



PROJECT MUSE®

Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy
from Late Antiquity to Modern Times (review)

Stuart Robertson

Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies, Volume 24,
Number 3, Spring 2006, pp. 181-184 (Review)

Published by Purdue University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/sho.2006.0072>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/197156>

and monographs by scholars such as Mark Jurgensmeyer, David Little, S. R. Appleby, and Roger D. Peterson. The reader longs for a deeper analytical and interpretive framework that sheds further light on these important ancient interpretations of biblical war texts. Fields of religious ethics, psychology, anthropology, and sociology have much to contribute. Professor Feldman resists taking risks. For example, he might have explored whether Pseudo-Philo's attitudes to warring behavior, so carefully described, provide hints to the background and provenance of this difficult-to-date-and-identify author. On the other hand, Professor Feldman has provided all the necessary primary material with consummate erudition and thoroughness, thereby inviting others to further analysis and exploration.

Susan Niditch
Department of Religion
Amherst College



Josephus on Jesus: The *Testimonium Flavianum* Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times, by Alice Whealey. *Studies in Biblical Literature* 36. New York: Peter Lang, 2003. 231 pages. \$65.95.

The passage in Josephus' extensive bequest to posterity most discussed today is one not everybody is sure he wrote. The *Testimonium Flavianum*, Josephus' comment on Jesus Christ, was apparently not of great interest in the first two centuries. This may be because it wasn't available. But interest in this questionable passage since the Protestant Reformation has more than made up for the early lack of it. Alice Whealey's last comment in this book is, "... after four hundred years the question of the *Testimonium Flavianum*'s authenticity has still not been settled" (p. 195).

It appears that Whealey shares the view of Louis Feldman, whose influence is strong in her study, that some form of the received text is authentic, though not that Josephus wrote, "He was the Christ." (I will refer to the passage in question as TF.)

Josephus wrote under the patronage of the Flavian dynasty of Roman emperors, and apparently all that he wrote was stored in the imperial library in Rome. Christians handed on Josephus' works through the centuries after this library perished, probably at the time the barbarians sacked the city in the early fifth century CE.

A question Whealey doesn't address that is pertinent to the matter of the early Christian use of Josephus is how Christians would have had access to the imperial library before Emperor Constantine lifted the ban on Christian-

ity. The received text is first quoted outside of *Antiquities* 18 in the writings of Eusebius, who wrote after Christianity was a legal religion. Constantine was Eusebius' patron, so he would have granted him access to the imperial library. But was this library moved to Constantinople when Constantine established his headquarters at the eastern capital? How did Origen (185–254 CE) know of Josephus' works, living in Alexandria in a time when Christianity was an illegal religion? This question surely bears on the matter of why Christians before Eusebius didn't make more use of Josephus.

Josephus on Jesus is divided into five chapters. In the first two chapters the author asks what sort of writers cited TF and why? She is very interested in detecting the motives of those who used TF. The last three chapters explore in detail later moments in the controversy, beginning with the sixteenth century and ending with the modern author Shlomo Pines' discussion of the medieval Arabic translation of Agapius of Hierapolis, which he takes to be an authentic citation of TF.

I pass over the author's discussion of the early history of the argument that has been adequately presented elsewhere, as in Steve Mason's *Josephus and the New Testament* (which Whealey does not mention), etc. It is the discussion of the periods after the Reformation that are the contribution of particular interest here. Whereas the major participants in the controversy are often mentioned in summary form elsewhere, Whealey provides details from lesser-known writers, some of whom may constitute the chief interest in this book for many. Where else can one find such intriguing detail brought together in a small, albeit not inexpensive book (\$66)?

For example, the author traces the discussion prompted by the late sixteenth-century legal scholar, Hubert Giphanius, who argued that TF is spurious (pp. 77ff). What Giphanius actually wrote does not survive. Did he actually write what is attributed to him? A report of what he wrote is found in an extract of a letter by Sebastian Lepusculus, a contemporary Greek and Hebrew professor at Basel. One senses the delight in Whealey, the sleuth, as she pursues the question of what Giphanius wrote from the conflicting reports of what he said in the paper trail that followed. Here is a story within a story, as discussion of a disputed passage in Josephus is traced through a disputed passage in Giphanius!

Whealey probes Christopher Arnold's collection of thirty letters (1661) mostly having to do with TF (pp. 123ff). Whereas in scholarly discussions of Josephus' famed remark, Arnold's name often appears, Whealey digs into the contents of several of the letters in Arnold's collection.

For example she tells of Tanaquilus Faber, a former Catholic who was a Reformed professor of philology at the Académie of Saumur, a French Calvin-

ist think-tank. How did Faber's name get drawn into the controversy? Because letters he wrote to friends came to the attention of the royal historiographer of King Louis XIII, Henricus Valesius. Faber believed no Jewish writer would offer such laudatory remarks about Jesus. Furthermore, TF doesn't fit into the context of this section of *Antiquities* 18 (pp. 129 ff). The process by which Faber's opinions came to light may be more interesting than his opinions.

Whealey presents the counter-arguments of Petrus Dielus Huetius, a seventeenth-century Catholic bishop who was something of a Renaissance man and apologist for Christianity, and of Carolus Daubuz, a Huguenot pastor who prepared a concordance of words Josephus used in the disputed passage and words found in undisputed parts of his works. Such is the kind of detail that Whealey offers.

The author is interested to see the motivation of those who drew on Josephus' statement about Jesus. Confessional interests collided with philological concerns. For example, early Christians who believed in the perpetual virginity of Mary found it difficult to accept Josephus' description of James as the brother of Jesus. What Josephus indisputably wrote about James is pertinent to the disputed passage about Jesus. Discovering the motive of those who write of the motives of others is a subjective aspect of writing history.

In her discussion of the early modern scholarship on TF, Whealey shows that skepticism was sometimes due to the spirit of criticism of ancient sources that led to the discovery of fraudulent documents such as the Donation of Constantine. Some of the skepticism also derived from questions about the existence of Jesus since the Enlightenment.

But skepticism also was due to confusion between *Josippon* and Josephus' *Antiquities*. *Josippon* was a tenth-century Hebrew translation of a synthesis of the first sixteen books of Josephus' *Antiquities*, excerpts from Pseudo-Hegesippus' *De excidio Hierosolymitano*, and parts of the Apocrypha (p. 58). Whealey's dissecting of the role of *Josippon* in the discussion of TF seems at times to lose sight of the fact that the TF is found in *Antiquities* Book 18, whereas *Josippon* draws only upon the first sixteen books of the *Antiquities*.

The author observes that the nineteenth-century Jewish Austrian historian, Robert Eisler, showed that a hostile remark about Jesus appears in one version of *Josippon*, and argued that remarks about Jesus were erased from other versions. But it is not clear to this reviewer how *Josippon* contributes to the discussion of TF. In this section of her book she might have benefited from Louis Feldman's remarks on *Josippon* in "Flavius Josephus Revisted," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (1984).

Whealey's contribution to the discussion of TF is valuable and very interesting. It would be interesting to patient readers who are not scholars. The au-

thor includes in a small book not only a lot of information, but very thoughtful discussion about it. There are a few places where the editors didn't proofread carefully, and it is odd that she should not mention some contemporary scholars. Clearly the author's interest was in the warp and woof of the discussion through the ages rather than trying to be encyclopedic in mentioning every contemporary scholar. But her attention to details of the discussion that few of us know about offers a significant contribution to the intriguing questions hovering around Josephus' *testimonium* to Jesus Christ.

Stuart Robertson

Department of Foreign Languages
& Literatures

Purdue University



Amos in Song and Book Culture, by Joyce Rilett Wood. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*, vol. 337. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002. 256 pp. \$80.00.

This monograph, based on the author's 1993 Toronto School of Theology dissertation, presents a new interpretation of the book of Amos. Distinguishing two editions of the book, Wood regards each as "a complete literary composition by a different author" (p. 11). The first is a cycle of seven poems featuring a coherent narrative sequence composed by Amos himself, while the second relates to the first as commentary to a text.

In the Introduction, Wood claims that while the book's literary inconsistencies rule out the notion of single authorship, complex redaction-critical analyses also fail because of the lack of objective criteria for assigning material to different historical strata. Thus rejecting the assumption of multiple editorial levels, Wood maintains that the notion of a single exilic editor "who preserved Amos's prophetic text but thoroughly rewrote it and converted it into a book with ten parts" suffices to resolve the book's literary problems (p. 15).

Chapter 1 investigates Amos's "written prophecy," which is understood as a continuous poetic text of seven poems, in which subsequent poems develop the thoughts of previous ones. Wood's identification of these poems is based largely on the distinction by previous scholarship between the prophet's original words and subsequent redactional additions. Occasionally, however, she departs from the received wisdom, as for instance in the case of 6:1 where Zion is taken to be authentic.

The second chapter on "Writing and Editing in Amos" looks for traces of intrusion, which suggest the presence of a second stage of literary composi-