should note here that the activities of Menahem together with certain acts of violence committed by Zealots have been omitted from the *Slavonic Version of De Bello*. See Josephus, *Slavonic Version* 2.439-450, pp. 301-302.

had 'royal' claims?<sup>1137</sup> Were there any more members of the same family who had leadership claims? According to *Luke*, John the Baptist, too, was one more member of Jesus's family.<sup>1138</sup> In *Romans*<sup>1139</sup> Jesus was the firstborn among many brothers (πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς). *Mark*, *Luke*, *John* and the *Acts* state that Apostle Simon the Zealot (Σίμων ὁ ζηλωτής) was the third brother of Jesus Christ.<sup>1140</sup> I have also pointed to other indications in the first Chapter that Matthew also was brother of Jesus. One should also take into account that according to Hegesippus, the uncle of Jesus, Klōpas (the Robber brother of Panther), had a son named Simon who became the leader of the Christians, and who was crucified under Trajan c.106-107 CE. According to Hegesippus, up to Simon's time the Church was regarded as 'pure' because there was succession in its leadership only from among the same family.<sup>1141</sup> If so, is it possible that

---

<sup>1137</sup> Interestingly, Epiphanius provides a controversial statement that Jesus Christ was royal because of two reasons: he was a physical descendant of King David and he had been a High Priest. Epiphanius is also clear that Jacob inherited the High Priesthood from his brother Jesus. Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp. 323-324.

<sup>1138</sup> *Luke* 1:36: Virgin Mary was related to Elisabeth, the mother of John the Baptist. Craig A. Evans, 'Josephus on John the Baptist', in *The Historical Jesus in Context* eds Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison Jr and John Dominic Crossan (Princeton, 2006), pp. 55-63 at 56 (John the Baptist must have been a Galilean, for he was arrested and executed by the king Herod Antipas (r. 4-39 CE) who owned Galilee.

<sup>1139</sup> 8:29.

<sup>1140</sup> In *Mark* 6:3, Jesus Christ had four brothers: Jacob (James), Jose, Judas and Simōn. His brothers were mentioned also in *Mark* 3:31-34; *John* 2:12; *John* 7:3, 5, 10; Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 3, p. 460. Cf. *Acts* 1:13: ἀνέβησαν οὗ ἦσαν καταμένοντες, ὃ τε Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Φίλιππος καὶ Θωμᾶς, Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Μαθθαῖος, Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμων ὁ ζηλωτής καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου; *Luke* 6:15: καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτήν. For Apostle Symeōn the Zealot and Levi see *Hōrologion*, pp. 389, 353.

<sup>1141</sup> *Fragmenta Hegesippi*, ed. Routh, vol. 1 (1846), pp. 207-208: ἀπὸ τούτων δηλαδὴ τῶν αἰρετικῶν κατηγοροῦσι τινὲς Συμεῶνος τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ὡς ὄντος ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ... (fragm. in Eusebius *H.E.* 3.32). *Fragmenta Hegesippi*, ed. Routh, vol. 1, p. 215: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ, πάλιν ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος· ὃν προέθεντο πάντες ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου δεύτερον. διατοῦτο ἐκάλουν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παρθένον; vol. 1, p. 219: Κλωπᾶν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὑπάρχειν Ἠγήσιππος ἱστορεῖ (from Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.11). Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 3, pp. 456-7: οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἀδελφὸς γίνεται τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ἣν δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰακώβ, ἐπὶ κληρὸν δὲ Πάνθηρ καλούμενον· ἀμφότεροι οὗτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πάνθηρος (Josef the father of Jesus and his brother Klōpas the robber were sons of a certain Panther); vol. 3, p. 43: Συμεὼν, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατραδέλφου αὐτοῦ, υἱὸς τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἰωσήφ. See also *Hōrologion*, 9<sup>th</sup> and the 23<sup>rd</sup> of October, pp. 224, 233. There is evidence in *John* that Klōpas, the

Menahem became the leader of the family after his uncle Jacob was executed, and some time before Simon took over as a leader of Christianity?<sup>1142</sup> Jacob's execution is dated to 62 CE, and Simon's to c.106-107 CE. If Menahem was not one of the leaders of the Church, then Simon succeeded Jacob immediately after his death, and ruled the Church continuously for 44-45 years, which is rather long.

*De Bello* states that the new High Priest Ananos was terrified of Menahem's revolt and ordered for the execution of the *Zealots*, but there were many more Zealots whom he failed to control.<sup>1143</sup> It is important to observe here that the followers of Menahem are called Zealots in *De Bello* and *Sikarioi* in the *Antiquities*.<sup>1144</sup>

According to *De Bello*, High Priest Ananos later fought a battle against the Galilean *Zealots* but they were well trained, well equipped and fought fiercely, with the result that they secured full control of the Temple.<sup>1145</sup> This is how Menahem ended up wearing his kingly robes inside the Temple. Does it make

---

brother of St Joseph had a daughter called Maria, who was by the side of Virgin Mary when Jesus Christ was crucified: *John* 19:25: Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή. Cf. J. T. Burtchaell, *From Synagogue to Church: Public services and offices in the earliest Christian communities* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 136-179 on various and often contradictory views of scholars over the issue of how the first Church was structured in terms of organization. This line of succession to the leadership of the Church is also confirmed by the *Chronicon Paschale*. *Chr. Paschale*, ed. cit., p. 460. Also see W. Telfer, 'Was Hegesippus a Jew?', *HTR* 53 (1960), pp. 143-153.

<sup>1142</sup> Also see Rhoads, *Israel*, p. 50, a son of Judas presented himself as Messiah (*Bel.* 2:444); p. 54, Menahem the leader of the revolt in 66 was son or grandson of Judas (*Bel.*, 2.433). Judas's sons James and Simon were crucified by Tiberius Alexander (*Ant.* 20:102). Eleazar son of Jairus was also of the Judas family (*Bel.*, 7.253); p. 96, Eleazar son of Ananias against Menahem (*Bel.* 2.444), Zealots against John (*Bel.* 5.5); Idumeans against John (*Bel.* 4.570); Zealots against Simon (*Bel.* 4.514; John against Simon (*Bel.* 4.577).

<sup>1143</sup> *Bel.* 4.161-163, vol. 6, p. 368 (ζηλωτὰς).

<sup>1144</sup> *Ant.* 20.185-188, vol. 4, pp. 307-308 (Sicarioi); 20.208-210, vol. 4, p. 311 (Sicarioi against the High Priest family)

<sup>1145</sup> *Bel.* 4.193-232, vol. 6, pp. 372-378: they fought fiercely and were assisted by a certain John from Gischala.

sense here that the Galilean Zealot followers of Menahem could have raised the inscription Eisler discovered in the Slavonic version?

*De Bello* states that the Idumeans<sup>1146</sup> who were allies of the *Zealots*, came to their support, murdered High Priest Ananos, and together with the Zealots they slaughtered large numbers of Jerusalemites. The entire class of the Sadducees was exterminated.<sup>1147</sup> The *Antiquities* also reveal that robbers who used short swords, meaning Sikarioi, executed Jonathan the High Priest. More Israelites, and especially the upper classes, were slaughtered.<sup>1148</sup> This is exactly the stage when *De Bello* remarked that the most violent of the *Zealots* were the contingent of the *Galileans*.<sup>1149</sup> *De Bello* is clear that the leadership of Israel fell to the hands of exactly these *Zealot* extremists.<sup>1150</sup> A certain Galilean John the Essene exterminated the last pockets of resistance of the legitimate authorities in Jerusalem.<sup>1151</sup> One more Galilean John, leader of elite forces of *Zealots* was one of the eminent leaders of the revolution.<sup>1152</sup> At the same time when John the Essene was active in Jerusalem, the mighty fort of Masada fall into the control of the *Sikarioi*,<sup>1153</sup> and different groups of *Zealots*<sup>1154</sup> joined forces against the Roman army who by that time were approaching Jerusalem.<sup>1155</sup>

---

<sup>1146</sup> See Introduction, p. 39, Eisler pointed to the *Slavonic* that Jesus had Idumean allies (Edom).

<sup>1147</sup> *Bel.* 4.314-319, vol. 6, p. 388; 4.283-409, vol. 6, pp. 384-400: Idumeans leave Jerusalem; Zealots stay there in control. Sicarioi control Masada; 4.490, vol. 6, p. 411: Zealots still in control of Jerusalem; 4.514-515, vol. 6, p. 414: Zealots against the troops of a Simon; they were forced to return back inside Jerusalem walls; 4.538-584, vol. 6, pp. 417-422: Zealots had further problems with Simon; conflict between Idumeans and Zealots; Simon entered Jerusalem and the Zealots led by John retrieved in the Temple and resisted Simon's troops; 5.1-26, vol. 6, pp. 434-438: civil conflict between two fractions of Zealots, one led by Eleazar, one by John; Simon, too, was in the city opposing both of them; 5.98-105, vol. 6, pp. 447-448: John overpowered Eleazar; 5.248-252, vol. 6, pp. 468-469: the Romans are outside the city; Zealots joined forces again with John; 5.278-279, vol. 6, p. 472: John and Simon join forces.

<sup>1148</sup> *Ant.* 20.160-172, vol. 4, pp. 303-305.

<sup>1149</sup> *Bel.* 4.538-584, vol. 6, pp. 417-422; 5.1-26, vol. 6, pp. 434-438.

<sup>1150</sup> *Bel.* 4.135-150, vol. 6, pp. 364-366; 4.300-409, vol. 6, pp. 386-400.

<sup>1151</sup> *Bel.* 2.567, vol. 6, p. 256; 3.11, vol. 6, p. 275.

<sup>1152</sup> *Bel.* 2.585, vol. 6, p. 260; 4.193-209, vol. 6, pp. 372-374.

<sup>1153</sup> *Bel.* 4.283-409, vol. 6, pp. 384-400: *Zealots* still in control of Jerusalem; 4.490, vol. 6, p. 411: *Zealots* gave a battle against the troops of a certain Simon, and were forced to return back inside

*De Bello* also reports that a certain *Jesus son of Ananias*, four years before the start of the war prophesized that Jerusalem would be destroyed.<sup>1156</sup> Interestingly, the *New Testament* too, in a number of passages stresses the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple through prophecies made by Jesus, who repeatedly asked for this Temple to be destroyed so he would rebuilt it.<sup>1157</sup> The question here is whether one of the two sources based its narrative on the other. There is one more peculiar coincidence in between the *NT* and "Josephus," also regarding one more "prophecy." *Mark*<sup>1158</sup> states that Jesus "predicted" that his people would flee to the mountains at times of great turmoil. In *Luke*,<sup>1159</sup> Jesus also predicted that his followers would flee in the countryside.<sup>1160</sup> Striking evidence deriving from certain manuscripts of *Sepher Josippon*, examined by Robert Eisler, indicates that the Galilean leader of *Sikarioi* Eleazar son of Deinaios, who together with his warriors fled to the mountains, were no others than 'those bandits who leaned after the son of Joseph.'<sup>1161</sup> Eisler claimed here that this son of Joseph was no other than Jesus, but others, to the best of my knowledge, remain silent on this point. Professor Richard Horsley also pointed out that the *Haran Garwaita* Mandaean text (4th-6th c.), based on earlier (now lost) source, states that in the years following Jesus some 'Nasoraioi' were persecuted by the

---

Jerusalem walls; cf. 4.514-515, vol. 6, p. 414. See Brandon, *Jesus*, pp. 143-144, on the events at Masada, when the Zealots resulted into mass suicide under the command of Eleazar, a descendant of the revolutionary Judas of Galilee.

<sup>1154</sup> *Bel.* 5.248- 252, vol. 6, pp. 468-469.

<sup>1155</sup> *Bel.* 5.278-279, vol. 6, p. 472.

<sup>1156</sup> 6.300-309, vol. 6, pp. 553-554.

<sup>1157</sup> *John* 2:13-19; *Mark* 13.1-3; *Mark* 14:56-58; *Luke* 13:34-35; 21:5-7; *Matthew* 23:37-24:3; 26:61; *Acts* 6:14.

<sup>1158</sup> 13:14-20.

<sup>1159</sup> 17:22-31.

<sup>1160</sup> C. J. Cadoux, *The early Christian attitude to war* (London, 1940<sup>2</sup>), p. 30, on these two *NT* references.

<sup>1161</sup> R. Eisler, 'Flavius Josephus on Jesus called the Christ', *JQR* 21.1-2 (1930), pp. 5, 7. On the the Hebrew *Josippon* manuscripts been censored by Christians with reference to Jesus see *ibid.*, pp. 20-21.



authorities and escaped in hilly areas.<sup>1162</sup> Again, the question here is whether those 'Nasoraioi' were no others than the Sicarii followers of the family of Jesus who fled because they were persecuted during the war.

Having the above historical context and the previous finds in mind, I believe that in *James*, the epistle included in the *NT* and which has been attributed by Church tradition to Jacob, should be re-examined. In this work, the brother of Jesus, Jacob appears to preach his followers that the wars (πόλεμοι) in which they fought (πολεμεῖτε), the battles they fought (μάχαι, μάχεσθε), the murders they committed (φονεύετε) and their religious fanaticism (ζηλοῦτε) lead nowhere.<sup>1163</sup> For once more the question here is whether the condemnation of violence in these passages was made by a historical Jacob who commanded the five thousands Zealot warriors, or whether it is the product of a later Christian author who did his best to alter the image of Jacob as a leader of warriors and present him as exactly the opposite, a peacemaker.

In my opinion, the *Acts*<sup>1164</sup> also contain one more story, which deserves to be re-examined. A Roman officer of the Italian regiment which was stationed in Caesarea believed in God, and sent soldiers to bring Peter to him, because he wanted to listen to his preaching. After Peter had a vision and heard heavenly divine instructions, he followed those soldiers. When they took him to the

---

<sup>1162</sup> R. A. Horsley ed., *Christian Origins, A people's history of Christianity*, general ed. D. R. Janz, 7 vols (Minneapolis, 2005), vol. 1, pp. 48-52 (the poverty of the peasants); pp. 94-109 (*Haran Gawaita*).

<sup>1163</sup> *James* 4:1-2. These lines have been mistranslated into *The Bible*, p. 248, James 4:1-2: "Those conflicts and disputes among you, where do they come from? Do they not come from your cravings that are at war within you? You want something and do not have it; So you commit murder". Cf. Eisler, *Messiah*, p. 265, who observed that those who asked John the Baptist for advise in *Luke* 3:14 were in fact στρατευόμενοι, meaning soldiers or warriors who, according to Eisler, must have been revolutionaries. John advised them not to "crash" anyone (μηδένα διασεΐσητε).

<sup>1164</sup> 10:1-33

officer, the officer fell to Peter's feet.<sup>1165</sup> Then Peter explained to this officer and to the Gentile soldiers that their prayers were heard by God because Peter had a divine vision that the Gentiles should not be regarded as unclean, meaning that the Gentile officer and the soldiers were so eager to join the "Church" that God decided to permit them to join the real faith. Peter also assured everybody that Jesus came to preach the message of peace in Israel.<sup>1166</sup> The first problem here is that a number of scholars indicate that this particular Italian regiment, which is not mentioned by Josephus, was not present in Caesarea when Peter appeared to be active, but it arrived in the region at a much later time, during the Great Revolt.<sup>1167</sup> The second problem here is why should one accept the above explanation that a Roman officer sent his soldiers to bring Peter Barjona to him, just because he wanted to fall to the feet of this divine man? Why should one accept that similarly to Ananias and Sapphira, this officer also fall to Peter's feet for religious reasons? Could this also be one of the several stories we examined previously in this and the previous Chapter, which were invented for proselytising or propaganda reasons?

Under the light of the above finds and analysis, I am not convinced that Eusebius says the full story that the Christians fled Jerusalem before God erased from the face of the earth all those impious and unjust Jews who exterminated Jesus and the Apostles.<sup>1168</sup> Our understanding that the first Christians had nothing to do with the revolts is based exactly on this statement, and the lack of "clear" evidence in any "reliable" sources that the Christians had anything to do with the violent events.

---

<sup>1165</sup> 10:25.

<sup>1166</sup> *Acts* 10:36.

<sup>1167</sup> See de Blois et al (eds.), *The Impact of the Roman Army (200 B.C. – A.D. 476)*, (Leiden, 2007) p. 412.

<sup>1168</sup> *H.E.* 3.5.2-4, vol. 31, p. 103 (the Christians moved to Pella of Peraia).

## CONCLUSIONS

The second Chapter presented and analysed the most complete account of new and older indications on the links between Essenism and Christianity. According to my examination and analysis, these links appear to be stronger than previously thought. The second and the third Chapters, also presented the most complete evidence produced so far, that different ancient sources used different names (depending on language and style), to define the same people devoted to religion. Therefore, the widely accepted hypothesis that the Essenes and "other" Zealot groups had nothing to do with Early Christianity, can no longer stand on the same irremovable ground.

The first well documented Israelite Messianic movement, the "Essenes," emerged at a time of significant conflicts, both internal but also with the Greeks of Antioch. These Zealot 'protectors of the real faith' did not hesitate to raise arms against any establishment in Jerusalem which they regarded as profane or illegitimate. They fought against the "Hellenised High Priests" who succeeded Onias III. Later they fought against those Hasmoneans who declared themselves Kings, and at a later stage they also raised arms against the Herodians. It is hard to generalise that all the Essenes/Zealots were on the same side, but we have seen clear evidence of a religious tradition which resisted every dynasty that took over the leadership of Israel after High Priest Onias III. The relations of the Zealot Messianic movement to Egypt and Oniad Heliopolis

remain obscure, but several strong indications do exist that Heliopolis was active and on the side of Alexandria. The Seleucids would never trust the Oniads to return, for it appears that they had formed strong alliances with Egypt even before Antiochos III conquered Judea. Any re-instatement of the Oniads would have jeopardised the chances for an effective Seleucid control of the region. The Oniads, despite the army they had, for a long time appeared unable to liberate their Holy City from the Seleucids. However, we have also seen in the fourth Chapter a report that a strange, unnamed Egyptian, a leader of Holy Warriors (Sikarioi), reached Jerusalem and was wanted by the Romans.

In the fourth Chapter, we have also seen that the strongest movement of the Zealots/Sikarioi came from Galilee, and had exactly the same enemies with the Egyptian leader of the Sikarioi. Both groups of Zealots/Sikarioi, the Galileans and the Egyptians, fought against the Jerusalem establishment and the Romans.

The fourth Chapter also presented and analysed extensive new evidence that Galilee was the epicentre of the first century revolutionary movement, for a much longer period than previously thought. Therefore, the view that Galilee, the cradle of Christianity, had little to do with the revolts, should no longer be regarded as valid.

In the fourth Chapter I placed the *NT* within the historical context of the Galilean revolts. The *NT* appears to contain a large number of indications which point to the direction that Jesus's Galilean movement was not irrelevant to the period and the region it came from. Contrary to the *NT* we have been taught for long, the fourth Chapter explored another *NT*, the *NT* studied by Eisler, Kordatos, Brandon and Eisenman, which is clear that those who wanted to arrest and murder Jesus were terrified by the masses of the Israelites who

followed him.<sup>1169</sup> The majority supported Jesus, and his brother commanded myriads of Zealots.<sup>1170</sup> According to these passages, "Christianity" in the first century was a Messianic movement, which enjoyed massive support. The popular story believed by most Christians and Jews, that the Jews were against Jesus, is not based on the study of the whole *NT* material.

The *NT*, apart from the resurrected and supernatural Messiah, the spiritual healer and the pacifist preacher, also contains information about an earthly courageous and combatant Galilean Jesus, who may well be more original and earlier than the other *NT* pictures of him. The authors of *Matthew* and *Luke*, both of whom know very good Hebrew, present an important amount of information about this type of an earthly leader-Messiah. I am not in a position to confirm that the earliest stories contained in the *NT* about Jesus, were produced with reference to a historical charismatic revolutionary Galilean rabbi leader who perished heroically during the struggle for freedom. However, I find this highly possible. I would also not exclude the possibility that at some later stage this particular leader was remembered, and was called to come back from the dead in order to find solutions for the massive problems Israel faced after the destructive Kitos and Bar-Kochba wars in the second century. This would explain to me why Jesus does not appear to be resurrected in the early *Gospels* texts I examined in the first Chapter. This would also explain to me why there was need for so many supernatural and other stories to be added. The Messiah had to be as powerful as possible to attract as many Gentile allies as possible.

I also repeatedly brought forward the case that the different accounts in between the *Antiquities*, *De Bello* and *De Vita* are very hard to be explained on

---

<sup>1169</sup> *Mark* 11:18.

<sup>1170</sup> *Luke* 19:47-48: (ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἅπας); *Acts* 6:7; 4:4; :14-16; 21:18-20.

the basis that a single author made mistakes and contradicted himself. *II* and *IV Maccabees* appear to contain far more fiction and inventions than *I Maccabees*. *Luke* and the *Acts* appear to know "Josephus" far better than previously thought, thus their date may be later than widely accepted. The relation between those who produced "Josephus" and the "Luke-Paul" material, may also be deeper than previously thought.

There is a serious problem in dating the books of the *Septuagint*, and the *Maccabees II* and *IV* in particular, which appear to be the earliest sources with the strongest anti-Hellenic rhetoric. The minority of scholars who date *II* and *IV Maccabees* as late as in the second century CE, or later, appear to have a point in the sense that it was exactly during that period when certain Christians did produce works with similar arguments against the Greeks.

The third Chapter also investigated the rise of a particular historical phenomenon that could have influenced the growth of anti-Hellenism. The defeat of the Greeks by the Hasmoneans, especially during the reign of Simon, and the subsequent unprecedented influx of revenue from the captured Greek cities, must have had a massive impact on the mentality of some Israelites. For centuries, up to that moment, Israel lived as a subject and a vassal of other powers. Also up to that moment, the Greeks were undefeated. From the moment the Greeks were weak and losing, anti-Hellenism became a profitable business in the sense that it urged the faithful Holy Warriors for further conquering wars against the infidel idolaters. The Greeks appear to have lost more ground in the north, in particular, and some Israelites in Galilee must have profited greatly from this change. However, the Greeks repeatedly fought back throughout all seven decades of the first century.

This thesis also brought into light extensive new evidence that *II Maccabees*

"Josephus" and even "Philo" used specific techniques in order to prove that it was the Greeks who started the large scale conflicts in their cities.

## EPILOGUE

None of the first- and second-century Christian works appears to accept the Greeks as equals, regardless to which God the Greeks believed. It was not only "Josephus" who stated that "if all the books of the Greeks were destroyed, that would be no loss at all."<sup>1171</sup> The *Didachē* (1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> c.)<sup>1172</sup> also states that the Apostles preached their Christian flock to stay away from the study of mathematics, astronomy and music, because they lead to idolatry.<sup>1173</sup> For some believers to God, the gods of the Greeks were adulterers, murderers, wrathful, thieves, and the Greeks themselves were vile,<sup>1174</sup> they 'committed every evil act, thus defiling the earth and the air with their actions.'<sup>1175</sup> The Greeks were dishonest and deceivers.<sup>1176</sup> Plato was gluttonous,<sup>1177</sup> Sappho was a prostitute,<sup>1178</sup> Diogenēs, Cleanthēs and Herodotus taught cannibalism,<sup>1179</sup> and Greek festivals, theatres

---

<sup>1171</sup> *Contra Apionem* 1.37-46, vol. 5, p. 8, 1.45.

<sup>1172</sup> Also known as the *Teachings of the Twelve Apostles*, *Apostolic Constitutions* and *Didaskalia*. Some sections of this text are dated by scholars to the first century and other sections to the second century. See *The Didachē*, in *Apostolic Fathers*, 5, vol. 1, pp. 303-333 at 316-318; The earliest Greek manuscript that contains this work is of the eleventh century: *ibid*, vol. 1, pp. 305-307; See also G. Alon, 'Halakah in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (*Didachē*)', pp. 165-194 in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. J. A. Draper (Leiden, 1996); D. Fiensy, 'The Hellenistic Synagogal prayers: one hundred years of discussion', *JSP* 5 (1987), pp. 17-27, on the Israelite origin of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Books VII-VIII; Concerning the originality of *Const. Ap.* 7.33-38, D. A. Fiensy, *Prayers alleged to be Jewish: an Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum*, *Brown Judaic Studies* 65 (Chico, 1985), p. 187, came to the conclusion that "the verbal parallels to the Hebrew texts are from the Jewish stratum."

<sup>1173</sup> *The Didachē* in *Apostolic Fathers*, 3.4, vol. 1, p. 312.

<sup>1174</sup> Aristidēs, *Apologia* 8.1-4, ed. Vona, p. 120.

<sup>1175</sup> Aristidēs, *Apologia* 11.5 and 12.1, ed. Vona, p. 120.

<sup>1176</sup> Justin, *Apologia* 54, pp. 65-66.

<sup>1177</sup> Tatian, *Oratio* 2.1, p. 269.

<sup>1178</sup> Tatian, *Oratio* 3, p. 270; 25, p. 291; 33, p. 298.

<sup>1179</sup> Theophilus, *Autolycum* 3.5, p. 104.

and lecture rooms were a source of moral corruption.<sup>1180</sup> The Greeks were so irrational that they even taught the earth is a moving sphere<sup>1181</sup> and were so stupid that they even made statues of their women.<sup>1182</sup> God's menace against Hellas was such, that its people would be left unburied and their flesh would be eaten by vultures and wild beasts.<sup>1183</sup>

In the 17th and 18th century, Deists like Reimarus brought forward ancient anti-Christian works which criticised the authenticity, the credibility and the morality of ancient Christian and Jewish authors.<sup>1184</sup> The first such work was *Ἀληθὴς λόγος*, written by Celsus, most probably in between 161-180. Regardless that it has been published since 1924,<sup>1185</sup> and even earlier within Origen's *Contra Celsum*, I have seen that the majority of the modern scholars who specialise on Jesus and Early Christianity, do not appear to take Celsus seriously.

Although it is hard to reconstruct with any accuracy the lost parts of Celsus's work,<sup>1186</sup> it is clear that at some point Celsus invited the Christians to follow and support the emperor.<sup>1187</sup> He also said that there was a death penalty for anyone

---

<sup>1180</sup> Tatian, *Oratio* 22, pp. 289-290.

<sup>1181</sup> Theophilus, *Autolycum* 2. 32, p. 80.

<sup>1182</sup> Tatian, *Oratio* 33.1, p. 298.

<sup>1183</sup> *Oracula Sibyllina* 3.638-645, ed. J. Geffcken, *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig, 1902), p. 81; Davila, *Provenance*, p. 185-186, Davila appears not to be aware of the anti-Hellenic language of 3 *Sibyl*, and assumes that its author could have been "a devout gentile who looked forward to the conversion of the nations to a Hellenized and therefore sanitized form of Judaism."

<sup>1184</sup> Strauss, *Life*, vol. 1, p. 11-14.

<sup>1185</sup> Ed. O. Glöckner (Bonn 1924), replaced by ed. R. Bader, *Der Ἀληθὴς λόγος des Kelsos* (Stuttgart, 1940).

<sup>1186</sup> There are indications that Origen, or Origen's later editors, censored and altered Celsus extensively. See Bader, pp. 10-24.

<sup>1187</sup> Celsus, *Ἀληθὴς*, 8.73, p. 215. A number of "second century" Christian *Apologiae* are aggressive attacks against the Gods venerated not only by the Gentiles in general but also by the *Pontifex maximus*; Cf. R. Gordon, 'The Veil of Power: emperors, sacrifices and benefactors', in *Pagan Priests, Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, eds M. Beard and J. North (London, 1990), pp. 201-234 at 202-219, on Emperors performing as High Priests and offering sacrifices to the Gods; Cf. M. McGehee, 'Why Tatian Never "Apologised" To The Greeks', in *J ECS* (1993), pp. 143-158, who indicated that Tatian wrote a *Protrepticus* rather than an *Apology*.



being Christian<sup>1188</sup> and that the Christians were hiding because they were trying to avoid this death penalty.<sup>1189</sup> My analysis and cross-examination of the *NT* and "Josephus" within the historical context of the Galilean revolts in particular, sheds new light on the accusations and the aforementioned information provided by Celsus in the sense that the Christians could have been persecuted for disturbing the *pax Romana*. Modern scholarship often disputes the scale of the Roman persecutions against Christians, and there is little doubt that some numbers of Christian martyrs are over-exaggerated.<sup>1190</sup> Regardless of estimates on how many Christians perished, all scholars of Early Christianity accept that the Romans did persecute Christianity, at least in some cases, because it disturbed the *pax deorum* and not the *pax Romana*,<sup>1191</sup> meaning that the Christians

---

<sup>1188</sup> *Contra Celsum* 8.69.: πρὸς θανάτου δίκην.

<sup>1189</sup> *Contra Celsum* 1.3, vol. 1, p. 84, δίκην τοῦ θανάτου.

<sup>1190</sup> E.g., Sordi, *The Christians*, pp. 3-4, argued that very rarely there were cases of general persecution against Christians, and that the case of the "continuous persecutions" is a myth, that there were some small-scale local persecutions and long periods of peaceful coexistence; p. 6, Sordi claimed that the only large-scale persecutions against Christians took place at the most difficult time for the empire, during the reigns of Valerian (r. 253-260) and Diocletian (r. 284-305). This conclusion derives mainly from the surviving Christian *Acta Martyrum*, composed sometime in the fourth and fifth centuries.

<sup>1191</sup> W. H. C. Frend, 'Christianity', in *OCD* (Oxford, 1970), p. 232: "The legal position of Christianity in the first two centuries has caused difficulties to generations of scholars. Why were the early Christians persecuted at all?"; Fox, *Pagans*, p. 428, p. 430 (why the Christians were persecuted while the Jews were not?). See also Frend, *Martyrdom*, introduction, p. xi; Cf. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, 'Christianity', in *OCD* (Oxford, 1999), p. 327: "Christians in that period may have attracted suspicion partly through a presumed association with rebellious Jews"; E. Ferguson, 'Early Christian Martyrdom and Civil Disobedience', *J ECS* 1 (1993), pp. 73-83, too, did not examine martyrdom as related to revolts. D. MacCulloch, *A History of Christianity* (London, 2009), p. 109, cannot find an answer as to why the Romans tolerated the Jews after the revolts but did not tolerate the Christians; William C. Weinrich, *Spirit and Martyrdom. A Study of the work of the Holy Spirit in contexts of Persecution and Martyrdom in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (Washington, 1981), puts forward a thesis on the spiritual motivation of the Christians for martyrdom, without relating it to the revolts; A. Droge and J. Talbot, *A Noble Death, suicide and martyrdom among Christians and Jews in Antiquity* (San Francisco, 1992), pp. 113-126, on *NT* accepting that Jesus' death had a voluntary nature and under certain circumstances it was an example to be followed by later Christians; Also see G. de Ste. Croix, 'Why were the Early Christians Persecuted', in *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy*, eds M. Whitby and J. Streeter (Oxford, 2006), pp. 105-152 at 121, (persecutions took place regardless who the emperor was, until the third century); p. 152: the main reason Christianity was persecuted was that it "would never countenance other religions" and that it was a missionary *superstitio*; J. Engberg, *Impulsore Chresto: Opposition to Christianity in the Roman Empire c. 50-250*, trans. G. Carter (Frankfurt, 2007). Engberg, too, does not see a

did not pose any direct revolutionary or militant threat to the authorities. The Church regards any persecutions of the Christians to be unjustified. The Christian interpretation of martyrdom derives from the sphere of religious spiritualism and is entirely disconnected from the historical context of the Israelite revolutions.

Arriving from a very different direction regarding the way Christianity presented its history, Celsus accused the Christians that they reworked and changed their texts, they distorted the truth and declared "the unjust as just, the murderer as holy and the dead as immortal."<sup>1192</sup> One should also take into account here that before Celsus said this, the Roman authorities forbade the circulation of Christian works.<sup>1193</sup> In the first and third Chapters we have also seen a number of indications that the official "Imperial Roman" and "Royal Greek" documents often presented by "Flavius Josephus" and *Maccabees I* and *II*, are fakes. These must have been exactly some of the works the first Christians had in their hands during the second century. Does it make sense here that some Christians were persecuted because they were forgers of such official documents? Is the case raised by Celsus that Christianity organised and unleashed propaganda, aiming at twisting the record in order to prove any allegations against it as false, without foundation?

---

relation between the persecutions and any Christian political involvement against Rome. Lucy Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London, 2004), p. 12, is not aware of any persecutions of Christians by the Roman before 64 CE. She accepts that between 64 and 250 CE there were small-scale persecutions. According to Grig, first systematic one was that by Decius (r.249-251), and the Great one was that by Diocletian (r.284-305); R. Joseph Hoffman, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity. An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century* (Chico, 1984), p. 15, accepts the standard version that the crime of the Christians who were punished by Nero was that they rejected the state-approved cults. Benko-O'Rourke, pp. 258-262, also accept that the persecutions were motivated by religion only.

<sup>1192</sup> Celsus, *Ἀληθείας*, 2.16, pp. 66-67: εἰ τις λέγων εἶναι τινα δίκαιον δεικνύει αὐτὸν ἀδικοῦντα, καὶ λέγων ὅσιον δεικνύει φονεύοντα, καὶ λέγων ἀθάνατον δεικνύει νεκρόν. Cf. Lenzman, *L'origine*, pp. 273-294; Also see Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2.13, vol. 1, p. 318: he claimed he knew more about Jesus than what the *Gospels* reported.

<sup>1193</sup> A. A. Glavinas, *Οι διωγμοί κατά της Εκκλησίας στην Προκωνσταντίνηνα εποχή* (Κατερίνη, 1992), pp. 96-99.

It may not be coincidental that the first anti-Christian work, written by Celsus, first appeared in the second half of the second century. Before the second century the Christians were known mainly by other names, used to define Israelite people devoted to their religion. In light of this, it makes sense that the Christians may not have been clearly distinguished from the rest of the Jews, long before Celsus wrote his work. Although an increasing number of scholars dispute the *parting of the ways* between Jews and Christians in the first century,<sup>1194</sup> in my opinion there was an early *parting of the ways*, though very different from what other scholars examine. Israel at that time was divided into at least two different camps. Those who raised Holy Wars, and those who were able to realise that those wars would lead nowhere.

---

<sup>1194</sup> Sanders, *Schismatics*, p. 30, on Eric Meyers about a first century Christian house opposite to a synagogue in Capernaum, known as the "house of Peter"; p. 74 Sanders concludes that the evidence is not clear. The fact that during Byzantium a number of former synagogues and other older buildings were converted into churches complicates the case; pp. 37 and 39, Sanders concludes that there is no archeological evidence to distinguish Christianity from Judaism before 70 CE; Phillip S. Alexander, 'The parting of the Ways from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism,' in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 1-25 at 2 the distinction between the two became clear at later centuries; p. 20, Alexander does not see any connection of the Christians to the Great Revolt; E. Leigh Gibson, 'The Jews and Christians in the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Entangled or Parted Ways?' in Becker-Reed, pp. 145-158 also does not examine the conflict within political context; Martin Goodman, 'Modeling the Parting of the Ways,' in Becker-Reed, pp. 119-129, at p. 122, on the four different datings about when Christianity parted from Judaism (c. 30 with Jesus, few years later with Paul, 70 and 135 CE).

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1

#### *Greeks or Hellēnes?*

According to Aristotle the very first Hellas was an area or city not far from Dodonē, near the river Achelōos, and the Selloi inhabited that region. Aristotle explained that those Selloi at an ancient time were also called Graikoi,<sup>1195</sup> and were *Hellēnes*.<sup>1196</sup> Also according to Aristotle, Graia was a city in the location of Ōrōpos of Voiōtia, opposite the city Eretria of Evoia,<sup>1197</sup> and it is likely that the first people who were called Graikoi derive from that area. The Graikoi colonised an area near Rome during or before the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE.<sup>1198</sup> Most probably, the Romans applied the name Graeci (Greeks) to all Hellenic peoples because the first Hellēnes whom they came to know were called Graikoi. In turn and gradually the entire West and the Slavs, being influenced by the Romans, learned to call all Hellenic peoples as Greeks.

---

<sup>1195</sup> Graeci in Latin, "Γραικοί" in Greek.

<sup>1196</sup> Aristotle, *Metereologica*, ed. F. H. Fobes, *Aristoteles et Corpus Aristotelicum Phil., Meteorologica* (Cambridge, 1919), (Bekker), p. 352 a-b: περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὴν ἀρχαίαν. αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ περὶ Δωδώνην καὶ τὸν Ἀχελῶν· οὗτος γὰρ πολλαχοῦ τὸ ρεῦμα μεταβέβληκεν· ᾧκουν γὰρ οἱ Σελλοὶ ἐνταῦθα καὶ οἱ καλούμενοι τότε μὲν Γραικοὶ νῦν δ' Ἕλληνες.. Stephanos Byzantios the Grammarian (*fl.* 528-35) in his *Ethnica* stated that the name Graikos also meant *Hellēn*; a certain Graikos was son of Thessalos, and the *Hellēnes* people known as Graikoi decent from that particular person: Stephanos, *Ethnica*, ed. cit., p. 212: Γραικός, ὁ Ἕλληνα, ὁξυτόνως, ὁ Θεσσαλοῦ υἱός, ἀφ' οὗ Γραικοὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες. Pseudo Zonaras (13<sup>th</sup> c. CE) adds that Graikos means brave, and that some Hellēnes were called Graikoi for their exceptional bravery. Ps.-Zonaras *Lexicon*, vol. 1, p. 451.

<sup>1197</sup> Aristotle, *Fragmenta*, 8.613, ed. V. Rose, *Aristotelis Qui Ferebantur Librorum, Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 386-387. On the location of Graia in Voiōtia also see Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *De compositione verborum*, 16, ed. W. Rhys Roberts, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus On Literary Composition* (London, 1910), p. 166.

<sup>1198</sup> T.J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 1-7.

## APPENDIX 2

### *Lost and censored works*

Paulus Krueger, the editor of *Codex Justinianus* observed in a note<sup>1199</sup> that almost the exact wording of the novel which called for the destruction of all anti-Christian works, pre-existed within a law published by Theodosius II in 448. This earlier law called for the destruction of any anti-Christian work written by Porphyrius only. The difference between the earlier law and the novel is that the latter, apart from calling for the burning of the works of Porphyrius, it adds the phrase "ἢ ἕτερος τίς," thus calling for the burning of Porphyrius's and "anybody else's" works against Christianity.<sup>1200</sup> The question here is how many sources, which might have contained important information about the history of Early Christianity, do not survive because of this law? The entire Roman governmental anti-Christian legislation of the first centuries has been lost.<sup>1201</sup> The writings of Antonius Julianus, the Roman procurator of Judea (66-70), with reference to the history of the region where Christianity emerged, have also been lost.<sup>1202</sup> The works of Justus of Tiberias, an Israelite contemporary and an opponent of Josephus who wrote about the same period, have also been lost. There is nothing surviving from the *commentarii* of the

---

<sup>1199</sup> *Codex Justinianus* ed. Paulus Krueger (Berlin 1877), I, 1.3 (bottom of page, no page numbers in this edition).

<sup>1200</sup> *Concilia Oecumenica, Concilium universale Ephesenum anno 431* 1.1.4, ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, 8 vols (Berlin, 1927-62), vol. 2, p 66: πάντα ὅσα Πορφύριος ὑπὸ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μανίας ἐλαυνόμενος [ἢ ἕτερος τίς] κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς θρησκευτικῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν συνέγραψε, παρ' οἷωδὴποτε εὐρισκόμενα πυρὶ παραδίδοσθαι. (what I have in brackets above exists only in *Codex Just.*, and is not part of the text of the Theodosian law).

<sup>1201</sup> E. Bickerman, 'Pliny, Trajan, Hadrian and the Christians,' in *Studies in Jewish and Christian history* 3 (Leiden, 1986), pp. 152-171 at p. 152, the Christian compilers of *Corpus juris* did not include any Roman anti-Christian legislation. The only two surviving sources which mention Roman anti-Christian legislation are the letter of Trajan to Pliny and a letter by Hadrian. Idem, p. 156, Hadrian's letter is extant in *H.E.* IV 9.1-3, vol. 31, p. 172.

<sup>1202</sup> Minucius, *Octavius* 33, p. 417.

Emperors Vespasian and Titus who themselves fought in the war Josephus wrote about.<sup>1203</sup> Pliny the Elder also wrote a work that must have reported the same war. This does not survive either. Tacitus's extensive description of the same war in his *Historiae* is also missing. Appian's *Ekatontaetia* which covered the period and the region of the same war does not survive either. Dio Cassius does not report anything about any conflicts in Galilee, and this may also be an indication that something may be missing from his work.<sup>1204</sup> Josephus himself in the introduction of his *De Bello* attacks a number of other authors, whose names he does not give but calls them Greek, that they produced their accounts of the war between the Jews and the Romans either out of hatred for the Jews or because they wanted to flatter the Romans.<sup>1205</sup> Their works do not survive either. At first glance the disappearance of much of what the Gentiles wrote against the Jews may sound irrelevant, but the question here is how Jewish were the first Christians themselves in the first century and what exactly did they do during the periods of conflict.

Celsus and Porphyrius who wrote against Christianity are known to us only from what was written against them by Christian authors. Their anti-Christian works have been destroyed. One should also observe that nothing Jewish written in Greek survives after 70 CE, apart from Josephus and perhaps some parts of the *Sibylline Oracles*.<sup>1206</sup> Several Hebrew manuscripts which contained references to the Early Christians have also been censored by Christians.<sup>1207</sup>

---

<sup>1203</sup> Cohen, *Josephus*, p. 248.

<sup>1204</sup> Cohen, *Josephus*, p. 249 (Plinny, *Aufidii Bassi*), p. 250, p. 252.

<sup>1205</sup> Cohen, *Josephus*, p. 248 (*Bel.* 1.1-8, vol. 6, pp. 3-4).

<sup>1206</sup> Martin Goodman, 'Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple', in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 27-38 at p. 29; p. 35, (*Sib. Orac.* 5.1-50).

<sup>1207</sup> Eisler, *The Messiah*, pp. 93-112.

## APPENDIX 3

### *Jewish (?) Pseudepigrapha*

The *Assumption of Moses* is not a work of Moses but a first century CE pseudepigrapho whose author presented himself as Moses making prophesies about events that happened centuries later.<sup>1208</sup> There are a number of other pseudepigrapha both in Jewish and in Christian literature which also claim to be works of Moses, but were in fact written centuries later by authors who impersonated him.<sup>1209</sup> Other anonymous authors impersonated other prophets. For example, in the second century CE someone produced a work in Hebrew and presented it as an original written by prophet Ezra who lived about six centuries earlier.<sup>1210</sup> This pseudepigraphon passed as an original for centuries. It was translated into Greek and became accepted as a core Christian reading. Similarly, the *Treatise of Shem* is not a work by Shem, the son of Noah, but was written in the first century BCE.<sup>1211</sup> Some more anonymous authors managed to pass their own works to be original *Psalms of David*, but these have now been dated to between the third c. BCE and the first c. CE.<sup>1212</sup> Another example of a successful fabrication is the interpolation in the *Septuagint* version of *Daniel*, chapter eight, which for centuries passed as an original prophecy made by prophet Daniel. Modern scholars indicate that this must be a work of someone who lived during or after the reign of Antiochos IV (r.175 - 164 BCE),<sup>1213</sup> that is centuries after prophet Daniel (end of 7<sup>th</sup> c. to last decades of 6<sup>th</sup> c. BCE).

---

<sup>1208</sup> *Assumption*, introduction p. 14; pp. 76-77 (Latin text, 7.1), condemns certain persons who reigned in Israel and who appointed themselves a High Priests. (Could these be the Hasmoneans?) 7.2 predicts that they would be destroyed by a wicked man who appointed himself as king but was not of priestly descent (Could this be Herod?) In 7.7 his sons (Herodians?) reigned; 7.8-9: a western king conquered them and burned their Temple. (Is this Titus?)

<sup>1209</sup> *Assumption*, pp. 14-17.

<sup>1210</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, pp. 137-141.

<sup>1211</sup> *OTP*, vol. 1, pp. 471-475.

<sup>1212</sup> *OTP*, vol. 2, pp. 609-610.

<sup>1213</sup> Eissfeldt, *Old Testament*, pp. 520-527; CCB, pp. 274-280; Mose Aberbach, *Jewish Education and History*, ed. and trans. David Aberbach (London, 2009), pp. 27-29.

Similarly, *I Enoch* is not the work of prophet Enoch<sup>1214</sup> but a composite pseudepigraphon, written some time between the second century BCE and the first CE.<sup>1215</sup> The *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* is also not a work of the prophet, but of an anonymous author, written some time between the first century BCE and the first century CE.<sup>1216</sup> This is also the case with numerous other works.<sup>1217</sup>

---

<sup>1214</sup> Mentioned in Genesis 5:24

<sup>1215</sup> *OTP*, vol. 1, pp. 5-7.

<sup>1216</sup> *OTP*, vol. 1, pp. 487-488.

<sup>1217</sup> Eg *Testament of Abraham*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the *Testament of Moses*, the *Testament of Job*, the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, the *Odes of Solomon*, the *Prayer of Joseph*, *II, III and IV Baruch*. See *OTP*, vol. 1, pp. 874-875 (*Test. Abr.*), pp. 681-683 (*Apoc. Abr.*), pp. 920-921 (*Test. Mos.*), pp. 833-834 (*Test. Job*), pp. 497-501 (*Apoc. Zeph.*), pp. 615-616 (*II Bar.*), pp. 653-656 (*III Bar.*); vol. 2, pp. 640-641 (*Ps. Sol.*), pp. 726-727 (*Od. Sol.*), p. 700 (*Pr. Jos.*), p. 414 (*IV Bar.*).



## APPENDIX 4

### Greeks in the works of Philo of Alexandria

Philo of Alexandria (c.30 BCE-c.54 CE), a contemporary of Jesus Christ, was another important Israelite who was closely associated with cultural Hellenism. He produced a vast amount of works composed in Greek.<sup>1218</sup> Regardless of his Jewish roots, Judaism rejected his works for a long time.<sup>1219</sup> No mention of Philo was made in Jewish literature until the sixteenth century.<sup>1220</sup> His works were preserved by Christians.<sup>1221</sup> David Runia points to some of the earliest Christian references to Philo in the Syriac *Canons of Maruta of Maipherkat*, which influenced Christianity to perceive him as one of their own.<sup>1222</sup> These *Canons* state that Philo was in contact with Jacob the brother of Jesus and addressed several letters to him.<sup>1223</sup> Regardless of the historical validity of these statements, scholars argue that although Philo most probably was not a Christian, he prepared the way for Christians towards their Hellenisation and it is widely accepted that he heavily influenced Christian thought. A main characteristic of Philo's works is that they incorporated passages from works of other authors.<sup>1224</sup> One should take into account here that these works were edited and

---

<sup>1218</sup> V.D.Hoek, p. 210.

<sup>1219</sup> Davila, *Provenance*, p. 177, on Philo's ethnic and religious identity as a proper Jew.

<sup>1220</sup> Feldman, *Josephus*, p. 14, "Josephus is the only Jewish author who mentions Philo until the sixteenth century." There has been no detailed study on the common material used both by Philo and Josephus.

<sup>1221</sup> D. Winston, 'Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden tensions in Philo's thought,' in *Philonica*, vol. 2 (Atlanta, 1990), pp. 1-19 at 1.

<sup>1222</sup> Runia, *Philo*, pp. 4-6, on Eusebius, *H.E.*, 16-17.18, vol. 1, pp. 72-77.

<sup>1223</sup> Runia, *Philo*, pp. 4-6, citing the Syriac *Canons of Maruta of Maipherquat and related sources*, ed. A. Vööbus (Louvain, 1982) (no reference to page no.).

<sup>1224</sup> V.D.Hoek, p.1; p. 209: it is not certain that he was the first Jew who employed Hellenic philosophy to interpret the *Bible*; See also H. Chadwick, 'Philo and the beginnings of Christian thought', in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, ed. A.H. Armstrong (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 137-192; Fairweather, pp. 205-212; R. M. Berchman, *From Philo to Origen, Middle Platonism in Transition* (Chico, 1984), p. 11, on Philo as a pioneer and the importance of Alexandria as the cultural centre of Jewish and Christian Platonists. Also see S. Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria, an introduction* (New York, 1979), p. 14.

published over the centuries by Byzantine<sup>1225</sup> religious circles. The *Biblical Antiquities*, previously attributed to Philo and originally composed in Hebrew, is in fact in its entirety a pseudepigraphon, most probably composed in the second century.<sup>1226</sup> As James Royse convincingly argued, a large body of works that have been attributed to Philo are not actually his and what is often accepted as Philo's work is frequently interpolated.<sup>1227</sup> A full exploration of interpolations and pseudepigrapha in Philo, which is beyond the scope of this Appendix, would further elucidate this important subject.

Philo often used *Hellēn* and its derivatives within arguments of syncretism between Hellenic and Jewish philosophy. For example, in the *De somniis*, Philo finds that there is a close relationship between what the Jews call 'Tharra' and what the Greeks mean when they refer to Socrates, with reference to the dictum 'know thyself'.<sup>1228</sup> Apart from identifying the Greeks as a distinct people, Philo also repeatedly used the *Greeks-Barbarians* motif in a number of his works.<sup>1229</sup> In the vast majority of instances where Philo mentions the Greeks and their culture, he is neither biased nor critical towards them.

---

<sup>1225</sup> Runia, *Philo*, pp. 16-31, on the transmission and circulation of Philo's works in Early Christianity and Byzantium.

<sup>1226</sup> F. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: rewriting the Bible* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 3-6: the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*Biblical Antiquities*) survives only in Latin. Its original, in Hebrew, does not survive, nor does its Greek translation.

<sup>1227</sup> Royse, *Spurious*, pp. 134-147.

<sup>1228</sup> Philo, *De Somniis* I 58, ed. P. Wedland (Berlin, 1893), vol. 3, p. 217: τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον Θάρρα μὲν Ἑβραῖοι, Σωκράτην δὲ Ἕλληνας ὀνομάζουσι· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνον ἐγγηράσαιφασιν τῇ περὶ τοῦ γνῶθι σαυτὸν ἀκριβεστάτῃ σκέψει, μηδὲν ἔξω τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν φιλοσοφοῦντα.

<sup>1229</sup> Philo, *De Mutatione Nominum* 36, ed. Wendland (Berlin, 1898), vol. 3, p. 162; idem, *De Abrahamo* 267, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4, p. 58; idem, *De Josepho* 30 and 56, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4, pp. 67, 73; idem, *De decalogo*, 153, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4, p. 303; idem, *De specialibus legibus*, 4.120, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1906), vol. 5, p. 236; idem, *Quod omnis* 73 and 98, ed. cit., vol. 6, pp. 21, 28; idem *Legatio ad Gaium* 145, p. 182; idem, *De praemiis et poenis*, 165, ed. idem, Cohn (Berlin, 1915), vol. 5, p. 374; idem, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.12, 2.18, 2.27, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4, pp. 203, 204, 206. In *Vit. Cont.* 49, vol. 6, p. 58, *Hellēnes* and *Barbarians* imitate the Italian luxurious life-style.

Being faithful to Judaism, Philo often used material from the works of the Greeks to support his pro-Judaic arguments.<sup>1230</sup> His deep encounter with Greek philosophy went so far as to identify the wisdom and *Logos* of God with Heraclitus's (fl. c.500 BCE) definition of *logos* (reason) as a force of creation and regulation of the universe.<sup>1231</sup> In his *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* Philo stated that the Greeks present a certain theory that everything is composed of two opposite parts as Heraclitus said, though long before him Moses came to the same conclusion.<sup>1232</sup> This observation made by Philo seems to have been over-exaggerated in the *De Vita Mosis*,<sup>1233</sup> which contains a statement that Moses was not mentioned by any writer of the Greeks because of their envy towards him. *De Vita Mosis* goes on to accuse the Greeks for profligacy, licentiousness and

---

<sup>1230</sup> Cf. Fairweather, p.178.

<sup>1231</sup> Heraclitus, *Testimonia* 8.1-2, in *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, ed. H., Diels, W. Kranz, 3 vols (Berlin, 1934-1937), (Lehre), vol. 1, p. 145: τὸ περιοδικὸν πῦρ αἰῖδιον [εἶναι θεόν], εἰμαρμένην δὲ λόγον ἐκ τῆς ἐναντιοδρομίας δημιουργὸν τῶν ὄντων; idem, 16, p. 147: τὸν δὲ λόγον κριτὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποφαίνεται οὐ τὸν ὅποιονδῆποτε, ἀλλὰ τὸν κοινὸν καὶ θεῖον; *Fragmenta*, 31.5, ed. ibid, p. 158: δυνάμει γὰρ λέγει ὅτι τὸ πῦρ ὑπὸ τοῦ διοικοῦντος λόγου καὶ θεοῦ τὰ σύμπαντα δι' αἴρος τρέπεται εἰς ὕγρον (my italics). Philo, *De Josepho* 175, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4, p. 98: ἀλλ' ἡ θεὸς ἡ λόγος ἡ νόμος θεῖος; idem, *De cherubim* 36, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1896), vol. 1, p. 179: καὶ κυβερνήτης τοῦ παντὸς λόγος θεῖος; idem, *De opificio mundi* 25, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1896), vol. 1, p. 8: ὁ θεοῦ λόγος; idem, *De migratione Abrahami* 3-4, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, ed. P. Wendland (Berlin, 1897) vol. 2, p. 269: αἰσθησις δὲ συγγενὲς καὶ ἀδελφὸν ἐστὶ διανοίας, ἄλογον λογικῆς, ἐπειδὴ μιᾶς ἁμφω μέρη ψυχῆς ταῦτα, πατρὸς δὲ οἶκος ὁ λόγος, ὅτι πατὴρ μὲν ἡμῶν ὁ νοῦς σπεύρων εἰς ἕκαστον τῶν μερῶν τὰς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεις καὶ διανέμων εἰς αὐτὰ τὰς ἐνεργείας ἐπιμέλειάν τε καὶ ἐπιτροπὴν ἀνημμένος ἀπάντων, οἶκος δέ, ἐν ᾧ διαιτᾶται, τῆς ἄλλης ὑπεξηρημένος οἰκίας ὁ λόγος· καθάπερ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ἐστία, καὶ νοῦ λόγος ἐνδιαίτημα; ibid, 80-81, vol. 2, p. 284: ὑποβολεὺς δὲ λόγου νοῦς, ὡς νοῦ θεός; idem, *Legum allegoriarum libri i-iii* 1.65, ed. Cohn, vol. 1, p. 78: τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ σοφίας· ἡ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ θεοῦ λόγος; idem, *De confusione linguarum* 148, ed. Wendland, vol. 2, p. 257: θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος; idem, *Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum* (QG) 2.62a. *Fragmenta Graeca*, ed. F. Petit (Paris, 1978), *Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 35 vols (Paris, 1961-1992), vol. 33, p. 116: Ἔδει γὰρ τὸν λογικὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ τύπον ὑπὸ θεοῦ λόγου χαραχθῆναι, ἐπειδὴ ὁ πρὸ τοῦ λόγου θεὸς κρείσσω ἐστὶν ἢ πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις· τῷ δὲ ὑπὲρ τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ βελτίστη καὶ τινι ἐξαιρέτῳ καθεστῶτι ιδέα οὐδὲ θέμις ἦν γενητὸν ἐξομοιωθῆναι.

<sup>1232</sup> Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 214, ed. P. Wendland (Berlin, 1898), vol. 3, p. 48: οὐ τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ὃ φασιν Ἕλληνες τὸν μέγαν καὶ ἀοίδιμον παρ' αὐτοῖς Ἡράκλειτον κεφάλαιον τῆς αὐτοῦ προσησάμενον φιλοσοφίας αὐχεῖν ὡς ἐφ' εὐρέσει καινῇ; παλαιὸν γὰρ εὖρεμα Μωυσέως ἐστὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἐναντία τμημάτων λόγον ἔχοντα ἀποτελεῖσθαι, καθάπερ ἐναργῶς ἐδείχθη.

<sup>1233</sup> L. Cohn, the editor of Philo of Alexandria, *De Vita Mosis*, pointed out the problematic division of the text: see F.H. Colson, *Philo*, ed. cit., vol. 6 (1935), preface, p. 5.

lack of honour.<sup>1234</sup> The same work<sup>1235</sup> also distinguished between peoples who lived in different parts of the world, either “Barbarians or Greeks, continentals, islanders, people of the East, of the West, in Europe, Asia, and the entire world”, adding that they all followed the law which Moses gave to the Jews prohibiting working on the seventh day.<sup>1236</sup>

Contrary to the anti-Hellenic statement in *De Vita Mosis*, being an admirer of Hellenic paideia, Philo in the *De Providentia* praised *Hellas* for producing men of exceptional importance and stated that the countries of the Barbarians failed to produce men of such stature. For Philo *Hellas* was the only country that gave birth to men of knowledge and genius.<sup>1237</sup> The contradiction of the perceptions of the Greeks in these two works is clear, and the question arises as to whether one of them was not stated originally by Philo. Although Ellen Birnbaum identified Philo’s different perceptions of the Greeks,<sup>1238</sup> she did not come to the conclusion that some of these perceptions could have been the product of Christian interpolators. However, it is clear that the entire corpus of writings accepted as being Philo’s works, regardless their authenticity, apart from a

---

<sup>1234</sup> Philo of Alexandria, *De Vita Mosis* 1, 2-4, ed. Colson, vol. 6, p. 276: διὰ φθόνον ἴσως καὶ ἐν οὐκ ὀλίγοις τῶν διατεταγμένων ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις νομοθετῶν ἐναντίωσιν οὐκ ἐθελήσαντων αὐτὸν μνήμης ἀξιῶσαι τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλησι λογίων· ὧν οἱ πλείους τὰς δυνάμεις ἃς ἔσχον διὰ παιδείας ὑβρίσαν ἐν τε ποιήμασι καὶ τοῖς καταλογάδην συγγράμμασι κωμωδίας καὶ συβαριτικὰς ἀσελγείας συνθέντες, περιβόητον αἰσχύνην, οὓς ἔδει ταῖς φύσεσι καταχρήσασθαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ βίων ὑφήγησιν.

<sup>1235</sup> On the style of this work as an *Apologia* see Erwin R. Goudenough, *An introduction to Philo Judaeus* (Oxford, 1986<sup>2</sup>), p. 33.

<sup>1236</sup> Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2.20-22, ed. Cohn, (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4, pp. 204-205: ... βαρβάρους, Ἑλληνας, ἡπειρώτας, νησιώτας, ἔθνη τὰ ἐῷα, τὰ ἐσπέρια, Εὐρώπην, Ἀσίαν, ἅπασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀπὸ περάτων ἐπὶ πέρατα. τίς γὰρ τὴν ἱερὰν ἐκείνην ἐβδόμην οὐκ ἐκτετίμηκεν.

<sup>1237</sup> Philo, *De Providentia*, vol. 9, p. 502: οὐδ’ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος τι γεννᾶται. τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὐ κατηγορητέον, ὡς λυπρᾶς καὶ ἀγόνου· πολὺ γὰρ κὰν ταύτῃ τὸ βαθύγειον. εἰ δ’ ἡ βάρβαρος διαφέρει ταῖς εὐκαρπείαις, πλεονεκτεῖ μὲν τροφαῖς, ἐλαττοῦται δὲ τοῖς τρεφομένοις, ὧν χάριν αἱ τροφαί. μόνῃ γὰρ ἡ Ἑλλὰς ἀψεudῶς ἀνθρωπογονεῖ, φυτὸν οὐράνιον καὶ βλάστημα θεῖον ἡκριβωμένον, λογισμὸν ἀποτίκτουσα οἰκειούμενον ἐπιστήμη.

<sup>1238</sup> E. Birnbaum, ‘Philo on the Greeks: a Jewish Perspective on Culture and Society in First Century Alexandria’, *Philonica* 8 (2001), pp. 37-58.

single case in *De Vita Mosis*,<sup>1239</sup> cannot be classified as anti-Hellenic. On the contrary, he appears very different and more cultured than most of the Christian Apologists.

---

<sup>1239</sup> Numerous instances with references to Hellēnes also exist in *Legum allegoriarum libri*, *De cherubim*, *Quod deus sit immutabilis*, *De plantatione*, *De ebrietate*, *De congressa eruditionis gratia*, *De aeternitate mundi* and other works.

## APPENDIX 5

### *Eviōnaioi/Engratites, some of the first Christians?*

The name Eviōnaioi most probably derives from a certain religious leader called Eviōn, who in turn was a follower of a certain Cerinthus, a contemporary opponent of St. Paul, who preached circumcision and taught that Jesus was not born by a virgin. There are indications that Cerinthus himself was a follower of St Matthew.<sup>1240</sup> Both Origen (c.185-254 CE), who lived in Alexandria and Palestine, and the *Chronicon Paschale* (7<sup>th</sup> c. CE) state that the Greek translation of Eviōnaioi is πτωχοί, meaning ‘poor.’ This probably provides an explanation as to why the *Galatians* and *Romans* referred to the first Christians with the same word: πτωχοί.<sup>1241</sup> Both Hippolytos of Rome (c.170-236) and Origen confirm that the Eviōnaioi followed ancient Jewish customs and were almost the same as Jews.<sup>1242</sup> In *Evangelium Ebionitum* (2nd c. ?), the Gospel used by Eviōnaioi, the twelve Apostles symbolised the twelve tribes of Israel.<sup>1243</sup> According to Epiphanius, the Nazōraioi were also known with the name ‘Eviōnaioi’, who

---

<sup>1240</sup> A. Klijn and G. Reinink, *Patristic evidence for Jewish-Christian sects* (Leiden, 1973), pp. 4-23. Fitzmyer, *Essays*, pp. 435-453, on the origin and the customs of the Evionites. Richard Bauckham, 'The origin of the Ebionites,' in Tomson, Peter J. and Doris Lambers-Petry, eds., *The Image of Judeo-Christians* (Tübingen, 2003), pp. 162-181, they were different from the Nazoreans, strongly anti-Paul. p. 175, from a study of their literature, Bauckham concluded that they first appeared some time in the second century. p. 177, Tertullian most probably made a mistake that their leader was a certain Ebion.

<sup>1241</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 2,1.21-23, ed. cit., vol. 1, pp 276-278; *Chr. Paschale*, ed. cit., p. 472. For the “poor” in NT, see *Galatians* 2:10.1; *Romans* 15:26.2. Cf. Leander E. Keck, ‘The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity’, *ZNW* 57 (1966), pp. 54-78 at 77-78, who on the basis of his own textual analysis rejects the argument that the poor in the *Acts* are identical with the poor in the Qumran texts. Also see Tel Ilan, p. 433, Ebion means poor/pauper in Hebrew.

<sup>1242</sup> Origen, *Matthaei* 11, 12.7, p. 328: Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ ὀλίγῳ διαφέροντες αὐτῶν Ἐβιωνᾶιοι; St. Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 7, pinax, p. 279: Τίνα τὰ τοῖς Ἐβιωναίοις δοκοῦντα, καὶ ὅτι ἔθουσιν Ἰουδαίκοις μᾶλλον προσέχουσι.

<sup>1243</sup> *Evangelium Ebionitum*, Fragment 2. 14, trans Elliott, *Apocryphal*, p. 15: “you shall be twelve apostles for a testimony of Israel.” This work is also known as *Gospel of the Hebrews*. See also R. Eisler, *The Messiah*, pp. 347-351, on the twelve and the seventy apostles in Israelite tradition.

were Jews and knew Hebrew well.<sup>1244</sup> The Eviōnaioi, Nazōraioi, Ossaioi and Nasaraioi, were all followers of the same heresy.<sup>1245</sup> John of Damascus (c.676-749 CE), himself a monk of the Mar Saba (St Savvas) monastery located not far from Jerusalem, confirmed that the Eviōnaioi were no others than Nazōraioi, that they abstained from the consumption of meat, they were baptised and accepted Jesus Christ not as God but as a man.<sup>1246</sup> This probably derives from Irenaeus (*fl.* 2<sup>nd</sup> c.), bishop of Lyons,<sup>1247</sup> who also explained that according to the Eviōnaioi, Jesus Christ was a natural son of Joseph.<sup>1248</sup>

Origen in his *Contra Celsum* identified the Eviōnaioi as being the same with the Egkratitai,<sup>1249</sup> and Epiphanius named the Egkratitai as ‘Apostolic’ because they were followers of the original Apostles who followed Christ. He also called them ‘Tatians’ because they later became followers of Tatian (c.110-172 CE).<sup>1250</sup> This information is repeated by a number of other Christian sources which clearly testify that at some stage, Tatian became the leader of Egkratitai.<sup>1251</sup>

---

<sup>1244</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, p. 329. Cf. D. G. Horrell, ‘Early Jewish Christianity’ in ed. P. F. Esler, *The Early Christian World*, 2 vols (London, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 136-167 at p. 159, who questions “what was the relationship between the Nazarenes and the Ebionites?”

<sup>1245</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp. 222-223: συνήπται γὰρ οὗτος πάλιν ὁ Ἠλξαῖ τοῖς μετὰ τὸν Χριστὸν Ἐβιωναίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ναζωραίοις τοῖς μετέπειτα γεγονόσι. καὶ κέχρηται αὐτῷ τέσσαρες αἰρέσεις, ἐπειδὴ θέλγονται τῇ αὐτοῦ πλάνῃ. <ή> Ἐβιωναίων τε τῶν μετέπειτα <γεγονότων καὶ> Ναζωραίων, Ὀσσαίων τε τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ Νασαραίων τῶν ἄνω μοι προδεδηλωμένων; vol. 1, p. 158, list of Christian heresies among which the ninth heresy is the Nazōraioi and the tenth is the Eviōnaioi.

<sup>1246</sup> John of Damascus, *Haeresibus* 30, vol. 4, p. 28: Ναζωραῖοι, οἱ Χριστὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν θεοῦ, πάντα δὲ κατὰ νόμον πολιτευόμενοι. Ἐβιωναῖοι, παραπλήσιοι τοῖς προειρημένοις Κηρινθιανοῖς καὶ Ναζωραίοις, συνήφθη δὲ κατὰ τι ἢ τῶν Σαμψαίων καὶ Ἐλκεσαίων. For the connection between Nazoreans and Ebionites see also Schaff, *History*, vol. 2, pp. 430-434.

<sup>1247</sup> Modern Lyons, France.

<sup>1248</sup> Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, fragm. gr. 30 (ex. Eus.), 21.7, eds A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les Hérésies*, 9 vols (Paris 1969-1979), vol. 3,2, pp. 398-399. On the natural birth of Jesus see similar statements in Eusebius, *H.E.* 5, 8.10, vol. 2, p. 37; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 5, 61, vol. 3, p. 166; Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, pp. 326-329.

<sup>1249</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 5, 65.5-6, vol. 3, p. 174.

<sup>1250</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 2, p. 387: Apostolic, Apotactic and Egkratitai; p. 380: Egkratitai, Tatians and Katharoi.

<sup>1251</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 2, pp. 211, 215; idem, *Doctrina*, p. 268; John of Damascus, *Haeresibus* 47, vol. 4, p. 33: Egkratitai, followers of Tatian. John of Damascus copied Theodoretus

Epiphanius also adopted the view that the Eviōnaioi were followers of Jacob, the brother of Christ, and they believed that Paul was Greek, son of Greek parents, who wanted to marry the daughter of a Jewish priest.<sup>1252</sup> It is evident that, according to this statement, Paul was a foreigner, a Greek in ethnic and religious terms, who converted to Judaism because of a love affair. In the end, according to the explanation given by the Eviōnaioi, through Epiphanius, Paul was not permitted to marry the Jewish girl, and as a reaction to this he attacked Sabbath and circumcision.<sup>1253</sup> Clearly, the Eviōnaioi rejected Paul and this is confirmed by Origen, who did not hesitate to attack them on this issue.<sup>1254</sup>

Basil the Great (330-379), Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia and a foremost authority on monasticism, mentioned that the Egkratitai were also known with the name Hydroparastatai, because they drunk water and not wine. They were also called Katharoi (from where the name 'Cathars' derives, meaning 'cleansed') because they claimed to be pure.<sup>1255</sup> We have seen in the second Chapter that this mode of life characterised the Nazirai/Essenes. Despite some indications that the Eviōnaioi/Egkratitai might have been some of the first followers of Jesus, the Church gradually classified them as heretics for among other things they refused to accept the doctrines of the Virgin birth and that Jesus was the Son of God. However, it is not possible to date them with accuracy in the first century, but this cannot be excluded either.

---

of Cyrrhus, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*, PG 83, 369-372: the Egkratitai did not accept St Paul. They followed Tatian and believed that Jesus Christ was a descendant of David and not the Son of God. They did not accept St Paul's *Epistles* and the *Acts*.

<sup>1252</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, p. 355: ἐξ Ἑλλήνων δὲ αὐτὸν ὑποτίθενται, λαβόντες τὴν πρόφασιν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου διὰ τὸ φιλαλήθως ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ῥηθὲν ὅτι «Ταρσεὺς εἰμι, οὐκ Ἀσῆμου πόλεως πολίτης». εἶτα φάσκουσιν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἑλληνα καὶ Ἑλληνίδος μητρὸς καὶ Ἑλληνος πατρὸς παῖδα. See also Anthony Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago, 1994), p. 6, a small numbers of scholars still regard Matthew and his circle as Gentiles. Saldarini rejects this conclusion.

<sup>1253</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, vol. 1, p. 355.

<sup>1254</sup> Origen, *In Jeremiam*, *Homily* 19.17-23, ed. E. Klostermann *Origenes Werke*, 12 vols (Leipzig 1899 - Berlin 1955), vol. 3, p. 167.

<sup>1255</sup> See Basil of Caesarea, *Epistle* 188. 1, ed. Y. Courtonne, *Saint Basile Lettres*, 3 vols (Paris, 1957-1966), vol. 2, p. 122: Katharoi, Egkratitai and Hydroparastatai.



## APPENDIX 6

### *Parting of the ways during the first century?*

1. A central argument raised by those who claim that Christianity became distinguished from Judaism already in the first century, is that Paul, contrary to Jewish custom, rejected circumcision and welcomed uncircumcised Gentiles.<sup>1256</sup> To this one could counter-argue that according to the *Antiquities*, the Jewish teacher rabbi Ananias advised Izates, a convert to Judaism, that there was no need for him to be circumcised. Contrary to this rabbi, another rabbi from Galilee, called Eleazar, compelled Izates to be circumcised.<sup>1257</sup> Therefore, this story, as well as other evidence coming from *Matthew* that the Scribes and Pharisees made extensive efforts to convert Gentiles, indicates that Judaism too did try to convert Gentiles.<sup>1258</sup> In other words, this argument that the ways parted because Christianity, contrary to Judaism, opened the gates to the Gentiles, may not be as valid as previously thought.

2. Another central argument employed by those who see a clear *parting of the ways* between Christianity and Judaism in the first century, is that Jesus accepted the consumption of forbidden/defiled food.<sup>1259</sup> Scholars see this teaching in two passages, one in *Matthew* and one in *Mark*. Jesus in *Matthew*<sup>1260</sup> states that "*it is not what goes into the mouth that defiles a person, but it is what comes out of the mouth that defiles.*"<sup>1261</sup> *Mark*<sup>1262</sup> presents a different version of the same

---

<sup>1256</sup> Zeitlin, *Rise*, pp. 365-376 (Paul, *parting of the ways*, Gentiles).

<sup>1257</sup> *Ant.* 20.40-47, vol. 4, p. 283.

<sup>1258</sup> Eg. *Matthew* 23:15 attacks the Scribes and the Pharisees who travel extensively trying to make a convert. Also see Bird, *Crossing*, pp. 2-3, Bird cites that there also were other Christian missions apart from that led by Paul. Cf. the expulsions of Jewish missionaries from Rome.

<sup>1259</sup> See *Leviticus* 11, *Deuteronomy* 14:3-21.

<sup>1260</sup> 15:11.

<sup>1261</sup> *Trans. Holy*, p.17.

teaching: "Do you not see that whatever goes into a person from outside cannot defile, since it enters, not the heart but the stomach, and goes out into the sewer? (Thus he declared all foods clean.)"<sup>1263</sup> The problem regarding the originality of this "teaching" of Jesus is that in *Matthew* and *Mark* there is no direct instruction given by Jesus, on the consumption of defiled or forbidden food, unless one accepts that the phrase which has been placed in brackets in *Mark* (*thus he declared all foods clean*) by Metzger and his associates, is an original first century line and not a later addition. It is important to examine here that regarding the same controversy on the consumption of forbidden food, Peter has a vision in the *Acts*<sup>1264</sup> exactly on this subject, as if God wanted to clarify "Jesus's" teaching. The supernatural divine voice of the Lord asked Peter to kill and eat any "of four-footed creatures and reptiles and birds of the earth." When Peter replied in shock that this was against the *Law*, the same divine voice declared: "*What God has made clean, you must not call profane.*" The question here is why the *Acts* needed to report this vision, if the line from *Mark*, placed in brackets above, was originally said by a historical Jesus. At this point one should also take into account that after the first and second century Messianic wars, large numbers of Israelites ended up as slaves or refugees. Was it possible for them to keep the *Law* regarding their diet under such hard living conditions? How could an Israelite slave or prisoner or refugee survive when the only food he could get, was defiled? Therefore, is it possible that the vision in the *Acts*, and the explanation about what Jesus said in *Mark*, were produced after the disasters, in accordance to the new living conditions?<sup>1265</sup> Contrary to the argument that a historical Jesus preached for the consumption of forbidden food, one must take into account that in *Matthew*<sup>1266</sup> Jesus is categorical that his followers must

---

<sup>1262</sup> 7:18-19.

<sup>1263</sup> Trans. *Holy*, p. 43.

<sup>1264</sup> 10:10-15.

<sup>1265</sup> Also see Sanders, *Schismatics*, p. 2, on the ability of the author of the *Acts* to fabricate speeches for his main characters and to present fabrications as historical events.

<sup>1266</sup> 5:17-48.

follow all the commands of the *Law*, without a single exception. This is also repeated by Jacob his brother in *James*:<sup>1267</sup> "For whoever keeps the whole law but fails in one point has become accountable of all of it." Therefore, where exactly is the *parting of the ways* here? Why exactly should one accept that the text in the brackets in *Mark* and Peter's vision in the *Acts* are earlier than the above clear instructions provided by Jesus and his brother to keep the Law and stay away from the unclean food?

3. Dr. Andrew Chester, has provided a well researched answer to the argument that Christianity parted from Judaism from the very beginning, on the basis that, unlike Judaism, it perceived the Messiah in a very different eschatological way. Through an extensive analysis of primary ancient sources, Chester concluded that regarding their Messianic expectations and eschatology, the "*Christian texts certainly show evidence of distinctive developments, but they are also in essential continuity with Judaism throughout.*"<sup>1268</sup> Chester also observed that even the spiritual interpretation of the Heavenly Kingdom does have its Jewish precedence in Josephus and Philo.<sup>1269</sup> Therefore, the spiritual interpretation of the Kingdom of the Messiah can no longer be claimed solely as a Christian novelty. Chester warned: "the reasons for the separation may in some case be more mundane and less purely theological than we are sometimes led to suppose."<sup>1270</sup> However, Chester did not analyse any of those "mundane" reasons.

4. Another central argument in support to the *parting of the ways* during the first

---

<sup>1267</sup> 2:10.

<sup>1268</sup> Andrew Chester, 'The Parting of the Ways: Eschatology and Messianic Hope', in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 239-313: Chester juxtaposed the *Sibylline Oracles*, 4 *Ezra*, 2 *Baruch*, *Amidah*, *Kaddish*, *Shema*, *Haftarah Benedictions*, *Birkat ha-Mazon*, *Josephus*, *Revelation*, *Papias*, *Justin*, *Irenaeus*, *Barnabas*, *Didache*, *Hermas*, 1 and 2 *Clement*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Epistle to Diognetus*.

<sup>1269</sup> Chester, 'Parting,' pp. 303-304.

<sup>1270</sup> Chester, 'Parting,' p. 305

century is that the Jews opposed Jesus.<sup>1271</sup> Apart from the *Birkat ha-Mînîm*, already examined in the second Chapter, which attacks the Notzrim, there is no other non-Christian source dated clearly in the first century, which presents Jewish perceptions of the first Christians. The case that the Jews opposed Jesus appears to have been built upon a few *NT* passages. For example, in *Matthew*<sup>1272</sup> a crowd of Jews asks for Jesus and not for Barabbas to be executed ("*his blood be on us and on our children*"). The first problem here is that in the same text, this was asked by a particular crowd of people, and not by all Jews.<sup>1273</sup> The second problem here is that, as analysed in my introduction, there is an entire unanswered issue about who exactly this Barabbas, Son of the Father was in the different manuscripts. Another passage which some scholars accept as evidence that most Jews opposed Jesus is *John* 8:44, where Jesus says to the Jews: "*You are from your father the devil, and you chose to do your father's desires.*" As far as I have seen, this passage has been examined outside the wider context of the same text, for *John* is clear that Jesus said this to a particular group of Jews who were trying to kill him (*now you are trying to kill me*),<sup>1274</sup> and whom he did not perceive as proper Jews. He told them they were not descendants of Abraham (*if you were Abraham's children*).<sup>1275</sup> Why, then, should one keep accepting that the above *NT* passages provide strong evidence that Jesus faced the opposition of most Jews? There is also another case in *Matthew* that the Pharisees were against Jesus and his disciples because they were hungry and fed themselves by picking crops during Sabbath.<sup>1276</sup> Should this accusation be taken seriously, or does it sound like a fabrication made to defame the Pharisees? And why should one accept *Matthew* and *Mark* that the Pharisees and the council of the

---

<sup>1271</sup> James D. G. Dunn, 'The Question of Anti-Semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period', in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 177-211.

<sup>1272</sup> 27:25.

<sup>1273</sup> 27:15.

<sup>1274</sup> 8:40.

<sup>1275</sup> 8:39.

<sup>1276</sup> *Matthew* 12:1-2.

Herodians wanted to kill Jesus because he cured the hand of a man during Sabbath?<sup>1277</sup> Why should *Mark* be trusted that the Scribes hated Jesus because he forgave the sins of a paralysed man and made him walk?<sup>1278</sup> Why should one accept that these are the historical reasons that some Jews wanted to murder Jesus, and not accept the other information contained also in the *NT* that masses of Jews supported Jesus and the Apostles? We have already seen in *Mark*<sup>1279</sup> that those few Jews who wanted to murder Jesus, were terrified by the vast majority of the Jews, the mob (ὄχλος) which followed Jesus. *Luke*<sup>1280</sup> is also clear that the small minority of those who wanted to assassinate Jesus, were terrified because the entire people (ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἅπας), the whole of Israel in Jerusalem was on the side of Jesus. The *Acts* also mention that a multitude of the priests also followed Jesus and the Apostles,<sup>1281</sup> five thousand men believed in Jesus in one day,<sup>1282</sup> a multitude of men and women believed and followed him,<sup>1283</sup> and Jacob the brother of Jesus also had myriads of Zealot followers.<sup>1284</sup> According to these passages, "Christianity" in the first century was an Israelite Messianic movement, which enjoyed massive support by the Jews. The question here is why this movement should be examined as irrelevant to the Zealot movement, which at the same period was ravaging both Israel and the Gentile cities of the region?

There is an ever growing number of scholars who argue that Early Christianity was primarily Jewish, guided by Jews,<sup>1285</sup> and that "no full accounting of the

---

<sup>1277</sup> *Matthew* 12:9-14 and *Mark* 3:1-6.

<sup>1278</sup> *Mark* 2:1-12. Also see *Mark* 3:22, after Jesus performed another miracle (3:11), the Scribes accused him of being a master of deamons.

<sup>1279</sup> 11:18.

<sup>1280</sup> 19:47-48.

<sup>1281</sup> *Acts* 6:7.

<sup>1282</sup> 4:4

<sup>1283</sup> 5:14-16

<sup>1284</sup> 21:18-20.

<sup>1285</sup> E.g. Kümmel, *Das neue*, p. 38 (John Lightfoot, 1602-1675); Matti Myllykoski, 'Christian Jews and Jewish Christians: The Jewish Origins of Christianity in English Literature from

separation of Christianity from Judaism can be provided” because of a lack of sufficient evidence.<sup>1286</sup> The academic ‘rediscovering’ of the Jewish roots of Christianity gained new momentum after the Holocaust, and this process still continues.<sup>1287</sup> However, so far and to the best of my knowledge, there is no study available investigating the possibility that Christianity not only had Jewish or Gentile backgrounds, but also other Israelite origins that were neither Jewish nor Gentile.

---

Elizabeth I to Toland's Nazarenes,' in F. Stanley Jones, ed., *The Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 3-41 at p. 4, the importance of Toland (1670-1722) on the critical study of the Jewish identity of Christianity; Berger, *Qumran*, p. 8-9.

<sup>1286</sup> S. Katz, 'The Rabbinic Response to Christianity,' vol. 4, pp 259- 298, in *CHJ, The Late Roman Rabbinic Period*, ed. S. T. Katz (Cambridge, 2006), p. 259.

<sup>1287</sup> A. Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism - Hellenism Dicotomy, a historiographical case study of Second Peter and Jude* (Stockholm, 2001), p. 342.

## APPENDIX 7

### *Greeks in the Early Church?*

It is not widely known that according to *De Bello*, the Great Revolt began in Caesarea c. 60CE,<sup>1288</sup> during a conflict between Israelites and Greeks. Just like Philo in the case of the conflict in Alexandria, Josephus put the blame to the Greeks who formed the majority. The Israelites, however, claimed Caesarea as being their own city on the grounds that it was built by their own King Herod the Great, but the problem was that Herod's enlarged Kingdom also comprised non-Israelite peoples, including Greeks, all taxed by Herod. It is not clear whether both the Greeks and the Israelites had paid for the construction of Caesarea. However, *De Bello* says that each party wanted the city for themselves. The dispute as to who was the owner of the city escalated and the Roman authorities of Syria were called to intervene. They concluded that the city belonged to the Greeks (πόλιν Ἑλλήνων) because of the way Herod built it with pagan Temples and statues.<sup>1289</sup> This was a fundamental element that contravened the religious beliefs of the Israelites and a clear indication that the city was not made for them. *De Bello* did not approve this settlement, and explained with resentment that the Roman army sided with the Greeks just because they both were one and the same people (συγγενεῖς, akin).<sup>1290</sup> Regardless of this Roman verdict, the Jews of the city refused to accept the

---

<sup>1288</sup> I date this from the last year of procurator Felix in Caesarea, as mentioned by Josephus.

<sup>1289</sup> *Bel.* 2.266-268, vol. 6, p. 205: οἱ δὲ ἕτεροι τὸν οἰκιστὴν μὲν προσωπολόγουν Ἰουδαῖον, αὐτὴν μέντοι γε τὴν πόλιν Ἑλλήνων ἔφασαν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἀνδριάντας καὶ ναοὺς ἐγκαθιδρῦσαι Ἰουδαίοις αὐτὴν ἀνατιθέντα. διὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἡμφισβήτησαν ἑκάτεροι· προήκει δ' αὐτοῖς τὸ φιλόνηκον εἰς ὅπλα καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν οἱ θρασύτεροι παρ' ἀμφοῖν προεπήδων ἐπὶ μάχην· οὔτε γὰρ Ἰουδαίων οἱ γεραῖοι τοὺς ἰδίους στασιαστὰς κατέχειν οἷοί τε ἦσαν καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν αἰσχος ἐδόκει Ἰουδαίων ἐλαττοῦσθαι. On the reasons behind the Great Revolt cf. Goodman, *The ruling*, pp. 7-14, who presents five different reasons as to why the Jews revolted: (a) incompetence of the Roman governors of Judea; (b) the oppressiveness of Roman rule; (c) religious Messianism and anti-Hellenism; (d) socioeconomic class differences; and (e) interethnic differences between Israelites and Gentiles, mainly Greeks.

<sup>1290</sup> Josephus, *Bel.* 2.268-270, vol. 6, p. 205: ... τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν τῇ παρὰ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀμύνη· τὸ γὰρ πλέον Ῥωμαίοις τῆς ἐκεῖ δυνάμεως ἐκ Συρίας ἦν κατειλεγμένον καὶ καθάπερ συγγενεῖς ἦσαν πρὸς τὰς βοηθείας ἔτοιμοι.

Greeks as their masters, and protested. In order to resolve the problem, Felix the procurator sent leaders of both the Greek and the Israelite communities of Caesarea to Emperor Nero.<sup>1291</sup> The Emperor, after he realised that there was not even one Synagogue inside Caesarea, also sided with Greeks.<sup>1292</sup> However, the Israelites did not accept this imperial decision. *De Bello* continues by stressing the importance of an incident that occurred in a village near Caesarea, which escalated the problem. A Greek refused to sell the land he owned next to a Synagogue to the Israelites. Instead, he decided to build a factory there. In turn, the Israelites attacked the builders and stopped the construction. Soon after, Roman soldiers were called to suppress the perpetrators.<sup>1293</sup> The *Antiquities* also state that the Jews of Caesarea protested to Nero but he was already convinced by 'Hellenic epistles' to take the side of the Greeks. By the time Felix was replaced with Porcius Festus (c.60-62), the conflict spread to other areas and the Roman army was mobilised against strongholds of the Israelite revolutionaries. The *Sikarioi* had already attacked, robbed and burned down villages.<sup>1294</sup>

Following the incidence in Caesarea, the conflict between Greeks and Jews escalated and spread in cities such as Antioch and Alexandria. It is important to note here that according to *De Bello*, this was the first time when some Jews who had the Roman citizenship lost their immunity and were crucified by the Romans like common criminals. Further revolts erupted in Jerusalem and resulted to the slaughter of many Jews, including women and children.<sup>1295</sup> According to *De Bello*, King Agrippas advised his people to learn from the

---

<sup>1291</sup> *Bel.* 2.270, vol. 6, p. 205.

<sup>1292</sup> *Bel.* 2.284-286, vol. 6, pp. 208-209.

<sup>1293</sup> *Bel.* 2.284-300, vol. 6, pp. 208-211: Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ καὶ οἱ Καισαρέων Ἕλληνες νικήσαντες παρὰ Νέρωνι τῆς πόλεως ἄρχειν τὰ τῆς κρίσεως ἐκόμισαν γράμματα, καὶ προσελάμβανεν τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ πόλεμος δωδεκάτῳ μὲν ἔτει τῆς Νέρωνος ἡγεμονίας ... οἱ γὰρ ἐν Καισαρείᾳ Ἰουδαῖοι, συναγωγὴν ἔχοντες παρὰ χωρίον, οὗ δεσπότης ἦν τις Ἕλλην Καισαρεύς, πολλάκις μὲν κτήσασθαι τὸν τόπον ἐσπούδασαν τιμὴν πολλαπλασίονα τῆς ἀξίας διδόντες.

<sup>1294</sup> *Ant.*, 20.183-189, vol. 4, pp. 305-308.

<sup>1295</sup> *Bel.* 2.307-308, vol. 6, pp. 212-213. For the conflict in Alexandria see further evidence in *CPJ*, vol. 2 (1960), pp. 228-233.



example of the Greeks (Ἑλλήνων) ‘who surpass every nation under the sun in nobility and fill such a wide domain and yet bow before the fasces of a Roman governor’.<sup>1296</sup> In the same speech, emphasizing the limited means of his people in comparison to those of the Greeks, Agrippas stated that Alexandria alone as a city was paying in a month more revenue to Rome than the whole of the Jewish people paid in a whole year, and urged them to start paying their taxes.<sup>1297</sup> At this point, one should observe that contrary to *De Bello* as to how the Great revolt began from Caesarea, the *Vita* provides a different explanation that the revolt started this time in Galilee, under the leadership of a certain Galilean *Jesus the son of ‘Sapphias (Σαπφίας),’* because King Agrippas installed idols inside his palace.<sup>1298</sup> The question here is which of the two accounts is more historical. Did this particular Jesus start the revolt, or was it the Greeks in Caesarea who were responsible for the Great Disasters which followed?

According to the *Vita*, despite King Agrippas’s efforts to pacify the revolutionary Galileans by drawing a realistic picture of their limits, the *Galileans* under the leadership of Jesus son of Sapphias attacked and slaughtered all the Greeks of Tiberias (ἀναιροῦσιν δ’ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντας τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας Ἑλληνας).<sup>1299</sup> This is when, according to *De Bello*, Jesus became the governor of Tiberias.<sup>1300</sup> It may be interesting to observe here that according to *John*,<sup>1301</sup> the disciples of Jesus went near Tiberias, but Jesus was not with them at that time. A multitude came from Tiberias to find Jesus, but were disappointed and left. My question here is whether the author of *John*,

---

<sup>1296</sup> *Bel.* 2.364-366, vol. 6, pp. 222-230: τί οὖν; ὑμεῖς πλουσιώτεροι Γαλατῶν, ἰσχυρότεροι Γερμανῶν, Ἑλλήνων συνετώτεροι ... χαλεπὸν τὸ δουλεύειν, ἐρεῖ τις. πόσῳ μᾶλλον Ἑλλησιν, οἱ τῶν ὑφ’ ἡλίῳ πάντων προύχοντες εὐγενεῖα καὶ τοσαύτην νεμόμενοι χώραν ἐξ Ῥωμαίων ὑπεῖκουσιν ῥάβδοις; trans. Williamson, *Josephus*, p. 150.

<sup>1297</sup> *Bel.* 2.364-407, vol. 6, pp. 222-230.

<sup>1298</sup> *Josephi Vita* 62-67, vol.4, p. 331-334;

<sup>1299</sup> *Josephi Vita*, 64-67, vol. 5, p. 332.

<sup>1300</sup> *Bell.* 2.600: (Ἰησοῦς τις υἱὸς Σαπφία, τότε ἄρχων τῆς Τιβεριάδος).

<sup>1301</sup> 6:22-23.

knowing about the slaughter of the Greeks in Tiberias, purposely kept Jesus away from this city. Coming back to *De Bello*, the Greeks (*Hellēnes*) of Scythopolis near Galilee also slaughtered the Jewish population of their city.<sup>1302</sup> The Greeks (*Hellēnes*) of Damascus, also eliminated "ten thousand and five hundred" Jews,<sup>1303</sup> while the Roman troops also attacked and slaughtered many Jews in Joppa.<sup>1304</sup> The revolutionaries slaughtered many Gentiles in a great number of villages and Greek or Hellenised cities, some of which were burnt and demolished to the ground.<sup>1305</sup> These events divided the population of all cities in Syria into two camps: the revolutionaries on one side and all the rest on the other.<sup>1306</sup>

Soon after his victories against the revolutionaries Vespasian was elected Emperor and his son Titus (later Emperor, 79-81 CE) succeeded his father in the leadership of the army. The Greeks of all areas affected by the revolution remained firmly by the side of the Romans. *De Bello* reports that the troops of the Greek Alexander "Epiphanēs" came to assist Titus's army, who by that time was besieging Jerusalem<sup>1307</sup> against the "suicidal maniacs."<sup>1308</sup> *De Bello* also states that the famine inside the city was so severe that a mother murdered, cooked and cannibalised her own child, something that became known to the Romans and made them despise the Jews.<sup>1309</sup> The problem here is that there is no

---

<sup>1302</sup> *Bel.* 7.364-366, vol. 6, p. 616-617: τί οὖν τοὺς ἐν Σκυθοπόλει φῶμεν; ἡμῖν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι διὰ τοὺς Ἑλληνας πολεμεῖν ἐτόλμησαν, ἀλλ' οὐ μετὰ τῶν συγγενῶν ἡμῶν Ῥωμαίους ἀμύνεσθαι. πολὺ τοίνυν ὤνησεν αὐτοὺς ἢ πρὸς ἐκείνους εὖνοια καὶ πίστις· ὑπ' αὐτῶν μέντοι πανοικεσία πικρῶς κατεφονεύθησαν ταύτην τῆς συμμαχίας ἀπολαβόντες ἀμοιβήν.

<sup>1303</sup> *Bel.* 2.559-561, vol. 6, p. 255.

<sup>1304</sup> *Bel.*, 2.507-509, vol. 6, pp. 246-247.

<sup>1305</sup> *Bel.* 2.458-460, vol. 6, p. 238. (eg. Philadelphia, Eusevonitis, Gerasa, Pella, Scythopolis, Gadara, Hippos, Gaulanitis, Kedasa (near Tyre), Ptolemais, Gaba, Caesarea, Sebaste, Ascalon, Anthedon and Gaza).

<sup>1306</sup> *Bel.* 2.462, vol. 6, p. 239: καὶ πᾶσα πόλις εἰς δύο διήρητο στρατόπεδα. That ancient 'Syria' actually referred to most lands included in the former Antiochian Kingdom and was much larger than modern Syria in terms of border.

<sup>1307</sup> *Bel.* 5.460-465, vol. 6, pp. 497-498.

<sup>1308</sup> *Bel.* 4.371-376, vol. 6, pp. 395-396.

<sup>1309</sup> *Bel.* 6.201-219, vol. 6, pp. 539-541.

explanation in the text as to how the Romans came to know this, and the *Lamentations* which praise the Nazirai for their purity, also report that certain "compassionate" women cooked and ate their own children.<sup>1310</sup> Once more the question here is whether one of the above texts is based on another, and whether "Josephus's" determination to defame the revolutionaries was such that he did not hesitate, in some cases, to concoct such fiction.

Also according to *De Bello*, during the course of the Great Revolt, the Greeks and Romans massacred much of the population of the Jewish district of Alexandria until they surrendered and begged for mercy. The Roman governor of the city, who stood on the side of the Greeks, was Tiberius Alexander, a Jew and nephew of Philo the scholar.<sup>1311</sup> At this point one should take into account that the Slavonic *De Bello* names Tiberius Alexander as a persecutor of Christians,<sup>1312</sup> and this raises further questions on whether the Christians participated in the revolts.

Another Greek city, Antioch, was not immune to this ferocious conflict, but *De Bello* states that a multitude of the *Hellēnes* there, were followers of Judaism.<sup>1313</sup> This appears to be confirmed by the *Acts*, which state that a certain mixed Greek speaking community in Antioch was the first to adopt the Greek term 'Christian' to define itself.<sup>1314</sup> However, one should also observe that regardless of any ethnic Greeks becoming Jewish, *De Bello* clearly remarks that the conflict

---

<sup>1310</sup> The Hebrew text of *Lamentations* does not have Nazirai. Instead it mentions "princes," see *Holy*, p. 854. *Sept. Lamentations* 4.7: Ἐκαθαρίωθησαν ναζιραῖοι αὐτῆς ὑπὲρ χιόνα, ἔλαμψαν ὑπὲρ γάλα; 4.10: Χεῖρες γυναικῶν οἰκτιρμόνων ἤψησαν τὰ παῖδιά αὐτῶν, ἐγενήθησαν εἰς βρῶσιν.

<sup>1311</sup> *Bel.* 2.487-498, vol. 6, p. 243-245. Cf. Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs*, pp. 185-190, on the alliance of Tiberius Julius Alexander to the Hellenes and the Romans.

<sup>1312</sup> *Slavonic Version*, pp. 269-270.

<sup>1313</sup> *Bel.* 7.43-45, vol. 6, p. 577: καὶ συνεχώρησαν αὐτοῖς ἐξ Ἰσοῦ τῆς πόλεως τοῖς Ἑλλησι μετέχειν... ἀεὶ τε προσαγόμενοι ταῖς θρησκευταῖς πολὺ πλῆθος Ἑλλήνων. For the conflict in Antioch see 7.45 ff., vol. 6, pp. 577 ff.

<sup>1314</sup> Eg. *Acts* 11:26, 26:28.

there was between Greeks and Jews. There are no indications that any Greeks sided with the revolutionaries. The pretext for the conflict in Antioch was that a Jew who was not of the side of the revolutionaries accused some of his own people and his own father of conspiring to take over the city. In swift response, the Greeks (*Hellēnes*) arrested those accused as conspirators and burned them alive. The rest of the Jews, according to the orders of Antiochos "Epiphanēs," who almost appears to come back from the dead, were forced not to keep the Sabbath and were asked to sacrifice 'according to the *Hellēnic* rites' in order to prove their loyalty to the authorities of the city. Just like in the times of the Maccabees martyrs, those who refused to sacrifice were executed. Soon after that the Jews of Antioch were accused of burning parts of the city and their persecution continued.<sup>1315</sup> Regardless of the accuracy of the above accounts provided by "Josephus," it appears that the Galileans and other Israelite revolutionaries did not have any Greeks on their side. It is this kind of background in the Greek-Israelite relations, which must have influenced "Josephus" to criticize the Greeks for not respecting the truth when they wrote history.<sup>1316</sup> *Contra Apionem* also attacked the Greeks for praising the sexual relations between their gods and men, for incest,<sup>1317</sup> and for having thousands of books, which contradicted each other. "Josephus" proudly declared that, contrary to the Greeks, the Jews only had twenty-two books, all superior to any of the works of the Greeks because they were accurately written by Prophets. "Flavius Josephus" went as far as to state that if all the books of the Greeks were destroyed it would be no loss at all.<sup>1318</sup> The problem here is how could one

---

<sup>1315</sup> Josephus, *Bel.* 7.44-62, vol. 6, pp. 577-579; 7.45 (αἰεὶ τε προσαγόμενοι ταῖς θρησκευαίαις πολὺν πλῆθος Ἑλλήνων); 7.50-52 (καὶ τοῦ μεμισηκέναι τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνη τεκμήριον ἐμπαρέχειν οἰόμενος τὸ ἐπιθύειν ὥσπερ νόμος ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν).

<sup>1316</sup> *Bel.* 1. 16, vol. 6, p. 6: τιμάσθω δὴ παρ' ἡμῖν τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀληθές, ἐπεὶ παρ' Ἑλλήσιν ἡμέλῃται.

<sup>1317</sup> *Contra Apionem*, 2.236-75, vol. 5, pp. 90-95.

<sup>1318</sup> *Contra Apionem*, 1.37-46, vol. 5, p. 8, 1.45: ὁ τίς ἂν ὑπομείνειεν Ἑλλήνων ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ; ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀφανισθῆναι συγγράμματα τὴν τυχούσαν ὑποστήσεται βλάβην. On Josephus's perceptions of Greeks see also T. Rajak, 'Greeks and

explain that a highly Hellenised Roman world with a massive Greek presence lost all of its own historical records and accounts for much of the period "Josephus" was writing about,<sup>1319</sup> but preserved in numerous copies only the works of this anti-Hellenic "Flavius Josephus"? Did the Greeks do so out of admiration for the ancestors of the first Christians, the Jews?

Contrary to the general assumption, apart from the collection of Gentile references to the Jews preserved by "Flavius Josephus," very little is known about BCE Jews or other Israelites from any independent Greek or other Gentile sources. I have tried to investigate every single Greek reference to the Jews collected and analysed by Stern. The oldest such reference which has been accepted by Stern as deriving from a lost work of Hecataeus of Abdēra, is in fact a fragment written/revised by Photius or another CE author, something that Stern failed to mention.<sup>1320</sup> It is also widely accepted that a Greek student of Aristotle called Theophrastus (c.370-288/5 BCE) praised the Jews as a *genos* of philosophers. The problem here is that this passage has been "preserved" by

---

Barbarians in Josephus,' in *Hellenism in the land of Israel*, eds J. Collin and G. Sterling (Indiana, 2001), pp. 244-262.

<sup>1319</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>1320</sup> Stern, vol. 1, p. 22; Cf. Diodorus Siculus (*fl.* 1st c. BCE), *Bibliotheca*, vol. 4 (1970), pp. 180-183; Photios, *Bibliotheca* 244, pp. 542-43 (ed. Henry p. 380). Stern in his reproduction of Photius through the edition of Diodorus's *Bibliotheca historica*, did not include the introductory section written by Photius who clearly states that because he was about to examine the Jewish war (Great Revolt), he wanted to say first a few things about who the Jews were, where they came from, and what their laws were about; All scholars I examined accept Stern, e.g. Bob Becking, 'The Hellenistic period and ancient Israel: three preliminary statements,' in Grabbe, *Moses*, pp. 78-90 at p. 88, again, Becking is based on Diod. 40.3 as presented by Stern. Scholars base their dating of an early *Pentateuch* on this statement, which is the first available; Philip Davies, 'Judeans in Egypt: Hebrew and Greek stories,' in Grabbe, *Moses*, pp. 108-128, is also based on Hecataeus in Diodorus 40.3 (Stern); Also see P. Van der Horst, *Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context, Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritism, Hellenism, and Christianity* (Mohr Siebeck, 2006), p. 85; Stern, *Appendix* (1984), pp. 5-7, also accepts that *Contra Apionem* 1.174 quoted an original Choerilus of Samos (5th c. BCE) who mentioned certain Solyma mountains in Syria but Stern questions this evidence in the sense that it could be an alteration of the Homeric Solymi in *Iliad* 6.184 which had nothing to do with Syria. Also see Stern, vol. 1, pp. 1-2: Herodotus knows nothing about the Jews. He mentions some Syrians who practised circumcision, and Stern assumes that this was with reference to the Jews, but this practise was widely spread in the Middle East.

"Porphyry," (c.232-305 CE) against whom the Church and soon after the Byzantine State too, issued decrees, ordering the people of the Empire to destroy all his works.<sup>1321</sup> My question here is whether this "Porphyry" which survived is a Christian version, published in order to take advantage of the original Porphyry's popularity, and altered in accordance to the taste of editors who specialised in the production of pseudepigrapha. This hypothesis could provide an explanation as to why this same text, which claims that Theophrastus praised the Jews, also praises both the Essenes and Josephus.<sup>1322</sup> Though I am not in a position to proceed to a further detailed examination on "Porphyry's" authenticity, for this falls beyond the scope of my thesis, I simply want to raise the case here that not all of what we see under his name may be authentic. In my opinion, the fact that *Contra Apionem* also quotes this "Theophrastus," points to the same direction, namely that what "Theophrastus" said about the Jews may be a fabrication.<sup>1323</sup> Interestingly, the author of *Contra Apionem* states that another student of Aristotle, Clearchos, also testified that his teacher expressed admiration for the Jews, and that a learned Jewish man called Hyperohidēs, was *Hellenic* not only in language, but also in his 'psyche.'<sup>1324</sup> Again, the problem here is that apart from Josephus nobody else appears to know anything about what Aristotle said about the Jews, or who this Hyperohidēs was.

The scholars who claim that the Greek Megasthenēs (c.350-290 BCE) declared that the Jews were one of the most philosophical people of the world, should also observe that this quotation was preserved by Clement of Alexandria, who

---

<sup>1321</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>1322</sup> Porphyry, *De Abstinencia*, 2.26, ed. A. Nauck, *Porphyrii philosophi Platonici opuscula selecta* (Leipzig, 1860), pp. 97-98 (philosophers, Essenes). Cf. Stern, vol. 1, pp. 8-11, accepts this as historical.

<sup>1323</sup> *Contra Apionem* 1.166-167, vol. 5, p. 76.

<sup>1324</sup> Levine, *Judaism*, p. xi, with reference to Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, 1.176-83, vol. 5, pp. 32-33: Ἑλληνικὸς ἦν οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ.

is a Christian and not a Greek Gentile source.<sup>1325</sup> The scholars who claim that Hermippus of Smyrna (fl. c.3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE) had written that Pythagoras (fl. 6<sup>th</sup> c. BCE) was inspired by Jewish and Thracian traditions should also observe that this comes from *Contra Apionem*,<sup>1326</sup> and not from any other Greek Gentile source. Interestingly, this information that Pythagoras learned from the Hebrews has also been "preserved" in another work of "Porphyry" who in turn claimed that he was aware of the Hebrew teachers of Pythagoras from a (now lost) work of Antonius Diogenes (fl. c. 100CE).<sup>1327</sup>

Contrary to the above favourable views of the Jews, "Josephus" also presented negative perceptions of the Jews expressed in a work (now lost) of Apīōn (fl. 1<sup>st</sup> c. CE), who claimed that the Jews took an oath that they will not conduct friendly relations with non-Jews, especially with Greeks and Egyptians. On the contrary, "Josephus" claimed that the Jews had absolutely nothing against the Greeks, and that relations between Israelites and Greeks were often so good that many Greeks became Jewish.<sup>1328</sup> The first problem with this report is that, it does not mention any Jews becoming Gentiles by accepting the religion of the Greeks, thus it does not indicate that the relation between the two was on equal terms. The second problem here is that this same "Josephus" expressed biased anti-Hellenic views and was hostile to the Greeks in a number of instances examined previously. Therefore, one should question whether "Josephus" is

---

<sup>1325</sup> Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1.15.72.5, vol. 1, p. 46; J. Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and Synagogue, a study in the origin of antisemitism* (London, 1934), p. 14: "Theophrastus, Clearchus and Hermippus, writers of the third century, considered Jews as a race of philosophers". Cf. Rajak, *Translation*, p. 72, on Megasthenēs and Clearchus of Soli who held the opinion that the Jews were followers of certain Indian customs.

<sup>1326</sup> *Contra Apionem*, 1.162-165, vol. 5, pp. 30-31; see also idem 1.165-218, pp. 31-39, for more ancient Greeks who praised the Jews.

<sup>1327</sup> Porphyry, *Vita Pythagorae*, 11.7, ed. A. Nauck, *Porphyrii philosophi Platonici opuscula tria* (Leipzig, 1860), p. 18.

<sup>1328</sup> *Contra Apionem* 2.121-124, vol. 5, p. 69: πρὸς δευτέραν Ἀπίωνι μυθολογίαν καταψεύσασθαι τινα καὶ ὄρκον ἡμῶν ὡς ὁμνούντων ... μηδενὶ εὐνοήσειν ἄλλοφύλῳ, μάλιστα δὲ Ἑλλήσιν... τῶν Ἑλλήνων δὲ πλεον τοῖς τόποις ἢ τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἀφεστήκαμεν, ὥστε μηδεμίαν ἡμῖν εἶναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐχθρὰν μηδὲ ζηλοτυπίαν. τούναντίον μέντοι πολλοὶ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους νόμους συνέβησαν εἰσελθεῖν.

stating the truth when he says numerous Greeks became Jewish. Given the reputation of the Jews instigating repeated revolts and fighting Holy Wars against infidels during the first century, how many Greeks and Romans were eager to approach Judaism and/or the Jewish oriented Galilean Christian movement? Eventually, the Greek world became Christian, but my question here is whether this change started in the first century, or whether it was gradual and began at a later stage. However, it may not be an easy task to investigate what exactly has happened to the ancient Greek world to accept writers like the anti-Hellenic Josephus and *Maccabees II* and *IV* as highly important.

One of the few BCE Gentiles who appears to know the Jews is Strabo (c.64 BCE-c.21CE), already mentioned in the second Chapter. Strabo is often quoted that he praised the Jews who followed Moses for their wisdom and justice, but it is less known that he also stated that they were governed by tyrants, that they were bands of robbers who harassed their own people as well as their Gentile neighbours, but always respected their acropolis, meaning their Temple in Jerusalem.<sup>1329</sup> It seems that there is controversy in every single important issue regarding the interaction between Greeks and Jews/Early Christians. Apart from the above contradictions, there is also no agreement among scholars whether Judea or Galilee were significantly Hellenised any time before the second century CE.<sup>1330</sup> It is likely that there was little Greek presence inside

---

<sup>1329</sup> Strabo, *Geographica* 16.2.35-37, vol. 2, p. 1061: (35) σωφρόνως ζῶντας, (37) δικαιοπραγούντες καὶ θεοσεβείς. The author of the *Antiquities* also quotes some "lost" parts from Strabo's *Geographica* that the Judeans were of Egyptian origin, were settled in Cyrene, were given rights by the rulers of Egypt, and were very strong in Egypt: 14.115-18, vol. 3, pp. 260-261.

<sup>1330</sup> Sanders, 'Jesus,' pp. 36-39, Sanders dismantles the argument that the Jews of the Palestine were Hellenised to a great extent. There is no such evidence for this, neither from the sources nor from archaeology. Most did not know Greek at all. As Josephus remarks, "his countrymen did not wish to acquire foreign languages and culture" (*Ant.* 20.263-6, vol. 4, pp. 319-320). The hellenisation of the region took place much later, after the Bar Kochba war. Sanders attacks the scholars who use evidence from later centuries to draw conclusions for the first. He attacks the "fantasy of Hellenisation;" p. 7, no pagan temples found in Sepphoris by archaeologists; pp.18-19,



these areas during the first century.

However, one of the main arguments often employed in explaining that the Christians had nothing to do with the repeated, long lasting and devastating wars against the Greeks in the Middle East during the first century, is that the Church from the very beginning included the Greeks.<sup>1331</sup> It should be clear here that this theory is based solely upon the interpretation of specific reports provided by the *New Testament*, for there is no other Gentile source to confirm that there were Greeks in the Church during the first century. Therefore, it is imperative to examine each one of these NT reports in order to see who exactly these Greeks were.

It should also be clear that in the first three *Gospels*, there is only one single reference to anyone named as Greek. *Mark* 7:26 names a woman who approached Jesus as Greek (*Hellēnis*). She asked him to deliver her daughter from a demon, but Jesus answered that 'there were others to be fed,' meaning his own people, and it was not good to feed the 'dogs' (referring to her and her daughter) before his own people. The Greek woman accepted that she would wait like a dog for something to fall under the table.<sup>1332</sup> After that, Jesus

---

Sanders argues that Herod did not built an amphitheater in Jerusalem, but only in Caesarea. p. 22, Sebaste (Samaria) had a large Temple dedicated to Emperor Augustus (Sebastos is the Greek translation of Augustus). For an opposite view see Stanley E. Porter, 'Jesus and the use of Greek in Galilee', in Chilton-Evans, pp. 123-154 at 153-154 (concludes that lower Galilee was Hellenised already by the times of Jesus). Also see Clark, 'Early,' p. 15, Sepphoris did have a theater, hippodrome and pagan temples. p. 17, Tiberias sided with Vespasian during the Great Revolt (ref. Jos., Life 9, 40); p. 20, for the Greek language in Galilee even before Alexander the Great, and the inscriptions of Galilee which were predominantly in Greek, from the 3rd c. BCE onwards.

<sup>1331</sup> Martin Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, trans. S.G.F. Brandon, *The Formation of Christian Dogma* (London, 1957), pp. 7-8, on Paul as the founder of Gentile Christianity, the Greeks who welcomed him and the process of the Hellenisation of the Church.

<sup>1332</sup> *Mark* 7:26-30: ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει· καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαίμονιον ἐκβάλῃ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ, Ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα, οὐ γάρ ἐστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν. ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὑπάγε, ἐξελήλυθεν ἐκ τῆς

performed a miracle, and delivered the daughter of the *Hellēnis* from the demon.<sup>1333</sup> It appears that the Early Christians in their every day language referred to the Gentiles as dogs, for it is not only the above passage which points to this conclusion. Jesus in *Matthew* advised “give not that which is holy to the dogs” to support his argument that the non-baptised were dogs and pigs.<sup>1334</sup> John Chrysostom who examined the above texts in *Matthew* and *Mark*, also concluded that the Early Christians called the Gentiles “dogs.”<sup>1335</sup> Paul in the *Philippians*<sup>1336</sup> also talked about infidel dogs, next to the evil workers and the uncircumcised, at a time when he boasted that himself and his followers were properly circumcised. The *Apocalypsis*<sup>1337</sup> also attacks the infidel “dogs,” along with the adulterers and the murderers. My question here is whether this type of language indicates that such authors were moderate, rather than extremist. Should this evidence be discarded? Is this evidence thin and not strong enough, to reveal that some Early Christians also had a dark side?

*Matthew*<sup>1338</sup> also mentions the same story with the woman and her daughter, though he calls them *Canaanite*<sup>1339</sup> dogs,<sup>1340</sup> not Greek. The third problem is that apart from naming this woman as Greek, *Mark* also states that she was

---

θυγατρός σου τὸ δαιμόνιον. In King James’s Version of *The Holy Bible* τῷ γένει is translated as ‘nation’ and Ἑλληνίς as ‘Greek.’ In *Matthew* 15:21-28, a woman who asked Jesus to deliver her daughter from a deamon is called ‘Hananaia’. Also See Paul J. Achtemeier, ‘Jesus and the Disciples as Miracle Workers in the Apocryphal New Testament’ in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (Notre Dame, Ind., 1976), pp. 149-186, on the importance of magic in the early centuries, and the impact the Christian miracles stories had; The Church must have been able to attract some Gentiles because of these stories.

<sup>1333</sup> *Mark* 7:24-30.

<sup>1334</sup> *The Didachē* in *Apostolic Fathers*, 9.5, vol. 1, p. 322. *Matthew* 7:6: “do not give what is holy to dogs; and do not throw your pearls before swine.”

<sup>1335</sup> John Chrysostom, *De Chananæa*, PG 52, 449-460, at 457i: Οἱ ἔθνικοὶ κύνες ἐκλήθησαν.

<sup>1336</sup> 3:2-3: Βλέπετε τοὺς κύνας, βλέπετε τοὺς κακοὺς ἐργάτας, βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή.

<sup>1337</sup> 22:15.

<sup>1338</sup> 15:21-28. Burkill, ‘Syrophoenician,’ p. 28, believes that *Matthew* based his story on *Mark*.

<sup>1339</sup> 15:22.

<sup>1340</sup> 15:26.

Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει. The phrase τῷ γένει seems to indicate the birthplace of that woman, namely Syrophoenicia. Indeed, a few lines above this, in 7:24, *Mark* states that Jesus met this woman close to the border of Tyre, that is in Syrophoenicia, meaning that this woman was native. In the *Acts*, a Jew named Akylas who acted in Corinth and also lived in Italy is called Ποντικὸς τῷ γένει, because Pontos in the Black Sea was either his or his parents place of birth.<sup>1341</sup> Hence the phrase Ποντικὸς τῷ γένει means ‘from Pontus’ in the sense that this man was either born or raised there, but the problem is that a birthplace does not appear to be the only definite indication of ethnic origin. Therefore, one may argue that apart from Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει, *Mark* could have used *Hellēnis* as a term inclusive of an ethnic sense, to indicate that she was an ethnic Greek woman, who was born or lived in Syrophoenicia.<sup>1342</sup> However, there is further primary evidence, which comes to contradict this view. Papyrus 45<sup>1343</sup> which has been dated by scholars to the first half of the third century and is the earliest available papyrus which contains this passage, does not mention τῷ γένει,<sup>1344</sup> meaning that in this version this woman could be seen both as Greek and Syrophoenician in ethnic terms, perhaps of mixed race. This implication regarding the ethnic identity of this “Greek” woman is not the last. A Sinaitic Syrian version of *Mark* does not call the woman as *Hellēnis*, *Syrophoenician*, or *Canaanite* but only as “Aramean.” To add further difficulties in defining the identity of this *Hellēnis*, scholars are not in agreement as to whether a certain spelling of “Aramean” actually means “widow,” or whether the term Aramean

---

<sup>1341</sup> *Acts* 18:2: καὶ εὗρόν τινα Ἰουδαῖον ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν, Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει.

<sup>1342</sup> There is one more passage in *Acts* 11:19-20, which also supports the view that Συροφοινίκισσα indicated a place of birth: there were some Jews called ‘Cypriots’ and ‘Cyreneans’ who initially preached only Jews about Christ, but also Hellēnes. It is evident that the ethnic origin of those preachers was Jewish, but the birth place of some of them was Cyprus and Kyrēnē, and that is why they were called Cypriots and Cyreneans. Burkill, ‘Syrophoenician,’ p. 24, accepts her ethnic origin as Syrophoenician.

<sup>1343</sup> Also known as *Papyrus Chester Beatty I*.

<sup>1344</sup> Comfort-Barrett, p. 168. In *Mark* 7:26, ed. Nestle–Aland, there is no other version of Ἑλληνίς in a manuscript.

was used with reference to ethnicity.<sup>1345</sup> Some scholars are convinced that the *Syriac*<sup>1346</sup> version of *Mark* 7:26 means that "that woman was a widow from the area of Tyre of Phoenicia."<sup>1347</sup>

The question remains as to which of the above three versions (*Syriac Mark*, *Greek Mark* and *Matthew*) contains the earliest tradition of the text? However, the fact that the Church opted to preserve and reproduce this particular version, means that the Church accepted that this particular "dog" was Greek and Syrophoenician in some sense.<sup>1348</sup>

Although some argue that Jesus finally welcomed the infidel Greek dog into the Church by performing the miracle, some others may find it very hard to believe that this miracle ever happened.

Having finished with the entire *Synopsis* regarding its inclusion of the Greeks in the Church, one should also examine that there is mention of Greeks in the fourth *Gospel* in three instances contained within two different passages. In the first passage, Jesus Christ said to some Judeans that he would go to a place they could not follow him. Those who heard Jesus asked themselves whether he meant that he would go abroad to the Greeks (Ἕλληνας) in order to teach the Greeks.<sup>1349</sup> The question here is whether *John* presents a different Jesus to the one we have seen in the first Chapter in *Matthew*, where he advised his

---

<sup>1345</sup> Burkill, 'Syrophoenician,' p. 23, citing V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London, 1952), pp. 349-350, which seems to be a wrong reference. Cf. B. Witherington, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Michigan, 2001), p. 21, who finds it difficult to explain the origins of the use of the term Syrophoenician.

<sup>1346</sup> *Codex Palimpsestus Sinaiticus*.

<sup>1347</sup> Wilson-Kiraz, p. 310. *Syriac* 7:27 also mentions the dogs.

<sup>1348</sup> Also see Marcus I. Boas, *God, Christ and Pagan* (London, 1961<sup>3</sup>), p. 139: 'here certainly, Jesus's' attitude is hardly one of brotherly love'; Cf. Brandon, *Jesus*, p. 172; Zeitlin, *Rise*, p. 159, for Zeitlin, the reaction of Jesus to the Canaanite woman was an act of patriotism.

<sup>1349</sup> *John* 7:35: εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, Ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐχ εὐρῆσομεν αὐτόν; μὴ εἰς τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων μέλλει πορεύεσθαι καὶ διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας;

followers to avoid any contact with the Gentiles, but similar to the Jesus who only after resurrection, advised to preach the Gentiles. Therefore, once more one should question here which one of these two Jesuses appears to fit into historical context? The next reference to Greeks in *John* is often used as evidence to prove that Jesus himself preached to the Greeks<sup>1350</sup> who visited Jerusalem for pilgrimage during the celebrations of the Jewish Passover. The indication here is that some Greeks expressed interest for Judaism, a *religio licita*.<sup>1351</sup> According to *John*, some of these Greeks tried to meet Jesus. When Jesus was told by the Apostles Philip and Andreas that these Greeks wanted to visit him, he replied: 'The hour is come, for the Son of man to be glorified' and then he preached to the Greeks. With this response to Philip and Andreas, *John* emphasized the importance of Jesus, for even the foreigner Greeks came to him. The problem here is that these references to the Greeks in *John* can hardly be accepted as historical. Most scholars discard the whole of *John* in their search for a historical Jesus, and the additional problem here is that "Josephus" as well as the *Maccabees I, II* and *III* also present similar fabricated stories that a number of Greeks and Romans recognised the importance of the Jews. In this sense, *John* appears to be a continuator of the same tradition. This conclusion also finds strong support in the fact that the Syriac *John* in both *S Codex Palimpsestus Sinaiticus* and *C Codex Nitriensis Curetonianus*, does not know of any Greeks who came to Jesus, nor it questions whether Jesus had the intention to go abroad to the Greeks. Instead of any Greeks, the Syriac text mentions Arameans.<sup>1352</sup> In my

---

<sup>1350</sup> *John* 12:20–23: Ἦσαν δὲ Ἕλληνές τινες ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ· οὗτοι οὖν προσῆλθον Φίλιππῳ τῷ ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἡρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Κύριε, θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν. ἔρχεται ὁ Φίλιππος καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἀνδρέᾳ· ἔρχεται Ἀνδρέας καὶ Φίλιππος καὶ λέγουσιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκρίνεται αὐτοῖς λέγων, Ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

<sup>1351</sup> D. R. Edwards, *Religion and Power* (New York, 1996), p. 22, from the very beginning when Judea came under the Romans, Judaism was recognised as *religio licita*.

<sup>1352</sup> Wilson-Kiraz, p. 750: *John* 7:35 : Is he going then to teach the descendents of the Arameans?"; p. 790: 12:20 "And there were some Arameans who had gone up to worship at the feast." Also see George A. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels*, 4 vols. (Leiden, 1996), vol. 1, preface, p. 9: Syriac Fathers of the early centuries produced six different versions of the

opinion, this difference indicates that the Greek version of *John* mentions Greeks because it was written for the conversion of Greeks in their own language, while the Syriac version mentions Arameans because it was published in Aramaic, aiming at the conversion of the Aramean speaking peoples. Also in my opinion, this difference betrays a specific technique used by rabbis to infiltrate and try to convert the minds of the infidels: by bringing the Greeks and the Arameans into the story, this increased the chances to convert and transform them to a flock that would follow Jesus and his priests.

Having examined the "Greeks" in the fourth Gospel too, could one now come to the safe conclusion that the *Gospels* refer to historical and not fictional Greeks in the Church?

The next work in the *NT*, the *Acts*, refer to Greeks in about ten different incidents. In one of them, which is well known, Paul was accused by traditionalist Jews that he defiled the Temple because he tried to bring Greeks inside it.<sup>1353</sup> The infidels who dared enter the Temple had to face the capital punishment.<sup>1354</sup> As a result, the Jews attacked Paul and his life was saved thanks to Roman soldiers who supported him because he was a Roman citizen.<sup>1355</sup> The first problem here is that Paul appears to take the Greeks to the Temple, and not to Jesus. Therefore, where is the indication here that Paul brought Greeks into the Christian Church and not into Judaism? We have also

---

*New Testament* in the vernacular language; p. 10, Kiraz brought together the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshitta and Harklean versions; Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London, 1990), pp. 408-419, although no direct copy of the original *Diatessaron* is extant, there exist a number of variants in different languages (eg an Arabic translation of it, altered to resemble standard Gospels, the Persian etc); p. 410, some argue that the first *Gospels* which appeared in Syriac derived from *Diatessaron*.

<sup>1353</sup> *Acts* 21:28: Ἑλληνας εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον. (this entire passage does not exist in a papyrus fragment)

<sup>1354</sup> See A. M. Rabello, *The Jews in the Roman Empire: Legal Problems from Herod to Justinian* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 28-32.

<sup>1355</sup> *Acts* 21:27-35. (the entire passage does not exist in a papyrus fragment)

seen previous reports about Paul's arrest in Caesarea during the fights between Greeks and Jews, and his execution in Rome. We have also seen that Paul himself in the *Acts* declared that he was a Zealot of God.<sup>1356</sup> The case that Paul was a proper rabbi who stood on the side of his Jewish people, is confirmed by another story. When he arrived at Derbē and Lystra, he circumcised a certain Timotheos, whose mother was Jewish and his father was Greek.<sup>1357</sup> In other words, Paul made this young man a proper Jew, not an uncircumcised Christian. This man was Jewish by birth, because he had a Jewish mother. Therefore, where exactly is a Greek who became a Christian here? Why should this be regarded as one more example of a Greek who joined the Church from an early stage?

The *Acts* in seven instances repeat that Paul and his disciples preached in Asia Minor and Greece in a number of synagogues to both Jews and Greeks.<sup>1358</sup> One should observe that in almost every trip Paul faced the opposition of some or all the Jews who were in the synagogues, but was hardly opposed by any Greeks.<sup>1359</sup> My question here is whether this is historical or is yet another

---

<sup>1356</sup> *Acts* 22:3.

<sup>1357</sup> *Acts* 16:1-3. It does exist in Papyrus 45, dated in the first half of 2nd c. See Comfort-Barrett, p. 200.

<sup>1358</sup> *Acts* 19:10: πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν..., Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας; 14:1: ἐν Ἰκονίῳ... εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ... οὕτως ὥστε πιστεῦσαι Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος; 17:4: τῶν τε σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολὺ γυναικῶν; 20:21: Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλήσιν τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν; 17:1-6; 17:10-12: εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπήεσαν... πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπίστευσαν, καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων γυναικῶν τῶν εὐσχημόνων καὶ ἀνδρῶν; 18:4: ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον, ἔπειθ' ἐν τε Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας.

<sup>1359</sup> *Acts* 13:14-43: Paul preaches *Israelites* in a synagogue in Piciidian Antioch. In 13:43, Judeans and proselytes follow Paul and Barnabas. In 13:45, the Judeans opposed and cursed Paul and in 13:48 the Gentiles believed. In 13:50 the Judeans expelled Paul and Barnabas from the city. In the synagogue of Iconium, *Acts* 14:1-5, Paul converted Judeans and Greeks, but those Judeans who did not believe, together with Gentiles attacked and stoned Paul and his followers. Then in Lystra (14:8-18) Paul made a miracle and persuaded the people not to make sacrifices to Zeus. In 14:19, the text brings the reader back to Piciidian Antioch, where the Judeans dragged Paul outside the city, after they stoned him and considered him dead. In Corinth, Paul meet the Judean Aquila who was expelled from Rome during the reign of

proselytizing technique, in the sense that in this way the author of the *Acts* made his hero more attractive to his Greek readership. One more problem in accepting the historicity of the above reports of the *Acts* about Greeks, is that out of the seven instances of Greeks, there is documentary evidence in papyri only for the two of them, in a single papyrus.<sup>1360</sup>

The other problem in testing the historicity of these reports is that Paul appears to be preaching for the resurrected rather than for the pre-resurrected Jesus. I have also analysed in the first Chapter that the resurrected Jesus was unknown in the earliest texts of *Matthew* and *Mark*, and the question remains as to when exactly the first resurrection stories were published. There is no textual evidence that the first such stories appeared before the Great Revolt, unless one accepts that the *Acts* and some of the *Epistles* were written before and not after the Revolt. At this point I would like to return again to the first Chapter, to the work of those scholars who claim that the *Acts* and "Paul" are products of the second rather than the first century. If not, and they do report about a historical Paul who was active before the Great Revolt, then one should question what exactly this historical rabbi Paul was trying to do when Galilee and other parts of Israel were fighting in the revolts? Was he on the side of the Holy Warriors or against them? Is it possible that a historical rabbi Paul sided with the revolutionaries, and travelled abroad in order to find Diaspora Jewish and possibly Gentile support for the Messianic movement against Rome? Could this explain why a number of Jews in the Diaspora synagogues did not want to listen to Paul and his Messianic message, fearing the consequences? At this point I believe that one should pay some attention to the *Romans*, chapter 11, where "Paul" begins with the declaration that he is a proper Israelite of the tribe

---

Claudius, preached Judeans and Greeks in the synagogue, and all Judeans turned against him (18:1-12). In Ephesus the believers to Artemis turned against Paul's men (19:28-29).

<sup>1360</sup> *Acts* 17:1-6 and 14:1 survive in Pap. 45: see Comfort-Barrett, pp. 198, 201. The earliest Greek manuscript which contains the *Acts* is *Codex Sinaiticus*.



of Benjamin<sup>1361</sup> and talks about violence and disasters in Israel,<sup>1362</sup> which profited the Gentiles of the world.<sup>1363</sup> Then Paul explained to the Gentiles that he became an Apostle to save/accept some of them,<sup>1364</sup> because their inclusion/acceptance would bring "life from the dead."<sup>1365</sup> My question here is whether this "acceptance" of the new blood of the Gentiles would bring hope to Israel (meaning allies against Rome), or whether this was written at a much later stage, after the repeated depopulation Israel suffered in the second century. At that later time was there any need to re-create the flock with new sheep, or else face extinction? One should also question why exactly "Paul" comes back to his fellow Israelites to whom he previously stated that he was a genuine Jew, to explain to them that without a sufficient number of Gentiles joining Israel, Israel could not be saved?<sup>1366</sup> In light of these observations, I believe that Paul's mission to the Greeks deserves to be re-examined within the historical context of the Galilean Messianic revolts. In the course of time this mission might have been altered and interpreted as spiritual, but its historical beginnings could have been very different and closely related to the political struggle for the survival of Israel.

The *Acts* also refer to *Hellenists* in three passages. In the first instance the *Hellenists* were Christians active at the time when Judas the Galilean instigated the insurrection,<sup>1367</sup> and when "his men beat the Apostles."<sup>1368</sup> During a Church

---

<sup>1361</sup> 11:1.

<sup>1362</sup> 11:7.

<sup>1363</sup> 11:12.

<sup>1364</sup> 11:13-14.

<sup>1365</sup> 11:15.

<sup>1366</sup> 11.25-26. Note here that the latest Nestle stops at 21, meaning that it has indications that 21-36 does not exist in certain early manuscripts or that it is a later explanation.

<sup>1367</sup> 5:37.

<sup>1368</sup> 5:40.

meeting the Hellenists accused the Hebrew Christians for not instructing<sup>1369</sup> their widows to serve in the common meal in the synagogue.<sup>1370</sup> This incident is often wrongly mistranslated that the Hebrews neglected to distribute food to their widows,<sup>1371</sup> but in my opinion, the Greek text is clear that the Hellenists complained to the Hebrews that their widows were not serving the table, as they should. Because of this, the Hellenists complained that they wasted their time, waiting to be served, and decided to do this work themselves. This is why they elected seven deacons for this reason. Interestingly, all those deacons had Greek names,<sup>1372</sup> and this was during the time when a multitude of priests "obeyed to the faith" (ὕπήκουον τῇ πίστει),<sup>1373</sup> meaning Christianity. In the second instance, Paul approached the Apostles in Jerusalem and talked to them about Jesus but they did not accept him and soon after this, some *Hellenists* tried to kill Paul.<sup>1374</sup> This suggests that these Hellenists were followers of the original Apostles, and, most probably, they were the same Hellenists we have seen before, who were together with the Hebrews<sup>1375</sup> (i.e. the original Apostles). In both instances examined above, one should observe that the Hellenists are portrayed as more traditionalist than other Israelites, who were not called

---

<sup>1369</sup> Acts 6:1-2: Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις πληθυνόντων τῶν μαθητῶν ἐγένετο γογγυσμός τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους, ὅτι παρεθεωροῦντο ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ αἱ χήραι αὐτῶν. (not in papyri)

<sup>1370</sup> T. Kluzz, 'Paul and the development of Gentile Christianity', in Esler, *Early*, vol. 1, pp. 168-197 at 171-178, is of the opinion that in Acts 6:1-6 the widows of the Hellenists were neglected by the Hebrews. This is how this passage has been translated into English *Bibles*. Kluzz, based on Acts 7:59-8.1-3 concludes that the conflict on the issue of the widows resulted into violence between the Hebrews and the Hellenists. Cf. Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis, 1992), pp. 149-192, who does not find sufficient evidence that there ever was a division between Hellenists and Hebrews in the NT.

<sup>1371</sup> *Holy Bible*, Acts 6:1, p. 128: "Now during those days, when the disciples were increasing in number, the Hellenists complained against the Hebrews because their widows were being neglected in the daily distribution of food". Goldstein, 'Jewish,' p. 64, accepts this explanation.

<sup>1372</sup> Acts 6:5: Στέφανον, ἄνδρα πλήρης πίστεως καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Πρόχορον καὶ Νικάνορα καὶ Τίμωνα καὶ Παρμενᾶν καὶ Νικόλαον προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχεία.

<sup>1373</sup> Acts 6:7.

<sup>1374</sup> 9:23-30.

<sup>1375</sup> Also see Nestle-Aland, critical apparatus recording certain NT manuscripts that transmit 'Hellēnes' instead of 'Hellenists.' This insidence (9:28-30) does not survive in papyri.

Hellenists. Therefore, any argument that a Hellenised Israelite was *de facto* more moderate or less religious than a non-Hellenised Israelite, should no longer be accepted.

In the third instance in the *Acts* some Christians were terrified with the martyrdom of Archdeacon Stephen and left Jerusalem. They went to Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch where they preached only to Jews. In Antioch they also spoke to certain *Hellenists* about Jesus Christ. The problem here is that some early manuscripts preserving the *Acts*, dated to the fifth and seventh centuries CE, instead of *Hellenists* used Ἑλληνας. Although the second Nestle-Aland edition<sup>1376</sup> opted for *Hellēnes* instead of *Hellenists*, the 27<sup>th</sup> edition opted for the well-established variant *Hellenists*,<sup>1377</sup> most probably because it is likely that the previous version in some manuscripts was the result of a misspelled *Hellenists*. In other words, in this case too, there is no hard evidence to claim that those in Antioch were Greek. The *Hellenists* in all above instances appear to be Hellenised Jews in terms of language and/or some other aspects. There is no indication that they were former Gentile Greeks who became Christian.

The *Acts*<sup>1378</sup> claim that Paul managed to convert two ethnic Greeks in Athens, Dionysius the Areopagite, along with someone called Damaris. One of the first who highlighted the problem in accepting this report as historically accurate, was Ferdinand Charles Baur (1792-1860), who warned that most Christian texts have been written with the intention to convert their readers to Christianity, and did not hesitate to distort history in order to achieve their aims. Baur

---

<sup>1376</sup> *Novum Testamentum Graecae* (1968).

<sup>1377</sup> *Acts* 11:19-20 (ed. Nestle-Aland, 1968<sup>2</sup>): Οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ διῆλθον ἕως Φοινίκης καὶ Κύπρου καὶ Ἀντιοχείας μηδενὶ λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις. ἦσαν δέ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες Κύπριοι καὶ Κυρηναῖοι, οἵτινες ἐλθόντες εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἐλάλουν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν. Cf. Nestle-Aland (2006<sup>27</sup>), p. 354. (It does not exist in papyri.)

<sup>1378</sup> 17:34.

argued that Paul's entire visit to Athens should be put into question because the narrative of the *Acts* for this visit appears to be pre-designed and does not sound like a report of a historical visit to Athens.<sup>1379</sup> Baur also observed that Paul in Athens, instead of preaching to a community with a Jewish connection, as he did in most other places he visited, Paul engaged in direct conversation with Epicurean and Stoic philosophers. Bauer also warned that such philosophers are known to have opposed Christianity at a later stage and not in the first century. Baur also indicated that Paul in the *Acts* 17.18<sup>1380</sup> most probably paraphrased the very first verse from the teaching of Socrates, as quoted in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*.<sup>1381</sup> More importantly, Baur questioned why exactly did Paul choose to deliver his speech in Areopagus? This was a court where criminal cases were judged, but there is no information in the *Acts* that the Athenians arrested Paul as a criminal.<sup>1382</sup> Baur could not find any logical explanation as to why the court of judges assembled in Areios Pagos to listen to Paul. Baur also could not explain how Dionysius Areopagite was convinced by Paul to be converted. and also questioned whether the name Dionysius was taken from another story mentioned in Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica*<sup>1383</sup> where a certain bishop of Corinth called Dionysius wrote to the Christians of Athens to give them encouragement after the Greeks murdered their bishop Publius, during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Another scholar, Eduard Norden (1868-1941),<sup>1384</sup> argued that the author/s of the *Acts* modelled the story of Paul visiting Areopagus upon a text presented by Flavius Philostratus on the teachings of

---

<sup>1379</sup> Ferdinand Charles Baur, *Paulus der Apostel Jesus Christi*, (Stuttgart, 1845), p. 167-168; Also, Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 528 on Dibelius that the Areopagus speech as foreign in the NT.

<sup>1380</sup> Ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι.

<sup>1381</sup> ed. E.C. Marchant, *Xenophontis opera omnia* (Oxford, 1921<sup>2</sup>), 1.1.1, vol. 2, p. 1 : ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης οὓς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, ἕτερα δὲ καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρων. ἀδικεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς νέους διαφθείρων.

<sup>1382</sup> Baur, *Paulus*, p. 169-171.

<sup>1383</sup> 4.23, vol. 31, p. 202.

<sup>1384</sup> *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig, 1923), pp. 31-56.

Apollonius of Tyana.<sup>1385</sup> Moreover, Hamilton B. Timothy observed that Clement is aware that Paul quoted Aratus's *Phaenomena*, when he addressed the Athenian Areopagites,<sup>1386</sup> and my question here is whether Clement knew this information not because of his own research on how exactly the authors of the *Acts* composed this work, but because "Clement" was familiar with a circle or the followers of a circle who produced the *Acts* some time in the second century. In support of the case that "Clement" must have been in touch with a circle who produced pseudepigrapha and other fabricated stories, some scholars have also observed that Pseudo-Dionysius, who for a long time was accepted to be Dionysius the Areopagite converted by Paul, presents remarkable textual similarities with Clement.<sup>1387</sup> Therefore, the question arises as to whether further research on "Clement" and Pseudo-Dionysius could reveal more information on the identity of those who specialised in fabricating or altering earlier sources. At this stage I would also like to indicate that one of the texts attributed to Pseudo-Dionysius, just like certain parts of Clement's *Stromata*, is strongly anti-Hellenic, in the sense that it attacks the evil ideas, the idiocy and the fallacy of the Greeks.<sup>1388</sup> In other words, certain fabricators

---

<sup>1385</sup> *Acts* 17:23: εὗρον καὶ βωμὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο, Ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ. Cf. Flavius Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, 6.3.52, ed. C. L. Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati opera*, (Leipzig, 1870), vol. 1: περὶ πάντων θεῶν εὖ λέγειν καὶ ταῦτα Αῤῥήνησιν, οὓς καὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων βωμοὶ ἴδονται.

<sup>1386</sup> *The Early Christian Apologists and Greek Philosophy exemplified by Irenaeus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria* (Assen, 1973), p. 71. Cf. *Phaenomena of Aratus* 1.5, ed. J. Martin *Arati phaenomena* (Florence, 1956): Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος εἰμέν.

<sup>1387</sup> See John Ferguson, *Clement of Alexandria* (NY, 1974), p. 17; Bogan Gabriel Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses* (Leiden, 2009), pp. 32-34, on the remarkable similarities between *Hypotyposeis* and the *Corpus Dionysiacum* on the angelic hierarchy.

<sup>1388</sup> *Corpus Dionysiacum* IV/1, *Ioannis Scythopolitani, Prologus et Scholia in Dionysii Areopagitae Librum De Divinis Nominibus cum additamentis interpretum aliorum*, ed. Beate Regina Suchla, PTS 62 (Berlin, 2011), p. 227, 249C; p. 275, 284A (evil); p. 350, 337B (idiocy); p. 424, 392A-B (fallacies). Also see Istvan Perczel, 'The Earliest Syriac Reception of Dionysius,' in Coakley-Stang, pp. 27-41 at 28-30, on the earliest Greek and Syriac receptions of the Ps.-Dion. texts. Professor Wilhelm Bousset (1865-1920), an exception among many other Clement "experts," argued that certain anti-Hellenic points in *Stromata* were added some time after the first four *Stromata* were completed. Bousset pointed out that these passages can be distinguished from the original Clement because they contradict his positive views of Greek philosophy displayed elsewhere. See: D. W. Bousset, *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische*

transformed this Athenean "Dionysius the Areopagite" to an anti-Hellenist, who after his conversion attacked the Greeks, his own people, as if they were no others than infidel "dogs."

Up to this point, in my opinion, there is no reliable evidence in the *Gospels* and the *Acts* that there were historical Greeks who followed Jesus or Paul. One may even dispute how many historical Greeks were present in the Synagogues Paul mentions, let alone that there is no archaeological evidence for an such synagogues in the first century CE.

In the *Epistles*, "Paul" appears to address both Jews and Greeks. In *Romans* he aimed to convert of the entire world, both "*Hellēnes* and Barbarians, the Jew first, and also the Greek."<sup>1389</sup> This pattern is repeated in three more passages in the *Romans*,<sup>1390</sup> another three in *I Corinthians*<sup>1391</sup> and one more in *Galatians*.<sup>1392</sup> In

---

*Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus* (Göttingen 1915), pp. 205-18, Bousset pointed to the following anti-Hellenic points: *Stromata* 1.17.81.1-5; 1.17.87.1-88.88; 1.20.100.3-5; 1.21.101-147; 1.22.148-150 (*Sept.* was an early translation); 1.23.151-29.182 (praise of Moses); 2.1.1.3 (attack on Hellenic style); 5.14.89.1-141 (Greek theft). Idem, pp. 219-236 (analysis of the fifth book of *Stromata*); Cf. Ridings, *Attic*, pp. 20-21: refers to J. Munck, *Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte* 2 (Stuttgart 1933), pp. 141-143, who disposed Bousset's theory, on the basis that the anti-Hellenic attacks Bousset identified as interpolations exist throughout *Stromata*; Ridings, *Attic*, pp. 21-24 on scholars responding to Munck and Bousset. Cf. Van den Hoek, *Clement*, p. 1, who questions that the *Stromata* have an heterogeneous texture; I have more to add to Bousset's theory in a new study.

<sup>1389</sup> *Romans* 1:14-16: Ἑλλῆσιν τε καὶ βαρβάροις, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλῆνι.; This passage does not exist in a papyrus fragment.

<sup>1390</sup> *Romans* 2:8-10: Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλῆνος... Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλῆνι; 3:9-11: Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήνας; 10:12: Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλῆνος. (The entire passage does not exist in a papyrus fragment)

<sup>1391</sup> *I Corinthians* 1:22-24: ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι σημεῖα αἰτοῦσιν καὶ Ἕλληνες σοφίαν ζητοῦσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον ἔθνεσιν..., Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλῆσιν, Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν. Interestingly, two Byzantine manuscripts (C<sup>3</sup> and D<sup>2</sup>) of the ninth century (mentioned in the *apparatus criticus* of the Nestle-Aland (2001<sup>27</sup>), p. 442, use Ἑλλῆσι instead of ἔθνεσιν. The NT edition of the *Αποστολική Διακονία της Ελλάδος* (Athens, 1968) uses Ἑλλῆσι instead of ἔθνεσιν; This passage does not exist in a papyrus fragment; 10:32-11:1: καὶ Ἰουδαίοις γίνεσθε καὶ Ἑλλῆσιν (It does exist in Papyrus 46, dated c. 200: see Comfort-Barrett, p. 268); 12:13: εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες. (It does exist in Papyrus 46, dated c. 200: see Comfort-Barrett, p. 271).

*Colossians* the pattern of placing the Jews first is reversed: this time the Greeks come before the Jews.<sup>1393</sup>

The only<sup>1394</sup> clear indication I have seen in the *NT* that there was an ethnic Greek who became "Christian," is in *Galatians*, where Paul states that there was no need for Titus to be circumcised because he was Greek (Ἕλλην).<sup>1395</sup> It is clear at this point that unlike Timotheos, Titus was not compelled to be circumcised because he was a Gentile Greek and not a Jew. The problem here with this explanation that Titus was a Gentile Greek is that, also according to *Galatians*, Paul accused Peter for dining together with Gentiles,<sup>1396</sup> and emphasized how important it was for him to be a Zealot Jew. Also in *Galatians*<sup>1397</sup> "Paul" explained that his mission was to preach to the uncircumcised, and Peter's mission was to preach to the circumcised. If so, then why did Paul in the *Acts* circumcise Timotheos, and why did he appear to preach inside synagogues? Who is the original Paul and, who is the later "Paul"? Also, how could one explain why Paul who had a Gentile Greek with him, attacked Peter for befriending Gentiles? Is it historically accurate that "Paul" had a Gentile Greek follower?

---

<sup>1392</sup> *Galatians* 3:28: οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. It does exist in Papyrus 46, dated c. 200: see Comfort-Barrett, p. 316.

<sup>1393</sup> *Colossians* 3:9-11: Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος, ἀλλὰ [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός. It does exist in Papyrus 46, dated c. 200: see Comfort-Barrett, p. 331.)

<sup>1394</sup> In *I Thessalonians* 2:14 Paul appears to be talking to non Jewish believers. It is not clear whether these are Samaritans in the diaspora, Greek, a mixed community or another ethnic group. Nicolaus, the proselyte from Antioch is not called Greek in *Acts* 6:5. Why exactly a proselyte has to be and ethnic Greek and not a former Jew or Samaritan or one from another ethnic group?

<sup>1395</sup> *Galatians* 2:3: ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί, Ἕλλην ὢν, ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι. It does exist in Papyrus 46, dated c. 200: see Comfort-Barrett, p. 314.

<sup>1396</sup> *Galatians* 2:12. Cf. Porphyry, *Contra Christianos*, ed. C. Blondel, *Macarii Magnetis quae supersunt ex inedito codice editit* (Paris, 1876), trans. J. Abramides (Thessalonikē, 2000), p. 84.

<sup>1397</sup> 2:7. Also see *I Timothy* 2:7 (Paul is emphatic that he became a preacher and Apostle, who teaches the Gentiles the Real Faith and Truth).

Therefore, where exactly is the solid evidence deriving from reliable primary sources, which confirms Greek presence in the Early Church?<sup>1398</sup> Why exactly should one accept that there was any significant number of Greeks who were attracted to the Messiah of the Israelites during the decades of wars and revolts against Rome and against many Greek cities in the Middle East?<sup>1399</sup>

---

<sup>1398</sup> Cf. Falk, *Jesus*, p. 60, on the theory that “the Essenes helped found Christianity as a religion for the Gentiles,” meaning that it was them behind the fabrication of the above works; Craig S. Keener, ‘Paul and the Corinthian Believers,’ in *BCP*, pp. 46-62 at p. 50, among other scholars, assumes that because of the references on idolatry and the vices mentioned in *I Corinthians* 5:11 and 6:9-10, Paul was preaching Gentiles. But why exactly one has to accept that none of the members of the Israelite community in Corinth were adulterers, attracted to idolatry, alcoholic, thieves or homosexuals? Were all those similar teachings in the *Torah* against such sins and sinners, written with reference to Gentiles only? Also see Falk, *Jesus*, pp. 14-23, 113, Rabbi Jacob Emden (1697-1776) concluded Jesus and Paul created a religion for the gentiles, based on the Noahide Commandments; p. 60, Emden regarded Paul as a proper Jew. Cf. Sanders, *Schismatics*, pp 29-30, Sanders concludes that the Jerusalem based Christianity was different from Paul's congregation in Corinth who were Gentiles; Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, ‘Whose Fast Is it?’ in Becker-Reed, pp. 259-282, p. 279, is sure that there is a Gentile Christian community in the *Acts* 27:9, who celebrated Yom Kippur (the Christian Fast of the Seventh Month); pp. 259-260 and 272-280 on clear evidence that this Fast was a Christians custom in Rome until at least the fifth century, in parallel to the contemporary Yom Kippur; p. 270, on the Christian Fast of the Seventh Month (Yom Kippur) kept only in Rome.

<sup>1399</sup> Cf. Bird, *Crossing*, pp. 70-72, epigraphic evidence from ossuaries found by archaeologists in Palestine indicate that the presence of proselytes there during the Hellenistic period and the first centuries CE were very minimal. Also see Levine, *Judaism*, p. 24: certain “geographically isolated regions were far less ‘Hellenised’, as, for example the Upper Galilee, the Golan, and southern Judea.” Also see E. Schürer, *The history of the Jewish People in the age of Jesus Christ, 175 BCE-AD 135. A new English version*, revised and ed. by G. Vermes et al., 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1973-1987), vol. 3, pp. 156-158, 161. Also see J. Lieu, *Neither Jew nor Greek. Constructing Early Christianity* (London, 2002), pp. 31-47, on the issue of Gentiles who were sympathisers of Judaism and made offerings to Synagogues, as testified by ancient inscriptions. The problem here is that all this evidence is second century or much later.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 1. Lexica, Encyclopedias and collections of sources

*Blackwell Companion to The New Testament, The*, ed. David E. Aune (Oxford, 2010)

*Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity, The*, ed. K. Parry et al. (Oxford, 2001)

*Cambridge Companion to the Bible, The*, eds., Kee, Meyers, Rogerson and Saldarini, (Cambridge, 1997)

*Cambridge history of Christianity, Origins to Constantine, The*, eds M. M. Mitchell and F. M. Young, 9 vols (Cambridge, 2006)

*Cambridge History of Judaism, The*, ed. S. T. Katz et. al., 4 vols., (Cambridge, 1984-2006)

*Catholic Encyclopedia, The*, (New York, 1912)

Chrēstou, P., *Εκκλησιαστική Γραμματολογία*, 2 vols. (Thessalonikē, 1998<sup>2</sup>)

*Clavis apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*, ed., Geerard, M. (Turnhout, 1992)

*Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, ed. M. Geerard, vol. 1, *Patres Ante-Nicaeni* (Turnhout, 1983)

*Concordance of the Septuagint, A*, ed. G. Morrish (Michigan, 1976)

*Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament, A*, eds Edwin Hatch, H.A. Redpath et al., vol. II.A (Graz, 1975)

*Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Christiane* (Rome, 1983) ed. A. Di Berardino, trans. A. Walford, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1992)

*Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, eds K. Van der Toorn, B. Becking, P. W. Van der Horst (Leiden, 1995)

- Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic literature*, ed. Marcus Jastrow (Berlin, 1926)
- Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* (New York, 1990)
- Greek-English Lexicon*, H.G. Liddell and R. Scott (Oxford, 1855<sup>4</sup> and 1861<sup>5</sup>), (cont. H.S. Jones, 1940<sup>9</sup>)
- Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature: a translation and adaptation of the fourth revised and augmented edition of W. Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* by W. Arndt and F. Gingrich (Chicago, 1979)
- Greek Lexicon of the Roman and the Byzantine Periods, from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100*, ed. E. A. Sophocles, 2 vols. (New York, 1887)
- Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the Ancient World and Problems of Chronology in the Bible*, ed. Jack Finegan (Peabody Mass., 1998<sup>2</sup>)
- Handbook of Early Christianity, Social Science Approaches*, eds A. Blasi, J. Duhaime and P. Turcotte eds (Walnut Creek, 2002)
- International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, The* (Michigan, 1915)
- Jewish Encyclopedia, The*, 12 vols. (New York, 1907)
- Lexicon of Jewish names in Late Antiquity, Part I, Palestine 330 BCE-200 CE*, ed. Tal Ilan (Tübingen, 2002)
- Namenbuch*, ed. Friedrich Preisigke (Heidelberg, 1922)
- Oxford Classical Dictionary*, eds N. Hammond, H. Scullard (Oxford, 1970<sup>2</sup>), and S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth (1999<sup>3</sup>)
- Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed.-in-chief A. P. Kazdhan, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1991)
- Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G.W.H. Lampe (Oxford, 1961)
- Stamatakis, I., *Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἀρχαίας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης* (Athens, 1972; repr. 2002)

*Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Alder, 5 vols (Leipzig, 1928 – 38)

*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, A Digital Library of Greek Literature* (Irvine, 1999)

*Tusculum Lexikon*, eds W. Buchwald, A. Hohlweg, and O. Prinz, Greek trans. A.A. Furlas (Athens, 1993)

## 2. Primary sources

*Acta Pauli et Theclae*, ed. R.A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 3 vols (Hildesheim, 1959), vol. 1

*Acta Petri*, ed. R. A. Lipsius, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 3 vols (Hildesheim, 1959), vol. 1

*Acta Petri, Martyrium Petri*, ed. L. Vouaux (Paris, 1922)

*Acts of Christian Martyrs, The*, ed. H. Musurillo (Oxford, 1972)

Adamantius, *De recta in deum fide* (olim sub auctore Origene Adamantio), ed. W.H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *Der Dialog des Adamantius* (Περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν ὁρθῆς πίστεως), (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901)

Aeschylus, *Prometheus vinctus*, ed. G. Murray, *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Oxford, 1955<sup>2</sup>)

*Apocalypsis apocrypha Joannis*, ed. C. Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae* (Leipzig, 1866; repr. Hildesheim, 1966); ed. F. Nau, 'Une deuxième apocalypse apocryphe grecque de saint Jean', *Revue Biblique* 23 (1914); *Apocalypsis apocrypha Joannis* (versio tertia), ed. A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1893)

*Apocryphal New Testament, The, A collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* by J.K. Elliott (Oxford, 1993)

Apollodorus, Ps.-, *Bibliotheca*, ed. R. Wagner, *Apollodori bibliotheca* (Leipzig, 1891; repr. 1971)

Appian, *Syriaca*, eds P. Viereck, A.G. Roos and E. Gabba, *Appiani historia Romana* (Leipzig, 1939 repr. 1967)

\_\_\_\_\_, *The civil wars*, trans. J. Carter (London, 1996)

Aratus, *Phaenomena*, ed. J. Martin *Arati phaenomena* (Florence, 1956)

Archilochus, *Fragmenta*, ed. M.L. West, *Iambi et elegi Graeci*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1971), vol. 1.

*Aristeae Epistula*, ed. A. Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* (Paris, 1962); ed. H. S. J. Thackeray in Henry G. Meecham, *The Letter of Aristeas* (Manchester, 1935), pp. 5-41

Aristobulus Judaeus, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca*, ed. A. Denis (Leiden, 1970)

Aristidēs, *Apologia*, ed. C. Vona, *Fragmenta, L'apologia di Aristide* (Rome, 1950); ed. and trans. J. Rendel Harris et al., *The Apology of Aristidēs, Text and Studies*, 1.1 (Cambridge, 1891)

Aristotle, *Meteorologica* (Bekker), ed. F.H. Fobes, *Aristotelis meteorologicorum libri quattuor, Aristoteles et Corpus Aristotelicum Phil., Meteorologica* (Cambridge, 1919)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Fragmenta*, ed. V. Rose, *Aristotelis Qui Ferebantur Librorum, Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1886)

Arrian, *Alexandri Anabasis*, eds. A.G. Roos and G. Wirth, *Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia*, vol. 1. (Leipzig, 1967), trans. A. de Sélincourt *The Campaigns of Alexander the Great* (Middlesex, 1971)

*Assumption of Moses*, ed. R. H. Charles (London, 1897)

Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria, *Quaestiones in scripturam sacram*, PG 28, cols. 712-796

\_\_\_\_\_, *Homilia in sanctos patres et prophetas*, PG 28, 1064-

Basil the Great, *Epistles*, ed. Y. Courtonne, *Saint Basile Lettres*, 3 vols (Paris, 1957-1966)

Barnabas, *The Epistle of*, ed. K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1 (London, 1912); trans. J. A. Kleist (London, 1957)

- Blemmydēs, Nikēphoros, *Autobiographia sive Curriculum Vitae*, ed. J.A. Munitiz, CCSG 13 (Leuven, 1984)
- Celsus, *Ἀληθὴς λόγος*, ed. R. Bader, *Der Ἀληθὴς λόγος des Kelsos* (Stuttgart, 1940)
- Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn, 1832) ); trans. M. Whitby and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale, 284-628 A.D.* (Liverpool, 1989)
- Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, ed. A. C. Clark, trans. C. MacDonald, *Cicero* (Harvard, 1977)
- Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, eds O. Stählin, L. Früchtel and U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus, DGCS*, 3 vols (Berlin, 1960-1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Stromata*, PG 8, cols 685-1382
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Protrepticus*, ed. C. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le protreptique* (Paris, 1949<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Protrepticus and Paedagogus*, ed. O. Stahlin (Berlin, 1972)
- Clement of Rome, *First Letter to Corinthians* ed. and trans. K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols (London, 1998), vol. 1, pp. 3-121
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Second letter to Corinthians* ed. and trans. Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols (London, 1998), vol. 1, pp. 125-163
- Codex Theodosianus Livre XVI*, ed. Élisabeth Magnou-Nortier, *Le code Théodosien* (Paris, 2002)
- Concilia Oecumenica*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, 8 vols (Berlin, 1927-62)
- Concilium Quinisextum*, ed. H. Ohme, *Das Konzil Quinisextum* (Turnhout, 2006)
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, Emperor, *De administrando imperio*, ed. G. Moravcsik, CFHB 1 (Dumbarton Oaks, 1967<sup>2</sup>)
- Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, eds V. A. Tcherikover and A. Funks, 3 vols (Harvard, 1957-64)
- Corpus Inscriptorum Judaicarum*, ed. J. B. Frey, 2 vols (Rome, 1936-1952)

- Dead Sea Scrolls, The*, trans. G. Vermes (The Folio Society: London, 2000)
- Didachē*, ed. and trans. J. A. Kleist (London, 1957); ed. K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London, 1998)
- Dio, Cassius, *Historiae Romanae*, ed. U.P. Boissevain, in *Dio's Roman History*, trans by E. Cary, 9 vols. (Loeb: London, 1914-27); *Historiae Romanae*, ed. U. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani*, 5 vols. (Berlin, 1895-1931)
- Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes*, ed. J. von Arnim, *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1893-1896)
- Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*, eds F. Vogel and C.T. Fischer, *Diodori bibliotheca historica*, 6 vols (Leipzig, 1888, repr. 1964-1970); ed. Pierre Bertrac, *Diodore de Sicile, Bibliothèque Historique* (Paris, 1993), vol. 1
- Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *De compositione verborum*, eds. H. Usener and L. Radermacher, *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant* vol. 6 (Leipzig, 1929); ed. W. Rhys Roberts, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus On Literary Composition* (London, 1910)
- Epiphanius, *Panarion (Adversus haereses)*, ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus und Panarion*, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1:1915; 2:1922; 3:1933)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Doctrina Patrum*, ed. F. Diekamp (Münster, 1907)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Fragmenta*, Fragm. 24, ed. K. Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols (Tübingen, 1928), vol. 2
- \_\_\_\_\_, *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*, ed. and trans. J. E. Dean, *Epiphanius' Treatise on weights and measures: the Syriac version* (Chicago, 1935)
- Etymologicum Gudianum*, ed. F. G. Sturtzcius, *Etymologicum Graecae Linguae Gudianum* (Leipzig, 1818)
- Euripides, *Cyclops*, ed. J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae* (Oxford, 1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Hippolytus*, ed. J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae* (Oxford, 1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Alcestis*, ed. A. Garzya (Teubner: Leipzig, 1980)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Fragmenta*, ed. A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1889<sup>2</sup>)

- Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, ed. J. Ziegler, *Eusebius Werke, Der Jesajakommentar*, in DGCS (Berlin, 1975)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, ΑΛΛΗΛΟΥΙΑ ΑΓΓΑΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΖΑΧΑΡΙΟΥ 112, PG 23
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire Ecclésiastique*, SC, 31, 41, 55 (Paris, 1952, 1955, 1958); trans. K. Lake, *Eusebius of Caesarea, The Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 1 (Loeb: London, 1926); trans. J. E. L. Oulton, vol. 2 (Loeb: London, 1942)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Vita Constantini*, PG 20, cols. 905-1232.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, ed. K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke, DGCS*, 8 vols (Leipzig 1902-Berlin, 1956), vol. 8 (Berlin, 1954-56)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, ed. I.A. Heikel in *Eusebius Werke, DGCS*, 8 vols (Leipzig 1902 - Berlin 1956), vol. 6 (Leipzig, 1913)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Onomasticon*, ed. P. De Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingae, 1887<sup>2</sup>); ed. E. Klostermann, *Das Onomastikon* (Leipzig, 1904)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Contra Hieroclem*, ed. Kayser, C. L., "*Flavii Philostrati opera*" 2 vols (Leipzig, 1870), vol. 1, pp. 369-413
- Evagrius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, eds. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, *The ecclesiastical history of Evagrius with the scholia* (London, 1898); PG 86, cols 2115-2886
- Evangelia Apocrypha*, ed. C. Von Tischendorf (Athens, 1959)
- Evangelium Ebionitum*, trans Elliott, *Apocryphal*
- Evangelium Petri*, ed. M. G. Mara, *Évangile de Pierre*, SC 201 (Paris, 1973)
- Evangelium Thomae Graecae*, ed. C. Von Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Leipzig, 1876)
- Evangelium Thomae Latinum*, ed. C. Von Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Leipzig, 1876)
- Georgius Monachus, *Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1904)

Glykas, Michael, *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1836)

Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Machabaeorum Laudem*, PG 35, cols. 912-933

Hegesippus, *Fragmenta Hegisippi*, ed. M.J. Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*, 5 vols (Oxford, 1846-1848), vol. 1 (1846); ed. T. Kock, *Hegesippus, Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1888)

Heraclitus, *Ἀπαντα*, ed. T. Phalkos-Arvanitakes (Athens, 1999)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Testimonia*, eds. H. Diels, W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 3 vols (Berlin, 1934-1937)

Herodianus, Aelius et Pseudo-Herodianus, *De prosodia catholica*, ed. Lentz, A., *Grammatici Graeci*, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1867)

Herodotus, *Historiae*, ed. H. B. Rosén, *Herodoti Historiae*, 2 vols (Leipzig and Stuttgart, 1987, 1997); trans. A. de Sélincourt, *Herodotus, The Histories* (London, 1974)

Hesiod, *Fragmenta*, ed. R. Merkelbach and M.L. West (Oxford, 1967)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Opera et dies*, ed. F. Solmsen, *Hesiodi opera* (Oxford, 1983<sup>2</sup>); ed. Glenn W. Most, *Hesiod, Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia* (Loeb: London, 2006)

Hesychios, *Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte et al., *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, 3 vols (Copenhagen 1953-1966, Berlin 2005)

Hippolytos of Rome, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, ed. M. Marcovich (Berlin, 1986)

*Historia Alexandri Magni*, recensio 3, ed. H. Engelmann, *Der griechische Alexanderroman, Rezension g. Buch II*, 3 vols (Meisenheim am Glan, 1963), vol. 2

Homer, *Iliad*, ed. M. L. West, *Homeri Ilias*, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1998-2000)

*Hōrologion, Ὠρολόγιον τὸ Μέγα*, ed. Αποστολική Διακονία τῆς Ἑλλάδος (Athens, 1998)

Ignatius, *Epistles*, ed. K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London, 1998)



- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ad Philippenses* (Epistle 5), ed. F. X. Funk, *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1881), vol. 2
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ad Tarsenses* (Epistle 4), ed. Funk, vol. 2
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ad Antiochenses* (Epistle 9), ed. Funk, vol. 2
- Infancy Gospel of Thomas*, ed. Tony Burke, *De Infantia Iesu Evangelium Thomae, Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum* 17 (Turnhout, 2010)
- Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, ed. W.W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1857)
- \_\_\_\_\_, Fragment gr. 30 (ex. Eus.), eds. A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies*, 9 vols (Paris 1969-1979), vol. 3.2 (1974)
- Isocrates, *Panegyricus* (Orat. 4), ed. Basilius G. Mandilaras, *Isocrates, Opera Omnia*, 3 vols. (Munich, 2003), vol. 2; trans. G. Norlin, *Isocrates*, 3 vols (Loeb: London, 1928), vol. 1.
- Jerome, *Epistula* 58, ed. I. Hilberg, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, 4 vols (Vienna, 1996), vol. 1
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Commentary on Philemon*, trans. T. P. Scheck, *St. Jerome's Commentaries on Galatians, Titus and Philemon* (Indiana, 2010)
- John Chrysostom, *In Joannem*, PG 59, cols.123-128.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Fragmenta in Jeremiam* 35, PG 64, cols. 996-997
- \_\_\_\_\_, *In Acta Apostolorum, Homilia* 46, PG 60, cols. 321-326
- \_\_\_\_\_, *De Chananaea*, PG 52, 449-460
- John of Damascus, *De haeresibus*, ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes Von Damaskos, Herausgegeben vom Byzantinischen Institut der Abtei Scheyern*, 5 vols (Berlin, 1969-1988), vol. 4 (1981)
- John Lydos, *De magistratibus populi Romani*, ed. A.C. Bandy, *Ioannes Lydus, On powers or the magistracies of the Roman State* (Philadelphia, 1983)
- Josephus, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, ed. B. Niese, 6 vols (Berlin, 1887-1894)

- \_\_\_\_\_, *De Bello Judaico*, ed. N.A. Meščerskij, *Istorija Iudejkoj Vojny Iosifa Flavija v drevnerusskom perevode* (Moscow, 1958), in H. Leeming et al., *Josephus's Jewish War and its Slavonic Version* (Leiden, 2003); trans by G. A. Williamson, *The Jewish War* (Middlesex, 1970<sup>2</sup>); trans. and commentary S. Mason and H. Chapman, *Judean War*, 2 vols (Leiden, 2008)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Flavius Josephus vom Jüdischen Kriege Buch I-IV. Nach der slavischen Übersetzung deutsch herausgegeben und mit dem griechischen text verglichen*, eds Alexander Berendts and Konrad Grass in *Eesti Vabariigi Tartu Ülikooli toimetused, Acta et commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis (Dorpatensis) B, Humaniora*, 4 vols (Tartu, 1924-27)
- Julian, Apostate, *Contra Galilaeos*, ed. C.J. Neumann, *Juliani imperatoris librorum contra Christianos quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1880) in ed. W.C. Wright, *Julian*, 3 vols. (Loeb: Harvard, 1923), vol. 3.
- Julius Africanus, Sextus, *Epistula ad Aristidem*, ed. W. Reichardt (Leipzig, 1909)
- Justin the Martyr, *Apologia*, ed. E.J. Goodspeed, *Justinus Martyr Apol., Apologia "Die ältesten Apologeten"* (Göttingen, 1915); ed. M. Marcovich, *Iustini Martyris, Apologiae pro Christianis* (Berlin and New York, 1994)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Dialogus cum Tryphona*, ed. M. Marcovich (Berlin, 1997); ed. E.J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen, 1915); ed. and trans. by J.C.M. Van Winden, *An early Christian Philosopher, Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, chs. 1-9* (Leiden, 1971)
- Justinian I, Emperor, *Codex Justinianus*, ed. P. Krueger, *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. 2, *Codex Iustinianus* (Berlin, 1877); trans. C. F. Kolbert, *The digest of Roman Law* (London, 1979); *Codex Justinianus, De paganis, sacrificiis et templis*, ed. A. Kamara, *Η αντιπαγανιστική νομοθεσία της Υστερης Ρωμαϊκής Αυτοκρατορίας μέσα από τους Κώδικες* (Athens, 2000), pp. 140-165; *Codex Justinianus, Novela VI*, eds R. Schoell, G. Kroll, *Corpus Iuris Civilis, Novellae* (Berlin, 1895), vol. 3, pp. 35-47
- Kedrēnos, *Chronographia*, ed. I. Bekker in *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae opera*, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1838-1839)
- Komnēnē, Anna, *Alexias*, eds. D. R. Reinsch and A. Kambylis, *Annae Comnenae Alexias* CFHB 40.1-2 (Berlin, 2001); trans. E.R.A. Sewter, *Anna Comnena, Alexiad* (London, 1969)
- Lactantius, *Divine Institutions*, trans. A. Bowen and P. Garnsey (Liverpool, 2003)

- Libanius, *Epistulae*, in ed. R. Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, 7 vols (Leipzig, 1903-1911)
- Livy, *Historia Romana*, ed. E. Rhys and trans. Revd. Canon Roberts, *The History of Rome by Titus Livius*, 6 vols (New York, 1912)
- Lucian of Samosata, *The death of Peregrine*, pp. 79-95 in *The works of Lucian of Samosata*, trans. H. Fowler and F. Fowler, 4 vols (Oxford, 1905)
- Malalas, John, *Chronicle*, ed. J. Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (Berlin, 2000); ed. L. Dindorf, *Ioannis Malalae chronographia* (Bonn, 1831); trans. E. and M. Jeffreys, R. Scott et al., *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Sydney, 1986)
- Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, 1.6, ed. J. Dalfen, *Marci Aurelii Antonini, Ad se ipsum, libri XII* (Leipzig, 1979)
- Martyrium Ignatii Antiocheni (martyrium Antiochenum)*, ed. F.X. Funk and F. Diekamp, *Patres apostolici*, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1913<sup>3</sup>), vol. 2
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Martyrium Ignatii Antiocheni (martyrium Romanum)*, ed. F.X. Funk, *Martyrium S. Ignatii Episcopi Antiochae, Martyrim Vaticanum*, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1881), vol. 2
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Martyrium Ignatii Per S. Metaphrastem Conscriptorum*, ed. Funk, (1881), vol. 2
- Martyrium Petri*, ed. R. A. Lipsius, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, Martyrium Petri* (Hildesheim, 1959)
- Martyrium Polycarpi, Epistula ecclesiae Smyrnensis de martyrio sancti Polycarpi* in ed. H. Musurillo, *The acts of the Christian martyrs* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 2-21
- Minucius Felix, Marcus, *Octavius*, ed. J. P. Waltzing, trans Gerald H. Rendall, *Minucius Felix* (London, 1931)
- Moschos, John, *Leimonarion*, PG 87.3, cols. 2853-3112; Modern Greek trans. by Monk Theologos of Stavronikēta (Athos, 1986)
- Nazir, trans. B. D. Klein, *Nazir, translated into English with notes, glossary and indices*, vol. 8 (London, 1936) in I. Epstein, *Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nashim*, 8 vols. (London, 1936)

*Novum Testamentum Graecae*, eds Nestle – Aland (Stuttgart, 1979)

Nicolaos, *Fragmenta*, ed. K. Müller, *Nicolai Damasceni, De vita sua*, 5 vols (Paris, 1841-1883)

Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apokalypsin*, ed. H. C. Hoskier, *The complete commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse* (Michigan, 1928)

*Old Testament, The Bible in Hebrew with an English translation* (Vienna, 1876-77); *The Holy Bible* (Edinburgh, 1958); *The Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic text, a new translation*, eds M. Lonzano and Y. Norzi, trans. The Jewish Publication Society of America (Philadelphia, 1917); *Greek Bible, Bambas Version* (London, 1998); *Holy Bible, New Revised Standard Version with Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1977<sup>3</sup>); *The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments with the Apocryphal / Deuterocanonical Books, New revised standard Version*, ed. B. M. Metzger et al. (Oxford, 1989)

*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 2 vols (NY, 1983-1985)

*Onomastica Vaticana*, ed. P. De Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingae, 1887<sup>2</sup>)

*Oracula Sibyllina*, ed. J. Geffcken, *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig, 1902)

Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ed. M. Borret, *Origène contre Celse*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1967-1976)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Commentarium in Evangelium Matthaei*, ed. R. Girod, *Origène, Commentaire sur L'Évangile Selon Matthieu, livres X et XI*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1970)

\_\_\_\_\_, *In Jeremiam*, ed. E. Klostermann *Origenes Werke*, 12 vols (Leipzig 1899 – Berlin 1955), vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1901)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Catena in Acta (catena Andreae)*, ed. J.A. Cramer, *Catena in Acta SS Apostolorum* (Oxford, 1838)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Selecta in Psalmos*, PG 12, cols. 1053-1109

Papias, *Papiae Fragmenta*, ed. F. X. Funk, *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tubingen and Leipzig, 1901); ed. and trans. by J. A. Kleist, *Papias: The fragments* (London, 1957)

Paulus Orosius, trans. A. T. Fear, *Seven books of history against the Pagans*,  
*Translated Texts for Historians* 54, trans. A. T. Fear (Liverpool, 2010)

Philo of Alexandria, *Opera*, ed. L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*,  
6 vols. (Berlin, 1896-1915)

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Abrahamo*, ed. L. Cohn (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4

\_\_\_\_\_, *De cherubim*, ed. L. Cohn (Berlin, 1896), vol. 1

\_\_\_\_\_, *De confusione linguarum*, ed. P. Wendland (Berlin, 1897), vol. 2

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Decalogo*, ed. L. Cohn (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Josepho*, ed. L. Cohn (Berlin, 1902), vol. 4

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Migratione Abrahami*, ed. P. Wendland (Berlin, 1897), vol. 2

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Mutatione Nominum*, ed. P. Wendland (Berlin, 1898), vol. 3

\_\_\_\_\_, *De opificio mundi*, ed. L. Cohn (Berlin, 1896), vol. 1

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Praemiis Et Poenis*, ed. L. Cohn (Berlin, 1915), vol. 5

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Providentia*, ed. L. Cohn in *Philo*, by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker,  
12 vols (Loeb: London, 1921-1962), vol. 9 (1941)

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Specialibus Legibus*, ed. L. Cohn, (Berlin, 1906), vol. 5

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Somniis I*, ed. P. Wedland (Berlin, 1893), vol.3

\_\_\_\_\_, *De Vita Mosis*, ed. L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 4  
(Berlin, 1902), also used by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker in *Philo*, 12  
vols (London, 1921-1962), vol. 6 (1935); ed. R. Arnaldez et al., *Philo, De  
Vita Mosis* (Paris, 1967)

\_\_\_\_\_, *De vita contemplativa*, ed. Cohn (Berlin, 1915), vol. 6

\_\_\_\_\_, *In Flaccum*, ed. L. Cohn and S. Reiter (Berlin, 1915), vol. 6

\_\_\_\_\_, *Legatio ad Gaium*, ed. S. Reiter (Berlin, 1915), vol. 4

\_\_\_\_\_, *Legum allegoriarum libri i-iii*, ed. L. Cohn (Berlin, 1896), vol. 1

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Questiones In Exodum*, ed. F. Petit in *Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum. Fragmenta Graeca, Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* 3 3 (Paris, 1978)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Quis rerum divinarum Heres*, ed. P. Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt* (Berlin, 1898), vol. 3
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit*, ed. L. Cohn (Berlin, 1915), vol. 4
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Hypothetica sive Apologia pro Judaeis*, ed. Gifford in F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, *Philo*, 12 vols (Loeb: London, 1921-1962), vol. 9
- Philostratus, Flavius, *Vita Apollonii*, ed. C.L. Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati opera*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1870-1871)
- Philoxenus, *Fragmenta*, ed. C. Theodoridis, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos* (Berlin, 1976)
- Photios, Patriarch, *Bibliotheca*, ed. R. Henry, *Bibliothèque*, 8 vols (Paris 1959-77);  
Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. I. Bekker (Berlin, 1824)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, eds B. Laourdas and L.G. Westernick, *Photii, Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1983)
- Pliny the Younger, *Epistola 91 C. Plinius Traiano Imperatori*, trans. E. Warmington et al., *Pliny, Letters and Panegyricus*, 2 vols (Loeb: London, 1969), vol. 2
- Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 31.62 ed. W.H.S. Jones, 10 vols. (London, 1938-1963)
- Plutarch, *Romulum*, ed. K. Ziegler, *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1957-1959)
- Polybius of Megalopolis, *Polybii Historiae* 21.43, ed. L. Dindorfus and T. Büttner-Wobst, 4 vols (Leipzig, 1866-82), vol. 3 (1867, Dind.)
- Polycarp, *To the Philippians*, ed. K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London, 1998)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp*, ed. and trans. J. A. Kleist (London, 1957)

- Polycrates, *Fragmentum synodicae epistulae*, ed. M.J. Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1846<sup>2</sup>, repr. 1974)
- Porphyry, *Vita Pythagorae*, ed. A. Nauck, *Porphyrii philosophi Platonici opuscula tria* (Leipzig, 1860)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *De Abstinentia*, ed. A. Nauck, *Porphyrii philosophi Platonici opuscula selecta* (Leipzig, 1860)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Contra Christianos*, ed. C. Blondel, *Macarii Magnetis quae supersunt ex inedito codice editit* (Paris, 1876), trans. G. Avramidēs, *Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν* (Athens, 2000)
- Poseidōnios, *Fragments*, ed. W. Theiler, *Posidonios, Die Fragmente*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1982)
- Psellos, Michaël, *Epistulae*, eds E. Kurtz and F. Drexl, *Michaelis Pselli Scripta Minora*, 2 vols (Milan, 1936, 1941)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Quaestionum Naturalium*, PG 122, cols 783-846
- Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite, *Corpus Dionysiacum IV/1, Ioannis Scythopolitani, Prologus et Scholia in Dionysii Areopagitae Librum De Divinis Nominibus cum additamentis interpretum aliorum*, ed. Beate Regina Suchla, PTS 62 (Berlin, 2011)
- Pseudo-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos 9*, ed. Miroslav Marcovich, *Pseudo Iustinus, Cohortatio ad Graecos; De monarchia; Oratio ad Graecos* (Berlin, 1990)
- Quintus Curtius Rufus, *Historia Alexandri*, trans. J. Rolfe, *Quintus Curtius, History of Alexander*, 2 vols (Loeb: London, 1936)
- Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, The*, ed. Y. Yadin (Oxford, 1962)
- Seniores Alexandrini, Psalmus CXVIII, Fragmenta*, Fragn. 7, ed. J.B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, 8 vols (Paris, 1876-1891; repr. Farnborough, 1966), vol. 2 (1884)
- Septuaginta*, ed. A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1935; repr. 1971); *Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Gottingensis editum* (Gottingen 1931-)

- Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. W. Bright, *Socrates' Ecclesiastical History* (Oxford, 1893<sup>2</sup>); PG 67, cols. 29-842; ed. G. C. Hansen, *Socrates Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1995)
- Stephanos, Byzantios, *Ethnica*, ed. A. Meineke, *Stephan von Byzanz. Ethnika* (Berlin, 1849)
- Strabo, *Geographica*, ed. A. Meineke, *Strabonis Geographica*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1852-53)
- Suetonius, *The Twelve Caesars*, ed. J. C. Rolfe, *Suetonius*, 2 vols (Harvard, 1997-1998); trans. R. Graves, *The Twelve Caesars*, (Harmondsworth, 1957)
- Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Alder, 5 vols (Leipzig, 1928 – 38)
- Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae: Propylaeum ad Acta sanctorum Novembris*, ed. H. Delehay (Brussels, 1902)
- Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, ed. E.J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen, 1915); ed. Molly Whittaker, *Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments* (Oxford, 1982)
- Tacitus, *Histories*, ed. E. Koestermann, *Cornelius Tacitus Annalen*, 4 vols (Heidelberg, 1963-68);, ed. and trans. C. H. Moore, *Tacitus Histories* (Loeb: London, 1925); *Tacitus, The Annals of Imperial Rome*, trans. M. Grant (Penguin, 1968); *Tacitus, The Annals*, trans. J. Jackson, 4 vols (London 1937)
- Ten Harugei Malkhut, The*, trans. David G. Roskies, *The Literature of Destruction: Jewish Responses to Catastrophe* (Philadelphia, 1989), pp. 60-69
- Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, ed. E. Evans, 2 vols (Oxford, 1972); trans P. Holmes, *Tertullianus against Marcion* (Edinburgh, 1909)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Apologeticus*, trans. A. Souter, *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus* (Cambridge, 1917)
- Theodoretus of Cyrrhus, *Commentaria in Isaiam*, ed. J. N. Guinot, *Théodoret de Cyr, Commentaire sur Isaïe*, 3 vols (Paris, 1980-1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*, PG 83, cols. 369-372



- Theodoros Studitēs, *Homilia in nativitatem Mariae* (olim sub auctore Joanne Damasceno); PG 96, 696
- Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum*, ed. R.M. Grant, *Theophilus of Antioch* (Oxford, 1970)
- Thucydides, *Historiae*, ed. O. Luschkat, *Thucydides Historiae* (Leipzig, 1960); ed. H.S. Jones, *Thucydides, Historiae* 2 vols (Oxford, 1898)
- Titus Livius, *The History of Rome*, ed. E. Rhys, trans. C. Roberts (New York, 1912)
- Valerius Maximus, *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, versions *a* and *b*, ed. M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 2 vols (Jerusalem, 1974-1980), vol. 1
- Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, ed. E.C. Marchant, *Xenophontis opera omnia* (Oxford, 1921<sup>2</sup>)
- Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, ed. L. Dindorf, *Ioannis Zonarae, Epitome Historiarum*, 5 vols (Leipzig, 1868-1871)
- Zonaras, Ps.-, *Lexicon*, ed. J.A.H. Tittmann, *Iohannis Zonarae lexicon ex tribus codicibus manuscriptis*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1808)

### 3. Secondary studies

- Aberbach, Mose, *Jewish Education and History*, ed. and trans. David Aberbach (London, 2009)
- Achtemeier, Paul J., 'Jesus and the Disciples as Miracle Workers in the Apocryphal New Testament' in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (Notre Dame, Ind., 1976)
- Adam, A. K., 'According to whose Law? Aristobulus, Galilee and the ΝΟΜΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ,' *JSP* 14 (Sheffield, 1995), pp. 15-21

- Agouridēs, Savvas, *Ὁ χαρακτήρ τῶν πρώτων κατὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διωγμῶν καὶ ἡ περὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν ἀλληλογραφία τοῦ Πλινίου μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Τραϊανοῦ*, Βιβλικά Μελετήματα, 2 (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1971)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ὁ χριστιανισμός ἐναντι Ιουδαϊσμοῦ καὶ Ελληνισμοῦ κατὰ το Β' αἰ. μ.Χ.* (Athens, 1997)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ὁράματα καὶ Πράγματα* (Athens, 1991)
- Akenson, Donald H., *Surpassing wonder: the invention of the Bible and the Talmuds* (Chicago, 1998)
- Aldhouse Green, M., *Dying for the Gods, human sacrifice in Iron Age and Roman Europe* (Stroud, 2001)
- Alexander, P. J., *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition*, ed. D. de F. Abrahamse (Berkeley, 1985)
- Alexander, Phillip S., 'The parting of the Ways from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism,' in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 1-25
- Allison, Dale C. Allison, Jr, *The Historical Christ and the Theological Jesus* (Grand Rapids, 2009)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (London, 2010)
- Alon, G., *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age*, ed. and trans. Levi, 2 vols (Jerusalem, 1980-1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Halakah in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (Didache),' in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. J A. Draper (Leiden, 1996), pp. 165-194
- Anderson, Paul N., Felix Just and Tom Thatcher eds. *John Jesus and History: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*, Symposium Series 1, Society of Biblical Literature (Atlanta, 2007)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Why this study is needed, and why it is needed now,' in *John, Jesus, and History*, vol. 1, eds. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta, 2007), pp. 13-70
- Andriessen, D. P., 'The Authorship of the Epistula Ad Diognetum' in *Vig. Chr.* 1 (1947), pp. 19-136

- Angelou, A. D., 'Who am I? Scholarios' answers and the Hellenic identity', in *Φιλέλλην. Studies in honour of Robert Browning*, eds C.N. Constantinides, N.M. Panagiotakes, E.J. Jeffreys and A.D. Angelou (Venice, 1996), pp. 1-19
- Applebaum, Shimon, 'The Zealots: The case for revaluation,' pp. 155-170 in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. 61 (1971)
- Aquilar M., 'Maccabees - Symbolic Wars and Age sets,' in *Ancient Israel, the Old Testament in its social context*, ed. P. Esler (London, 2005), pp. 240-253
- Arnal, William, 'The Q Document' in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe (Minneapolis, 2007), pp. 119-154
- Aslan, Reza, *Zealot: the life and times of Jesus of Nazareth* (London, 2013)
- Athanassiadi, P., *Julian and Hellenism* (Oxford, 1981)
- \_\_\_\_\_, and M. Frede, eds, *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 1999)
- Atwill, J., *Caesar's Messiah, the Roman Conspiracy to invent Jesus* (Charleston, 2011)
- Bahat, Dan, 'Jerusalem between the Hasmoneans and Herod the Great,' in Rami Arav, ed., *Cities through the Looking Glass: Essays on the History and Archaeology of Biblical Urbanism* (Winona Lake, 2008)
- Baigent, Michael and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London, 1991)
- Bammel, E., 'The revolutionary theory from Reimarus to Brandon,' in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 11-68
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The poor and the Zealots,' in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge, 1984)
- Bar -Kochva, B., *The Image of the Jews in Greek Literature* (Berkeley, 2010)
- Barnard, L. W., *Athenagoras: a Study in Second Century Christian Apologetic* (Paris, 1972)

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Justin Martyr: his Life and Thought* (Cambridge, 1967)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The embassy of Athenagoras', in *Vig. Chr.* 21 (1967), pp. 88-92
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The origins and emergence of the Church in Edessa during the first two centuries A.D.', in *Vig. Chr.* 22 (1968) pp. 161-175
- Barnes Tatum, W., *Jesus: a brief history* (Oxford, 2009)
- Barnett, Paul W., *Jesus and the Logic of History* (Leicester, 1997)
- Bartlet, John R., *1 Maccabees* (Sheffield, 1998)
- Bartlett, John R., *Jews in the Hellenistic World, Josephus, Aristaeus, the Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus, Cambridge Commentaries on writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200BC to AD 200* (Cambridge, 1985)
- Basser, Herbert W., 'Avon Gilyon (Document of Sin, b. Shabb. 116a) or Euvanggeleon (Good News)', in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011), pp. 93-105
- Bassler, Jouette M., 'Paul and his Letters,' in Aune, *The Blackwell*, pp. 373-397
- Batto, B. F., 'Zedeq', in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, eds Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, Pieter W. van der Horst (Leiden, 1995)
- Bauckham, Richard, 'Jews and Jewish Christians in the land of Israel at the time of the Bar Kochba war, with special reference to the Apocalypse of Peter' in *TIEJ* , pp. 228-238
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'James and the Jerusalem Community' in O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik, eds, *The Early Centuries, Jewish Believers in Jesus* (Massachusetts, 2007), pp. 55-93
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Cambridge, 2006)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The origin of the Ebionites,' in Tomson, Peter J. and Doris Lambers-Petry, eds., *The Image of Judeo-Christians* (Tübingen, 2003)
- Bauer, Bruno, *Christus und die Caesaren. Der Ursprung des Christenthums aus dem römischen Griechenthum* (Berlin, 1879)

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh, 1990)
- Baur, Ferdinand Charles, *Paulus der Apostel Jesus Christi*, (Stuttgart, 1845)
- Beard M. and J. North, eds, *Pagan Priests, Religion and Power in the Ancient World* (London, 1990)
- \_\_\_\_\_, J. North, S. Price, eds, *Religions of Rome*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1998)
- Beavis, M. A., 'Philo's Therapeutai: Philosopher's Dream or Utopian Construction?' in *JSP* 14.1 (2004), pp. 30-42
- Becker, Adam H., and Annette Y. Reed, eds., *The Ways that Never Parted : Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages* (Tübingen 2003)
- Becking, Bob, 'The Hellenistic period and ancient Israel: three preliminary statements,' in Grabbe, *Moses*, pp. 78-90
- Behan McCullagh, C., *Justifying historical descriptions* (Cambridge, 1984)
- Bellinzoni, Arthur J., *The Two-Source Hypothesis: a Critical Appraisal* (Mercer, 1985)
- Bell, H. I, 'Anti-Semitism in Alexandria' in *JRS* 31 (1941), pp. 1-18.
- Benedict XVI, Pope, *Jesus of Nazareth, from the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration* (London, 2007)
- Benko, Stephen, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians* (London, 1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_, and J. O' Rourke, eds. *The Catacombs and the Colosseum, the Roman empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity* (Valley Forge, 1971)
- Berchman, M., *From Philo to Origen, Middle Platonism in Transition* (Chico, 1984)
- Berendts, Alexander *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen "De Bello Judaico" des Josephus in Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1906)
- Berger, Albrecht, 'The cult of the Maccabees in the eastern Orthodox Church,' in Gabriela Signiori, ed., *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-*

*Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective* (Leiden, 2012)

Berger, Klaus, *Qumran und Jesus: Wahrheit unter Verschluss?* (Stuttgart, 1993), trans. James S. Currie, *The Truth under Lock and Key* (Louisville, 1995)

Bergmeier, Roland, 'Loyalität als Gegenstand paulinischer Paraklese: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm 13, 1 ff und Jos. B.J. 2,140,' in *Theokratia: Jahrbuch des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* 1 1967-1969 (Leiden 1970), pp. 51-63

Bermejo-Rubio, Fernando, 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance, A Reassessment of the Arguments,' in *Journal for the study of historical Jesus*, 12 (2014), pp. 1-105

Betz, O., and R. Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan. Klarstellungen* (Giessen, 1993), trans. J. Bowden, *Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican: Clarifications* (London, 1994)

Bianchi, U., ed., *La tradizione dell' enkrateia* (Roma, 1985)

Bickerman, Elias, 'The name of Christians,' in *Studies in Jewish and Christian history* 3 (Leiden, 1986), pp. 139-151

———, 'Pliny, Trajan, Hadrian and the Christians,' in *Studies in Jewish and Christian history* 3 (Leiden, 1986), pp. 152-171

Bigg, Charles, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (Oxford, 1886)

Bird, Michael, *Crossing over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Peabody, Mass., 2010)

Birnbaum, E., 'Philo on the Greeks: a Jewish Perspective on Culture and Society in First Century Alexandria' in *Philonica* 8 (2001), pp. 37-58

Black, Matthew, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (London, 1961)

Blackman, Edwin C., *Marcion and his Influence* (London, 1948)

Bloom, J., *The Jewish Revolts Against Rome A.D. 66-135* (North Carolina, 2010)

Boardman, John, *The Greeks Overseas, Their Early Colonies and Trade* (New York, 1999<sup>4</sup>)

- Boas, M. I. *God, Christ and Pagan* (London, 1961<sup>3</sup>)
- Bond, Helen K. 'The Quest for the Historical Jesus: An Appraisal,' in *The Blackwell Companion to Jesus*, ed. Delbert Burkett (Oxford, 2011), pp. 337-353
- Borg, Marcus J., *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship* (Valley Forge, 1994)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the teachings of Jesus*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, vol. 5 (New York, 1984)
- Bouquet, A.C., *Every day life in New Testament Times* (London, 1953)
- Bousset, D. W., *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus* (Göttingen 1915)
- Bowersock, G. W., *Hellenism in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1990)
- Boyarín, Daniel, *Dying for God, Martyrdom and the making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford, 1999)
- Braaten C. E. and R. A. Harrisville, eds, *The historical Jesus and the kerygmatic Christ, Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (New York, 1964)
- Brandon, S. G. F., *Jesus and the Zealots, a study of the Political factor in primitive Christianity* (Manchester, 1967)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church, a study of the effects of the Jewish overthrow of AD 70 on Christianity* (London, 1978<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (London, 1968)
- Brighton, Mark A., *The Sicarii in Josephus's Judean War. Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations* (Leiden, 2009)
- Brown, Peter, *The World of Late Antiquity* (London, 1989<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Rise of Western Christendom* (London, 2003<sup>2</sup>)
- Browning, Robert, *Φιλέλλην*, festschrift ed. Costas N. Constantinides et al (Venice, 1996)

- Bucur, Bogan Gabriel, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses* (Leiden, 2009)
- Buitenwerf, R., *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its social setting* (Leiden, 2003)
- Bultmann, R., 'The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus' in *The historical Jesus and the kerygmatic Christ, Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, eds C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville (New York, 1964), pp. 15-53
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The history of the Synoptic tradition*, trans J. Marsh (Oxford, 1968)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jesus* (Berlin 1926), trans L. Pettibone Smith et. al., *Jesus and the Word* (NY, 1958<sup>2</sup>)
- Burkill, T. A., 'The Syrophoenician woman: The congruence of Mark 7:24-31' in *ZNW* 57 (Berlin, 1966), pp. 23-37
- Burtchaell, J. T., *From Synagogue to Church: Public services and offices in the earliest Christian communities* (Cambridge, 1992)
- Butler, B.C., *The originality of St. Matthew* (Cambridge, 1951)
- Cacciari, Antonio, 'Philo and the Nazirite' in ed. F. Calabi, *Italian Studies of Philo of Alexandria* (Boston, 2003), pp. 147-166
- Cadbury, Henry J., *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York, 1958<sup>2</sup>)
- Cadoux, C. J., *The early Christian attitude to war* (London, 1940<sup>2</sup>)
- Cantalamessa, R., *Easter in the Early Church, an Anthology of Jewish and Early Christian Texts* (Collegeville Min., 1993)
- Carmichael, J., *The death of Jesus* (New York, 1963)
- Carpenter, Edward, *Παγανισμός και Χριστιανική Θρησκεία*, trans in Greek by M. Ζαχαριάδου (Athens, 2002)
- Carson, D. A., 'Pseudonymity and Pseudepigraphy' in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, eds Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove, 2000), pp. 857-864



- Chadwick, Henry, *Early Christian thought and the classical tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen* (Oxford, 1966)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Early Church* (Middlesex, 1977)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Church in Ancient Society, from Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2001)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Philo and the beginnings of Christian thought' in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, ed. A.H. Armstrong (Cambridge, 1967)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams (Cambridge, 1989)
- Charlesworth, James H., *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1992)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'From Old to New,' in J. H. Charlesworth and Peter Pokorny, eds., *Jesus Research: An International Perspective (The first Princeton-Prague Symposium on Jesus Research)* (Michigan, 2009), pp. 56-72
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?' in Schiffman, *Dead*, pp. 130-131
- Chesnutt, Randall D., *From Death to Life: Conversion of Joseph and Aseneth* (Sheffield, 1995)
- Chester, Andrew, 'The Parting of the Ways: Eschatology and Messianic Hope', in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 239-313
- Chilton, Bruce, 'Targum, Jesus, and the Gospels', in *The Historical Jesus in Context*, eds Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison Jr., John Dominic Crossan (Princeton, 2006), pp. 238-255
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Craig A. Evans, eds., *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the state of current research*, (Leiden, 1994)
- Chrēstou, P., *Οι Περιπέτειες των Εθνικών Ονομάτων των Ελλήνων* (Thessalonikē, 1993)
- Clark, E. A., *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton, 1999)

- Clark Kee, Howard, 'Early Christianity in the Galilee,' in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (New York, 1992), pp. 3-22
- Clayton Croy, N., *3 Maccabees* (Leiden, 2006)
- Coakley, Sarah and Charles M. Stang, eds., *Re-thinking Dionysius the Areopagite* (Oxford, 2009)
- Cohen, Avinoam, 'A theological polemic with Christianity?' in *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. D. Jaffé (Leiden, 2010), pp. 67-84
- Cohen, Shaye J. D., *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (Leiden, 1979)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Was Judaism in Antiquity a Missionary Religion?,' in *Mor, AAA*, pp. 14-23
- Collins, John J., and Gregory E. Sterling, *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Indiana, 2001)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Artapanus revisited' in *From Judaism to Christianity: Tradition and Transition, A Festschrift for Thomas H. Tobin, S.J., on the Occasion of His Sixty - fifth Birthday*, ed. P. Walters (Leiden, 2010), pp. 59-68
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Hellenistic Judaism in recent scholarship', in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*, ed. J.J. Collins (Leiden, 2005), pp. 1-20
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The limits of Hellenization in Judea', pp. 21-43 in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule* (Leiden, 2005)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Third Sibyl revisited', in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule* (Leiden, 2005), pp. 82-98
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Sibyl and the Potter: political propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt,' in Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici, Angela Standhardtner, eds, *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi* (Leiden, 1994), pp. 57-69

- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Anti-Semetism in antiquity? The case of Alexandria', in Collins, *Jewish*, pp. 181-201
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Messianism in the Maccabean Period', in Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, Ernest S. Frerichs, eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 97-109
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Qumran, Apocalypticism, and the New Testament,' in Schiffman, *Dead*, pp. 133-138
- Comfort, Philip W., and David P. Barrett, *The text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: A Corrected Enlarged Edition of the Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts* (Wheaton, Illinois, 2001)
- Constantellos, Demetrios, 'Μαρτυρίες για την Ταυτότητα τῶν Βυζαντινῶν καί τῶν Ρωμηῶν, σέ Ἑλληνικές Πηγές,' See <http://www.enromiosini.gr/peri-rwmiosinis/h-tautothta-twn-buzantinwn-kai-twn-rw/>. Last accessed 31 Feb 2014.
- Cook, Michael J., 'How Credible Is Jewish Scholarship on Jesus?' in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011), pp. 251-270
- Cotton, R., 'Anointing in the Old Testament,' accessible online at [http://www.agts.edu/faculty/faculty\\_publications/articles/cotton\\_anointing.pdf](http://www.agts.edu/faculty/faculty_publications/articles/cotton_anointing.pdf) (last accessed on 22 December 2012).
- Cresswell, *Jesus the Terrorist* (Ropley, 2010)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Censored Messiah, the truth about Jesus Christ* (Alresford, 2004)
- Griggs, C. W., *Early Egyptian Christianity from its origins to 451 CE* (Leiden, 1990)
- Grig, Lucy, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London, 2004)
- Crossan, J. D., *The historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh, 1991)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (New York, 1994)
- Cupane, C., 'Ἡ τῶν Ρωμαίων γλῶσσα' in *Byzantina Mediterranea. Festschrift für Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. K. Belke, E. Kislinger, A. Klzer and M. A. Stassinopoulou (Vienna-Cologne-Weimar, 2007), pp. 133-156

- Daniélou, J., *Les manuscrits de la mer Morte et les origines du Christianisme* (Paris, 1956)
- Davila, James R., *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian or other?* (Leiden, 2005)
- De Blois et al. (eds.), *The Impact of the Roman Army (200 B.C. – A.D. 476)*, (Leiden, 2007)
- De Boor, M. C., 'The Nazoreans' in *TIEJ*, pp. 239-262
- De Jonge, M., review of S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots, a study of the Political factor in primitive Christianity* (Manchester, 1967) in *Vig. Chr.* 23 (1969), pp. 228-231
- De Lange, N. R. M., *Apocrypha: Jewish Literature of the Hellenistic Age* (New York, 1978)
- , *Origen and the Jews, studies in Jewish - Christian relations in third century palestine* (Cambridge, 1976)
- deSilva, David A., *4 Maccabees* (Sheffield, 1998)
- Deschner, Karlheinz, *Kriminalgeschichte des Christentums*, 10 vols (Reinbek, 1986), trans. Ξ. Αρμύρος, *Η εγκληματική ιστορία του χριστιανισμού* (Athens, 2004), vol. 1
- Ditten, Hans, 'Βάρβαροι, Έλληνες und Ρωμαῖοι bei den letzten byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibern', in *Actes du XIIe Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines*, vol. II (Belgrade, 1964), pp. 273-299
- Dodd, C. H., *History and the Gospel* (London, 1964<sup>2</sup>)
- Donfield, Karl P., 'I Thessalonians' in Aune, *The Blackwell*, pp. 504-514
- Downing, F. Gerald, 'Imitation and Emulation, Josephus and Luke: Plot and Psycholinguistics' in *The Elijah-Elisha narrative in the composition of Luke*, eds. John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden (London, 2014), pp. 113-129
- Droge, A., and J. Talbot, *A Noble Death, suicide and martyrdom among Chritians and Jews in Antiquity* (San Francisco, 1992)

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Tübingen, 1989)
- Dunbabin, T.J., *The Western Greeks* (repr. Oxford, 1999)
- Dunn, James D. G., 'The Question of Anti-Semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period', in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 177-211.
- Dupont-Sommer, André, *Le Quatrième Livre des Machabées* (Paris, 1939)
- Dzielska, M., *Hypatia z Aleksandrii*, trans F. Lyra, *Hypatia of Alexandria* (Harvard, 1995)
- Eck, W., 'The Bar Kokhba revolt: the Roman point of view' in *JRS* 89 (1999), pp. 76-89
- Edwards, D. R., *Religion and Power* (New York, 1996)
- Edwards, Douglas, 'The Socio-Economic and Cultural Ethos in the First Century,' in *LIL*, pp. 53-73
- Edwards, James R., *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition* (Michigan, 2009)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Gospel according to Mark* (Leicester, 2002)
- Eisenman, Robert, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians* (Dorset, 1996)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *James the Brother of Jesus* (London, 2002)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Pesher* (Leiden, 1986)
- Eisler, R., *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*, 2 vols (Heidelberg, 1928-1930)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* (London, 1931)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The enigma of the fourth Gospel, its author and its writer* (London, 1938)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Christ passage in Josephus' in *JQR* 18.3 (1928)

- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Flavius Josephus on Jesus called the Christ' in *JQR* 21.1-2 (Philadelphia, 1930)
- Eissfeldt, Otto, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, trans P. R. Ackroyd, *The Old Testament, an Introduction*, from the 3rd German edition (Oxford, 1965)
- Ellegård, Alvar, *Jesus – One Hundred Years Before Christ: A Study In Creative Mythology* (London, 1999)
- Elliott, J. K., *The Apocryphal New Testament: a collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford, 1993)
- Elm, S., 'Hellenism and Historiography: Gregory of Nazianzus and Julian in Dialogue' in *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies*, eds D. Martin, P. Cox Miller (Durham, 2005), pp. 258-277
- Elsner, J., 'Archaeologies and agendas: reflections on late ancient art and Early Christian art' in *JRS* 93 (2003), pp. 114-128
- Engberg, J., *Impulsore Chresto: Opposition to Christianity in the Roman Empire c. 50-250*, trans. G. Carter (Frankfurt, 2007)
- Esler, P. F., *The First Christians in their Social Worlds, Social-scientific approaches to New Testament interpretation* (London, 1994)
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *The Early Christian World*, 2 vols (London, 2000)
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *Ancient Israel, the Old Testament in its social context* (London, 2005)
- Evans, Craig A., ed., *The Historical Jesus: Critical Concepts in Religious Studies* (London, 2004)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Jesus in non-Christian sources', in Chilton-Evans, pp. 443-478
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The recently published Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus', in Chilton-Evans, pp. 547-565
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Jesus's Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction,' in *Jesus in Context: Temple, Purity and Restoration*, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans (Leiden, 1997), pp. 395-439
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Josephus on John the Baptist', in *The Historical Jesus in Context* eds Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison Jr and John Dominic Crossan (Princeton, 2006), pp. 55-63

- Everton, Sean F., 'What Are The Odds?,' in *Journal for the study of historical Jesus* 13, (2015), pp 24-42
- Fairweather, W., *Jesus and the Greeks* (Edinburgh, 1924)
- Falk, Harvey, *Jesus the Pharisee* (New York, 1985)
- Farmer, William R., *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period* (1956, r. Westport, Conn., 1973)
- Fedalto, G., ed., *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, 2 vols (Padova, 1988)
- Feldman, L. H, *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered* (Leiden, 2006)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)* (Berlin, 1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Josephus' Portrait of David,' *Hebrew College Annual*, vol. LX (New York, 1989)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Scholarship on Philo and Josephus 1937-1962* (N.Y., 1963)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, 1993)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Philo's Portrayal of Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism* (Indiana, 2007)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Josephus' Portrait of David', *Hebrew College Annual* LX (1989), pp. 129-174
- Ferguson, Everett, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Michigan, 1993<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Martyrion', in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* (New York, 1990), pp. 580-583
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Early Christian Martyrdom and Civil Disobedience' in *J ECS* 1 (Baltimore, 1993), pp. 73-83
- Ferguson, John, *Clement of Alexandria* (NY, 1974)
- Fiensy, David. A., *Prayers alleged to be Jewish, An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum*, *Brown Judaic Studies* 65 (Chico, 1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Hellenistic Synagogal prayers: one hundred years of discussion,' in *JSP* 5 (Sheffield, 1987), pp. 17-27

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jesus the Galilean: Soundings in a First Century Life* (New Jersey, 2007)
- Finn, T. M., *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: West and East Syria, Message of the Fathers of the Church* (Collegeville, 1992)
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London, 1971)
- Flint, Peter, 'Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Amy-Jill Levine, D. C. Allison Jr., J. D. Crossan, eds, *The Historical Jesus in Context* (Princeton, 2006), pp. 110-131
- Fox, Robin Lane, *Pagans and Christians* (Harmondsworth, 1986)
- Francis, J. A., *Subversive Virtue, Asceticism and Authority in the Second-Century Pagan World* (Pennsylvania, 1995)
- Fredriksen, Paula, 'What Parting of the Ways?', in *The Ways that Never Parted, Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, eds A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed (Tübingen, 2003), pp. 35-63
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews: A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity* (London, 2000)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Historical Jesus, the scene in the Temple and the Gospel of John' in *JJH*, pp. 249-276
- Frend, W. H. C., *The Rise of Christianity* (London, 1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church, a Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus* (Oxford, 1965)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Christianity' in *OCD* (Oxford, 1970)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Martyrdom and political oppression,' in *The Early Christian World*, ed. P. F. Esler, 2 vols (London, 2000), vol. 2, pp. 815-839
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The archaeology of Early Christianity* (London, 1996)
- Frieman, Shulamis, *Who's Who in the Talmud*, (Northvale, New Jersey, 1995)
- Frey, J. B., ed. *Corpus Inscriptorum Judaicarum*, 2 vols (Rome, 1936-1952)



- Freyne, Seán, 'The Galilean World of Jesus' in *The Early Christian World*, ed. P. F. Esler, 2 vols (London, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 113-135
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Galilee and Judea in the first century', in *CCOC* 1, pp. 37-52
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Jesus in Jewish Galilee' in *E. P. Sanders: Redefining First-century Jewish and Christian Identities*, ed. F. Udoh et al. (Indiana, 2008), pp. 197-212
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Geography of Restoration: Galilee-Jerusalem Relations in Early Jewish and Christian Experience,' in *NTS* (Cambridge, 2001), vol. 47.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary approaches and historical Investigations* (Dublin, 1988)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Urban-Rural Relationships in First Century Galilee' in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (Harvard, 1992), pp 75-94
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Geography, Politics and Economics of Galilee and the Quest for the Historical Jesus,' in Chilton-Evans, pp. 75-122
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Galileans in Light of Josephus' Vita' in *NTS* 26 (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 397-413
- Fujita, N., *A Crack in the Jar, What Ancient Jewish Documents tell us about the New Testament* (New York, 1986)
- Funk, Robert W., (and the Jesus Seminar), ed., *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus* (San Francisco, 1998)
- Gafni, Isaiah M., 'Pre-histories of Jerusalem in Hellenistic, Jewish and Christian literature', in *JSP* 1 (Sheffield, 1987) pp. 5-22
- Gager, John. G., *The origins of anti-semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in pagan and Christian antiquity* (Oxford, 1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Nashville, 1972)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford, 2000)
- Gambetti, S., *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 C.E. and the Persecution of the Jews: A Historical Reconstruction* (Leiden, 2009)

- Gamble, Harry Y., *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (Yale, 1995)
- Garber, Zev, 'The Jewish Jesus: a Partisan's Imagination,' in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011)
- García Martínez, F., *Textos de Qumrán* (Madrid, 1992), trans. W. G. E. Watson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English translation* (Leiden, 1994)
- Garrison, Roman, *The Graeco-Roman Context of Early Christian Literature* (Sheffield, 1997)
- Georgi, Dieter *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*, eds. Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici, Angela Standhardtner (Leiden, 1994)
- Glavinas, A. A., *Οι διωγμοί κατά της Εκκλησίας στην Προκωνσταντίνηα εποχή* (Katerine, 1992)
- Gmirkin, Russell, 'The War Scroll, the Hasidim, and the Maccabean Conflict,' in Schiffman, *Dead*, pp. 491-492
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch* (N.Y., 2006)
- Goldstein, J. A., 'Jewish acceptance and rejection of Hellenism' in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, eds., E. P. Sanders et al. (London, 1981), pp. 64-87
- Golb, Norman, *Who wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York, 1995)
- Goodblatt, David, et al., eds. *Historical perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kochba in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden, 2001)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Judean nationalism in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in Goodblatt, *Historical*, pp. 3-27
- Goodman, M., *State and Society in Roman Galilee, A.D. 132-212* (New Jersey, 1983)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Rome and Jerusalem, The Clash of Ancient civilisations* (London, 2007)

- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Josephus and Variety in First Century Judaism' in *The Religious History of the Roman Empire, Pagans, Jews and Christians*, eds J. A. North and S. R. F. Price, (Oxford, 2011), pp. 419-434
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The ruling class of Judea: The Origins of the Jewish revolt against Rome A.D. 66-70* (Cambridge, 1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple', in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 27-38
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Modeling the Parting of the Ways,' in Becker-Reed, pp. 119-129
- Gordon, R, 'The Veil of Power: emperors, sacrifices and benefactors' in *Pagan Priests, Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, eds. M. Beard and J. North (London, 1990), pp. 201-234
- Goudenough, Erwin R., *An introduction to Philo Judaeus* (Oxford, 1986<sup>2</sup>)
- Gounaridēs, Paris, *Γένος Ρωμαίων, Βυζαντινές και Νεοελληνικές Ερμηνείες* (Athens, 1996)
- Grabbe, Lester L., ed., *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 317 (Sheffield, 2001)
- Grabowski, Tomasz, 'Achaeus, the Ptolemies and the Fourth Syrian War,' in Edward Dabrowa, *New studies on the Seleucids. Electrum* vol. 18 (2011)
- Grant, Robert M., *Greek Apologists of the Second century* (London, 1988)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Athenagoras or Pseudo-Athenagoras,' in *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 47 (1954), pp. 121-129
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Marcion and the Critical Method' in Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd, eds., *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare* (Waterloo, Ont., 1984), pp. 207-215
- Grant, Michael, *Herod the Great* (New York, 1971)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The History of Ancient Israel* (London, 1986)

- Gray, L. H., 'The Armenian acts of the martyrdom of S. Ignatius of Antioch,' *Armenian quarterly* 1 (Columbia, 1946), pp. 47-66
- Green, Peter, *Alexander to Actium: The Hellenistic Age* (London, 1993)
- Gerdmar, A., *Rethinking the Judaism - Hellenism Dicotomy, a historiographical case study of Second Peter and Jude* (Stockholm, 2001)
- Goulder, M. D., 'The Two Roots of the Christian Myth' in *The Myth of God Incarnate*, ed. J. Hick (London, 1977), pp. 64-85
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Midrash and Lction in Matthew* (London, 1974)
- Gruen, Erich S., *Heritage and Hellenism* (Univ. of California, 1998)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Harvard, 2002)
- Gunther, John J., *St Paul's Opponents and Their Background. A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings, Supplements Novum Testamentum, 35* (Leiden, 1973)
- Guthrie, Donald, *New Testament Introduction* (Illinois, 1990)
- Guthrie, W.K.C., *A history of Greek Philosophy, 6 vols* (Cambridge, 1962-1981), vol. 1, *The earlier Presocratics and the Pythagoreans* (1962)
- Gwyn, David M., S. Bangert et. al., *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, 2010)
- Haacker, Klauss, 'Paul's life,' in James D. G. Dunn, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to St Paul* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 19-33
- Hadas, Moses, *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (N.Y., 1953)
- Haenchen, Ernst, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1971)
- Hahn, Johannes, 'The Veneration of the Maccabean brothers in fourth century Antioch: religious competition, martyrdom, and innovation,' in Gabriela Signiori, ed., *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 79-104

- Hagner, Donald A., 'The New Testament, History and the Historical-Critical Method' in David A. Black and David S. Dockery, eds, *New Testament Criticism and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, 1991)
- Halsberghe, G. H., *The cult of Sol Invictus* (Leiden, 1972)
- Hardwick, Josephus Michael E. Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius* (Atlanta, 1989)
- Hargis, J. W., *Against the Christians: The rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic* (NY, 2001)
- Harland, P., 'Acculturation and Identity in the Diaspora, A Jewish Family and Pagan Guilds at Hierapolis' in *The Religious History of the Roman Empire, Pagans, Jews and Christians*, eds J. A. North and S. R. F. Price (Oxford, 2011), pp. 385-418
- Harpur, T., *The Pagan Christ, recovering the lost light* (Toronto, 2004)
- Harris, W. V., ed., *The spread of Christianity in the first four centuries, Essays in Explanation* (Leiden, 2005)
- Harris, S. L., *Understanding the Bible* (Mayfield, 1985)
- Harvey, Graham, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden, 1996)
- Hayman, Allison P., ed. and trans. *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew*, *Corpus Christianorum Orientalium*, 339 (Louvain, 1973)
- Hengel, Martin, *Juden, Griechen und Barbaren, Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlicher Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1976), trans. John Bowden, *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians* (London, 1980)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur Jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* (Leiden, 1961), trans. David Smith, *The Zealots. Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 AD* (Edinburgh, 1989)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?*, Biblical Series 28 (Philadelphia, 1971)

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begengung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2 Jh.s v. Chr.* (Tübingen, 1973), trans. J. Bowden, *Judaism and Hellenism* (London, 1981<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians,' in James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992), pp. 39-83
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Zur urchristlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, trans. J. Bowden, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (London, 1979)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The pre-Christian Paul,' in Lieu, *The Jews*, pp. 29-52
- Herzog II, William R., *Prophet and Teacher: An Introduction to the Historical Jesus* (Louisville, 2005)
- Hill, Craig C., *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis, 1992)
- Hirsch, E. and M. Seligsohn, 'Jebusites', in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 12 vols. (New York, 1907)
- Hock, Ronald F., *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas* (Santa Rosa, California, 1995)
- Hoehner, Harold W., *Herod Antipas* (Cambridge, 1972)
- Hoffman, R. Joseph, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity. An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century* (Chico, 1984)
- Honigman, Sylvie, *Tales of High Priests and Taxes* (Oakland, Cal. 2014)
- Horbury, William, 'The depiction of Judaeo-Christians in the Toledot Yesu,' in Tomson, Peter J. and Doris Lambers-Petry, eds., *The Image of Judeo-Christians* (Tübingen, 2003)
- Horrell, D. G., 'Early Jewish Christianity,' in *The Early Christian World*, ed. P. F. Esler, 2 vols (London, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 136-167
- Horsley, G. H. R., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (Sydney, 1989), trans. K. Papademetriou, Η Ελληνική της Καινής Διαθήκης,

Γλωσσολογικές μελέτες με τη συμβολή επιγραφών και παπύρων  
(Thessalonikē, 2003)

Horsley, R. A. ed., *Christian Origins, A people's history of Christianity*, general ed. D. R. Janz, 7 vols (Minneapolis, 2005), vol. 1

\_\_\_\_\_, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence. Popular Resistance in Roman Palestine* (San Francisco, 1987)

Hoskyns, Edwyn and Noel Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament* (London, 1958)

Howell, Martha and Walter Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods* (New York, 2001)

Humphries, M., *Early Christianity* (London, 2006)

Isaac B., I. Roll, 'Judea in the Early Years of Hadrian's Reign,' *Latomus, Revue D' Études Latines* 38 (Bruxelles, 1979), pp. 54-66

Jack, J. W. *The historic Christ, an examination of Dr. Robert Eisler's theory according to the Slavonic version of Josephus and the other sources* (London, 1933)

Jaeger, W., *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, 1961)

James, M. R., *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1924)

Janin, R., *La géographie ecclésiastique de l' empire byzantin: Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1969)

Jennings, Theodore W., Jr., 'The Gay Jesus,' in *The Blackwell Companion to Jesus*, ed. Delbert Burkett (Oxford, 2011), pp. 443-457.

Jensen, M. H., 'Herod Antipas in Galilee: Friend or Foe of the Historical Jesus?' in *JSHJ* 5.1 (2007), pp. 7-32

Jervell, Jacob, fest. *Mighty Minorities? Minorities in Early Christianity – Positions and Strategies*, ed. Hellholm, David et al., (Oslo, 1995)

Jones, A. H. M., *The Herods of Judea* (Oxford, 1967)

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Greek City, from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford, 1998<sup>2</sup>)

- Jossa, Giorgio, *Gesù e i movimenti di liberazione della Palestina* (Brescia, 1980)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jews or Christians?: The Followers of Jesus in Search of their own Identity* (Tübingen, 2006)
- Jüthner, J., *Hellenen und Barbaren* (Leipzig, 1923)
- Kaldellis, A., *Hellenism in Byzantium, The Transformation of the Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, 2007)
- Kalthoff, A., *Die Entstehung des Christentums: Neue Beiträge zum Christusproblem* (Leipzig, 1904)
- Kamara, A., ed. and trans. Η αντιπαγανιστική νομοθεσία της Ύστερης Ρωμαϊκής Αυτοκρατορίας μέσα από τους Κώδικες (Athens, 2000)
- Kampen, John, *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (Atlanta, 1988)
- Katz, S. T. et. al., eds, *Cambridge History of Judaism, The*, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1984-2006)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Rabbinic Response to Christianity' in *The Late Roman Rabbinic Period, CHJ* 4 vols (Cambridge, 2006), vol. 4, pp. 259- 298
- Kaufmann, K., 'Sadducees', *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 12 vols. (New York, 1907), vol. 10
- Kautsky, K., *Der Ursprung des Christentums* (Berlin, 1908), tr. *Foundations of Christianity, A Study in Christian Origins* (London, 1925)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Die materialistische Geschichtsauffassung* (Berlin, 1927), trans and ed. John Kautsky and R. Meyer, *The Materialist Conception of History* (Yale, 1988).
- Kee, H. C., Meyers, Rogerson and Saldarini, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to the Bible* (Cambridge, 1997)
- Keener, Craig S., *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels* (Michigan, 2012)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Paul and the Corinthian Believers,' in *BCP*, pp. 46-62



- Kerem, Yitzchak, 'The Jewish and Greek Jesus,' in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011), pp. 159-180
- Kessler, Edward, *An introduction to Jewish-Christian relations* (Cambridge, 2010)
- Keck, Leander E., 'The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity', *ZNW* 57 (1966)
- Kimelman, R., 'Birkat Ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity' in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, ed. E. P. Sanders et al. (London, 1981), pp. 226-244
- Kiraz, George A., *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels*, 4 vols. (Leiden, 1996)
- Kissinger, Warren S., *The Lives of Jesus: A History and Bibliography* (New York, 1985)
- Klauck, H-J., *Die religiöse Umwelt des Urchristentums* (Stuttgart, 1995-96), trans B. Mc Neil *The Religious Context of Early Christianity* (Edinburgh, 2000)
- Kleist, J. A., *Ancient Christian Writings* (London, 1957)
- Klijn, A. and G. Reinink, *Patristic evidence for Jewish-Christian sects* (Leiden, 1973)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition* (Leiden, 1992)
- Klinker-De Klerck, Myriam, 'The Pastoral Epistles: authentic pauline writings', in *European Journal of Theology* 17:2 (2008), pp. 101-108
- Kluzz, T., 'Paul and the development of Gentile Christianity' in *The Early Christian World*, ed. P. F. Esler, 2 vols (London, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 168-197
- Knox, Wilfred L., *Some Hellenistic elements in Primitive Christianity* (London, 1944)
- Kocijancic, Gorazd, 'The Identity of Dionysius the Areopagite: A Philosophical Approach', in Filip Inanovic, ed., *Dionysius the Areopagite between Orthodoxy and Heresy* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 3-11
- Koester, H., *The future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. B. A. Pearson (Minneapolis, 1991)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London, 1990)

Koltun-Fromm, Naomi, 'Zipporah's Complaint: Moses is Not Conscientious in the Deed! Exegetical Traditions of Moses' Celibacy,' in Becker-Reed, pp. 283-306

Koppel, Mosse, and Navot Akiva, Idan and Nahum Dershowitz, 'Unsupervised Decomposition of a Document into Authorial Components', (2011). Available online at: <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology-new/P/P11/P11-1136.pdf> (last accessed on the 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2013).

Kordatos, Yianis *Ιησούς Χριστός και Χριστιανισμός*, 2 vols (Athens, 1975)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Αρχαίες Θρησκείες και Χριστιανισμός* (Athens, 1973<sup>5</sup>)

Kottek, Heimann, *Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet* (Leipzig, 1886)

Krodel, G., 'Persecution and Toleration of Christianity Until Hadrian,' in S. Benko and J. O' Rourke, eds. *The Catacombs and the Colosseum, the Roman empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity* (Valley Forge, 1971), pp. 255-267

Kümmel, Werner G., *Das neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970), trans. S. McLean Gilmour and H. C. Kee, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems* (London, 1973)

Larson, Martin A., *The Essene-Christian Faith: A Study in the Sources of Western Religion* (Costa Mesa, 1989)

Lechner, K., *Hellenen und Barbaren im Weltbild der Byzantiner* (München, 1954)

Leigh Gibson, E., 'The Jews and Christians in the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Entangled or Parted Ways?' in Becker-Reed, pp. 145-158

Lemche, Niels Peter, *The Israelites in History and Tradition* (1998)

Lemerle, P., *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1971), trans. M. Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, *Ο πρώτος Βυζαντινός Οὐμανισμός* (Athens, 1985<sup>2</sup>)

- Lémonon, J.P., *Pilate et le gouvernement de la Judée, textes et monumnets* (Paris, 1981)
- Lenzman, I., *L'origine du christianisme*, Editions en langues étrangères (Moscou, 1961), trans. Φ. Φωτίου, *Οι ρίζες του Χριστιανισμού* (Athens, 2001)
- Levine, Lee I., *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity, Conflict or Confluence?* (Seattle, 1998)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Ancient Synagogue, The First Thousand Years* (Yale, 2005<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (Harvard, 1992)
- Lieberman, S., *Greek in Jewish Palestine, Studies in the literary transmission beliefs and manners of Palestine in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE-IV century AD* (New York, 1942)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, studies in the literary transmission, beliefs and manners of Palestine in the 1st cent. BCE - 4th cent. CE* (New York, 1950)
- Lietzmann, Hans, *A History of the Early Church*, trans. B. L. Woolf (London 1961)
- Lieu, J., *Neither Jew nor Greek. Constructing Early Christianity* (London, 2002)
- \_\_\_\_\_, J. North, T. Rajak, eds., *The Jews among Pagans and Christians* (London, 1992)
- Livanos, Christopher, *Greek tradition and Latin influence in the work of George Scholarios* (New Jersey, 2006)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Scholarios and Neo-Paganism', in *Papers of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, eds. E. Jeffreys, J. Gilliland, 3 vols (London, 2006), vol. 2, pp. 207-208
- Lowden, J. H. and C. B. Tkačz, 'Maccabees', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed.-in-chief A.P. Kazhdan (Oxford, 1991)
- Luomanen, Petri, 'Ebionites and Nazarenes' in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe (Minneapolis, 2007)
- Lynwood Smith, Daniel, *The Rhetoric of Interruption: Speech making, Turn-Taking, and Rule-Breaking in Luke Acts and Ancient Greek Narrative* (Berlin, 2012)

- Maccoby, Hyam, *The Mythmaker: Paul and the invention of Christianity* (London, 1986)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jesus the Pharisee* (London, 2003)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Revolution in Judea: Jesus and the Jewish Resistance* (NY, 1980)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Paul and Hellenism* (London, 1991)
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *A History of Christianity* (London, 2009)
- Mach, M., 'Conservative revolution? The intolerant innovations of Qumran,' in *TIEJ*, pp. 61-79
- Mack, Burton L., *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia, 1988)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (Dorset, 1993)
- MacMullen, R., *Christianizing the Roman Empire, A.D. 100-400* (Yale, 1984)
- Magdalino, Paul, 'Hellenism and Nationalism', in *Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium*, ed. P. Magdalino (Aldershot, 1991), pp. 1-29
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Rhetoric of Hellenism', in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth Century Europe*, ed. P. Magdalino (Rio Grande Ohio, 1992), pp. 139-156
- Magid, Shaul, 'The New Jewish Reclamation of Jesus in Late Twentieth-Century America: Realigning and Rethinking Jesus the Jew', pp. 358-382 in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed., Zev Garber (West Lafayette, Ind., 2011)
- Malley, W. J., *Hellenism and Christianity* (Univ. Gregoriana Editrice, 1978)
- Marcus, J., 'Jewish Christianity' in *CCOC*, vol. 1, pp. 87-102
- Mason, Steve, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, Mass., 2003<sup>2</sup>)
- McDonald, L. M., *The biblical Canon, its Origin, Transmission and Authority* (Massachusetts, 2008<sup>3</sup>)

- McGehee, M., 'Why Tatian Never "Apologised" To The Greeks' in *J ECS* (Baltimore, 1993), pp. 143-158
- McGowan, A., 'Marcion's love of creation' in *J ECS* 9 (2001), pp. 295-311
- McKechnie, P., *The first Christian centuries* (Leicester, 2001)
- Meeks, W. A. and R. L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the first four centuries of the common era* (Missoula, 1978)
- Meier, John P., *Marginal, Meier, A marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, 3 vols (New York, 3:2001)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Criteria: How do we decide what comes from Jesus?' in *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research*, eds James D. G. Dunn and Scot McKnight (Winona Lake, 2005), pp. 123-144
- Mendels, D., *Identity, Religion and Historiography: Studies in Hellenistic History* (Sheffield, 1998)
- Metzger, B. M., *The Text of the New Testament* (Oxford, 1992)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Canon of the New Testament, its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford, 1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_, and B. D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford, 2005<sup>4</sup>)
- Μέξης, Δήμος, *Ο ιστορικός Γιάννης Κορδάτος και το έργο του: εισαγωγή, ανέκδοτη αυτοβιογραφία και αυτοκριτική* (Athens, 1975)
- Milik, J.T., *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea* (London, 1959)
- Mitchell, M. M., 'Gentile Christianity,' in *CCOC* , vol. 1, pp. 103-124
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Cult of Theos Hypsistos between Pagans, Jews and Christians' in P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede, eds, *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 81-148
- Mittelstadt, Martin William, 'For Profit or Delight? Richard Pervo's Contributions to Lukan Studies' in *Pneuma* 33.1 (2011)

- Modrzejewski, Joseph M., *Les Juifs d' Egypte, de Ramses II à Hadrien* (Paris, 1992), trans. R. Cornman *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Edinburgh, 1995)
- Moll, Sebastian, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (Tübingen, 2010)
- Momigliano, A., *The conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, essays edited by A. Momigliano (Oxford, 1963)
- Montserrat Torrents, José, *Jesús el Galileo armado: Historia laica de Jesús* (Madrid, 2007)
- Moody Smith, D., 'John: A source for Jesus research?,' in *JJH*, pp. 165-178
- Mopsik, C., 'Late Judeo-Aramaic: The language of Theosophic Kabbalah', *Aramaic Studies* 4.1 (2006), pp. 21-33
- Mor, Menahem, 'The Roman Army in Eretz-Israel in the years A.D. 70-132' pp. 575-602, vol. 2 in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East; Proceedings of a colloquium held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986*, eds Philip Freeman and David Kennedy, 2 vols, (Oxford, 1986)
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *Jewish Assimilation, Acculturation and Accommodation: Past Traditions, Current Issues and Future Prospects: Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization* (Lanham, 1992)
- Moses, Robert E., 'Jesus Barabbas, a Nominal Messiah? text and History in Matthew 27.16-17' in *New Testament Studies* 58.1 (2012), pp. 45-46, Mullen, R. L., *The expansion of Christianity, a gazetteer of its first three centuries* (Leiden, 2004)
- Munck, J., *Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte* 2 (Stuttgart 1933)
- Murphy, F., *Pseudo-Philo: rewriting the Bible* (Oxford, 1993)
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Wilmington, Delaware, 1983)
- Myllykoski, Matti, 'Christian Jews and Jewish Christians: The Jewish Origins of Christianity in English Literature from Elizabeth I to Toland's

- Nazarenus,' in F. Stanley Jones, ed., *The Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 3-41
- Mystakidēs, Basileios A., 'Αἱ λέξεις Ἑλλήν, Γραικός (γραικύλος), Ρωμαῖος (Γραικορωμαῖος), Βυζαντινός, Ὀθωμανός, Τοῦρκος', *Νέος Ποιμένας* (Tübingen, 1920<sup>2</sup>), pp. 5-30
- Nanos, Mark D., 'Galatians' in Aune, *The Blackwell*, pp. 455-474
- Nedava, Joseph, 'Who Were the Biryoni?' in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 63, (1972-73)
- Neusner, Jacob, William S. Green, Ernest S. Frerichs, eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge, 1987)
- Newton, M., *The concept of purity at Qumran and in the letters of Paul* (Cambridge, 1985)
- Niehoff, M. R., 'Philo's views on paganism' in *TIEJ*, pp. 135-158
- Nilsson, M. P., 'Bacchanalia', *OCD* (Oxford, 1970)
- Norden, Eduard, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig, 1923)
- North, J. A., *Roman Religion, Greece and Rome, New Surveys in the Classics*, 30 (Oxford, 2000)
- \_\_\_\_\_, and S. R. F. Price, eds., *The Religious History of the Roman Empire, Pagans, Jews and Christians* (Oxford, 2011)
- O'Collins, Gerald, *Jesus: A Portrait* (London, 2008)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic study of Jesus* (Oxford, 1995)
- O'Connel, Marvin R., *Critics of Trial: an introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis* (Washington, 1994)
- Ogg, George, *The Chronology of the Life of Paul* (London, 1968)
- O'Neill, J.C., 'The origins of monasticism', in *The Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. R. Williams (Cambridge, 1989)

- Oort, J. van, and D. Wyrwa, eds, *Heiden und Christen* (Leuven, 1998)
- Oppenheimer, Aharon, 'The Ban on Circumcision as a Cause of the Revolt: A Reconsideration', in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome* ed. Peter Schäfer (Tübingen, 2003), pp. 55-69
- Osborn, E.F., *The beginning of Christian Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1981)
- Ostrogorsky, G., *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, trans by J. M. Hussey, *History of the Byzantine State* (Oxford, 1968<sup>2</sup>)
- Pagels, E., *Beyond Belief, the secret Gospel of Thomas* (London, 2003)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Gnostic Paul* (Philadelphia, 1975)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis: Heracleon's Commentary on John* (Nashville, 1973)
- Parente, F., 'Onias III and the founding of the Temple of Leontopolis' in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*, eds F. Parente and J. Sievers (Leiden, 1994), pp. 69-98
- Parke, H. W., *Sibyls and Sibylline prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, ed. B. C. McGing (London, 1988)
- Parker, D.C., *Codex Sinaiticus. The Story of the World's Oldest Bible* (London, 2010)
- Parkes, J., *The Conflict of the Church and Synagogue, a study in the origin of antisemitism* (London, 1934)
- Pearson, Birger A., 'Pre-Valentinian Gnosticism in Alexandria' in *The future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. B. A. Pearson (Minneapolis, 1991), pp. 455-466
- Perkins, J., *The Suffering Self* (London, 1995)
- Pervo, Richard I., *Dating Acts: between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa Cal., 2006)
- Perczel, Istvan, 'The Earliest Syriac Reception of Dionysius,' in Coakley-Stang, pp. 27-41



- Piñero, Antonio and Jesús Peláez, *The Study of the New Testament* (Leiden, 2003)
- Pirenne, J., 'Les Empires du Proche – Orient et de la Méditerranée: Rapport de synthèse' in *Les Grands Empires* in *Charanis Studies, Essays in honour of Peter Charanis*, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou (New Brunswick, 1980)
- Porter, Stanley E. , 'Jesus and the use of Greek in Galilee', in Chilton-Evans, pp. 123-154
- Portier-Young, A., *Apocalypse against Empire, Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Michigan, 2011)
- Powell, Mark Allan , *Jesus As a Figure in History: How Modern Historians View the Man from Galilee* (Louisville, 1998)
- Prideaux H., *The Old and New Testament connected in the History of the Jews and Neighbouring Nations, from the Declension of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah to the Time of Christ*, 2 vols (London, 1717-1718)
- Pritz, R. A., *Nazarine Jewish Christianity from the End of the New Testament Period Until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century* (Jerusalem, 1988)
- Quispel, G., 'The Study of Encratism: a Historical Survey', in *La tradizione dell'enkrateia*, ed. U. Bianchi (Rome, 1985), pp. 35-81
- Rabello, A. M., *The Jews in the Roman Empire: Legal Problems from Herod to Justinian* (Aldershot, 2000)
- Räsänen, Heikki, *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of*, eds. Ismo Dunderberg, Christopher Tuckett and Kari Syreeni (Leiden, 2002)
- Rajak, Tessa, *Josephus, the historian and his society* (London, 2002)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Greeks and Barbarians in Josephus', in *Hellenism in the land of Israel*, eds. J. Collin and G. Sterling (Indiana, 2001), pp. 244-262
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Dying for the Law: The Martyr's Portrait' in *Portraits, Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire* eds. M. J. Edwards and S. Swain (Oxford, 1997), pp. 39-67
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Translation and Survival, The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford, 2009)

- \_\_\_\_\_, and S. Pearce et. al., eds, *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley, 2007)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Jewish Community and its boundaries' in *The Jews among Pagans and Christians*, eds., J. Lieu, J. North, T. Rajak (London, 1992), pp. 9-21
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome, Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Leiden, 2001)
- Rankin, Oliver S., *The Origins of the Festival of Hanukkah* (Edinburgh 1930)
- Rapp, C., 'Hellenic Identity, Romanitas and Christianity in Byzantium', in *Hellenisms: Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity*, ed. K. Zacharia (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 127-147
- Rappaport, Uriel, 'The Letter of Aristeas Again' in *JSP* 21.3 (London, 2012), pp. 285-303
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Hellenization of the Hasmoneans,' in Menahem Mor, ed., *Jewish Assimilation, Acculturation and Accommodation: Past Traditions, Current Issues and Future Prospects: Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization* (Lanham, 1992), pp. 1-13
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Who Were the Sicarii?,' in *The Jewish Revolt Against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Mladen Popovic (Leiden, 2011), pp. 323-342
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'How Anti-Roman Was the Galilee', in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (Harvard, 1992), pp. 95-102
- Rainbow, Paul A., 'The last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness' in *JJS* 48.1 (1997), pp. 30-52
- Reed, Jonathan L., 'Galileans, "Israelite Village Communities" and the Sayings Gospel Q,' in Eric. M. Meyers, ed., *Galilee Through the Centuries* (Winona Lake, 1999), pp. 87-108
- Reimarus, Hermann S., *Fragments*, ed. C. Talbert, trans. R. Fraser (London, 1971); 'The Real Intention of the Apostles,' in Craig A. Evans, ed., *The Historical Jesus: Critical Concepts in Religious Studies* (London, 2004), pp. 13-31

- Renan, E., *Vie de Jésus*, trans. William G. Hutchinson, *Renan's Life of Jesus* (London, 1897)
- Reynolds, J. and R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and God-Fearers at Aphrodisias* (Cambridge, 1987)
- Rhoads, David, *Israel in Revolution: 6-74 CE. A Political History Based on the Writings of Josephus* (Philadelphia, 1976)
- Richards, Randolph E., *Paul and the first-century letter writing: secretaries, composition and collection* (Downers Grove, 2004)
- Richardson, Peter, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (Cambridge, 1969)
- Richardson P., and D. Edwards, 'Jesus and Palestinian Social Protest: Archaeological and Literary Perspectives' in *Handbook of Early Christianity, Social Science Approaches*, eds A. Blasi, J. Duhaime, P. Turcotte (Walnut Creek, 2002), pp. 247-266
- Rickman G., *Modus Operandi, essays in honour of Geoffrey Rickman*, eds M. Austin, J. Harries, C. Smith (London, 1998)
- Riesner, Rainer, 'Pauline Chronology,' in Stephen Westerholm, *The Blackwell Companion to Paul* (Malden, MA, 2011), pp. 9-29
- Rius – Camps, J., *The four authentic letters of Ignatius, the martyr* (Roma, 1979)
- Rives, J. B., 'Christian expansion and Christian ideology' in *The spread of Christianity in the first four centuries, Essays in Explanation* ed. W. V. Harris (Leiden, 2005), pp. 15-41
- Roberts, J. J. M., 'The Old Testament's contribution to Messianic expectations' in *The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins. The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis, 1992), pp. 39-51
- Robertson, J. M., *Pagan Christs, studies in comparative Hierology* (London, 1911<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The historical Jesus* (London, 1916)
- Rocca, S., *The Forts of Judea* (Oxford, 2008)

- Roetzel, Calvin J., 'Paul in the second century,' in James D. G. Dunn, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to St Paul* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 227-241
- Royse, J. R., *The spurious texts of Philo of Alexandria: a study of textual transmission and corruption with indexes to the major collections of Greek fragments* (Leiden, 1991)
- Rubenson, S., 'Christian Asceticism and the Emergence of the Monastic Tradition' in *Asceticism*, eds V. L. Wimbush and R. Valantasis (Oxford, 1995), pp. 49-57
- Runciman, Steven, 'Byzantine and Hellene in the Fourteenth Century', in *Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου Ἀρμενοπούλου* (Thessalonikē, 1952), pp. 27-31
- Runia, D.T., *Philo and the Church Fathers: a Collection of Papers* (Leiden, 1995)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Assen, 1993)
- Safrai, Zeev, 'The Roman Army in the Galilee', pp. 103-114 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (New York, 1992)
- Saldarini, Anthony J., 'The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict,' in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* ed. Lee I. Levine (New York, 1992), pp. 23-38
- Salzman, M. R., 'Pagans and Christians' in *The Oxford handbook of Early Christian Studies*, eds S. Ashbrook Harvey and D. G. Hunter (Oxford, 2008), pp. 186-202
- Sanders, E. P., *E. P. Sanders: Redefining First-century Jewish and Christian Identities*, eds F. Udoh et al. (Indiana, 2008)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Jesus' Galilee' in *Räisänen*, pp. 3-41
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Jesus and the Temple', in *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research* eds James D. G. Dunn and Scot McKnight (Winona Lake, 2005), pp. 361-381
- Sanders, Jack T., *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants: The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations* (London 1993)
- Sandmel, S., *Philo of Alexandria, an introduction* (New York, 1979)
- Saradi, H., *Byzantium and the Origin of the Modern Greek National Consciousness* (Toronto, 1992)

- Shandruk, Walter, (University of Chicago), "Christ" and "Christians" are spelled in papyri, accessible online at <http://www.uc.edu/news/NR.aspx?id=12285> (last accessed on 22 December 2012)
- Schaff, Philip, *History of the Christian Church, Ante-Nicene Christianity*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1884)
- Schäfer Peter, *Judeophobia: Attitudes Towards the Jews in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1997)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton, 2007)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Jewish Jesus: how Judaism and Christianity shaped each other* (Princeton, 2012)
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome* (Tübingen, 2003)
- Schaflier, Samuel, *The Hasmoneans in Jewish Historiography* (Jerusalem(?), 1973)
- Schalit, Abraham, 'Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews' in *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4, (Leiden, 1965), pp. 163-188
- Schiffman L.H., E. Tov, J. VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: fifty years after their discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem, 2000)
- Schniedewind, William M., 'The Davidic Dynasty and Biblical Interpretation in Qumran Literature,' in Schiffman, *Dead*, pp. 82-91
- Schneemelcher, W. editor of E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. R. McL. Wilson, 2 vols (London, 1965)
- Schonfield, Hugh J., *According to the Hebrews* (London, 1937)
- Scholem, G. G., *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1965<sup>2</sup>)
- Schrötter, Jens, 'Jesus in Galilee,' in Charlesworth-Pokorny, pp. 36-55

- Schwartz, Daniel R., *2 Maccabees* (Berlin, 2008)
- Schwartz, S., *Imperialism and Jewish Society 200 BCE to 640 CE* (Princeton, 2001)
- Schweitzer, Albert, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen, 1913), trans W. Montgomery et al., *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London, 2000)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Paul and His interpreters: a critical history* (London, 1912)
- Scolnic, B. E., *Alcimus, enemy of the Maccabees* (Lanham, 2005)
- Setzer, Claudia, *Jewish Responses to Early Christians: History and Polemics, 30-150 CE* (Minneapolis, 1994)
- Sevenster, J. N., *Do you know Greek?*, trans J. de Bruin (Leiden, 1968)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The roots of Pagan anti-Semitism in the ancient world* (Leiden, 1975)
- Sharon, Nadav, 'Between Opposition to the Hasmoneans and Resistance to Rome: The *Psalms of Solomon* and the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *Reactions to Empire: Sacred Texts in their Socio-Political Contexts*, eds John A. Dunne and Dan Batovici (Tübingen, 2014), pp. 41-54
- Shepkaru, S., *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian World* (Cambridge, 2006)
- Schultz, Brian, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* (Leiden, 2009)
- Schürer, E., *The history of the Jewish People in the age of Jesus Christ, 175 BCE-AD 135, a new English version* revised and edited by Geza Vermes et al., 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1973-1987)
- Signiori, Gabriela, ed., *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective* (Leiden, 2012)
- Siker, J. S., 'Christianity in the second and third centuries' in *The Early Christian World*, ed. P. F. Esler, 2 vols (London, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 231-257
- Simon, M., *Verus Israel* (Paris, 1964), trans H. McKeating, *Verus Israel, a study of the relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire 135-425* (Oxford, 1986)

- Sirat, C., *Hebrew manuscripts of the Middle Ages*, ed. N. De Lange (Cambridge, 2002)
- Sivertsev, A., *Judaism and Imperial Ideology* (Cambridge, 2011)
- Skarsaune, O. and R. Hvalvik, eds, *The Early Centuries, Jewish Believers in Jesus* (Massachusetts, 2007)
- Smallwood E. M., *The Jews under Roman Rule, from Pompey to Diocletian* (Leiden, 1976)
- Smith, M. F., *Supplement to Diogenes of Oinoanda, the Epicurean Inscription* (Naples, 2003)
- Smith, Morton, 'On the wine God in Palestine' , in *Salo Wittmayer Baron Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem, 1975), pp. 815-829
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jesus the Magician* (San Francisco, 1978)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Zealots and Sicarii: their origin and relations' *HTR* 64 (1971), pp. 1-19
- Snaith, Norman H., *The Jews from Cyrus to Herod* (Wallington, 1949)
- Sokolof, D., *Manual of the Orthodox Church's Divine Services* (New York, 1899)
- Sokoloff, Michael, 'A new dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic', *Aramaic Studies* 1.1 (2000), pp. 67-107
- Sordi, Marta, *I cristiani el l'impero*, trans. A. Bedini, *The Christians and the Roman Empire* (London, 1986)
- Stanley Jones, F., *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity. Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71* (Atlanta, 1995)
- Stanton, G. N. and G. G. Stroumsa, eds. *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge, 1998)
- Stead, Christopher, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1994)
- Ste. Croix, G. de, 'Why were the Early Christians Persecuted' in *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy*, eds M. Whitby, J. Streeter (Oxford, 2006), pp. 105-152

- Stern, M., ed., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 2 vols (Jerusalem, 1974-1980)
- Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel, 'Whose Fast Is it?' in Becker-Reed, pp. 259-282
- Stoneman, R., 'Jewish Traditions on Alexander the Great,' in *Philonica* 6 (1994), pp. 37-53
- Strauss, David Friedrich, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, 3 vols (London, 1846)
- Streeter, Burnett H., *The Four Gospels: a Study of Origins* (London, 1924)
- Stroumsa, G. G., *Barbarian Philosophy, the religious revolution of Early Christianity* (Tübingen, 1999)
- Svorōnos, N.G., *Το ελληνικό έθνος, γένεση και διαμόρφωση του νέου ελληνισμού* (Athens, 2005)
- Sweeney, M. A., 'The religious world of ancient Israel to 586' *The Blackwell companion to Judaism*, eds J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck, (Oxford, 2000), pp. 20-36
- Sweet, J. P. M., 'The Zealots and Jesus', pp. 1-9 in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge, 1984)
- Swete, H. Barclay, *An introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, 1900)
- Thackeray, H. St. J., 'Septuagint,' part 2, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Michigan, 1915)
- Talbot, James, *The Jesus Dynasty* (London, 2006)
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, 'Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters,' in Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, Ernest S. Frerichs, eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge, 1987)
- Tarn, W. W., *Hellenistic Civilisation* (London, 1936)
- Taylor, J. E., *Christians and the Holy Places. The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins* (Oxford, 1993)



- \_\_\_\_, 'The phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity: reality or scholarly invention?' in *Vig. Chr.* 44 (1990), pp. 313-327
- Taylor, J., *Pythagoreans and the Essenes, Structural Parallels* (Paris, 2004)
- \_\_\_\_, 'The community of goods among the first Christians and among the Essenes,' in David Goodblatt et al., eds. *Historical perspectives from the Hasmonaeans to Bar Kochba in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 147-161
- Taylor, T., *The Theoretic Arithmetic of the Pythagoreans* (Dorset, 2006<sup>6</sup>)
- Tcherikover, V. A. and A. Funks, eds, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, 3 vols (Harvard, 1957-64)
- \_\_\_\_, 'The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas', in *HTR* 51.2 (April 1958), pp. 59-85
- Teicher, J. L., 'The Teaching of the pre-Pauline Church in the Dead Sea Scrolls' in *JJS* 4 (London, 1953), pp. 1-13
- Telfer, W., 'Was Hegesippus a Jew?' in *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 53 (Harvard, 1960), pp. 143-153
- Tenney, Merrill C., *New Testament Times* (London, 1965)
- Theissen, Gerd and Dagmar Winter, *Die Kriterienfrage in der Jesusforschung : Vom Differenzkriterium zum Plausibilitätskriterium* (Göttingen, 1997), trans M. E. Boring, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria* (Louisville, 2002)
- Thompson, James W., *The beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Washington, 1982)
- Thomas L. Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: The Quest for the Historical Abraham* (Harrisburg, Penn., 2002<sup>2</sup>)
- Timothy, Hamilton B., *The Early Christian Apologists and Greek Philosophy exemplified by Irenaeus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria* (Assen, 1973)
- Toland, J., *Nazarenus*, ed. J. Champion (Oxford, 1999)

- Tov, Emanuel 'The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Simmilar Evidence in Other Sources,' in Adrian Schenker, ed., *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 121-144
- Treblico, P., *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1991)
- Trevett, Christine, *A study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 29 (Lewiston, 1992)
- Trombley, Frank R., *Hellenic religion and Christianization c.370-529*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1:1993, 2:1994)
- Tropper, Amram, 'Tractate Avot and Early Christian Succession Lists', in *The Ways that Never Parted*, (Avot is a Mishnaic tractate), pp. 159-188
- Tyson, Joseph B., *Marcion and Luke-Acts: a defining struggle* (Columbia, 2006), pp. 1-23.
- Vasilikopoulou, Iōannidou, Agnē, 'Η Κλασική Παιδεία στο Βυζάντιο', in *Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 33 (2001), pp. 323-336
- Van der Heeren, A., 'Pentateuch', *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1912), vol. 8, pp. 722-723
- Van Den Hoek, A., *Clement of Alexandria and his use of Philo in the Stromateis* (Leiden, 1988)
- Van der Horst, P., *Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context, Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritism, Hellenism, and Christianity* (Mohr Siebeck, 2006)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Samaritans and Hellenism,' in *Philonica* 6 (1994) pp. 28-36
- Van Henten, Jan W., 'Royal Ideology, 1 and 2 Maccabees and Egypt' in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* eds T. Rajak, S. Pearce et al., (Berkeley, 2007), pp. 265-282
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Datierung und Herkunft des Vierten Makabäerbuches in J. W. Henten and H. J. de Jonge et al, eds, *Tradition and Reinterpretation in Jewish and*

- Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Jürgen C. H. Lebram* (Leiden, 1986), pp. 136-147
- VanderKam, James C., 'Hanukkah: its timing and significance according to 1 and 2 Maccabees' in *JSP* 1 (Sheffield, 1987), pp. 23-40
- Van Winden, J.C.M., ed. and trans., *An early Christian Philosopher, Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*, chs. 1-9 (Leiden, 1971)
- Venturini, K. H., *Natürliche Geschichte des grossen Propheten von Nazareth*, 3 vols (Bethlehem, 1800)
- Vermes, Geza, *Jesus and the world of Judaism* (London, 1983)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The authentic Gospel of Jesus* (London, 2003)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Searching for the Real Jesus* (London, 2009)
- \_\_\_\_\_, and M. Goodman, *The Essenes according to the Classical sources* (Sheffield, 1989)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London, 1997)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (London, 2000)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Christian Beginnings, from Nazareth to Nicea (30-325)* (London, 2012)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Scrolls, Scriptures and Early Christianity* (London, 2005)
- Voorst, Robert, *Jesus Outside the New Testament: An Introduction to the Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids, 2000)
- Walters, Patricia, 'The Synoptic Problem,' in Aune, *The Blackwell*, pp. 236-253
- Walzer, R., *Galen on Jews and Christians* (Oxford, 1949)
- Wallace – Hadrill, A., 'To be Roman, Go Greek: thoughts on Hellenization at Rome', in *Modus Operandi, essays in honour of Geoffrey Rickman*, eds M. Austin, J. Harries, C. Smith (London, 1998), pp. 79-91
- Walters, P., 'The Synoptic Problem', in Aune, *Blackwell*, pp. 236-253

- Webb, Robert L., 'John the Baptist and his relationship to Jesus,' in Chilton-Evans, pp. 179-229
- Weinrich, W. C., *Spirit and Martyrdom. A Study of the work of the Holy Spirit in contexts of Persecution and Martyrdom in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (Washington, 1981)
- Weitling, W., *Das Evangelium eines armen Sünders* (Bern, 1845), trans Dinah Livingston, *The poor sinner's gospel* (London, 1969)
- Welburn, A., *The Beginnings of Christianity, Essene mystery, Gnostic revelation and the Christian vision* (Edinburgh, 1991)
- Wells, George A., *The Acts of the Apostles - A historical record?* (London, 2000)
- Werner, Martin, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, trans. S.G.F. Brandon, *The Formation of Christian Dogma* (London, 1957)
- Whealey, A., *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times* (NY, 2003).
- Whitacre, R., *A Patristic Greek Reader* (Massachusetts, 2007)
- Witherington III, Ben, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Michigan, 2001)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Jesus Quest: The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth by* (Carlisle, 1995)
- Wilde, Robert, *The treatment of the Jews in Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries*, The Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies 81 (Washington, 1949)
- Wilken R. L., *The Christians as the Romans saw them* (Yale, 1984<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Myth of Christian Beginnings* (New York, 1971)
- Williams, Charles S. C., *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1985<sup>2</sup>)
- Williams, David S., '3 Maccabees: a defence of diaspora Judaism?' in *JSP* 13 (Sheffield, 1995), pp. 17-29
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Stylometric Authorship Studies in Flavius Josephus and Related Literature* (N.Y, 1992)

- Williams, Margaret H., *The Jews among the Greeks and the Romans* (John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1998)
- Williams, R., 'An Illustration of Historical Inquiry: Histories of Jesus and Matthew 1.1-25' in BDT, pp. 120-122
- Williams, S. and G. Friell, *Theodosios, The empire at Bay* (Yale, 1995)
- Williamson, G. A., *The World of Josephus* (London, 1964)
- Wilson, E. J. and G. A. Kiraz, eds, *The Old Syriac Gospels*, (Piscataway, NJ, 2003<sup>2</sup>)
- Wilson, Ian, *Jesus: the evidence* (London, 1985<sup>2</sup>)
- Wilson, R. McL, 'Gnostic Origins,' *Vig. Chr.* 9 (1955)
- Winslow, D., 'Religion and the Early Roman Empire,' in *The Catacombs and the Colosseum, the Roman empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity*, eds S. Benko and J. O' Rourke (Valley Forge, 1971), pp. 237-254
- Winston, D., 'Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden tensions in Philo's thought', in *Philonica* 2 (1990), pp. 1-19
- Wissowa, G., 'The historical development of Roman Religion: an overview,' in *Roman Religion*, ed. C. Ando (Edinburgh, 2003), pp. 330-357
- Wright III, Benjamin G., *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*, JSJ 131 (Leiden, 2008)
- Wright Knust, J., 'Early Christian Re-Writing and the History of the Pericope Adulterae,' in *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 14.4 (Baltimore, 2006), pp. 485-536
- Wright, W., *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* ( Amsterdam, 1968)
- Yadin, Yigael, *Bar-Kokhba: The rediscovery of the legendary hero of the last Jewish Revolt against Imperial Rome* (London, 1971)
- O. Barag and M. Herschowitz, *Masasa I, The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Reports* (Jerusalem, 1989)

- Yonah, M. A., *The Jews under Roman and Byzantine Rule, a political History of Palestine from the Bar Kohba War to the Arab Conquest* (Jerusalem, 1984)
- Young, Frances M., *The use of sacrificial ideas in Greek Christian writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom* (Cambridge Mass., 1979)
- Zeitlin, Solomon, *The Rise and Fall of the Judaeae State: A Political, Social and religious History of the Second Commonwealth, Vol. 1, 332-37 BCE* (Philadelphia, 1968<sup>2</sup>)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Essenes and Messianic expectations', in *Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism*, (NY, 1974), vol. 2, pp. 57-119