

Josephus on the Essenes (*War* 2:119-61):
Hippolytus, Porphyry and Eusebius

Joan E. Taylor

Since offering to present a paper in this workshop I have reflected on what ‘reception’ means: how might a work of literature be ‘received’? Perhaps because of my archaeological interests I am drawn particularly to the physical artefacts of ancient books: scrolls and codices. In visualising ‘reception’, it seems appropriate to visualise libraries - public or private.¹ ‘Publication’ in the ancient world was - as we know - often an initial public reading of a work written on a scroll or scrolls (later a codex or codices), after which the work was copied by scribes, either at the expense of the author or by others, and held in libraries, sold in the marketplace or purchased as a gift. It could thereafter be excerpted in compilations, or shortened, by the practice of creating ‘epitomes’. Such excerpts and epitomes circulated at the same time as the whole works, but they remain less favoured as resources for us, by both historians and scholars of classical literature, in terms of reconstructing the original texts. With citations of any author’s works, however, we cannot often know whether the citer was using the whole work or an excerpt, or someone else’s previous citation.

In terms of the publication of Josephus’ work, the picture is slightly complex. As Richard Laqueur once pointed out, Josephus was, from the start, quite a self-publicist and businessman in creating his own copies. In *Against Apion* he states (1:51): ‘I have first presented my work to the emperors and then sold it to many Romans and Judaeans who fought in the war ...’ people who have ‘likewise mastered Hellenic education’. In *Vita* (364-5) he includes Agrippa’s positive endorsements of his βύβλον, the singular here indicating the first scroll - a taster - after which he sent Agrippa the remainder. Josephus

¹ For this I draw upon Lionel Casson, *Libraries in the Ancient World* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2001).

himself had the scrolls of *War* copied, at great expense (*War* 1:16),² but Titus apparently affixed his signature to them and ordered official publication (*Vita* 363). Josephus was apparently contemplating a new edition of *War* after attacks on it by Justus (*Ant.* 20:267), and there remains a question about whether he did in fact complete this: Laqueur thought he may well have done so in part. As a self-publisher, Josephus was the producer of copies of his works, and modifications could be actioned easily.

In terms of *War*, one of the versions he created was in Aramaic (*War* 1:3), intended for the people of Babylonia, Parthia, and Arabia, and the Jewish Diaspora in Mesopotamia and Adiabene, where the ruling dynasty had converted to Judaism to deter them from revolt or war against Rome (*War* 3:108).³ The notion that we have one work, written definitively and not altered by the author unless a new edition is produced, is a concept we owe to the logistics of printing presses and the publishing industry. We actually have at least two and possibly three ‘editions’ of *War*: (i) the Aramaic edition; (ii) the first Greek edition; (iii) the revised (post-Justus) Greek edition. In between, given the industry of copying was part of Josephus’ own enterprise, small ‘updates’, corrections and alterations could well have been authorised by the author at any point.

What then of our manuscripts of Josephus? In terms of the original physical production, Josephus’ text of *War* originally existed as scrolls. As Heinz Schreckenberg has noted, these were then transcribed into codex form, probably by the first half of the third century, and at this point copyists’ changes took place to organise them into that format. *War* and *Antiquities* became one work titled Ἰουδαϊκὴ Ἱστορία - with the subtitle of περὶ ἀλώσεως, ‘concerning the capture’, given to *War*. There was a non-chronological arrangement, with *War* placed after *Antiquities* in Christian editions to emphasise the disaster that was divinely due to the Jews.⁴ But how early did variants of title or content occur? No matter how early we get, to pit one variant against the other in terms of originality assumes that there was one definitive work. It is precisely here that we falter when faced with *War*.

² Richard Laqueur, *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus: Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer Quellenkritischer Grundlage* (Giessen: Munchow’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920), 21-22. See also Josephus, *War I-III*, ed. H. St. J. Thackeray (Josephus II; Loeb Classical Library; London: Heinemann, 1956), xii.

³ Josephus, *War*, ed. Thackeray, ix.

⁴ Heinz Schreckenberg and Kurt Schubert, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1991), 63.

The manuscript tradition is then important to review.⁵ For many centuries, western scholars knew Josephus only from Latin manuscripts. A Greek text of Josephus did not appear until Arnoldus Arlenius published an edition in 1544, from which William Whiston based his translation in 1732. After various other editions, Benedikt Niese's Greek text of Josephus' works, published between 1885 and 1895,⁶ has become standard, and was used as the basis of Thackeray's text of the Loeb Classical Library, though with editorial interventions, but it has been long been recognised that a better critical edition of the Greek text is now required. Currently, the University of Münster is working through a new critical apparatus for the works of Josephus, though *War* is to be addressed sometime in the future.

The situation we have now is that Niese remains the standard Greek edition, even though Schreckenberg's monumental review of all the manuscripts of Josephus listed a number that Niese did not use for *War*: the rather frequent note of '*Nicht bei Niese*' is somewhat disturbing, though some of these manuscripts were considered by Thackeray for the Loeb edition.

For completeness, it will be noted that the earliest Greek manuscripts for *War* date from the 10th to 11th centuries:⁷

- P Codex Parisinus gr 1425
- A Codex Ambrosianus (Mediolanensis) D. 50 sup. = Gr. 234
- V Vaticanus gr. 148
- C Codex Urbinas gr. 84

The remainder of the important manuscripts date from the 11th to 12th centuries:

- M Codex Marcianus (Venetus) gr. 383
- L Codex Laurentianus plut. lxxix. cod. 19
- N Codex Laurentianus plut. lxxix. cod. 17
- T Codex Cheltenhamensis (Philippicus)
- R Codex Palatinus (Vaticanus) gr. 284 (R), to which one might add Lipsiensis gr 37 (783), from the 10th-11th centuries, copied from the same exemplar as R.

⁵ For a summary of the situation see Tommaso Leoni, 'The Text of Josephus' Works: An Overview,' *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 40 (2009), 149-84.

⁶ Josephus, *Flavii Josephi Opera*, ed. Benedikt Niese, 7 vols (Berlin: Weidmann, 1885-95). *War* (*Bellum Judaicum*) is in Volume 6 (Parts I and II, 1894).

⁷ See Josephus, *Bellum*, ed. Niese (6/I), v-xvii; for the full list of manuscripts now known see Heinz Schreckenberg, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 13-47.

Important Latin codices survive from a slightly earlier date, for example the Neapolitana Lat. VF34 or the Wissenburgensis 22 from the 9th century, Vaticanus lat. 1992 from the 10th century, Canonicianus lat. 148 - which is dated to the 12th century and exists in the Bodleian Library, Oxford - and Parisinus lat. 5049 from the 15th century. The original Latin version of *War* was ascribed by Cassiodorus (*Institutiones Divinarum Litterarum* 1:17:1) to either Jerome, Ambrose or Rufinus and has never been published in a critical edition. There are undoubtedly some rich discoveries to be made in this exercise. A Latin codex containing *Antiquities* and *War* from the first half of the 9th century (Berne, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 50, fol. 2r) has the earliest picture of Josephus⁸ with - interestingly - some Greek text reading Ἰωσὺππος ἱσθωριωγράφος – ‘Josephus the Historian’ – which indicates a certain relationship between Greek and Latin texts for this copyist (see Figure 1), and presumably for others also. This means a greater critical engagement between Latin and Greek manuscripts seems a very worthy project for the future.

Niese divided up the oldest and most important Greek manuscripts into two groups: P and A on the one hand and V and R on the other, with M, L and C in between though M and L tend towards P and A and C tends towards V and R, with P and A being judged superior. However, Thackeray noted how already the type considered inferior has readings that appear in Porphyry, in the third century, which means, as he states: ‘the diversity of readings must have begun very early. Indeed some variants appear to preserve corrections gradually incorporated by the author himself in later editions of his work.’⁹ He also notes that P and A, most used by Niese, must be traced to an exemplar in which word endings were abbreviated.¹⁰ But if the inferior version is that used by Porphyry in the third century, it is this that is attested first in terms of our evidence.

⁸ Guy Deutsch, ‘Un portrait de Josèphe dans un manuscrit occidental du IXe siècle,’ *Revue de l’art* 53 (1981), 53-5; id. *Iconographie: L’Illustration de Flavius Josèphe dans le temps de Jean Fouquet* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 63 (Fig. 4). Schreckenberg, *Historiography*, 86-8 (Pl. 1), argues against Deutsch’s identification of Josephus as being presented as a hairy and infernal barbarian comparable with an ancient Oriental god of doom, stating rather that Josephus is not dark-skinned but rather this is an impression due to the natural damage of the parchment. He also suggests that Josephus is wearing a kind of Phrygian cap, not Deutsch’s soldier’s helmet, with a caduceus (herald’s wand): he is therefore shown as a messenger with an emblem of office. It is hard to accept either analysis; Josephus seems more likely to be presented as a ‘typical Oriental’, in baggy trousers.

⁹ Josephus, *War*, ed. Thackeray, xxix.

¹⁰ Josephus, *War*, ed. Thackeray, xxx.

Furthermore, it has been noted by Schreckenberg that the text of *War* Eusebius used seem close the manuscripts LVRC, MLVRC, VRC or VR, the inferior manuscripts as determined by Niese.¹¹ Not only that, but it seemed to contain material we do not have in any extant version of Josephus, for example in *Hist. Eccles.* 1:7:13 it is stated that according to Josephus Herod burned the genealogies of Judaeian tribes so that his own undistinguished ancestry would also not be known; this piece of Josephus only turns up in the 10th-century *History of the World*, in Arabic, by the Syrian bishop Agapius, who also attributes the information to Josephus.¹² We will not even begin to consider the question of the Testimonium Flavianum here.¹³

Only one ancient papyrus fragment of Josephus has been discovered: Papyrus Vindobonensis 29810. Published by Hans Oellacher in 1939, it is a piece from a codex dated to the late 3rd century, containing *War* 2:576-9 (recto) and 582-4 (verso), a total of some 112 words whole or part, though these are not very legible (see Figures 2 and 3). The important thing about this small manuscript fragment is that it apparently shows no obvious similarities to either of the two main Greek text types of Josephus, PA or VRC, agreeing sometimes with one or sometimes with the other, actually more like the variables of the M and L manuscripts.¹⁴ Also, there seems to be some text in *War* 2:578 that is indicated here illegibly, not found in any extant manuscript, lying between the words ἑκατοντάρχαις and ἔπειτα.

While the study of such manuscripts is of course key to establishing the most accurate Greek text, we know that there are other resources that can be very important, resources that may be classified as being part of the ‘reception history’. These are the

¹¹ Schreckenberg, *Flavius-Josephus-Tradition*, 79-87, esp. 85, but see also his comments that the Josephus text used by Eusebius supports a positive evaluation of A, p.26. Leoni, ‘Text of Josephus,’ 154. Josephus, *Bellum*, ed. Niese (6/I), xlii-li: Niese considers VR ‘deterioris’.

¹² Louis Feldman, ‘Introduction’, in Louis Feldman and Gohei Hata (eds), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Tokyo: Yamamoto Shoten, 1987), 23-70, at p. 57. The edition of Agapius is that of Alexandre Vasiliev (ed. and transl.), *Kitab al-`Unvan: Historie universelle écrite par Agapius (Mahboub) de Mendibj*, 2/1, *Patrologia Orientalis* 7/4 (Paris: Frimin-Didot, 1911).

¹³ I will, however, recommend the exhaustive study by James Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians* (WUNT 251; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 199-248, which has an excellent bibliography on the subject (pp. 261-5).

¹⁴ Hans Oellacher, *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien, Neue Serie. Griechische Literarische Papyri II* (Baden bei Wien: R. M. Rohrer, 1939), 61-63; Schreckenberg, *Flavius-Josephus-Tradition*, 54-5.

ancient versions - translations into different languages - but also the ancient citations: the important quotations provided largely by patristic authors.¹⁵ When we add to this the point that Josephus himself may have revised his own work and had different editions copied, the issue of the standard text becomes even more complex. We will review these considerations in regard to *War* 2:119-61, a passage about the Essenes.

I would like to assume at the outset that there was not necessarily one text produced by Josephus, and - in addition - even if there were, the citations may themselves illustrate earlier textual forms that our extant Greek manuscripts of the 10th to 12th centuries, as does the little papyrus. I will consider the dating of the manuscripts we have for the citations, and ask this question: *how* did Hippolytus or Eusebius use Josephus' description of the Essenes, found in *War* 2:119-61? Where did they find this material? What manuscripts did they know?

The physical Josephus manuscript is then the main subject of this study, as I consider the passage and its arrival in the hands of later authors. This is something of a post-script. While I have written already on Hippolytus and Porphyry in my recent book, *The Essenes, the Scrolls and the Dead Sea*,¹⁶ I jumped over Eusebius. He is in fact generally jumped over, in regard to *War* 2:119-61, since at the point he excerpts Josephus he states that he is using Porphyry.¹⁷ Nevertheless, in this discussion I would like to take him out of the shadows, since his announcement of Porphyry is a curious thing given how much he uses Josephus' *War* elsewhere, particularly in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*. However, before progressing to Eusebius, it is important to go back almost a century to review Hippolytus again.

Hippolytus

Hippolytus of Rome wrote about Ἑσσηνοί in a work known either as the *Philosophoumena*, *Elenchus* or *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, 'Against All Heresies' (c.230 CE), apparently using *War* 2:119-61.¹⁸ Hippolytus' aim was to refute Christian heresies,

¹⁵ For citations through to the 5th century see Schreckenberg, *Flavius-Josephus-Tradition*, 68-89; Michael Hardwick, *Josephus as a Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989) and also of great help is the online resource established by Steve Mason on the PACE website, <http://pace.mcmaster.ca/york/york/index.htm>

¹⁶ Joan E. Taylor, *The Essenes, The Scrolls and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: OUP, 2012), 104-8.

¹⁷ Schreckenberg does not include *War* 2:119-61 in his list of Josephus citations.

¹⁸ Schreckenberg, *Flavius-Josephus-Tradition*, 72-3.

but he includes a short section on various Jewish groups (*Haer.* 9:13-29) in order to show how in both Greek philosophy and Judaism there was diversity, and one thing led to another; Christianity was no different from them in this regard (though in Christian circles the term ἁἱρέσεις contained an implication of heterodoxy).

The relevant passage on Essenes (*Haer.* 9:18-28) is contained only in a single manuscript, acquired in 1841 by Constantine Minoides Mynas. Parisinus suppl. gr. 464 was found in Mount Athos monastery, and it is dated to the 14th century. This manuscript is not in a good state; the text editor Miroslav Marcovich noted that it has ‘suffered from moisture, worms and other causes’.¹⁹ The ink is blurred on the rough side of the folios because the parchment is poor. This is a manuscript plagued by ‘huge textual gaps, countless word omissions, displacement of words and even entire clauses, intrusive marginal glosses, and above all many scribal errors,’ a situation which Marcovich considers to be the final product of a long process of transmission and progressive deterioration, lasting eleven centuries’.²⁰ It is a bad copy of a manuscript that was probably far from being easily legible, but this may mean that the scribe writing the manuscript of the 14th century was copying a very old manuscript that was itself not very readable.

The ‘variants’ need then to be understood in the light of the physical evidence. Notwithstanding this, Morton Smith and Matthew Black suggested that Hippolytus found another pre-Josephan work for his Essenes.²¹ While multiple sources have also been suggested by Roland Bergmeier,²² Christoph Burchard argued that the differences of content were actually Christianising interpolations, a view supported also by Steve Mason and Tessa Rajak.²³ Some have suggested that the description of the Essenes by Josephus

¹⁹ Hippolytus of Rome, *Hippolytus, Refutatio omnium haerisium*, ed. Miroslav Marcovich (Patristische Texte und Studien 25; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin and New York, 1986), 6. See also the text and translation in Geza Vermes and Martin Goodman, *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies/JSOT Press, 1989), 62-72.

²⁰ Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, ed. Marcovich, 6-7.

²¹ Morton Smith, ‘Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena’, *HUCA* 29 (1958), 273–313 and Matthew Black, ‘The Account of the Essenes in Hippolytus and Josephus,’ in William D. Davies and David Daube (eds), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 172-82..

²² Roland Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus: Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 66-107.

²³ Christoph Burchard, ‘Zur Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus Bericht über die Essener, *Bell.* 2, 119-161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Eusebius, Niketas Choniates und anderen’, in Otto Betz, Klaus K. Haacker, Martin Hengel (eds), *Josephus Studien: Untersuchungen zu*

was already reworked by a Christian author prior to Hippolytus.²⁴ Albert I. Baumgarten has suggested that Hippolytus' source was a recension of Josephus with some pro-Pharisaic material.²⁵ Questions then arise about how accurate Hippolytus was usually, with Catherine Osbourne stating that he was not,²⁶ and Marcovich considering - on the basis of the better preserved part of *Refutatio* - that he was. Marcovich himself summarises the more probable alternatives to account for Hippolytus' version: (1) Hippolytus used a Josephus manuscript that was different from the *textus receptus*; (2) in addition this manuscript was an *Interpretatio Christiana* of Josephus' *War*; (3) Hippolytus used a source supplementing Josephus, and (4) Hippolytus had his own rhetorical embellishments and heresiological refinements.²⁷ All these may have been at work simultaneously.

Hippolytus did know Josephus, because there is one other place where Hippolytus indicates that he has read him. In a fragment of Hippolytus, 'On Jeremiah and Ezekiel' the Bishop of Rome mentions the dimensions of the temple:

What were the dimensions, then, of the temple of Solomon? Its length was sixty cubits, and its breadth twenty. And it was not turned to the east, that the worshippers might not worship the rising sun, but the Lord of the sun. And let no one marvel if, when the Scripture gives the length at forty cubits, I have said sixty. For a little after it mentions the other twenty, in describing the holy of holies, which it also names Dabir. Thus the holy place was forty cubits, and the holy of holies (an)other twenty. And Josephus says that the temple had two storeys, and that the whole height was one hundred and twenty cubits. For so also the book of Chronicles indicates, saying, 'And Solomon began to build the house of God. In

Josephus dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Festschrift für Otto Michel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 77-96; id. 'Die Essener bei Hippolyt, REF. IX 18, 2-28, 2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119-161', *JSJ* 8 (1977), 1-41; Steve Mason, 'Josephus and the Authorship of *War* 2:119-161 (on the Essenes)', *JSJ* 25, 207-21; id. 'What Josephus Says about Essenes in his Judean War', in Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins (eds), *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2000), 434-67; Tessa Rajak, 'Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe Vide: Josephus and the Essenes', in Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers (eds), *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period. Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 141-60; reprinted in ead. *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome. Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 219-40.

²⁴ Hardwick, *Josephus*, 51-7; Solomon Zeitlin, 'The Account of the Essenes in Josephus and the *Philosophoumena*', *JQR* 29 (1958-59), 292-9, suggests the missing source is Hegesippus (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 4:22:7).

²⁵ Albert I. Baumgarten, 'Josephus and Hippolytus on the Pharisees,' *HUCA* 55 (1984), 1-25.

²⁶ Catherine Osbourne, *Rethinking Early Greek Philosophy: Hippolytus of Rome and the Presocratics* (London: Duckworth, 1987), 187-8, 213.

²⁷ Miroslav Marcovich, *Studies in Early Greco-Roman Religions and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1988) 144-54, at 145.

length its first measure was sixty cubits, and its breadth twenty cubits, and its height one hundred and twenty; and he overlaid it within with pure gold.’²⁸

Here Hippolytus refers to *Ant.* 8:65-66, where Josephus writes about the sanctuary of the first Temple having an upper storey and rooms on the side. It does not then seem unreasonable to suppose that Hippolytus did have books of Josephus to hand, even a volume that contained both *Antiquities* (first) and *War* together, in the library of the church of Rome.

If we want further corroboration that there was such a book for the use of Christians in Rome, we may turn to Hippolytus’ predecessor, Irenaeus, who quoted a passage from *Antiquities* 2:238-53 in a work that is known only from a fragment²⁹ According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 5:5) Irenaeus, though Bishop of Lyons, spent some time in Rome. We also that Hippolytus knew Irenaeus, and quoted him, though he also used Clement of Alexandria, who refers to *War* 6:435-7 and *Ant.* 8:61-4 and 7:389 in *Stromateis* 1:21,³⁰ so it is possible Hippolytus was quoting from previous quotes, but that there was a book containing *War* in the library of the church of Rome does seem quite likely.

At any rate, what we have in the Paris manuscript of Hippolytus is a text that has different vocabulary and Greek syntax to the *textus receptus* of Niese, though at times it has a few short flurries of exact replications. However, it is hard to see that Hippolytus is quoting, and indeed he never states that this is what he is doing. He does not even give Josephus as his source. Hippolytus reads as a paraphrase of Josephus, in the same way that an epitome is a shortened paraphrase of a work. Hippolytus appears to have a codex open that he is rewriting for his own work; but he is not ‘quoting’.

The most glaring anomaly in terms of the content of the *textus receptus* of Josephus comes with a passage on the Sicarii that appears at *War* 2:150, the passage which mentions four levels of Essenes. In Hippolytus these four levels become four distinct fractured parts of the Judaeian revolutionary movement, and we suddenly jump to followers of Judas the

²⁸ 2 Chron. 3 1, 3, 4. This quotes the translation of S. D. F. Salmond from Hippolytus, *Fragments from his Commentaries on Various Books of Scripture* (Ante-Nicene Fathers 5; Fathers of the Third Century, ed. Philip Schaff; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1868), 442.

²⁹ Frag. 33: PG 7.1245-48; Schreckenberg, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography*, 54.

³⁰ See for references Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, ed. Marcovich, 425-6; Hardwick, *Josephus*, 25-36, 156, 162.

Galilean. Thus Zealots and Sicarii are one type of *Essenes* (*Haer.* 9:26).³¹ To account for this, the codex form - with its potential for leaves falling out and being placed back out of order - is something always to be borne in mind.

Hippolytus reads the beginning of the sentence about the Essenes: Διήρηνται δὲ κατὰ χρόνον τῆς ἀσκήσεως εἰς μοίρας τέσσαρας (Niese), ‘They have been divided, according to the duration of (their) training, into four parts,’ which he paraphrases - according to the manuscript - as: Διήρηνται δὲ κατὰ χρόνον καὶ οὐχ ὁμοίως τὴν ἄσκήσιν φυλάττουσιν, εἰς τέσσαρα μέρη διαχωρισθέντες, ‘They have been divided over time and they do not preserve the same training, being separated into four parts (*Haer.* 9:26:1)’ He then skips to what appears to be a discussion of Judas the Galilean and his successors which would more appropriately follow *War* 2:118, where Judas is introduced, prompting his description of the Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees. Hippolytus then struggles to create four types of revolutionary from what is consistently indicative of the radical fundamentalism of the followers of Judas. We learn that some of them will not handle coins with an image on them, or go through a gate where statues are erected, considering it a violation of the law to pass beneath an image; they will kill Gentiles unless they convert to Judaism, and are called by some ‘Zealots’ and by others ‘sicarii’. They call no one ‘Lord’ but God, even if they are tortured or killed.

Having done this curious detour, Hippolytus returns to the very next word of *War* 2:150, picking up from where he left off. The Greek text of Niese continues: καὶ τοσοῦτον οἱ μεταγενέστεροι τῶν προγενεστέρων ἐλαττοῦνται, ὥστ’ εἰ ψάσειαν αὐτῶν, ἐκείνους ἀπολούεσθαι καθάπερ ἄλλοφύλῳ συμφυρέντας : ‘The juniors are treated as so much more inferior in relation to the seniors, so that, if they touch them, those (seniors) wash themselves as if they have touched a foreigner.’ Hippolytus then paraphrases this as: τοσοῦτον δὲ οἱ μετέπειτα ἐλάττους τῇ ἀσκήσει γεγέννηνται, ὥστε τοὺς τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἔθεσιν ἐμμένοντας μηδὲ προσψάσειν αὐτῶν ὧν εἰ ψάσαιεν, εὐθέως ἀπολούονται, ὡς τινος ἄλλοφύλου ψάσαντες, ‘Those coming later to the training are

³¹ Certain passages can jump about: importantly in the Vossianus gr. F 72 (Lugduno-Batavus, L.B. Voss, in Niese), from the half of the 15th century, the Testimonium Flavianum (*Ant.* 18: 63-64) appears after *War* 2: 167. It is interesting in fact that in this manuscript the Testimonium would find itself here, right after the description of the Judaeans ἀἱρέσεις. See for the meaning of this term, ‘The Nazoraeans as a ‘Sect’ in ‘Sectarian’ Judaism A Reconsideration of the Current View via the Narrative of Acts and the Meaning of *Hairesis*,’ in Sacha Stern (ed.), *Sects and Sectarianism in Jewish History* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 87-118.

treated as so much more inferior, so that the maintainers of the ancient customs are not to come into contact with them, so that if they touch, immediately (they have) to wash, as if touching some foreign person' (*Haer.* 9:29:3).

Hippolytus' page break therefore came after the word τέσσαρας in *War* 2:150, and another page was inserted in between this and the following word at the beginning of the next page. The inserted page contained something of what we would expect in terms of the subject matter on the followers of Judas. There is, in Hippolytus, also a longer, fuller description of both the Pharisees (23) and the Sadducees (24). All in all, what Hippolytus read seems to have been different to what we now have in Josephus, *War* 2, paraphrasing aside. Once the inserted page is put in the right place, Hippolytus becomes much more logical and reliable.

In terms of the actual subject matter, Hippolytus provides some substantive differences of information. For example, the Essenes πάσης τε ἐπιθυμίας ἔργον ἀποστρέφονται, ἀπεχθῶς καὶ πρὸς τὸ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀκοῦσαι ἔχοντες, 'turn away from every act of desire, having an aversion against even hearing such things' (*Haer.* 9:18:3), as an addition to *War* 2:120, and they κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον γυναίξιν πιστεύοντες, 'do not trust women in any way'. He condenses the mention of Essene avoidance of oil, but mentions that the Essenes consider it defiling to be anointed (*Haer.* 9:19:2; *War* 2:123). In their dress and deportment, it is 'decent' (κόσμιος), which replaces the image of Essenes being like a child under tuition (*Haer.* 9:20:2; *War* 2:126). During their dawn services they μηδὲν πρότερον φθεγξάμενοι εἰ μὴ τὸν θεὸν ὑμνήαωσι, 'they do not speak a word until they have praised God in a hymn', whereas Josephus has them pray toward the sun as if entreating it to rise (*Haer.* 9:21:1, cf. *War* 2:128-9). Their linen wrap is πρὸς τὸ καλύψασθαι τὴν αἰσχύνην, 'in order to conceal their private parts' (*Haer.* 9:21:2, addition to *War* 2:129). At the end of the pure meal their linen cloths are put ἐν τῇ προόδῳ, 'in the vestibule' (*Haer.* 9:21:4, addition to *War* 2:131). We are told: πρὸ δὲ πάντων ὀργῆς ἀπέχουσι καὶ θυμοῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν ὁμοίων, ἐπίβουλα ταῦτα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κρίνοντες: 'they abstain from all fury and anger, and all such, judging these things dangerous to humanity' (*Haer.* 9:22:1, addition to *War* 2:135). Regarding their expertise in the medicinal properties of plants and stones they have gained their knowledge from 'the law and prophets' rather than 'the ancient ones,' and φάσκοντες μὴ μάτην ταῦτα γεγονέναι, 'deeming that these things were not brought into being in vain' (*Haer.* 9:22:2, addition to *War* 2:136). An Essene swears not to injure anyone, hate a person who

injures him, or is hostile to him, but will pray for him and aid the righteous, as opposed to the Essenes hating the unrighteous (*Haer.* 9:23:3, cf. *War* 2:139). On the Sabbath, τινὲς δὲ οὐδὲ κλινιδίου χωρίζονται, ‘some would not even move from a couch’ (*Haer.* 9:25:3, cf. *War* 2:147). The ‘forbidden things’, ἀσυνήθων, Essenes must not eat (*War* 2:152) are εἰδωλόθυτον, ‘things offered to idols’ in *Haer.* 9:26:4, and there is no mention of Essenes being tortured by the Romans. The doctrine of the immortality of both the body and the soul is asserted and the soul on death rests in a ventilated, light place until final judgement (*Haer.* 9:27, cf. *War* 2:154-5).

Such differences of information are interesting, since we do not know whether Hippolytus is adding his own perspective or accurately reflecting the text he is reading. To what degree he Christianises is a critical question.³² In regard to the comment on the resting places of souls, it does not necessarily reflect Christian so much as Jewish eschatological belief. The notion that the souls of the wicked will be placed in a dark chamber, while the souls of the righteous will be somewhere light, awaiting resurrection, is found in Pseudo-Philo,³³ 4 Ezra (7:75-101),³⁴ and 2 Baruch 30.1-5.³⁵ The belief in the resurrection of the body and final judgement may then be not so much Christianising as correctly explanatory. At any rate, what point is there in Christianising the Essenes, for Hippolytus, when in fact he associates them with Judaeen revolutionaries? As Vermes and Goodman have stated: ‘he was in general concerned to discredit the sects he described, not to Christianise them.’³⁶

If we remember that the manuscript of Hippolytus was poorly preserved and defective, what may at first appear editing on the part of Hippolytus, or even another source, could simply be the result of an alternative early manuscript of *War* paraphrased by Hippolytus, with one obvious error of pagination.

³² See Taylor, *Essenes*, 106-7.

³³ *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 3: 10; F. J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 35.

³⁴ J. M. Myers, *I and II Esdras: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* 1st ed. (Anchor Bible 42; New York: Doubleday, 1974), 255.

³⁵ A. F. J. Klijn, 2 (*Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, a new Translation and Introduction* in ed. James Charlesworth *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha I* (New York: Doubleday, 1983). I am very grateful to my MA student Daniel Hayter for finding and writing about these passages in his dissertation at King’s College London in 2012.

³⁶ Vermes and Goodman, *Essenes*, 63.

Eusebius

Turning then to our second Christian source on Josephus' Essenes of *War 2* we jump forward to Eusebius and the beginning of the 4th century. The earliest manuscript for Eusebius is in Syriac and dates to the year 411, produced in Edessa.³⁷ However, most manuscripts of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* date from the Middle Ages, comparable with Josephus manuscripts.³⁸ As with Josephus, Eusebius' *Historia* clearly went through several editions, at least three, from the securing of rule by Constantine and Licinius in 313 and Constantine deposing Licinius in 325,³⁹ which gives us some parallel for what is proposed above also for Josephus. However, it is not *Historia* that is our concern here, in looking at the Essenes, but another work, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, where *War 2:119-61* is quoted not directly but via a citation from Porphyry's *De Abstinencia* 4:11:2-13:10.⁴⁰ The Neoplatonist philosopher wrote about the Essenes positively in his pro-vegetarian work, around the year 263.

The *Praeparatio Evangelica* is linked with another piece of writing, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, and the two together are designated as the *Apodeixis* - 'thesis'. This is an apologetic work, in which numerous quotations are used strategically to further Eusebius' rhetorical purposes, its composition dated sometime between c. 312-14 and c. 320-22. The *Praeparatio*, in 15 books, counters pagan accusations that Christians have abandoned ancestral religion for a barbarian innovation, while the *Demonstratio*, in 20 books, counters Jewish accusations that Christians have adopted their scriptures while rejecting Jewish laws and customs. Eusebius' faithfulness to the texts was designed to show his intellectual integrity, in the face of criticism that Christians embraced 'an illogical faith without inquiry' (*Praep.* 1:1:11). Thus, citations make up 71% of *Praeparatio*, not including

³⁷ W. Wright and N. McClean, *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphili, Bishop of Caesarea, Syriac Text, edited from the manuscripts in London and St. Petersburg, with a collation of the Ancient Armenian Version of Adalbert Merx and Variant Readings from other Versions* (Cambridge: University Press, 1898).

³⁸ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Kirsopp Lake (Loeb Classical Library; London: Heinemann, 1926), xxvii-xxx.

³⁹ R. W. Burgess, 'The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*,' *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1997), 471-504, but see T. D. Barnes, 'Eusebius of Caesarea,' *Expository Times* 120 (2009), 6.

⁴⁰ Critical editions: Porphyry, *Porphyrii Philosophi Platonici Opuscula Tria*, ed. Augustus Nauck (Leipzig: Teubner, 1860); Porphyry, *De l'Abstinence, Porphyre Livre IV*, ed. Michael Patillon and Alain Segonds (Paris: Société d'édition, Les Belles-Lettres, 1995).

introduction, summary and conclusion, and *Demonstratio* consists almost entirely of citations. Eusebius would counter-attack with a battalion of ‘authorities’, his technique now extensively studied in the work of Sabrina Inowlocki.⁴¹

The manuscripts for Eusebius’ *Praeparatio* are about the same date as those of *War*, with the 10th century Parisianus 451 (a) and Marcianus 353 (h), so we do not get a more ancient copy.⁴² Rather, there may be some clues here that indicate something about the codices of Josephus that Eusebius had to hand. In *Praeparatio* Eusebius uses Josephus’ works extensively, particularly *Against Apion*.⁴³ For example, *Apion* 1:146-154 is used in *Praep.* 9:40:3-11, where he notes that Berossus is cited there. *Apion* 1:215-18 is found in *Praep.* 9:40:3-11; 1:6-26 in *Praep.* 10:1-21; 1:73-75 in *Praep.* 10:13:1-2; 1:82-90 in *Praep.* 10:13:3-10; 1:103-104 in *Praep.* 10:13:11-12, and 2:163-228 in *Praep.* 8:8:1-55. However, the material of *Apion* 1:197-204 is as not referred to as coming from Josephus but is rather cited as coming from ‘Hecataeus of Abdera’ in *Praep.* 9:4:2-9; and *Apion* 1:172-174 as quoted as coming from Choerilus in *Praep.* 9:9:102. Likewise, *Apion* 1:176-181 is cited as coming from Clearchus in *Praep.* 9:5:1-7. Since Josephus was himself making use of previous sources these may simply be overlaps rather than citations of *Apion*, so there is no reason for Eusebius to credit Josephus as an intermediate source.⁴⁴ However, most likely he did use Josephus as a direct source and disguised the fact, as Inowlocki thinks, but he wanted to go to the Graeco-Roman sources rather than Josephus for his polemic at a particular point.⁴⁵ He reached through Josephus to the works Josephus cited.

This use of classical authors via Josephus indeed occurs in a bunch in the beginning of *Praeparatio* Book 9, arranged so as to show ‘how many Greek historians have mentioned by name both Jews and Hebrews, and the philosophy taught long ago and

⁴¹ Sabrina Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity Vol. 64; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006).

⁴² Eusebius, *Eusebius Werke VIII: Die Praeparatio Evangelica*, ed. Karl Mras, 2nd ed. (GCS 43.1: Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1982-3), xiii-xxvii.

⁴³ It is interesting too to see the pattern of Eusebius’ usage of Josephus, thanks to the work of Schreckenberg and Inowlocki. Eusebius in *Historia* uses *War*, rather than any other work of Josephus; in his other works he generally uses *Antiquities*, and does not cite *War*, except in the case of the *Theophania* and the *Chronicon*. There is only one citation of *War* (2:169) in *Dem. Evang.* 390:1, a passage he had already cited in the *Hist. Eccles.* 2:6:3 and *Chronicon* (Jerome, 175: 18-23).

⁴⁴ Inowlocki, *Eusebius*, 271-2.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 294, and see the analysis on pp.162-3.

practised among them, as well as the history of their ancestors from the earliest times' (*Praep.* 9:1). However, Eusebius introduces Porphyry as the prime example from recent times, not someone he reaches back to through Josephus. While Eusebius can cut and paste these former authors without acknowledging Josephus, Porphyry citing Josephus is in a different category. He should have reached back through Porphyry to Josephus.

Eusebius does this exactly with Theophrastus. just immediately before our passage: 'So now take and read the statements of Theophrastus contained in the writings of Porphyry, *On Abstinence from Animal Food*, as follows,' and Eusebius duly quotes Theophrastus via Porphyry (9:2). However, Porphyry's quotation we recognise as coming from Josephus is introduced simply as: Καὶ ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ δὲ αὐτῆς ὑποθέσεως τοιαῦτα περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἱστορεῖ ὁ Πορφύριος: 'And in the fourth book of the same treatise Porphyry recounts concerning the same people these things' (*Praep.* 9:3:1), and there follows what we recognise as *War* 2:119-59 on the Essenes. Interestingly, 'the same people' refers back to the 'Jews and Hebrews' that are the subject of Book 9, so that Essenes are representative of Israel. Importantly, Eusebius closes the quoted passage from Porphyry by stating (*Praep.* 9:3:22):

Ταῦτα μὲν Πορφύριος, ἐκ παλαιῶν, ὡς εἰκός, ἀναγνωσμάτων, τῇ τῶν δηλουμένων ἀνδρῶν εὐσεβείᾳ τε ὁμοῦ καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ συγγράμματι τῶν σπουδασθέντων αὐτῷ Πεπὶ τῆς τῶν ἐμψύχων ἀποχῆς ἐμαρτύρησεν

After reading these things from ancient authors, as is probable, Porphyry testified both to the piety of the aforesaid men and likewise the(ir) philosophy, in the fourth treatise of his careful work *On Abstinence from Animal Food*.

It seems extraordinary that Eusebius here does not attest that Porphyry has used Josephus, which would have amply demonstrated how much Porphyry himself valued the testimony of the ancient Jewish author: the very one so much employed by Eusebius. It could have acted as an endorsement of Eusebius' quotations of Josephus overall. The omission has been explained on the basis of authority: when Eusebius cites Clement for Clearchus in *Praep.* 9:6:6-8 Inowlocki notes that he does not state that Clement is citing

Aristobulus, because Clement outshines Aristobulus.⁴⁶ Yet still it is a case of reaching back to Clearchus.

Why avoid Josephus? As noted above, in *Praeparatio* Book 9 Eusebius cites Josephus directly, from both *Against Apion* and *Antiquities*, and credits him quite frequently (9:10, 11, 13, 16 x2, 20, 40, 42 x2). In *Praep.* 9:20:3 he states that Josephus used Alexander Polyhistor who cites Cleodemus Malchus (*Ant.* 1:239-41). As Inowlocki states, ‘Josephus appears as the authority par excellence on questions of biblical history and on Greek knowledge of his own people’.⁴⁷ The missing Josephus here is then very odd.

Furthermore, while we might excuse Eusebius for not mentioning Josephus explicitly, to avoid mentioning him by feigning ignorance would not be consistent with what Eusebius otherwise does: he states that Porphyry is probably using some ancient author. Surely, given Eusebius’ use of Josephus’ *War* in *Historia* - the first edition being completed by the time of the writing of *Praeparatio* - he knew the passage on the Essenes, if it was actually in the manuscript he had. He quotes the very sentences on Judas the Galilean that immediately precede the passage on the Essenes (*War* 2:118) in *Hist. Eccles.* 1:5:3.

What then did Eusebius read in Porphyry? Did he state that it derived from ‘ancient authors’, as Eusebius thinks likely?

Not at all. In Porphyry the passage is explicitly ascribed to Josephus. In *de Abstinencia* 4 Porphyry states that there were three types of philosophers among the Jews before the destruction of the temple and the city of Jerusalem: the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes, the third *politeuma* being written about by Josephus in many of his writings: ‘the second book of the Jewish history, which he completed in seven books (= *War*), and in the eighteenth book of *Antiquities*, which consists of twenty books, and in the second of the books Josephus wrote “against the Greeks”, they are two books.’

Why did Eusebius deliberately avoid mentioning that Porphyry credited this passage to Josephus? The usual explanation is that for Eusebius to admit that a famous Greek philosopher derived his information about the Essenes from Josephus would have undermined Eusebius’ own demonstration.⁴⁸ The omission turned an arch-enemy of Christianity into an admirer of the Christians’ ancestors, according to Inowlocki.⁴⁹ Given

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 294.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 174.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 272.

the positive way that Josephus is otherwise cited, and given how the value of Josephus as a representative of Judaism could have been increased by such a citation, this does not seem convincing to me. To state that Porphyry wrote what he did *probably* on the basis of reading ancient texts, is more than an omission; it is a misrepresentation of what Porphyry wrote, and Porphyry's text would have been widely available for consultation.

Eusebius wrote his *Praeparatio* to those who are defined as new converts from 'the nations' (*Praep.* 1:1:12), though Inowlocki notes that he may have had in mind 'sympathetic pagans who were curious about Christianity' too.⁵⁰ Overall, Eusebius was otherwise very pleased to cite Josephus and Philo of Alexandria authoritatively, as also throughout the *Historia* (with detailed comment in *Hist.* 2:18; 3:9-10), so it seems strange for Eusebius to cite Porphyry without even a mention that the original text was found in Josephus, a witness to the Essenes in the first century. Eusebius was a good historian who looked to the oldest citations of evidence, throughout his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

It is possible, of course, that Eusebius had a bad copy of Porphyry that did not credit Josephus. However, it is we who have the bad manuscript tradition of Porphyry, as noted in the edition of Porphyry by Nauck. Eusebius clearly had a better version. The manuscripts for *de Abstinencia* derive from the 14th century, mostly following the text evidenced in Codex Vaticanus gr. 325 (V), though some follow a lost family tree designated by the sigla Ψ.⁵¹

The text of Porphyry, as we have it in Eusebius, is very good. Porphyry gives a fairly accurate rendering of Josephus, *War* 2:118-61, as established by Niese,⁵² without any major interpolations. There are some small modifications of word order and language, which may represent a slightly different manuscript version of Josephus. For example the food of the Essenes was ἁγνῆς οὔσης καὶ καθαρᾶς, 'sacred and pure' (*Abstin.* 4:12, addition to *War* 2:131). Porphyry also misses pieces out, with the longest omission being the section *War* 2:134-6, a section that does not neatly follow 2:133, so that in Porphyry the passage continues with 2:137. Porphyry also links the abstention from defecating on the Sabbath, illustrating Essenes' great power of endurance, with their endurance of torture by

⁵⁰ *Dem. Evang.* 1, pr. 8-9, Inowlocki, *Eusebius*, 16.

⁵¹ Porphyry, ed. Nauck, viii--xiv.

⁵² Burchard, 'Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus,' 77-96; Patillon, and Segonds, *Porphyrie*, 18-23.

the Romans (*Abstin.* 4:13, cf. *War* 2:147, 152). The frugality and toughness of their regime, a theme dear to Porphyry (*Abstin.* 1:45, 47; 4:2),⁵³ gave them extraordinary strength.

For Eusebius not to recognise this text as being in Josephus' *War* would be very strange. To read Porphyry as crediting Josephus, only to dismiss this with a reference to other 'ancient authors, as is probable' is also strange. If we look closely at what Porphyry states, the passage follows Porphyry's mention of the second book of a work 'against the Greeks'. Porphyry has explicitly said that Josephus wrote about the Essenes, but he has not explicitly said 'this is a passage from *War*', or 'this is what Josephus states'. The reference to the work 'against the Greeks' should really be a reference to *Against Apion*, but no description of the Essenes is found in any manuscripts of this two-book work, and Josephus is not otherwise known to have written a work with the title, 'To the Greeks'. Philo of Alexandria's *Hypothetica*, however, is a work we know of from Eusebius himself, who quotes it in *Praep.* 8:11:14-17, just before his mention of Porphyry and the Essenes.

Porphyry may have wrongly ascribed Philo's *Hypothetica* to Josephus, meaning that *Against Apion* is not referred to by Porphyry at all. Like *Apion*, this *Apologia* was also a two-part work, and contained a passage on the Essenes (i.e. *Hypoth.* 11:1-13). It was referred to by Eusebius as 'Apologia on Behalf of the Jews' (*Praep.* 8:10:19), and was clearly directed against the Greeks. It may be that Eusebius, reading Porphyry with *Against Apion* at hand, his main Josephus text for *Praeparatio*, looked in vain for any such extensive citation about the Essenes there. Eusebius, however, would also have recognised it as not being the passage he knew from Philo. He might have done his homework and checked if the passage was in any other of the works of Josephus, given what Porphyry states. But his search was negative. He did not ascribe it to Josephus in *Praeparatio*, and dismissed it with a reference to Porphyry *probably* finding it in ancient sources.

Given the flow of *Praeparatio*, where the quotation from Porphyry about the Essenes follows quite closely after the Essenes have been mentioned in Book 8, the missing citation of Josephus is very striking. In the Preface to this book, Eusebius states that he will use 'the words of the very authors who have been approved among the Jews for their hereditary learning: for I think it is proper for me to present the testimonies on which my proofs rest.' He therefore has no problem citing both Philo and Josephus, together, side by side. He provides a citation of Philo in terms of an account of government (*Praep.* 8:6-7) and then he goes to Josephus (8:8) who writes similarly, then to 'Eleazar', the purported

⁵³ Porphyry, *l'Abstinence*, ed. Patillon and Segonds, xxxii.

author of the Letter to Aristeas (8:9), before returning to Philo and Josephus, and stating one of his key themes, that there was a type of Jewish philosopher who interpreted the Mosaic laws allegorically, for ‘contemplation of things signified in the meaning of the laws’, and:

this was the category of Jewish philosophers at whose strict course of life thousands even of foreigners were struck with admiration, while the most distinguished of their own countrymen, Josephus and Philo and many others deemed them worthy of everlasting remembrance. But passing by most of these statements, I will be content at present, just merely for the sake of an example, with the testimony of Philo concerning the said persons which he has set down in many places of his own memoirs, and of these take and read the following from his *Apologia* for the Jews.

As noted, Eusebius then quotes the lost treatise of Philo, the *Hypothetica*, on the subject of the Essenes, from *Praep.* 8:11:1 to 18. He goes on to quote from Philo’s work *Quod omnis Probus Liber sit* in 8:12:1-14. Eusebius lets these passages suffice for examples, but he clearly knows Josephus’ references to the Essenes. It would have been so easy, after this extensive double quotation from Philo in Book 8, for him to state that Porphyry used Josephus as a resource, as just mentioned. What appears in Book 8 shows categorically that Eusebius knew numerous places that Josephus praised the Essenes; that he failed to recognise Porphyry’s passage as one of these is very telling.

Josephus

Finally, having looked at the reception of Josephus in Hippolytus and Eusebius, it may now be possible to make some observations on the text of Josephus as we have it in our existing manuscripts of *War*. One of the things that is immediately obvious about this passage is that it is a very long description, when the comments on the Pharisees and Sadducees are quite brief. A similar description of the three *haireseis* in *Ant.* 18:11-22 has a balanced appraisal of each school with each piece of similar length. Furthermore, a detailed discussion of the Essenes is in some ways uncalled for in the flow of the text. There is a focus on the reign of Archelaus and the mention of Simon, a certain Essene, who interprets Archelaus’ dream and his removal from power in 6 CE, and then a description of his wife Glaphyra’s prophetic dream (*War* 2:111-17). Josephus then mentions the revolt by Judas the Galilean (*War* 2:118), who became a ‘sophist’ of his own school not like the others’,

after which follows the description of the others, but nothing really prepares us for this long aside on how wonderful the Essenes are in every way.

From *War* 2:120 to 161 we get a detailed description of the Essenes, but - in comparison - when it comes to the Pharisees, they are dealt with in a few lines (162-3) and the Sadducees likewise (164-65) with a focus entirely on their differing attitudes to Fate and the future of the soul and body. Josephus writes that the Pharisees attribute everything to Fate and to God, and assert that to act rightly rests with humanity, but Fate co-operates with human action, every soul is immortal, they believe that the body is perishable, but the soul of the good pass into another body, while the souls of the wicked will be punished. The Sadducees remove Fate, and do not accept that God is involved in any evil, human beings have free choice, without accepting immortality of the soul, rewards or punishments. The Pharisees are loving to each other and have good relationships with the community, the Sadducees are rude (166).

This concentration on Fate, and rewards and punishments should follow on from mention of Judas the Galilean, who incited the people to revolt, as there should be only one ruler: God. Rather than stating that the school of Judas has ‘nothing in common with the others’, we should actually have what is stated in *Ant.* 18:23 that the followers of Judas held the same judgements as the Pharisees, except they had an unquenchable yearning for liberty. A quick resumé of the others should follow. If this is what Eusebius had in his edition of *War*, he would not have found Porphyry’s Essenes. He would have found a shorter description matching the existing short descriptions we have for the Pharisees and Sadducees. Since this was not what matched with Porphyry, he would not have ascribed Porphyry’s citation to Josephus.

There is some slight evidence of an interruption indicative of an addition in the text of *War* as we have it. Porphyry begins his quotation of Josephus with the words: εἰςὶ τοίνυν οἱ Ἑσσαῖοι Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν το γένος, φιλάλληλοι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πλέον, ‘the Essenes then are Jews (according to) the category/race, and more loving than the others’. This is actually not quite what we have in Niese, where we have in *War* 2:119: Ἑσσηνοὶ καλοῦνται, Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν γένος ὄντες, φιλάλληλοι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πλέον. ‘They are called Essenes, being Jews [as] a category/race, and more loving than the others. Porphyry’s expression reads as less awkward than that of Niese’s Josephus. The word for ‘Judaean’ is curiously repeated. If the original break was at the word Ἑσσηνοὶ

(and note Porphyry's Ἐσσηῖοι) it might account for this repetition and the slight awkwardness of the Greek phrasing here.

It seems a possibility then that Josephus' passage on the Essenes from the longer discussion of the schools of Judaism - as quoted by Porphyry - has been inserted here into the short version of the schools in the edition of Josephus that has become the standard text. Hippolytus appears to give us a paraphrase of this longer, less paganised, edition of Josephus, with longer sections on the followers of Judas, Pharisees and Sadducees, but his page out of order has confused the evidence. Ironically, in both Hippolytus and Eusebius, we have in fact a passage of Josephus we find in all the manuscripts of *War* 2:119-61, on the Essenes, and yet in neither case is it credited to Josephus. It is Porphyry who gives the correct source,⁵⁴ but his Josephus manuscript was not the same as that of Eusebius.

In conclusion, this survey of the reception of Josephus in early Christian texts has proven to be more than a simple tracing of the *Nachleben*. In considering the physical artefact of the codex, as used by both Hippolytus and Eusebius, questions are raised about the range of manuscripts of Josephus' *War* available in antiquity, given the possibility of two Greek editions, and an Aramaic version, and even multiple revisions. It is suggested that there is a good reason for Eusebius using Porphyry in *Praeparatio*, and not crediting Josephus as the author: his manuscript of Josephus did not contain this passage on the Essenes in the same form as Porphyry's. Either the codex he consulted in the library in Caesarea was defective or shortened, or else he was using an edition of Josephus that did not contain the passage in question. Hippolytus, on the other hand, had a version of Josephus in the library of the church of Rome that had longer passages on the 'Galileans', Pharisees and Sadducees, with some variants (in relation to the Josephus edition used by Porphyry) in regard to the Essenes also, variants that are less paganising than the textus receptus. In these instances of reception we have fragments of a complex early manuscript tradition now lost to us that is otherwise hinted at only by a single fragment of papyrus.

⁵⁴ The many Josephan features of theme and vocabulary make it highly unlikely to be an interpolation from some other Hellenistic Jewish author.

